3 1761 02090591 5

Papers of the Canadian Society of Church History

1975

BR
140
C.36
1975

Introductory Statement

The Canadian Society of Church History presents herewith a selection of papers delivered at its meeting held in June, 1975, at the University of Alberta. This reproduction of the papers is essentially for the convenience of members of the Society, although a limited number of copies are available to interested persons and institutions. Distribution in this form does not preclude publication of these papers elsewhere, and copyright remains the property of the authors.

No volume of the 1974 papers, from the meeting at the University of Toronto, was produced because most of those papers were published elsewhere. The address by A. L. Farris ("Mark Young Stark:Pioneer Missionary Statesman") appeared in *Scottish Tradition* III/IV, no. 2/1. "Donald Gee: Sectarian in Search of a Church" by Brian Ross will be published in *Evangelical Quarterly* (Great Britain). *Church History* has accepted Ogbu Kalu's paper on Jacobean bishops, and Jonathan Pearl's paper, "Folklore and Witchcraft in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe" will appear in *Studies in Religion*. Because the presidential address by Timothy Suttor took the form of a video-tape-presentation, it could not be reproduced.

Of the papers read at Edmonton in 1975, Frank Peake's "Robert McDonald (1829-1913), the Great Unknown Missionary of the Northwest" was printed in *The Journal of the Canadian Church History Society*, XVII (3), September, 1975.

The next annual meeting of the Society will be held at Laval University, Quebec, June 1 and 2, 1976. Persons interested in membership or seeking more information about the Society and its work are invited to write to the Secretary, Prof. John Moir, Scarborough College (University of Toronto), 1265 Military Trail, West Hill, Ontario, M1C 1A4.

President John P.B. Kenyon
Scarborough College
University of Toronto

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Allen L. Farris, "John Calvin: In Search of a Just Society" 1

Walter E. Ellis, "Gilboa to Ichabod, Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Canadian Baptists, 1895-1934" 16

Elliot Rose, "The Castle Builders: High Anglican Hopes of the Frontier in the Mid-Nineteenth Century" 42

John Corbett, "The World to Come: The Millenarian Tradition in Christianity, its Origins and Transmission" 64

John Calvin: In Search of a Just Society

by

Allan L. Farris

There are many caricatures abroad about John Calvin. Some caricatures have been sustained as much by friend as foe. Recent historical studies are doing much to destroy the caricatures, *i.e.* that Calvin was a cold, heartless, humourless and ultra-logical tyrant. In contradiction, he has been shown in a recent study, *L'Humanite de Calvin* by Richard Stauffer, to have been a compassionate friend, a devoted pastor, and a husband with a bit more romance in his soul than some of us!

One of the most exciting discoveries of recent years about John Calvin is that far from being an inflexible predestinarian, or a legalistic high churchman, he was a social revolutionary and one of the most advanced social thinkers of his time.

It strikes me that there are three major approaches to the thought of John Calvin:

(1) *The Classic Interpretation*. This dates back to the 17th Century and stresses Calvin's predestinarian thought to the point of distortion. The Dutch have contributed more than their share to this interpretation, although the English Westminster Confession of Faith runs a close second. On this continent this classic interpretation is best seen in the Princeton Theology which featured such stars as Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield.

(2) The second approach I call the *Scottish interpretation*. This view places stress on Calvin's view of Church, ministry and sacraments. This more recent view, somewhat coloured by the thought of Karl Barth, may be associated with Professor Thomas Torrance of Edinburgh, his brother-in-law Ronald Wallace, and his friend T.H.L. Parker. (An American equivalent which never gained much credence in America, and a bit earlier than the Scottish, may be seen in the Mercersburg Theology whose stars were the renowned church historian Philip Schaff, and John Nevin of the German Reformed Church.

(3) The third approach I call the Swiss-French interpretation. This is also of recent origin. This approach is concerned with Calvin's social, political and economic thought. In 1959 a young Geneva pastor, André Biéler, wrote a doctoral thesis entitled, La Pensée Économique et Sociale de Calvin. (Ironically enough it was written under the supervision of a Roman Catholic professor of Economics in the University of Geneva founded by Calvin.) This thesis underlined and documented the fact that Calvin's political and social thought was not only revolutionary and far-reaching but germane to his theological thought. Now significant studies based on this thesis are beginning to appear, i.e. Professor W. Fred Graham's, The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin and his Socio-Economic Impact. Again, we may find a slightly earlier American equivalent in the brothers Niebuhr. To discover the source of their socially oriented Calvinism I suspect one would have to examine the thought of certain professors in Eden Seminary, St. Louis. Now this is a broad analysis of schools of Calvinistic thought. There are probably exceptions, or those with feet in more than one camp, but I think the analysis holds true. I have introduced the analysis here to indicate the position taken by this paper and to indicate the source of my thinking.

I personally am indebted to the Swiss-French school for the position adopted in this paper, and in particular to André Biéler and, to a lesser extent, W. Fred Graham.

I. Calvin's Theological Undergirding of the Just Society

Calvin's theology, as Prof. Brian Gerrish has pointed out, is one of thankfulness.[1] Man was created by God for fellowship with Himself; to respond thankfully, joyfully and lovingly to the One in whom all his good consists. Man was made in God's image; that is, he was given the capacity to enter into personal relations with this Beneficent Father and to hold communion with Him as a rational, initiating, willing and responsive being. Since this image resides in all other persons as well, it follows that men are made for fellowship with one another, as well as with God. It is the image of God within us which permits us to enter into truly human and satisfying relationships

[1] Brian Gerrish: Reformers in Profile. Fortress Press (1967) p.153

with others. True humanity thus involves a triangular relationship involving God, my neighbour and myself.

But the Fall, argues Calvin, has ruptured that relationship. Love (which is the essential element in the <u>imago dei</u> relationship) instead of going out to God and to one's neighbour, turns in upon itself (incurvature) and in consequence both the vertical relationship with God and the horizontal relationship with the neighbour is disrupted, distorted and fractured. The human dilemma involving dissension, divisiveness, destructiveness and death takes its rise from this fundamental rupture in the created order.

The extraordinary intervention of God, as recorded in the history of salvation is, according to Calvin, calculated to remedy the disruptive effects of self love in which one is content to live without God and without neighbours; and to re-establish the joyful, thankful, responsible and loving relationships originally intended by God to be the fabric of a just society.

The image of God is restored, refurbished, (or better) rendered operative by the spirit of regeneration explicit in the hearing of the gospel. To hear the gospel is to be entered upon a new and true relationship with God through Christ, and at the same time to be entered upon a new and true relationship with one's neighbour. Responsibility towards one's neighbour is at once an imperative and a possibility through the regenerative powers inherent in faith in Christ. Not even moral turpitude on the part of one's neighbour relieves men of responsibility towards the neighbour.

> "Whatever man you meet who needs your aid, you have no reason to refuse to help him. Say, 'he is a stranger' but the Lord has given him a mark that ought to be familiar to you ... Say, 'he is contemptible and worthless' but the Lord shows him to be one to whom He has deigned to give the beauty of His image. Say that you owe nothing for any service of his, but God, as it were, has put him in His own place in order that you may recognize toward him the many and great benefits

> with which God has bound you to Himself. Say that he does not deserve even your least effort for his sake; but the image of God which recommends Him to you is worthy of your giving yourself and all your possessions." (Institutes III, vii; 6)

Here is the origin of Calvin's radical social ethic. Our neighbour bears the image of God; to use him, abuse him, or misuse him is to do violence to the person of God who images himself in every human soul, the Fall notwithstanding. We are, Calvin argues, responsible for each other and because of our common humanity grounded in the image of God, we are particularly responsible for the weak and indigent who have suffered in any way through the vicissitudes of life. The church for Calvin was a kind of "pilot project" of a restored and renewed community. That is why it was so important for the Christian church to engage in serious social service and be in the vanguard for the realization of social justice.

The demands of piety as expressed through religious exercises can never diminish this responsibility to honour God as he images himself in all men. Indeed, to engage in religious exercises without fulfilling responsibilities to one's neighbour is the worst form of hypocrisy. Listen to this comment:

> "I recognize that piety toward God comes before love of our brothers; therefore to observe the first table is more precious before God than to observe the second. But since God is invisible, our piety cannot be seen by our fellow men. It is true that religious ceremonials were established to give evidence of piety; but men's observance of them is no proof of their godliness; for it often happens that nobody is more diligent and zealous in going through ceremonies than the hypocrites. God, therefore, wanted to test our love for Him by enjoining us to love one another as brothers. For this reason, love is called the perfection of the law (not only here, but also in Romans 13:8) not because it is

> better than the worship of God, but because it is the convincing evidence of it. I have said we cannot see God; He therefore presents Himself to us in our brothers, and in their persons demands from us what we owe to Him. (Calvin Commentaries, LCC Vol.23)

It is clear from this that the "religious" man who is only interested in the salvation of his own soul is a selfish man and is as yet unredeemed. The test of true religion for Calvin is to be determined less by individual piety and more by social ethics. To claim to love God and to hate one's neighbour is a theological contradiction.

This brings us now to Calvin's concept of the solidarity of mankind. That solidarity is grounded in the fact that we all bear the image of God. "The Lord enjoins us to do good to all without exception, though the greater part, if estimated by their own merit, are unworthy of it. But Scripture enjoins a most excellent reason when it tells us that we are not to look to what men themselves deserve but to attend to the image of God which exists in all and to which we all owe honour and love." (Institutes III, vii; 6) God then is the substance and hence the motivation of all human community. Commenting on Matthew 5: 43-46, Calvin says:

> "Therefore God testifies that any man whoever he may be is our neighbour, in order to keep us in the bonds of brotherly love with which we are bound one to another by our common nature: for it is necessary that whenever I see another man, who is my flesh and bone, I see myself. Even though men, most often, break away from this holy society, their depravity does not remove the order of nature; for we must remember that God Himself is the Maker of this union. It follows that the precept of the law which commands us to love our neighbour applies to all men."

We are all responsible for each other, and we are particularly responsible for the weak, the indigent and those who have suffered

grievously through the trials and vicissitudes of life. The Church, as I have already intimated, must be a pilot project and point the way to a renewed and restored community. That is why it is so important for the Christian Church to engage in serious social service, to decry social inequities and to be in the vanguard of the quest for the just society. The Church is doubly responsible because within her has taken place and is taking place the work of re-creation and regeneration. Jesus Christ, the Head of, and Example to, the Church has in a very dramatic and costly way demonstrated what it means to love one's neighbour. This is one of the deeper meanings of the Cross. Thus the Christian who is predestined to conform his life to the perfect image of God in Christ cannot be unconcerned about any area of life where human welfare is at stake.

> "We must recognize that God has wanted to make us like members of a body. When we regard each other in this way, each will then conclude: I see my neighbour who has need of me and if I were in such extremity, I would wish to be helped; I must therefore do just that." (_Sermon_ on I Tim. 6: 17-19)

II. _Homiletical Implications of the Doctrine of the Imago Dei for Calvin._

Now this powerful teaching about the _imago dei_ and human solidarity had radical implications for the content and thrust of Calvin's preaching. Never forget that Calvin was fundamentally a preacher of the word and it is the thrust of his insight into the nature of the _imago dei_ that gives to his preaching a prophetic quality reminiscent of the Old Testament prophet Amos.

There has been much nonsense written about Calvin being a tyrant at Geneva, a dictator who imposed his iron will upon the lives of unwilling and unhappy citizens of Geneva. Calvin was not even a citizen of Geneva until 1555 -- nine years before his death -- and many of his cherished ecclesiastical reforms were never realized because of the opposition of the City Council. But Calvin nevertheless had a moral

authority. Directly across from his pulpit in La Cathedral de Saint Pierre were the seats of the syndics and councillors who, after hearing his powerful pulpit utterances and biblical expositions and applications, were often influenced to legislate during the week following in terms of the preacher's imperatives of equity and social justice.

Now in spite of his grand conception of a transformed and restored humanity, Calvin was nevertheless a realist. He knew that creeds and deeds were often at variance, and practice and principle frequently were far apart in the Christian community. His preaching then was geared to bring them into alignment. Seated in his congregation at Geneva were professing Christians who were not above exploiting their neighbours; living within Geneva, officially committed to the gospel, were persons whose pursuit of wealth was without compassion; whose desire for gain made them ride rough shod over the rights of individuals, and whose greed made them impervious to the rights of the poor and defenceless. Calvin did not spare them or gloss over their ugly covetousness.

Wealth to Calvin's mind possessed peculiar dangers and involved serious responsibilities. "Let us then that have riches . . . consider that their abundance was not intended to be laid out in intemperance or excess, but in relieving the necessities of the brethren." (_Comm._ II, Cor. 8:15) Those who sought monopoly control of staple items he publicly lambasted, for example those who stored up wheat in anticipation of shortages which would permit them to raise prices. "These people," he thundered, "entomb the grace of God, as if they warred against His bounty and against the paternal love which He displays towards everyone." (_Sermon_ 96 on Deut. 15: 16-23)

On another occasion he called wheat cornering operators, "murderers, savage beasts, biting and eating up the poor, sucking up their blood." (_Comm._, Matt. 3:9-16) Another concern on which Calvin expressed himself was the charging of interest. Lending for risk capital was permitted provided one charged no more than 5% interest, but one must charge _no_ interest when lending to the poor, indeed it would be better in the face of the

distress of the poor to give them the necessary money outright. Moreover, one must not neglect the responsibilities of charity in order to have money to lend to the business entrepreneur. Furthermore, what society permitted legally by way of lending rates if unjust was prohibited to the Christian.

III. The Outworking in the Life of the Church of Calvin's Radical Social Ethic.

The outworking of Calvin's understanding of responsibility for one's neighbour brought about a most exciting social welfare program in Geneva. In the Ecclesiastical Ordinances of 1541, Calvin called for four orders of ministry: pastors, doctors, elders and deacons. The office of the deacon was to have solicitude for the poor and to minister to their needs. In practice this required a division of the office of the diaconate into two parts, 'procurators' and 'hospitallers'. The procurators were the administrators who received funds and disbursed them, and generally supervised the operation of the institutions designated for the care of the unfortunates. The hospitallers were those who actually cared for the sick and the unfortunate. The procurators and hospitallers were to be elected to office in a manner similar to the elders.(Inst.IV,iii;9)

The main institution for the care of the unfortunates was the General Hospital (l'Hopital General). There were several departments in the hospital corresponding to the several social service needs of the community. Separate departments existed for the sick, for old people, for those unable to work; for widowed women, for orphaned and illegitimate children, and a special department in a separate building for those afflicted by the plague. In addition there was a kind of outpatients department, or a mobile nursing unit, to care for those not actually hospitalized. The hospital, in addition, provided the services of a physician and a surgeon who not only served those within the hospital institution but also those outside who were brought to their attention by the procurators or the hospitallers.

This far-reaching program of helpfulness was financed in the first instance from the sale of church lands or other properties no

longer needed by the new ecclesiastical regime. In addition, alms boxes were placed at all church doors; annual collections were also instituted, and citizens were encouraged to make provision for the upkeep of the enterprise in their wills. Calvin himself was a regular contributor to the fund although Jerome Bolsec, his uncomplimentary and undesired biographer, suggested he stole from the funds! Whatever was required to make up any deficit after all voluntary resources were exhausted was contributed by direct grant from the council.

Under the administration of the diaconate also was La Bourse Française and La Bourse Italienne. Both institutions came into being to assist in the rehabilitation of the refugees from the persecutions raging in France and the Piedmont respectively. Geneva's reputation as a city of refuge takes its rise from this situation forced upon it because of the presence in their midst of John Calvin, the acknowledged leader of the Reformation, and further, because of the willingness of the citizens to organize, administer and finance this significant ministry of helpfulness. The magnitude of the task can be seen when one realizes that Geneva at this time was a mere city of 13,500 and literally hundreds came to her gates for refuge. When the occasion for this kind of refugee service was past, the residue of funds was turned over to the l'Hôpital Général.

Although the ministers were tremendously interested in these projects of helpfulness, and were required to make a quarterly inspection in the company of the chief procurator to ascertain if all was in good order and the goals of the institutions were being achieved, yet it was primarily a lay movement of the Church, administered by the laity and functioning in terms of the imperatives of the gospel which required all Christians to be obedient servants, to emulate Christ's compassion and to love their neighbours as themselves. In their study, Les Diacres de la Ville de Genève, Heyer and Johannot observe, "in the sixteenth century the little nation of Geneva was organized like a large family, the heads of which did not abandon any of its members, small or great, sick or healthy, young or old. All were objects of a touching solicitude."

IV. Christian Vocations and the Realization of the Goal of the Just Society

Now social justice for Calvin was not just a matter of the Church raising a prophetic voice against injustice, and the establishment of programmes of social service. The Christian faith, according to Calvin, was meant to invade every avenue of life. Man's money, property and work, were all meant to be used, not to deprive the neighbour, but to serve him. Work, for example, through Calvin attained a new dignity. It was no longer to be considered a curse occasioned by sin: it was rather a means of serving God and one's neighbour. It was a means of reflecting the *imago dei*.

(1) Man's work, firstly, was derived from God's work. It involved in a true sense a participation in the Divine Creativity. Man's art, architecture, science, and agriculture, were made possible by the operation of God's creative powers within men.

(2) Work, secondly, was one of the ways in which the beneficent God in His Providence provided for the necessities of man's creaturely existence. The society which would not permit a man to work was depriving him of a basic human right. Through man's work, God provided for the needs of a man and those of his family. To deprive a man of the opportunity to work Calvin declared, dramatically, was tantamount to "slitting his throat". (*Sermons* on Deuteronomy 24:14-18, cf. *Commentaries* on Leviticus 19:11-13)

(3) Thirdly, work was a significant means of fulfilling one's responsibilities to one's neighbour. Calvin, as we have already seen, was impressed with the solidarity of human life. Men were not a collection of individuals; they were a community of mutually dependent people. For Calvin the personal ethics must be social ethics, and social ethics must have regard to one's neighbour. The end therefore to which a man devoted his work was of cardinal importance. Work could be an expression of a selfish and acquisitive spirit, or it could be a means of expressing one's new life in Christ, which required not only honour to God, but also love to one's neighbour in whom, however distorted, is reflected the image of God. By work a man was able in the most concrete fashion to show his love to his neighbour. Thus it is obvious that Calvin tied together inseparably the demands of the economic life and those of the ethical and religious life.

I have already mentioned that a man is to receive remuneration for his work. Wages for Calvin carry a spiritual significance. What a man receives by way of remuneration should be seen as a token of the graciousness of God. Wages, says Calvin, are tangible expressions of the gratuitous and unmerited salary with which God honours our labour. They are a concrete indication that God is at work providing for the needs of his children. (cf. Commentaries, Genesis 30:29)

Now this kind of thinking has profound implications for wage scales. When an employer pays an employee he is actually transmitting that which God gives to a man for his work, to meet his own needs and that of his neighbours. To withold any part of that by underpaying an employee is to dishonour God and to cheat one's neighbour, in this case the employee. Both employer and employee must realize God's part in this matter of income. The employer must realize that the fruit of his industry business or shop is a gift from God even as his employee must realize that his wages (paid by the employer) are also a gift from God. Bearing this in mind, employer and employee ought to be able to work out a suitable wage scale on the basis of common agreement.

This of course, Calvin realizes is a counsel of perfection. Men are not yet fully redeemed and self love does invade the structure of life to disrupt and distort. How does one then make actual wages correspond with the beneficence of God? Wages could be determined by market fluctuations or by government enactment. However mere human standards are never to be completely trusted. For example, the labour market might be oversupplied. Unscrupulous employers, Calvin feared, might use the occasion to drop wages below the amount required to sustain a labourer and his family. "For behold what the rich often do, they spy for occasions and opportunities to cut down by half the wages of poor people who need employment." (Sermons on Deuteronomy 24:14-18) Such action Calvin considered to be cruel and defrauding.

In actual practice Calvin put considerable confidence in the civic authorities in the matter of establishing a just wage. He favoured obviously wage and price controls. Here we can see how political science could be a means of serving the interests of one's neighbour by protecting

him from unscrupulous exploitation, as well as arranging a proper supply of goods and services.

If man's work is to find its true and proper meaning, indeed its original meaning, then man must consciously and personally relate himself to the work of God. In short, he must turn over the management of his work to God. In order to do this he must dispose himself to encounter God's work and be aware of its patterns and goals. To encounter God's work man must engage in Sunday Worship and by this means permit God to renew his life, shape and inform his ethics, and re-define his goals in life. "The Lord", wrote Calvin, "has not simply commanded men to set aside every seventh day as though he took pleasure in idlers. What pleases God is the fact that being freed from all other business, we now apply our minds to recognize and acknowledge the Creator of the world." (*Commentaries*, Genesis 2:3) Again he wrote, "The faithful must rest from *their* work in order to let God do *His* work in them." (*Institutes* II, viii; 28)

V. Government Action as a Means of Guaranteeing the Just and Free Society.

At this point we ought to speak briefly about the State or the role of civil government in the structure of Calvin's social thought. Unlike Luther who felt that if all men were thoroughly Christian there would be no need for the State, Calvin saw the State as a further expression of the Divine beneficence and the hope for a just society.

(1) Political action, in the first place, served to limit the activities of those whose self love would lead them to exploit the poor, take unfair advantage of the gullible, or profit from other's misfortunes. Interest rates were set by the State to limit the activities of greedy moneylenders; and restrictions were put on monopolists who sought to corner the market on staple goods like wheat and so demand inflated prices. Commenting on Psalm 82:3, (Give justice to the weak and the fatherless, maintain the right of the afflicted and the destitute) Calvin observed that:

> "a just and well-regulated government will be distinguished for maintaining the rights of the poor

> and afflicted...." "It is rare that rich men resort to magistrates for help, except when they happen to fall out among themselves. From these remarks, it is obvious why the cause of the poor and needy is here chiefly commended to rulers; for those who are exposed an easy prey to cruelty and wrongs of the rich have no less need of the assistance and protection of the magistrates than the sick have need of the aid of a physician."

(2) Governments existed in the second place to regulate business and industry so that there might be an equitable distribution of this world's goods and an opportunity for gainful employment. The Geneva Government often under Calvin's probing and sometimes with his assistance set up new industries to help absorb the greatly increased work force occasioned by the influx of refugees.

Governments had the right to tax the people for "public necessity" but they did not have the right to squander the tax revenues or to take more than a fair wage for themselves from the tax revenues. Calvin wrote:

> "Princes themselves will ... remember that their revenues are not so much private chests as treasuries of the _entire_ people - which cannot be squandered or spoiled without manifest injustice. Or rather, that these are almost the very blood of the people, which it would be the harshest inhumanity not to spare. Moreover, let them consider that their imposts and levies, and other kinds of tribute are nothing but supports of public necessity; but that to impose them upon the common folk without cause is tyrannical extortion."
> (_Institutes_ IV, xx; 13)

(3) Government, in the third place, had a responsibility to help promote the Church and provide her with the freedom to carry on her work under mandate to the Word of God.

> "Holy kings are greatly praised in Scripture because they restored the worship of God when it was corrupted or destroyed, or took care of religion that under them it might flourish pure and unblemished.... This proves the folly of those who would neglect the concern for God and would give attention only to rendering justice among men." (Institutes IV, xx; 9)

The Church, in turn, served the best interests of the State by bringing to bear upon the citizen, through worship, teaching, and discipline, the Gospel of Christ which rendered operative the imago dei and underlined the nature of the equity that contributed to the goals of a just society.

However, what happens when the State becomes unjust and proceeds to:

a) turn its police power against the innocent?
b) protect and support monopolies?
c) persecute and destroy those who assemble to worship God and to seek direction for their lives by the clear testimony of Holy Scriptures?

Calvin in the face of an unjust government counselled prayer and patience. God was undoubtedly punishing his people by permitting tyranny and they should seek to ascertain His will in the face of adversity. Calvin feared anarchy. It was a sign of ultimate evil. Tyranny, indeed was to be preferred to anarchy because at least in tyranny there was a modicum of order. Thus Christians were counselled to wait for some intervention, perhaps through a foreign power. Meanwhile they were to examine themselves, and their lives in community, to ascertain where the fault lay. At the same time they were to pray to God for forgiveness, expect deliverance and anticipate the vindication of His cause and that He would show compassion on His poor children.

However Calvin left the door open to more active rebellion.[1] There was in every State a second line of authority subject in obedience to the first line of authority (Prince, King, Queen). If the first line of authority became oppressive, tyrannical and required an obedience that was clearly at variance with God's will then the second line of authority could take action to overthrow the tyrants. John Knox in Scotland, for example, encouraged the nobility of the realm to take up arms against the Queen Regent, Mary of Guise. Théodore Bèze, Calvin's colleague and successor, after the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day in which the flower of the French Hugenots was cruelly slaughtered upon order of the King, thereafter urged the people to take up arms against their King because he had simply dethroned himself by using legitimate power in an illegitimate way to destroy those whom he was required under God to protect.[2] Historians have observed the connection between this outlook and that of the French Revolution, and also between it and the Puritan Revolution in England.

However quiescent Calvin himself may have seemed to be with reference to the right of revolution, this fact cannot be gainsaid, "Calvinism taught previously passive men the styles and methods of political activity and enabled them successfully to claim the right of participation in that on-going system of political action that is the modern state."[3]

Let me say in conclusion that as Calvin saw it, the Christians, reconstructed by the grace of God, empowered by the Spirit of God, guided and goaded by the commandments of God, and functioning fully within Church, State, and the diverse useful vocations of society, were the hope of the new day and the possibility of experiencing here and now the thrust of the Kingdom of God whose outlines would become visible in a just and equitable society.

[1] Cf. Hans Baron, Calvinist Republicanism and its Historical Roots, Church History. Vol. VIII, p.41

[2] Théodore Bèze, Concerning the Rights of Rulers over their Subjects and the Duty of Subjects toward their Rulers. Translated into English by Henri-Louis Gonin with an introduction by A.A. Van Schelven. Cape Town, Pretoria (1956) p.63

[3] W.F. Graham, The Constructive Revolutionary. John Knox Press (1971) p.172

Gilboa To Ichabod, Social and Religious Factors In The Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Canadian Baptists, 1895-1934

by

Walter E. Ellis

One hundred years ago, December 2, 1875, the carriages of Toronto's evangelical elite stood outside of the impressive new Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Inside the dedication sermon was being preached by the Rev. J. L. Burrows, D.D., of Louisville, Kentucky. Burrows chose for his text Psalm 45:16: "With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought; they shall enter into the King's palace." Burrows spoke of how the Lord collected living stones and built them into a Spiritual House, some gathered "from the cottages of the toiling, from the mansions of the prosperous, from dens of dissipation, from saloons of fashionable revelry, [and] from the circles of self-righteous morality.... With post-millenial optimism he preached that "the king's palace, the house of God [was] the capital of the world, the seat of moral government for the whole race". Said Burrows:

> "The factory is up and the machinery is in. Has the joint-stock company completed the purpose for which it was organized? Why No! It is just ready to begin its proper work.

That "work" was to "irradiate the glory of the Lord", for it was God's purpose, through the Church, to renovate and purify the earth.[1]

If Burrows spoke of building in spiritual metaphors and with Bay Street language, the congregation may well have been forgiven if they drew more practical and mundane conclusions. Certainly the new Jarvis Street Baptist Church was a palace fit for a king. The gothic church of Queenston stone, erected at a cost of $103,000, boasted Ohio dressing and columns hewn of New Brunswick granite. The tower, spire and vane rose 165 feet in "altitude" above fashionable Jarvis Street. The interior was furnished with a copper

baptistry curbed with Italian marble, a pulpit desk of polished brass; pews of walnut and chestnut finished in oil. The seats were of damask, the floors covered with handsome carpet. The organ, with 2240 pipes and over fifty stops, was the finest in Toronto.[2] In many respects the church building was a concrete symbol of the rising status and power of evangelicals in Canada. The bitter struggles of the Baptists and Methodists against the Family Compact and the Church of England and their battle over the clergy reserves and in favor of political reform had ended in victory. The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, a Liberal and a Baptist, had recently been elected Prime Minister, defeating Sir John A. MacDonald and the Conservatives.

However, if some Toronto Baptists basked in the glory of the King's palace that Thursday afternoon, there may have been others busy about their daily labors who remembered with discomfort the prophetic warning sounded by Dr. R. A. Fyfe, principal of Woodstock College and former minister of Bond Street Baptist Church at the closing service there the previous Sunday. In an historical survey of the history of Baptist work in Canada Fyfe spoke frankly of the lack of homogeneity, the hyper-individuality, the perfectionist piety, and the disruptive "Scottish" theology, related to the issue of open or close communion that had inhibited denominational cooperation and growth. He also recounted how the church had been forced to move from March Street in 1848 to escape a "vicious and miserable" environment and implied that similar considerations were involved in the move from Bond to fashionable Jarvis Street.

In contrast, since 1869 Baptist fortunes had improved. Membership in Toronto churches had grown 140 per cent, and in Ontario and Quebec had reached 23,000. Three new churches, the Yorkville, Parliament Street, and College Street churches had been formed bringing to six the number of Baptist congregations in the city. Decentralization was the key to growth and the future was bright for Baptists, but not without perils. Warned Fyfe:

> And if old Bond Street, about to enter into her fine new house, forgets for a single day her obligations to provide at the earliest possible day for the very large section of this city, which her removal leaves (more) destitute than ever of Baptist preaching, then she may expect, that her new house will be like the mountains of Gilboa on which no dew fell.[3]

The issue for Fyfe was basically how the denomination would deal with urbanization, how a church "strong in membership and wealth" would use those resources. With expansion in view he issued the following commandment:

> Thou shalt remember what God has so clearly shown thee, that the true way to strength [and to] extend the cause in the city is to plant Baptist churches, as many as possible, in the destitute localities, and sustain them until they can sustain themselves.[4]

Fifty years later an event of equal significance to Canadian Baptists also took place in Toronto. About 2:00 A. M. on the morning of October 20, 1926, several hundred persons emerged from the First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, and marched through the streets singing hymns. They were bound for an all-night protest meeting at Jarvis Street Baptist Church. The occasion for their demonstration was the exclusion of the fundamentalist leader, the Reverend Doctor Thomas Todhunter Shields, from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec: this the culmination of ten years of bitter controversy between "modernists" and "fundamentalists" for control of the denomination. This was but one incident in the great convulsion that saw North American Protestantism bifurcated in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. Among the Baptists the contention gave rise to schism from the Northern Baptist Convention in the United States, and from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and the Baptist Union of Western Canada.

Two basic historical interpretations have been forwarded to explain the fundamentalist-modernist contentions of the 1920's. The first stresses the socio-economic roots of religious differentiation and views the controversy as primarily the result of tensions which arose through urbanization and the impact of the agricultural

depression which followed World War I. The second stresses the ideology and deals with schism as the result of overriding theological differences. Specifically, Ernest R. Sandeen argues that the equation of nineteenth-century evangelicalism with fundamentalism leads historians to resort to sociological or psychological explanations when a closer examination of fundamentalism as a theological system reveals it to be the product of a coalition between new elements contributed by Princeton conservatives and the premillenarian dispensationalism contributed by supporters of the Prophetic Conference movement.[5]

Stewart Cole viewed liberalism as a positive attempt to mold doctrine in response to social and scientific change. Norman Furniss ridiculed the uneducated fundamentalists, characterizing them as fear-ridden men longing for certainty in an age of change. In his view the principal cause for the rise of the fundamentalist controversy was "the incompatibility of the nineteenth century orthodoxy cherished by many humble Americans with the progress made in science and theology since the Civil War."[6] Sandeen argues, however, that rural-urban tensions, biblical criticism and evolutionary theory existed for at least two generations prior to the explosion of the 1920's, and he flatly denies that fundamentalism "can be explained as a part of the Populist movement, agrarian protest, or the Southern mentality."[7] He correctly argues that fundamentalism and modernism developed in northern cities. But his uncritical assumption that the fundamentalist base of support was indistinguishable from that of the modernists--what Niebuhr called bourgeois culture, having its strength in the cities and in the churches supported by the urban middle class needs to be examined. Only by assuming social homogeneity has Sandeen been able to stress doctrine in opposition to Niebuhr's essentially sociological arguments.[8]

In many respects the issue of definition is crucial. If fundamentalism and modernism are defined in theological terms attention focuses there and predictable conclusions result. However, if

wider definitions are used, as in Everett L. Perry's "Socio-economic Factors and Fundamentalism", then the sociological argument is affirmed rather than denied. The latter view is taken by Dr. Mary B. Hill, who interprets the history of Canadian Baptists as the story of the gradual suppression of lower class American and Canadian churchmen, sectarian in theology and outlook, by a middle-class elite of British origin who gained control of the denominational machinery and used it to further church-type programs. Her data appears idiosyncratic, but Hill argues that high status Baptists utilized political skills and economic affluence to dictate church policy during the period of latent class struggle [1888-1910], but were unable to suppress conflict in the years following World War I.[9]

Time prohibits a detailed account of the controversies that led to schism among Canadian Baptists. Histories, most of which tend to be apologetic, are cited in footnotes. Briefly, tension surfaced first in Ontario and Quebec in Walmer Road Baptist Church in 1905, when the theology of the Rev. Oliver C. Horsman was challenged because of his introduction of A First Book of Christian Doctrine for use with young adults. Horsman resigned but schism ensued and an independent congregation known as the Tabernacle Church was established on Markham Street near Bloor.[10]

In May 1908 attention focused on McMaster University when Dr. Elmore Harris, a consulting editor of the Scofield Reference Bible, patron of the Toronto Bible Institute, and pastor emeritus of Walmer Road questioned the orthodoxy of Dr. I. G. Matthews, Professor of Old Testament. After investigation Matthews, like Horsman, was pronounced orthodox. However, Harris' supporters exacted a "statement of belief" from a reluctant Convention Assembly in 1910; a "canon" they would later attempt to enforce as "orthodoxy" Concurrently Dr. Albert Carman, Methodist superintendent and last bishop of the frontier-oriented Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, became embroiled with Dr. George Workman and Dr. George Jackson of Victoria College: the only significant instance of debate over biblical criticism in Canada outside the bounds of the Calvinist tradition.

The Great War interrupted but provided occasion to increase the heterogeneity of Baptists as men from various classes and religious traditions rubbed shoulders in trenches and denominationalism broke down under the influence of contact with the cosmopolitan world of Europe. In 1919 the dormant controversy surfaced anew when Dr. T. T. Shields, minister of Jarvis Street Baptist Church since May 1910, attacked The Canadian Baptist for a series of editorials favorable to such works as J. Munro Gibson's, The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture and A. H. Strong's Inspiration, Authority and Criticism. Ironically, the implied slurs and elitism reflected in P. T. Forsyth's Introduction to Gibson's book contributed to passage by the Ottawa Convention Assembly of a resolution which slapped the hands of editor, W.J. McKay and characterized as "new" and "vague" the doctrine of inspiration contained in the editorials.[11]

Tension surfaced in Jarvis Street Baptist Church in 1920, initially as a struggle over worship and liturgy between Shields and the organist, Dr. Edward Broome, then turned to church administration and a debate over the place of the diaconate and membership in Baptist polity. Finally, in February 1921, Shields preached his famous sermon, "The Christian Attitude Towards Amusements", interpreted as an attack on the "worldliness" of his opponents and raising the spectre of the notorious Dancing Deacon. In response a "Laymen's Committee" was formed to oust Shields.[12] Dr. Shields refused to submit a "requested" resignation following a resolution passed June 29, 1921 by a church meeting, retaliated with a summer crusade led by the New York controversialist Dr. John Roach Straton, added forty-six members irregularly that summer, and was sustained at the reconvened Annual Meeting on September 21, 1921. The "minority" came under censure; forty were excluded from church office, and 349 finally requested letters to establish on May 24, 1922 the Central Baptist Church, later Park Road Baptist Church, Toronto.

Historians have generally interpreted the contest from

within the context of their denominational commitments. For Dozois, a Convention historian, Shields turned "what was clearly a personality issue into a doctrinal debate, by charging his opponents with modernism, worldliness and heresy." For Tarr, the Plot that Failed was a concerted attempt to bring about "the downfall of one who was a recognized leader of the evangelical forces" in the hope that his defeat would "enable the liberal element to gain the ascendance."[13] Monistic theological or psychological interpretations fail to give serious consideration to the social characteristics of the factions. If social heterogeneity can be established, then the question becomes one of relating the differing theological emphases to their respective sociological constituencies.

Clearly in the Jarvis Street contest and in the wider struggle the contestants were conscious of social differences. Shields often complained that his "chief offense [was] that in these matters [he had] appealed to the people." He characterized his opponents as the wealthy, the worldly, and the wise. Convention supporters responded that "TOO MANY RICH MEN" was "another cry raised to becloud the issue," that most with a "moderate amount of this world's goods" opposed Shields on administrative and not on theological grounds. At this point a microcosmic study of the social characteristics of Jarvis Street members may shed light on the wider conflict.[14]

As early as 1875 Toronto was beginning to experience the growth of class-stratified dormitory suburbs and the idealized church where rich and poor shared a common religious and social life was beginning to disappear. Forty years later wealthy Torontonians were already beginning to abandon their palatial mansions on Jarvis Street and move north and west of Bloor Street into the districts around St. George Street and Walmer Road. Others moved across the Don Valley into the fashionable suburbs stretching east along Danforth. Still, in 1910, as Table I reveals, though power rested with the rich, Jarvis Street Baptist Church was a heterogeneous congregation. Although twenty-five

per cent of the members were merchant manufacturers and professionals, an equal number were blue collar workers and laborers. Significantly, however, many of the latter were printers or workers in the newspaper industry and their bosses were members of the church. Another twenty-five per cent were small entrepreneurs, managers or semi-professionals; approximately the same number white collar workers.

However, Fyfe's commandment of 1875 had not born the rich harvest expected among the blue collar workers. Baptist missions in working class areas of Toronto had not become self-supporting and Shields responded in 1912-13 by federating the Sumach and Parliament Street Missions with Jarvis Street, thus effecting an initial shift in the social characteristics of the congregation. Compare the occupational profile of the church in 1913, Table II, with the occupational profile in 1910, Table I. In three years the percentage of merchant manufacturers and professionals dropped from twelve to seven per cent. Blue collar workers and laborers increased from twenty-three to twenty-eight per cent. Significantly more single memberships, in contrast to family units, appear on church rolls and reflect recruitment from boarding-house areas located south and west of the church.

During and following the Great War the standard Baptist theology preached by Shields failed to produce a strong impact. Meanwhile the Jarvis Street elite were becoming critical of revivalist techniques and new members tended to be recruited from the "missions" and from lower segments on the occupational scale. However Shields discovered after 1920 that when controversy raged revivals flourished. For example, in 1922, following expulsion of the "minority", the Sunday School increased from 300 to 1000. Three prayer meetings a week were held that year and 182 new members were added. In 1923 recruitment increased to 384. The thesis that these additions reflect consolidation by Toronto "fundamentalists" cannot be supported, for the vast majority [253] joined by baptism, only 72 transfer of letter and 59 by religious experience. Data reveal similar pattern through 1925.

TABLE I

OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH 1910

Occupations	Number	Percentage
Professionals	43	13.11
Merchants, Manufacturers Wholesale	35	10.67
Entrepreneurs, Business Retail	27	8.23
Managerial, Sales, Semi-Professional	58	17.68
White Collar--incl. Clerks, Barbers, Police, Bank Workers	88	26.83
Blue Collar--Printing, Foremen	39	11.89
Manufacturing--Industrial Workers	17	5.18
Laborers--Chauffeurs, Domestics	21	6.40
Totals	328	100.00

Number of Occupational Units in Church: 524
Number Unidentified 196 (37.40)
Number Identified 328 (62.60)

NOTE: Appendix A constitutes a breakdown of the table by type of occupational units. It shows the more stable units, where both spouses were members, to predominate in the higher occupational categories.

TABLE II

OCCUPATION PROFILE JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH 1913

Occupations	Number	Percentage
Professions	49	10.94
Merchants, Manufacturers Wholesale	33	7.37
Entrepreneurs, Business Retail	49	10.94
Managerial, Sales, Semi-Professional	82	18.30
White Collar--incl. Clerks, Barbers, Police, Bank Workers	109	24.33
Blue Collar--Printing, Foremen	64	14.29
Manufacturing--Industrial Workers	32	7.14
Laborers--Chauffeurs,Domestics	30	6.70
Totals	448	100.00

Number of Occupational Units in Church: 715
Number Unidentified 267 (37.34)
Number Identified 448 (62.65)

NOTE: Appendix B constitutes a breakdown of the table by type of occupational unit and reveals the marked increase in absolute numbers of single working units and a drop in the number of widows in the congregation.

TABLE III

OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH 1922
STATUS AS JARVIS STREET MEMBERS IN 1913

Occupations	Number	Percentage
Professions	18	16.83
Merchants, Manufacturers Wholesale	24	22.43
Entrepreneurs, Business Retail	14	13.09
Managerial, Sales, Semi-Professional	14	13.09
White Collar--incl. Clerks	22	20.56
Blue Collar--Printing, Foremen	11	10.28
Manufacturing--Industrial Workers	2	1.87
Laborers--Chauffeurs, Domestics	2	1.87
Totals	107	100.00
Number of Occupational Units in Church:	128	
Number Unidentified	21	
Number Identified	107	

NOTE: Appendix D constitutes a breakdown of the Table by type of occupational unit and reveals that the largest percentage of white collar persons were single women. A detailed methodological explanation of the procedure for comparing the data is also included.

A social profile of the recruits would provide a definitive test of the socio-economic hypothesis were such data available. Unfortunately, Dr. H.C. Slade, now deceased, resolutely refused access to the membership rolls of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Nevertheless, Table III is a profile of the occupational characteristics of members of the Central Baptist Church. By incorporating data only on members dismissed who were members prior to 1913, the last year for which Jarvis Street data are available, it is possible to show conclusively that it was the rich and wealthy members of old Baptist families who were "exiled". Over thirty-eight per cent belonged to merchant-professional units while another thirteen per cent were retail entrepreneurs. Only fourteen per cent were blue collar workers and these were connected to elite families by employment or marriage.

When Jarvis Street Church granted letters of transfer to the minority Shields documented to his satisfaction the fact that most practised a churchlike pattern of piety, were irregular at communion, and inactive in the extended life of the congregation. The vast majority were members prior to his ministry and many were "aged and infirm". Of the 349 exiles 177 were members prior to 1910, most others life passage children of old Baptist families. Few, if any, were products of the pastoral or revival ministry of Dr. Shields. To summarize, Table IV, below, compares the occupation of members of the two churches, Jarvis Street and Central Baptist. Clearly, the schism resulted in isolation of old affluent Baptist families and in the capture of their church by a charismatic leader who instituted sect-type patterns and whose message and ministry produced differential class recruitment.[15]

TABLE IV
COMPARATIVE OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE
JARVIS AND CENTRAL BAPTIST
1913

Occupations	Jarvis No.	Jarvis %	Central No.	Central %
Professions and Entrepreneurs	89	23.23	56	52.33
Managerial, Sales	64	16.71	14	13.09
White Collar	93	24.29	22	20.56
Blue Collar-Labor	137	35.78	15	14.02
	383		107	
Unknown	199		21	
	582		128	

If occupation is the best single indicator of class assessed value of residence real estate is a significant indicator of status. Expenditure on housing is a major budget item and constitutes an important means through which income is transfered into status. Generally, home-owners tend to be more stable and less geographically mobile than renters. Thus, if status was a factor in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy one would expect more residence ownership and higher assessments among one group than another. Table V represents the 1913 assessed value of residence real estate for the total membership of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Thirty-seven per cent were owners, sixty-three per cent renters. Twenty-five per cent had assessments over $6000, another twenty-three per cent assessments in the $4-6,000 range. Among renters fifty per cent lived in homes assessed at less than $3000. The Anglican Diocese of Toronto owned considerable poor housing not far from Jarvis Street Church and many Baptists rented these properties. The boarding-house phenomena among new recruits has been mentioned previously.

[1] Appendix E constitutes a breakdown of the Occupational Profile of Jarvis Street Baptist Church in 1913, after those units which founded Central Baptist Church were removed. It reveals a marked decrease in the number of family units in the membership of the church.

TABLE V

ASSESSED VALUE RESIDENCE REAL ESTATE - 1913
JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH
TOTAL MEMBERSHIP

Status	Assessments						
	-1000	-2000	-3000	-4000	-5000	-6000	over 6000
Owners % of Known	4 [2.07]	27 [13.85]	31 [15.90]	40 [20.52]	28 [14.36]	17 [8.72]	48 [24.62
Renters % of Known	21 [6.41]	81 [24.70]	63 [19.21]	60 [18.30]	37 [11.28]	32 [9.76]	34 [10.37

Total Number of Units 523 — 257 family units [49.14%]
Number of Owners 198 [37.29%] — 102 single males [19.51%]
Number of Renters 328 [62.72%] — 116 single females [22.18%]
48 widows [9.18%]

In contrast,Table VI shows that almost sixty per cent of the Central-Park Road units were home owners and seventy per cent belonged to family as opposed to partial family membership units. Thirty-seven per cent had assessments over $6000; another twenty per cent were in the $4-6,000 range. The average assessment of the twenty-five homeowners with assessments over $6000 was $10,150.

TABLE VI

ASSESSED VALUE RESIDENCE REAL ESTATE - 1913
Members Joining Central Baptist Church - 1922

Status	Assessments						
	-1000	-2000	-3000	-4000	-5000	-6000	over 6000
Owners % of Known		7 [10.45]	9 [13.44]	12 [17.91]	9 [13.44]	5 [7.47]	25 [37.32]
Renters % of Known		8 [17.40]	8 [17.40]	13 [28.26]	2 [4.35]	5 [10.87]	10 [21.74]

Total Number of Units 113 — 79 family units [69.29%]
Number of Owners 67 [59.30%] — 7 single males [6.20%]
Number of Renters 46 [40.71%] — 15 single females [13.28%]
12 widows [10.62%]

Another city where similar patterns prevailed was Minneapolis. In 1902 controversy in the First Baptist Church resulted in formation of Trinity Baptist Church. There William Bell Riley, founder of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association [1919] and a close collaborator with Shields in the Baptist Bible Union (1922), won control of the First church over the opposition of high status members. Changed urban residence patterns dictated that the Minneapolis elite isolated themselves in a dormitory suburb and established a church whose theology and religious practices reflected high status homogeneity. The dilemma of elite urban Baptists is well summarized by an observation made in different context on the changing political structure of the city in industrial America. Samuel P. Hays of Pittsburgh University writes:

> The urban upper class faced two ways at one; decentralist in residential institutions, it was integrative in its economic and occupational life. While it sought to separate itself from the city in one way, in another it was propelled back into the center of urban affairs.[16]

Wealthy Baptists responded in like manner in their religious life. On the way from a religious to an occupational reference group they moved away from the egalitarian sectarianism reflected in the small town parish model. Concurrently they were charged with having a stranglehold on the denomination, a charge easily documented and believed by workers and farmers threatened by the power and wealth of the Bay Street establishment. Increasing social heterogeneity was inimical to denominational unity.

In Canada the rural phase of the controversy did not begin in earnest until after the Jarvis Street schism. In 1922 fundamentalists attempted unsuccessfully to gain control of McMaster's Board of Governors. However, in 1923 they were sustained by the Convention in London in their protest against the conferring of an honorary degree on "modernist" President W.H.P. Faunce, of Brown University. Finally in 1925 came the appointment of the Rev. L. H. Marshall to the McMaster faculty occasioning protracted

and bitter charges of modernism. Shields utilized The Gospel Witness, which he founded in 1922 and edited, to announce in sensational headlines, "Ichabod"--the glory had departed. The denomination finally appealed to the federal Parliament for an amendment to their charter to enable expulsion of dissidents. Jarvis Street Baptist Church was expelled from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and fundamentalists met on October 19, 1927 to commence formation of the rival Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec.

Nothing indicates more clearly the fact that the fundamentalist-modernist contention was an urban conflict exported to the countryside than an examination of areas where the contention did or did not flourish. In spite of sporadic visits by contestants there was little controversy and no schism in the Maritimes, in rural Quebec, or on the Canadian prairies. In British Columbia, where fundamentalists founded the Convention of Regular Baptist Churches of British Columbia, schism occurred primarily in Vancouver in working class areas east of Granville Street and in contiguous rural areas on the "north side of the Lower Fraser Valley."[17] In rural Ontario districts proximate to Toronto such as Simcoe County and Middlesex-Lambton felt the full brunt of the controversy. Fundamentalists made use of anti-urban sentiment, pointed the accusing finger at city sophisticates and intellectuals, and flattered rural pride with the claim that only they could save the denomination from an insignificant aristocracy of bureaucrats, skeptical schoolmen, and rich philanthropists. Rural churchmen, perturbed by a squabble not their own, requested denominational support. Help had to come soon or it would be too late.

Class differences became increasingly evident at denominational meetings. For example, an American Baptist minister present at the 1926 Convention observed:

> I was impressed by the personnel of the majority. It included...nearly all the solid elements of the denomination. As the followers of Dr. Shields

> gathered about him at the close of the meeting, to join in their singing and other emotional manifestations, I could not but be impressed by the inferior personnel of the group. I am speaking of the general appearance.[18]

Collective biographical studies of Baptists in the towns of Orillia and Barrie, Simcoe County, confirm such reports. In 1927 the First Baptist Church, Orillia, split when the fundamentalists withdrew to form Bethel Baptist Church. In Barrie a dissident McMaster student gathered members from neighboring Convention churches and turned Collier Street into an Independent Baptist Church. For purposes of conciseness the occupational data are grouped, community characteristics being similar. Table VII shows a non-statistically valid, but strong tendency to support the thesis that Convention supporters were of higher occupational status than Unionists. Differences might well have been more pronounced had not events moved too rapidly for differential recruitment to take place before schism.

Convention supporters showed a significantly higher proportion of merchants and entrepreneurs, the Unionists more farmers. In Barrie Convention blue collar workers were primarily railroad foremen or tradesmen. Unionists tended to be manual laborers or workers from the local tannery. Lack of uniformity in assessment practice prevents grouping of residence data for Barrie and Orillia. However, Table VIII reveals that a larger proportion of Orillia Convention loyalists owned homes and that the assessed value of their residences was higher. Similar data are available for Barrie.

In Simcoe county the contest was between conservative evangelical Baptists loyal to the denomination and dispensational millenarian leaders who appear to have attracted marginal workers alienated from the prevailing culture and more susceptible to anti-urban and anti-educational rhetoric. On the other hand the data are not so clear as to support the monistic argument that the conflict was merely a socio-economic confrontation.

TABLE VII

OCCUPATIONS OF BAPTISTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BAPTIST CONVENTION
OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC AND THE UNION OF REGULAR BAPTISTS
OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC
SIMCOE COUNTY, ONTARIO, CANADA
(NUMBER AND PER CENT)

Occupations	Convention Baptists	Regular Baptists	County Town Sample*
Agriculture	9 (7.03)	13 (21.66)	5 (4.54)
Professionals, Merchants, Entrepreneurs	26 (20.31)	5 (8.33)	16 (14.54)
Managerial, Sales, White Collar Occupations	29 (22.65)	18 (30.00)	38 (34.54)
Blue Collar Manufacturing, Laborers	64 (50.00)	24 (40.00)	51 (46.36)
Totals	128	60	110

CHI SQUARED 12.786 (3 d.f.) significant at .05 PHI .068 Cramer's V .068

*County Town Sample includes 43 entries being the first entry on every fifth page, Town of Orillia--Assessment Record 1927 for taxation year 1928, and 65 entries being every fourth entry, column 1, each page of Vernon's, Barrie City Directory--1937.

Methodology: Membership lists for Simcoe county churches reflect low quality record keeping. Profiles for First Baptist Church, Orillia are on the basis of the roll revised April 1, 1933, in Church Minute Book and Membership Register, April 17, 1929-May 6, 1935; for Bethel Baptist Church, from petitioners listed in letters, November 25, 1927, November 11, 1927, the latter requesting removal from the Church roll, plus additions to membership to 1933 found in Bethel Baptist Church Minute and Membership Register #1. For First Baptist Church, Barrie, Ontario, Year Book and Church Directory, 1931 (n.p., n.d.); for Collier Street Independent Baptist Church, Church Roll and Baptism (Collier Street Independent struck out and Emmanuel written in), list of members through #78, entry dated August 30/31, June 14/33.

Occupational Data From: Vernon's, Barrie, Midland, Orillia (Ontario) Street, Alphabetical, Business and Miscellaneous Directory . . . 1930 (Hamilton, Ontario: Vernon Directory Ltd., 1930) or tax assessment records.

TABLE VIII

ASSESSED VALUE RESIDENCE REAL ESTATE
MEMBERS FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH (CONVENTION) AND BETHEL
BAPTIST CHURCH(REGULAR), ORILLIA, ONTARIO -- 1928

Assessments (dollars)	First Baptist		Bethel Baptist		Orillia*
	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters	
over 4000	3	-	-	-	2
3500-3999	2	-	-	-	-
3000-3499	1	-	-	-	1
2500-2999	1	1	-	-	1
2000-2499	5	1	2	1	7
1500-1999	9	1	1	-	9
1000-1499	5	1	7	2	9
500- 999	8	-	1	1	12
0- 499	5	1	-	-	9
Totals	39	5	11	4	50

*Data Taken From: Town of Orillia Assessment Record 1927 for taxation year 1928, sample constitutes the first entry every 5th page.

Methodology: Orillia tax records provide no street addresses, only legal descriptions of property. However, religious designations for statistical and school tax purposes were provided. Checking Baptist designations if family name and street were correct it was assumed that the legal description was for this property. Eight Regular Baptists were listed as farmers-gentlemen. Six Convention Baptists fell in the same category. Thus, property owners in the county could have significant holdings, and the status of Baptists may be under-represented in this table.

What remains to be briefly explained is how two divergent social groups modified nineteenth century evangelicalism to produce new faiths for a new age.

The growing social heterogeneity of Baptists documented above had, during the period 1875-1910, produced divergent needs which could not easily be met within the bounds of traditional nineteenth century evangelicalism. One major concern was the issue of religious authority. In reality the impact of social and scientific change gave rise to three new authority systems in the period 1870-1895. The doctrine of Papal infallibility appeared in 1871, biblical inerrancy in 1881, and Pentecostalism in 1894.

Much has been made of higher criticism versus biblical infallibility in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. Suffice it to say that if biblical criticism was new, so was the inerrancy doctrine espoused by the Princeton theologians. The inerrancy doctrine was founded on Scottish Common Sense philosophy, and pushed Calvin and the fathers of Westminster far beyond the assertion that scripture was "the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving Knowledge, Faith,and Obedience."[19] Princeton asserted, contrary to orthodoxy, that "all the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, [were] without error, when the ipsissima verba of the original autographs [were] ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense."[20] It should be remembered that the original charges of biblical heresy were levelled by Charles A. Briggs of Union Seminary, New York against these Princeton innovations.

The second symbol modified related to the doctrine of the Priesthood of all believers;--in many respects the key to the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, though much neglected by historians. To the Toronto establishment it meant freedom from coercion and a buttress to an individuality which supported social

accommodation. To the urban workers and later to rural Baptists it came to mean the right of every man to interpret his Bible after the common sense hermeneutic contained in the Princeton formula. The professional urbanite was prepared for a professional clergy in a world of professionals, hence could entertain historical biblical study and higher criticism. In contrast, dispensationalists incorporated a laymen's form of higher criticism in their Scofield Bible, and scholars became fair game for the elitist charges levelled by Baptist democrats.

Finally, and most importantly, the needs of such a heterogeneous constituency could not be met by a single eschatology. If the comfortable found support in modern adaptations of post-millennialism, in the concept of historical progress, and soothed their drawing room consciences with the social gospel, such views touched a sour note among those Baptists undergoing the tensions produced by social dislocation and relative status loss. For the latter the theology of Doomsday, imported to America by the Plymouth Brethren and spread through the new laymen's Bible Institutes and by the Prophetic Conferences made more sense. Indeed, eschatological innovation was a major concern of Convention supporters as early as 1900, when Dr. Calvin Goodspeed of McMaster published his <u>The Messiah's Second Advent, A Study in Eschatology.</u> In the Education Day debate held at the Toronto Convention in 1926, Prof. L. H. Marshall voiced a common complaint when he pointed the accusing finger of Darbyism at his opponents. Marshall exulted:

> I am going to uncover the fire and let you see what it is. If I have to go back to England for it I will go. That is fair. There are many people in the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec who are not Baptists at all; they are Plymouth Brethren. [Hear, Hear, and applause.]
>
> A voice: Give us proof.
>
> Thomas Phillips once said that sometimes a Plymouth Brethren joined his church in Bloomsbury, and after a very short time the Plymouth was entirely gone and there was nothing but the brother left. Our experience in Canada is just the opposite; when a Plymouth Brethren joins a Baptist Church in Canada, in a short time the brother is entirely gone and there is nothing but the Plymouth left.[21]

Dean J. H. Farmer of McMaster likewise constantly claimed the question was whether "the Baptists [were] to forego the liberty of which they had always been the champions and accept a pre-millennial season of theology as indispensable to Baptist orthodoxy."[22]

Shields attempted to submerge the dispensational question but finally was forced to attack the Scofieldites, who withdrew from his Union and with independents of similar theology founded, in 1933, the Fellowship of Independent Baptist Churches of Canada. In short, "Christ Crucified, Risen, and Coming Again" was as new a symbolic package and as relevant to its constituency as anything to appear from Chicago, Crozer, Union Seminary, New York or Rochester. In America schisms and revivals have always gone hand in hand, and the fundamentalist revival could not begin until fundamentalist theology emerged full-blown with the publication of the Scofield Reference Bible in 1909. Only then did the differential class recruitment of members follow which altered further the social characteristics of the Baptists, precipitating the struggles for power that eventuated in schism. Indispensable to schism was the emergence of two divergent new theologies, both of which departed materially from nineteenth century evangelicalism.

Fundamentalism and modernism were not monolithic movements, and neither could claim to represent the "faith once for all delivered to the saints." However, fundamentalism produced a revival among recruits from the lower middle class, many of whom were migrants into urban centers. Later its missionaries spread out from the Bible Institutes to capture rural Canada with their new theology. The system offered security, recognition, and encouraged sectarian cohesion. Eventually fundamentalism found expression in the conservative Politics of Doomsday, Social Credit, and the new Middle American alliance.[23]

The controversy is dormant now but the scars remain. However, struggle left the Baptist denomination in Canada socially stratified and exhausted. Baptist churches associated with the

Baptist Federation of Canada find themselves locked in to a small upper-middle-class constituency where they compete with the United and Presbyterian churches for an increasingly narrow segment of the populace. It is as if through social mobility and urban stratification they had become what Fyfe feared, "The hills of Gilboa on which no dew fell". In contrast, the fundamentalists emerged to capture the natural Baptist constituency of Anglo-Saxon white collar and blue collar workers. With an aggressive spirit and new theology they have made impressive strides, especially since the merger in 1953 of the Fellowship of Independent Baptist Church and the Union of Regular Baptists of Ontario and Quebec in what eventually has become the nationwide Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches of Canada.

Some ask if reunification of Convention and Evangelical Baptists is possible. Perhaps it is too soon to tell. Social mobility and education is gradually changing the attitudes of Evangelical Baptists. Certainly social and doctrinal pluralism would need to be recognized and a good place to start would be a re-examination of our common roots in Calvin and the Philadelphia Confession. Important also is an understanding of the social bases of the schisms; the changes in institutions and doctrines that created a high incidence of tension and potential for religious conflict in the 1920's. If this paper contributes to such a dialogue, if it enables various "Baptist" groups to move beyond rhetoric and historical apology, it will have done its work.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Canadian Baptist, Vol. 21 No. 49, p. 1.

2. Canadian Baptist Archives, hereafter CBA, Jarvis Street File, mut. man., The Dai.. (December) 3, 1875, p. 4.

3. Rev. R. A. Fyfe, A Forty Years' Survey from Bond Street Pulpit, (Toronto: Dudley & Burns, 1876), p. 26.

4. Ibid.,p. 27.

5. Ernest R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism-Toward A Historical Interpretation (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968),p. 3; also, The Roots of Fundamentalism-British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970).

6. S. G. Cole, The History of Fundamentalism (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931), p. 334 and elsewhere; Norman F. Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. 38.

7. E. R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism, p. 26.

8. E. R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, see preface, xii. For a critical discussion of Sandeen which points out the problems of definition and interpretation relating to the terms fundamentalism and modernism see, LeRoy Moore, Jr., "Another Look at Fundamentalism: A Response to Ernest R. Sandeen," Church History, Vol. XXXVII (June 1968), pp. 195-202; also R. T. Handy, "Fundamentalism and Modernism in Perspective," Religion and Life, XXIV (Summer 1955), pp. 381-394; H. Richard Niebuhr, "Fundamentalism," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, E. R. Seligman, ed., III (New York: MacMillan Co., 1938), pp. 526-7.

9. Everett L. Perry, "The Role of Socio-economic Factors in the Rise and Development of American Fundamentalism." Unpub. PhD. diss., Div. School of the University of Chicago, 1959; p. 5; Mary B. Hill, "From Sect to Denomination in the Baptist Church in Canada," unpub. Ph.D. diss., State University of New York, Buffalo, 1971, p. 11, pp. 155-7.

10. Walter E. Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Baptists in North America, 1895-1934," unpub. Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1974, pp. 133-49.

11. Ibid., pp. 149-58.

12. T. T. Shields, "The Christian Attitude Towards Amusements," printed in, L. K. Tarr, Shields of Canada, pp. 208-218.

13. Literature relating to these schisms is considerable, and is primarily apologetic. For the Ontario and Quebec schism, material favorable to the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec see: W. G. Carder, "Controversy in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, 1908-1929" (Unpublished B.D. thesis, McMaster Divinity School, McMaster University, 1950),and J. E. Dozois, "Dr. Thomas Todhunter Shields (1873-1955) in the Stream of Fundamentalism" (unpublished B.D. thesis, McMaster Divinity School, McMaster University, 1962). For the fundamentalist case see L. K. Tarr, This Dominion His Dominion (Willowdale, Ontario: Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches, 1968); also, L. K. Tarr, Shields of Canada (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967).

    Literature relating to schism in the Baptist Union of Western Canada, favoring the Union, see G. H. Pousett, "The History of the Regular Baptists of British Columbia" (unpublished B.D. thesis, McMaster Divinity School, McMaster University, 1956); for the fundamentalist case see J.B. Richards, "Baptists in British Columbia: A Struggle to Maintain 'Sectarianism'" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, 1964).

14. T. T. Shields, "McMaster's Approval of Dr. Faunce's Infidelity," Gospel Witness, II, No. 38 (January 31, 1924), p. 13; The True Story of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church Trouble: by its Retired Deacons, Toronto, October 7, 1921, p. 3.

15. Data is taken from: Jarvis Street Baptist Church Directory, 1910, 1913; Central Baptist membership from: Document of Dismissal J. S. B. C., in C. B. A.

16. Samuel P. Hays, "The Changing Political Structure of the City in Industrial America," (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh mimeo, June, 1970), pp. 2-3.

17. J. B. Richards, "Baptists in British Columbia," p. 150.

18. CBA, Whidden Papers, Letter, O. C. S. Wallace, Entaw Place Baptist Church, Baltimore, Md., to S. J. Moore (Toronto Millionaire), November 9, 1926.

19. Second London Confession, 1677, in W. L. Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, (Valley Forge: Judson, 1969), p. 248.

20. A. A. Hodge and B.B. Warfield, "Inspiration," Presbyterian Review II (April 1881), pp. 238-9; also B. B. Warfield, The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, Samuel G. Craig, ed. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Reformed Publishing Co., 1949),p. 173.

21. CBA, Proceedings of the Educational Session of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec Held in First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, October 19, 1926, p. 82.

22. CBA, Dean J. H. Farmer Papers, Letter Farmer to Rev. A. P. McDiarmid, Robson, B. C., April 29, 1927; to J. H. Hunter, Sherbrooke, Quebec, February 22, 1927; to Mr. A. Murray, June 17, 1927; for Shields against dispensationalism see, T. T. Shields, The Doctrines of Grace (Toronto: The Gospel Witness, n.d.), pp. 197-208.

23. Erling Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1970).

The Castle Builders: High Anglican Hopes of the Frontier in the Mid-Nineteenth Century

by

Elliot Rose

While I was working on W. F. Hook of Leeds I became interested in the question of the High Church's expanding horizons - the development that begins in Oriel Common Room or Hursley Vicarage, and ends, if it can be said to have ended, in the slums of Johannesburg. Of course the nineteenth century Church in all its branches, Protestant and Catholic, was very conscious of mission, but I want to throw out some ideas about High Church attitudes to mission in what you might call the Pusey Period - the High Church's new romantic age.

I will admit the title is easy to misunderstand; the first half of it is a reference to Charlotte M. Yonge, and the second to Frederick Jackson Turner. Castle builders, of course, are people who indulge in unrealistic hopes. _The Castle Builders; or, the Deferred Confirmation_ (1854) is a novel of Charlotte M. Yonge which I have not read - it is an extreme rarity, a collector's item - but some of its characters reappear in later novels. One of them became a missionary in Australia. Another founded an Anglican sisterhood for slum work - the real-life order Miss Yonge had in mind was the Devonport Sisterhood, which by the time we meet Mother Constance in _Pillars of the House_ (1873) had been ten years in Hawaii where they were invited by King Kamehameha IV.

As for the Frontier, I am using the word in the sense familiar to North American historians. In his seminal paper of 1893, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History", F. J. Turner Said, "the religious aspects of the frontier make a chapter in our history which needs study"-it never got that study from him. Turner occasionally threw out suggestions that frontier religion was apt to be democratic and emotional[1], and on both counts we would not expect it to be High Anglican, but he never actually developed the point. Among post-Turner users of the thesis, however, there seems to be a received idea that frontier conditions favor

Evangelical Protestantism and disfavor sacerdotal and ritualistic churches. This - like most of the Frontier Thesis - is easier to accept if you ignore the ethnic cultural contribution, and also ignore non-American frontiers as Turner was entitled to do. Many members of this Society are better qualified than I to discuss its applicability to Canada.

In any case, the Nineteenth Century offered a wide choice of frontier situations, all of them promising growth points for Christianity and all apt to be seen, competitively, as growth points for a particular denomination, sect or party. In Anglicanism at the time of the Oxford Movement, the vigorous rise of the Church Missionary Society (then thirty-odd years old) had spurred the sobersided old S.P.G. to new efforts in emulation. In Canada, which was S.P.G. country, the natives were to be won for Church and King partly for their own souls' sake and partly to match the black and brown Evangelicals whom the C.M.S. was recruiting in the East. Here is a young lady, in the 1820's, imagining the activities of her admirer, who has gone out to Canada with that intention:

> What has this worn, weary old civilization to offer like the joy of sitting beneath one of the glorious aspiring pines of America, gazing out on the blue waters of her limpid inland seas, in her fresh pure air, with the simple children of the forest round him, their princely forms in attitudes of attention, their dark soft liquid eyes fixed upon him, as he tells them "Your Great Spirit, Him whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you", and then some glorious old chief bows his stately head, and throws aside his marks of superstition. "I believe", he says.[2]

Charlotte M.Yonge, who wrote this in 1860, had her tongue firmly in her cheek. It did not pan out that way. The young man, to his disgust, was expected to minister to "mere colonists, some of them Yankee, some Presbyterian Scots", who had no respect for English gentlemen. Their uncouthness eventually drove him to a fashionable pulpit in Toronto where he married another girl. The heroine, whom I have just quoted, died a spinster but was a good influence on many children, one of whom became a bishop in Australia, several novels later[3].

In the same novel, several years later, the son of the manqué missionary is surveying a railway near Lake Superior when he meets the heroine's long lost cousin, a mere boy struggling with back-breaking labour to farm in the bush, who nevertheless "comes to Lakeville, five miles across the bush and seven across the lake, to church on Sunday", thus proving what proper Anglican emigrants are made of[4]. Miss Yonge - Keble's disciple - was a very committed novelist and the most successful that the Tractarian school ever produced. She is very conscious of the needs of mission, both at home and abroad. As these quotations show, her picture of the mission field was not totally unrealistic, but she did place very high hopes on what Anglicanism could accomplish in the wilderness. Naturally she and all her friends would hotly deny that it was the wrong kind of religion for the wilderness. But I think they would have agreed that there was a sense in which the wilderness presented a tougher, more intractable challenge to missionaries of their school than to Evangelicals, because mission as they conceived it was a tougher proposition all round. The new High Church of the Oxford Movement and after was not more zealous for souls than the Evangelicals, but it had a new and more demanding conception of what a missionary church ought to be like. In this it stood contrasted not only to the Evangelicals, typified by the C.M.S., but equally to the old High Church party typified, in these matters,by the S.P.G.

These societies, and most other competitors in the field, Methodists, Moravians and so on, were mainly concerned about numbers. In areas of European settlement, the primary concern of the S.P.G., the problem was to prevent leakage of nominal believers into infidelity, and had its parallels with the problem of the contemporary industrial city. Among the heathen - the main concern of the C.M.S. - the more exciting prospect opened up of thousands of dark-skinned catechumens telling the wonderful works of God in dozens of languages, but all in the correct theological terms. Obviously these needs and these prospects excited the new High Church also. But they had to demand something more. Their central

doctrine was not "the just shall live by faith" but "I believe in the holy catholic church" - and wherever that church was newly planted it had to exhibit the notes of catholicity in correct and regular church order. And ideally - wherever it came to be the predominant religion - it ought to inform the whole surrounding society with the Anglican *ethos*. Thus Hursley should be the model of Carrigaboola. (Carrigaboola, which may possibly remind you of Borioboola-Gha, was the station in the Queensland outback one of whose missionaries and one of whose bishops I have already mentioned.[5])

A mission, then, must not only convert people to the right kind of Christianity, thereby saving their souls and helping the right kind of Christianity to prevail in the world over other kinds and over "infidelity"; it must also organize their future religious lives on right principles of ecclesiology. Even among mission-minded High Churchmen there could be some debate on what these were. Once the debate was resolved, however, and the frontier churches could be founded on the right lines, the interesting possibility opened up that they might serve as models for their Mother Church herself. The possibility was not, in fact, clearly seen by many in the mid-Nineteenth Century period. Early Anglo-Catholics still thought about the example they ought to set to the black man, whereas later ones were more aware of the example he might set to them, and on the whole this idea of mission influence in reverse is a Twentieth-Century perspective. But there were already hints and suggestions that the High Church missionary impulse might call a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old.

W. F. Hook was famous for his work in the industrial city - Leeds, not the prairie or the jungle, was his mission field. He comes into this paper because he was one of the first High Church champions who looked beyond the established Church of England to what is nowadays rather pretentiously called "the Worldwide Anglican Communion". It was the fully independent and voluntary churches of Scotland and America that most interested him. Throughout his

life he insisted on their equal dignity with the Church of England, and pointed to their faithfulness under the Cross (of disendowment) as evidence of the Divine blessing on Anglicanism. Hook was an Establishment man; he thought disestablishment was disastrous to secular society, and he thought America proved it; but in the providence of God it might be the salvation of the church. He was not entertaining romantic notions of martyrdom, as many Tractarians were doing, but soberly contemplating the future of the church when she could no longer count on the alliance of the State. To give one instance of his attitude, as early as 1835 we find him arguing, from the example of the United States, that lay representatives in synods would be more High Church than the clergy and therefore would be a good thing[6].

In this optimistic view of the democratic and voluntary principles, Hook was hardly at one with his brethren, - and in his own thought the values of establishment and independence were in tension. The same tension ran through the theorizings of the school on the subject of mission, as long as anybody could still entertain a hope that the Imperial government might establish the English church in the colonies. As long as the hope remained, the tension also cropped up in the practical politics of mission in the field. So did at least two others: the competing claims of London control _versus_ local control, and the competing claims of native peoples _versus_ settlers. Both of these were general problems of nineteenth-century British Imperialism. The new High Church came to have characteristic views on both.

The tension between London control and local control, in the special form it took in the context of Anglican missions, is the subject of Hans Cnattingius' book, _Bishops and Societies_[7]. He shows how the first colonial bishops, regardless of their style of churchmanship, were drawn by the nature of their situation into a tug-of-war, for effective control of their clergy, with S.P.G. or C.M.S. or (in the case of the hapless diocese of Madras) both of these and the S.P.C.K. as well. The S.P.C.K. was only marginally and reluctantly involved outside of Madras but the other two

both tended to make very overweening use of the power of the purse, and to do this in ignorance of local conditions. Bishops, concerned about these conditions, and lacking the power of the purse, had to insist on their canonical authority and sacred office. Thus a situation arose time and again in the overseas church where bishops, including Evangelicals, took a High Church line against societies, including the S.P.G., who took a Low one. Indeed the S.P.G. were the first offenders, in their dealings with Charles Inglis of Nova Scotia, before the C.M.S. was even founded. The old High Church in effect, although probably not as a result of any profound theological reflection, was on the side of London control. The new, as a matter of conscious principle, favored the colonial bishops' side of the question. It would be logical for them to go on to take an anti-authoritarian line on Imperial matters generally. It is also logical that the new High Church never founded its own missionary society but had to find other and more indirect means of furthering the cause.

On the competing claims of natives and settlers, the two old societies stood in contrast to each other. That is to say, they recognized different priorities in the strictly religious sphere. In politics they tried to stay neutral, and it would be fair to say that they showed equal humanitarian concern over such questions as the economic rights of natives. Respect for native customs and culture was rare among missionaries anyway - it was one of the things that isolated Colenso[8]. But the C.M.S. was primarily concerned with the heathen, and the S.P.G. with white settlers, from their foundations. This neatly reflects the emphases of their parent parties, the zeal of the High being for pastoral work and the zeal of Evangelicals being for evangelism, but there are other historical reasons for the difference. The S.P.G. had strict terms of reference laid down in its Royal Charter which could only with difficulty be amended, and originally it was confined to the Americas; the C.M.S. originally looked to Africa and India to avoid overlap. Many early C.M.S. workers in India found themselves serving white congregations in the absence of a

Company chaplain, but this was against the society's policy; in New Zealand especially it insisted that its men must only serve natives, and this was a major source of conflict with Bishop G. A. Selwyn[9]. We can understand why the C.M.S. insisted on this - it was so much easier to become a colonial parson than to preach in Tamil or Maori that there was a danger that all their workers would go the way of that disappointing young man of Charlotte M. Yonge's in Toronto. But bishops in many places needed clergy for both purposes. The new High Church could agree that the two needs were inseparable - because it had a vision of the Church in which there was neither Jew nor Greek, Roman nor Scythian, bond nor free - and in which self-appointed missionary societies had no place because they were not primitive. Both the old societies, from this point of view, had an imbalance only to be expected of unprimitive institutions. The missionary church must advance on both fronts,and settler and native must be united in Christian brotherhood. On this expectation - which again has an echo of Borioboola-Gha - comment is perhaps needless.

Cnattingius takes his story down to 1850 - an arbitrary date, not marked by an pivotal event, but roughly coinciding with a number of developments that make up a change of phase. Bishops and societies had had time to clarify their policies, and the courts had not had time to confuse the issues by raising legal and constitutional doubts about the Royal Supremacy in the overseas Empire. In the next phase, the building of the Anglican Communion was to be bedevilled by such doubts; the struggle was to be for synodical government and against Letter-Patent and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. On these questions as on the earlier ones between bishops and societies, earnest Anglicans on the spot, whatever their churchmanship, were pushed by circumstances into a "High" position for which the new High, but not the old, could supply the appropriate theoretical basis.

By 1850 this could be done through the pages of the Colonial Church Chronicle and Missionary Journal and (from 1864),

Foreign Ecclesiastical Reporter - actually founded in 1847. Bishop Selwyn, whose synod in 1844 was a breakthrough in modern Anglican history, repeated the achievement with more éclat in that same year; and in the following year Bishop Robert Gray went to Cape Town. Selwyn and Gray were the darling bishops of the Oxford school - New Zealand and South Africa were the horizons of its fondest hopes; and the Chronicle was its mouthpiece. It is true that its first number editorially claimed that it was not a party organ, and it was scrupulously impartial in reporting S.P.G. and C.M.S. affairs. The time was to come when it would reprove the S.P.G. for its dealings with colonial bishops; I have already suggested reasons why this would not be inconsistent with the new party line[10]. That the Chronicle did support a party is quite clear. In an article in the first number, "The Extension of the Reformed Catholic Church", ostensibly directed against Roman Catholic claims, it lists Orthodox and recent Anglican achievements but mentions nobody else. When it did not call its own religion "Reformed Catholic" it was quite likely to say "Anglo-Catholic". When, in 1860, the Bishop of Huron protested against the dangerous tendencies of Trinity College, Toronto, the Chronicle reported the dispute in a manner wholly favorable to the High Church side. The whole tone of the periodical would leave no doubt in the mind of a Church historian. It remains polite to Evangelicals, impolite to Rome, and on some subjects still a little uncertain as to which direction is High.

Mention of Toronto brings me to a quotation I cannot resist. It was borrowed by the Chronicle from the Toronto Church in 1852, and I am informed[11] that it was probably written by Bishop John Strachan himself. It describes how

> the desecrated and creedless precincts of Toronto University witnessed a scene pregnant with material for sad reflection, as connected with the moral degradation of an Institution which might have been an illustrious seat of learning in that "misgoverned land". Some years ago, the Society for Propagating the Gospel presented, with characteristic liberality, to the late King's College a valuable collection of theological works, rightly deeming that such a boon

> would be highly valued by an institution which reverenced the claims of Christianity. Whether moved by remorse, or constrained by the remonstrances of the friends of the Church, the "infidelizers" of the hapless College permitted the insertion of a clause in the University Act, setting aside the above-mentioned works for any College or Seminary that might be established under the auspices of the Bishop of the Diocese. The delivery of these volumes was made last week in due form to the authorities of Trinity College. The books were packed in eight large cases, and from their appearance, they had been stowed away in a lumber room for several years[12].

This was a fate which was eventually to befall the new college's own run of the Chronicle itself. The Chronicle shared Strachan's anger at the infidelizing of King's College, and at the secularizing of the Clergy Reserves. It was not by any means prepared to welcome colonial disestablishment, if colonial establishment on decent terms was to be had, and old Upper Canada had looked like a particularly hopeful venture in Church colonization - a planned effort, not merely to open up a new country economically, but to plant in virgin soil and in their purest form the social institutions of the old. That was colonization as it ought to be. The Chronicle agreed with Lord John Manners that there ought to be a colonial peerage[13], but naturally it was more anxious to ensure the proper authority of the clergy. For instance, it wanted emigrants to be under some form of pastoral guidance all the way from their old village to their new one, including the emigrant ship[14]. Another constant preoccupation is illustrated by the above quotation: mission did not just mean churches, but all the institutions a young community needed, and especially schools and colleges. This is so constant a preoccupation, indeed, that quotations can hardly do it justice; but for its flavor I select a description of a college for boys in "Van Diemen's Land",[15] where we are shown "the library, an upper room, overlooking the quadrangle" and dinner with the warden, fellows, candidates for Orders, the scholars (one of whom says grace in Latin) and other students "not on the foundation, though wearing the same kind of cap and gown". In all this we can see "the infant features of one of those Colleges which we see

in England, in their full maturity, feeding every department of our Church and State with a perennial flow of renovating energy, intellect, and high principle". It was certainly a very different source of talent to what Van Diemen's Land had used hitherto!

The most hopeful colony of all was New Zealand, and within New Zealand, Canterbury Province. This full-scale experiment in Anglican colonization is sufficiently well-known, and I shall not go into its actual fortunes which were better than might have been expected despite the Maori wars. The Chronicle gave it a great deal of space; it was very suspicious of the intentions of the New Zealand Company, but the Canterbury project represented its beau idéal. Previous colonies had uniformly failed to include in their plans

> a nobility, a gentry, an established Church, endowed colleges and schools. The consequence naturally is that our Colonies, British in name, are American in character. Along with the Colonists will be sent whatever is necessary for carrying out the whole of our ecclesiastical organization, and ample provisions will be made for educational institutions in connection with the Church. Great care will also be taken in the selection of emigrants, so as to prevent, as far as possible, the introduction of unwholesome elements into the young community[16].

This was in 1848; Selwyn's pioneering synod had recently met and legislated:

> Canon IX - That all persons be exhorted to come to the Holy Communion in seemly clothing: but that no one be excluded on account of his inability to procure a dress of foreign manufacture[17].

It was about the same time that a number of fictional characters invented by Charlotte M. Yonge conceived the ambition of starting a Sunday School, and eventually building a church in a benighted industrial slum near their home. Their doings made her best-loved book, The Daisy Chain; all her profits from it went to New Zealand where they founded a school, dedicated to St. Andrew in honor of the fictional chapel and school of St. Andrew's, Cocksmoor[18]. (The school served Melanesia - a mission based on a mission - to which Miss Yonge had already given the profits of her best-seller,

Heir of Redcliffe; she later wrote the biography of its martyr-bishop, John Coleridge Patteson - one of the very few missionaries, and the only bishop, who really got himself killed in the South Sea Islands.) One of the fictional family in the Daisy Chain, Norman May, went to New Zealand himself hoping to convert the Maori. In a pattern that we have heard of before, he was required to take charge of a school for white settlers. However, he was a more sterling character than the young man who went to Ontario, for he rose above the disappointment and became an Archdeacon. He was able to send some of his students into the Melanesian mission, where he actually followed them, becoming a missionary bishop at the end of his life[19].

The missionary church in Melanesia was based on the missionary church in New Zealand. Most of its workers, and most of its financial resources, must have come from England in the early days. From the standpoint of the school represented by the Chronicle it was important that actual New Zealanders if not actual Melanesians should assume full responsibility as soon as possible. No mission church was ever too young to send out its own missions. Oddly enough I have found no argument for this basing itself on the example of the Celtic and Anglo-Saxon churches in the Dark Ages. I would have expected to find this, because the example is actually in point and would be congenial to Oxford-movement minds. But their historical sights tended to be set on even earlier missionizing ventures, those which won whole barbarian kingdoms on the frontiers of the Roman Empire, and which had perhaps the attraction that we know very little about them and can therefore give the romantic imagination free rein.

Newly planted churches should be sending out their own missions. They and their missions should as soon as possible become self-supporting in the rugged pioneering way; they should not depend on doles of money or contingents of gentlemanly and inexperienced clergy from England (regardless of England's continuing duty to send them). The newest of new churches should be complete - that is to say, episcopal - from the first; the missionary team

should be headed by a bishop, himself an active missionary and not a dignified Establishment man sent out to supervise missionaries after the ground had been broken by presbyters on their own. All this added up to a need for local initiative and independence, which was somewhat at odds with the Chronicle's concern to transplant a paternalistic, hierarchically ordered society. Here we have yet another tension that might be matched in nineteenth-century Imperialism generally, between a desire that the colonies, and their churches, should be exact copies of the Mother country and a desire that they should be enterprising and spontaneous. This tension further has a very close parallel in the hopes the High Church placed in the Gothic Revival in architecture, which was to produce a style freely adaptable to all conditions without departing from the norms set once for all time in the late thirteenth century. Indeed, this architectural problem was one that mission-minded High Churchmen had to be very conscious of, though the Chronicle was able to leave it to its contemporary, The Ecclesiologist.

The Chronicle was concerned for the independence, and the ecclesiastical completeness - plene esse - of the frontier church. Ideally this meant that a bishop could be among the original trail-blazers. If the area was to be opened up to white settlement, the first settlers ought to find a bishop, if not a cathedral, there when they arrived. If they were ever going to develop a paternalistic and traditional society they would need one, but the Church's need was primary and applied equally to the territory of indigenous peoples. The Chronicle (and, incidentally, the Ecclesiologist also) tends in true Anglican fashion to equate the founding of the Church in a new country with the consecration of its first bishop.

Churches that were so founded were rare. The idea was familiar enough in mid-Victorian times to be made fun of by W.S. Gilbert[20]. The first actual proposal seems to have come from, of all people, Bishop John Strachan of Toronto about 1851. When the subdivision of the original enormous diocese was first mooted, the diocese of Huron was the only actual result but Strachan had put

forward a plan - enthusiastically endorsed by the Chronicle - for a diocese of "St. Mary's", which would be right out in the bush in unsettled country. The area was roughly the modern diocese of Algoma, and "St. Mary's" was Sault Ste. Marie. There were no clergy at all yet, but one day there would be a cathedral city. Certainly settlement, and not only work among Indians, was involved:

> An intelligent Bishop, aiming from the beginning at the extension and establishment of Christ's kingdom by means of his connexion with colonization might render his Diocese very different from the other Dioceses which have been settled at random[21].

Nothing directly came of this. The first scheme actually based on these principles was in 1861, when at the urging of Bishop Gray of Cape Town and of Livingstone the "Oxford and Cambridge Mission to Central Africa" was founded for the express purpose of sending a team headed by a bishop to the Zambesi[22]. This was the beginning of what soon became the Universities Mission to Central Africa, and the U.M.C.A. may be thought an exception to my earlier statement that the new High Church did not start a missionary society of its own. It is the exception that proves the rule; the U.M.C.A. expresses in its name its strictly limited objective, essentially to enlist support in Cambridge and Oxford (it was a Cambridge initiative) for founding one diocese on correct High Church principles. The real control was not to be in Cambridge or Oxford but on the spot. Even the U.M.C.A. was not able to live up to this intention, and when the second bishop decided to move his base to Zanzibar he had a row with his committee just as earlier bishops had had with S.P.G. or C.M.S.[23] The U.M.C.A. became a permanent institution and continued to send clergy to a large area of sub-Sahara Africa whose characteristic brand of Anglicanism has remained strongly "Anglo-Catholic". It has become permanent, in spite of losing the argument about Zanzibar, which on its principles it was bound to lose.

These principles had been discussed in the Chronicle, where the need for a bishop to be the spearhead of the Church's advance and to be a real missionary was coupled with the non-need

for him to be rich[24]. The question remained open whether he ought to have high social precedence. I think the Chronicle wanted him to, but it also wanted the advancing church as a whole to be otherworldly in its economic demands. Colonists ought to support their own church; the schools and other institutions that a Christian colony needed must be cheap; the clergy should be content with apostolic poverty, even if they dreamed of Gothic cathedrals. The Chronicle was fascinated when Selwyn in New Zealand planned a "St. John's College" which included a hospital, to be staffed by volunteers organized as "Brothers" and "Sisters" of a community, specifically to keep it cheap rather than to make it medieval[25]. The Rev. Stewart Darling, then a missionary in Canada West, wrote in 1852[26] to suggest that groups of missionaries, living together as communities, should support themselves by clearing the wilderness and farming it. I hardly like to mention that Darling became a Rector in Toronto and eventually went over to Rome. However, both he and Selwyn evidently thought that quasi-monastic institutions were suited to the wilderness for reasons of practical convenience as well as ascetic piety. It would not be difficult to make such a case, and of course High Church mission, like Roman Catholic, has often been carried out that way. As a strategy it has the disadvantage of depending on vocations for the life of an active religious order, and in the mid-century these were very rare among men.

The same Stewart Darling, as Rector of Holy Trinity, chaired a meeting in 1857 in the upper school room of that church, which was attended by several representatives of the Toronto black community, with the object of founding a black Torontonian mission to Africa[27]. This was following in the footsteps of the diocese of Barbados, which already supported missions around Cape Palmas (it later took over Gambia); at nearly the same time (1850) the first synod of Australian bishops had set up a Mission Board.[28] This last move was intimately bound up with Bishop Broughton (of Sydney)'s wish to unite the Australian dioceses in a self-governing entity that should not have policy made for it in London.

Almost every principle that the Chronicle espoused

required the colonial church to be self-governing. This was also a practical necessity, increasingly so as it became clear that no colonial legislature was willing to establish the Anglican church. I shall not deal with the legal entanglements, which make much too large and complicated a subject. The Chronicle, in any case, was more concerned with what the law ought to be than with what it was. From at least 1848 it consistently urged that the colonial church had to be free to manage its own affairs, whether it was in any sense "established" locally or not. In that year, commenting editorially on the views of "F.H.D." in favor of voluntarism, it still wanted establishment where possible but also wanted, like the writer, synodical government with lay participation. Scotland, after all, had both. "F.H.D." had written, "In fact, it has come to this, that the idea of an establishment must be given up."[29] This was still rather shocking; but Gladstone's bill of 1852, which would have accepted and regularized this fait accompli, was warmly supported. Even earlier, in 1851, an article, "The Church of the Future" (which drew part of its inspiration from the Crystal Palace exhibition) had drawn a very euphoric picture of the "Anglo-Catholic" church as it would be in 1901 - worldwide, numerous, and overwhelmingly non-established. When they had come to recognize the Royal Supremacy as "accidental" - an expression which could be matched in very early writings of W.F. Hook[30] - Anglicans would be more obedient to their own internal authorities than ever before:

> They wish to see a general understanding as to the limitations imposed by the Church on the private judgment of its individual ministers and members. They long and pray for a more visible, practical and efficient union of the several portions of at least the Anglo-Catholic Church than they now experience[31].

After the failure of Gladstone's bill, the need for synodical government and for freedom from Canterbury or the Colonial Office is a constant preoccupation. Naturally it became more intense after the Privy Council's decision in Colenso's case in 1865, but the Chronicle's position was clear enough before. It was urging free

election of bishops in 1855[32] referring to the Royal Supremacy and other aspects of the English Establishment, in 1858, as "local and temporary accidents"[33] and asserting the equality of local Metropolitans with Canterbury in 1861[34]. In 1867 A.C. Tait, then Bishop of London, canvassed the colonial bishops in hopes they would agree to accept the authority of Canterbury (and in some sense the Royal Supremacy) as the unifying principle of the Anglican communion. He was almost universally rebuffed. It seems clear that on this sort of question the Chronicle was in sympathy with the mind of the overseas church as a whole, and not with a party only.

After the Colenso case hardly anybody with a real grasp of the situation could want bishops in the British dependencies to be appointed by the Crown by letters-patent. Even before the Colenso case such a method of appointment was manifestly absurd for bishops outside the British dependencies. Yet this method was resorted to, in 1862 for the consecration of T.N. Staley for Hawaii, where the Royal Supremacy if it existed at all was exercised not by Victoria but by Kamehameha IV.

Briefly in the 1860's Hawaii was another darling mission field of the High Church. This time the hope was that a barbarian kingdom would be brought within the pale of Christendom, on the early medieval precedents, by the self-dedication of a converted king. High Churchmen seem to have persuaded themselves that Bishop Staley in Honolulu, like Bishop Mackenzie on the Zambesi, would be a true "Missionary Bishop", planting the church in virgin soil - the previous work of American Methodists did not count. American Episcopalians were involved in this venture which they were destined to take over, but it was mainly English and this was doubtless its attraction to Kamehameha who correctly saw American influence as a danger to his throne. Missionary rivalries played a part in the political struggles which eventually destroyed the monarchy, but in 1862 the exile of that ardent Anglican, Queen Liliuokalani, lay far ahead. Royal patronage seemed to ensure the Anglicanization of Hawaii. Its affairs were reported frequently

in the Chronicle with only the occasional sour note, as when in 1865 (quoting an Episcopalian source) it condemns attacks on the mission by American sectarians already working there:

> These low, uneducated persons, formerly blacksmiths, carpenters, shoemakers etcetera do not understand what gentlemanly feeling is[35].

Gentlemanly feeling was one of the blessings that the true church was supposed to introduce to the Sandwich Islanders, along with Christianity itself. Boarding schools on the English model were early planned. The Devonport Sisters came to run a girls' school. There was even to be a Cathedral School. Staley, in a report of 1864, is proud of these achievements and of the fact that he had persuaded a number of island chieftains to enrol in his District Visiting Society and Tract Society[36].

Honolulu was to have a proper cathedral from the start. Staley took out the plans with him. They were reviewed in the Ecclesiologist in June 1862:

> As for the materials, from information furnished by the government surveyor, it is found that the islands afford a very good rough stone, (a sort of coral rock) for general purposes, and that there are many natives who are accustomed to the working of it; but there is no stone which can be used for carving, mouldings, tracery or ashlar walling. Accordingly a severe early type [of Gothic] has been chosen, which will depend for its decoration on painting. Timber is procured from Vancouver's Island. We may congratulate Mr. Slater on his success while we confess our gratification at the good results which cannot fail to follow from so favourable an exhibition of the Church of England in its material aspect to the kingdom of Hawaii. It is unhappily many centuries since it has been usual for sovereigns voluntarily to take up the yoke of Christ, and to invite the indwelling of the Church in their nations. Hawaii is a solitary instance in these later ages of a country, first civilized, then Christianized, and now inviting the organization of the Church in its entirety. Our prayers and our wishes go with the success of Bishop Staley's mission, and we are in proportion more glad that he has provided himself with plans and designs, so well calculated to exhibit the true dignity and signification of the Episcopal and Cathedral system[37].

It is a temptation to go on quoting the Ecclesiologist, which is packed with references to the needs of High Church missions in every part of the Earth. The same volume has an article on the adaptation of Gothic to the climate of Ceylon - where, according to the most famous of Anglican missionary hymns, every prospect pleases and only Man is vile[38]. Ceylon had an ancient civilization; Hawaii had local building stone and native masons; it is remarkable how completely the Ecclesiologist and its favorite architects ignore the possibility of any local architectural tradition worth taking into account. It was assumed that all churches, and indeed all buildings whatsoever in a Christian country, must be Gothic; though they were prepared, and anxious, to develop new varieties of Gothic to suit the local climate and materials[39]. I have already suggested that this is of a piece with the Chronicle's ambivalent, if not contradictory, expectations of vigorous frontier spirit and manly independence in a transplanted deference society. In Hawaii we see attempts at both.

Under different skies, it might be necessary to build a different kind of Gothic. Under new social and political conditions, the old relationship of Church and State would not work, and it became necessary to take a new look at the nature of the Church. In nineteenth-century Anglicanism the revived High Church of the Oxford Movement was more ready than its rivals for both these mental exercises, however backward-looking it might be in its style of piety and its original aims. It remained backward-looking because its formula for change was to hunt for precedents in the past, where it was not compelled to turn Radical by pressure of circumstances, it would ally with old deference systems in Hursley or Honolulu, or try to import them into Ontario or New Zealand. The missionary strategy encouraged by the Chronicle was fairly rigid, and, as was normal in the Nineteenth Century, the cultural hegemony of Europe was assumed without question. In one area this produces a gap which is very strange to the Twentieth-Century

mind: in all the literature I have seen, with its very wide-ranging discussion of all sorts of problems, the mission field is never seen as a field for liturgical experiment. The larger Anglicanism of the future was to manage with the Prayer Book of 1662, translated into Zulu or Algonquin. From the old societies, S.P.G. and C.M.S., you would have expected this, as you would expect such mere Anglican quaintness as archdeacons in gaiters and the Victorian attitude to Sunday. In the Victorian age, and under the aegis of the new High Church no less than the other parties, all these things circled the globe. I am quite sure Archdeacon Norman May wore gaiters in New Zealand. In New Zealand the obligation of Sunday observance was undoubted but it presented a serious intellectual problem until the setting of the International Date Line[40]. In Melanesia, where the same problem arose, Bishop J.C. Patteson argued that other commandments were more important, but he only meant that the English Sunday would have to wait until his catechumens had given up murder, adultery and theft[41].

As for the Prayer Book of 1662, Anglicans of all styles of churchmanship took a pride in it then which Anglicans do not to-day. In the euphoric days when their communion had just begun a very rapid expansion, it was natural for them to take pleasure in the thought of a chorus of unceasing praise, going up in all languages from all meridians of longitude. As a tailpiece I will go back to Canada for a quotation that echoes my earlier one from Charlotte M.Yonge about the delights of preaching the Gospel on the shores of the Great Lakes. The Chronicle borrowed it from Ernest Hawkins' Annals of the Diocese of Toronto. Here is Strachan on his primary visitation:

> On the first night of our encampment, I discovered that one of our canoes was manned by converted Indians from our Mission at the Manatoulin. Before going to rest they assembled together, sung a hymn in their own language, and read some prayers, which had been translated for their use from the Liturgy. There was something indescribably touching in the service of praise to God upon these inhospitable rocks; the stillness, wildness, and darkness, combined with the sweet and plaintive voices, all contributed to add to the solemn and deep interest of the scene[42].

Such scenes fed the missionary imagination. The reality, for many, might be an ordinary parish in Toronto. The task of the new theology was to discern the Mystical Body in both.

FOOTNOTES

1. F.J. Turner, The Frontier in American History (New York, 1920), 36 (quotation); cf. 121, 164-5

2. C.M. Yonge, Hopes and Fears (1860), cap. 1

3. C.M. Yonge, Modern Broods (1900), cap. 28

4. Hopes and Fears, cap. 27

5. For Carrigaboola see C.M. Yonge, Pillars of the House (1873), caps. 12 and 46, and cf. above n. 3; for Borioboola-Gha, see C. Dickens, Bleak House (1853), cap. 4

6. W.R.W. Stephens, Life and Letters of W.F. Hook (1878), I, 270

7. London, SPCK, 1952

8. Peter Hinchliff, The Anglican Church in South Africa (1963), 66f, 103f

9. Cnattingius, op.cit., 225-9

10. Chronicle, ns, 1869, 369. I am indebted to Trinity College Library for access to its file of the Chronicle

11. By Professor Maurice Careless

12. Chronicle, V, 430

13. Chronicle, V, 34

14. E.g. Chronicle, II, 229, 233, 389, 426, 457

15. Chronicle, II, 297f

16. Chronicle, I, 369-70

17. Chronicle, I, 276

18. At Kohimarama near Auckland; see C. Coleridge, C.M. Yonge, her Life and Letters (1903), 210

19. Long Vacation (1895), Caps. 4, 33

20. "The Bishop of Rum-ti-Foo" (1867) and "The Three Kings of Chickeraboo" (1868), both reprinted in Bab Ballads

21. Chronicle, IV, 388

22. Hinchliff, 70*f*; *Chronicle*, ns, 1859, 93 (volume also binds up O. & C.M.C.A. report)

23. *Chronicle*, ns, 1864, 459; 1865, 201

24. *E.g. Chronicle*, IX, 169 (1855), 322-3 (1856); ns, 1858. 243-3,443-5

25. *Chronicle*, II, 473

26. *Chronicle*, VI, 56

27. *Chronicle*, ns, 1857, 450

28. Ross Border, *Church and State in Australia 1788-1872* (1962), 174*f*. Both boards are regularly reported in the *Chronicle* from 1850

29. *Chronicle*, II, 89*f* (quote, 91), and *cf*. 302

30. See his first published sermon, of 1822, "The Peculiar Character of the Church of England, Independently of its Connection with the State"

31. *Chronicle*, IV, 385

32. *Chronicle*, VIII, 419

33. Chronicle, ns, 1858, 3

34. *Chronicle*, ns, 1861, 121

35. *Chronicle*, ns, 1865, 240-1 (quoting *American Church Quarterly*)

36. *Chronicle*, ns, 1864, 23*f*

37. *Ecclesiologist*, XXIII, 158

38. *Ibid*, 32 Hymn: "From Greenland's Icy Mountains" by Bishop Heber of Calcutta. For the vileness of Man in Ceylon, see *Chronicle*, ns, 1857, 403

39. This was a constant preoccupation of the *Ecclesiologist*; for a rare instance of success, see Douglas Scott Richardson, "HyperboreanGothic: or, Wilderness Ecclesiology and the Wood Churches of Edward Medley" in *Architectura*, II, no. 1 (1972) (I owe this reference to Mr. William Westfall)

40. *Chronicle*, V, 329

41. C.M. Yonge, *Life of John Coleridge Patteson* (1888), II, 113-4

42. *Chronicle*, I, 371*f*

The World to Come : The Millenarian Tradition in Christianity
Its Origins and Transmission

by

John Corbett

"Now I say this, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed."

I Corinthians 15,50-52 (Auth. King James Version)

The coming of the Kingdom of God is the central concern of Christianity; everyone can share some of the feeling which inspires these words of Paul's. It is by no means so easy for scholars to come to terms with the millenarian tradition in Christianity - something surprising, perhaps, given the effort which has been expended over the last few decades in the 'pursuit of the millenium', whether it is the Christian millenium of the Middle Ages or the millenium sought by the 'cargo cults' of Melanesia. What follows is an attempt to indicate some shortcomings of the modern scholarship on the millenarian tradition in Christianity and to suggest, in the briefest fashion, some new approaches to the study of this phenomenon. I speak as a Classicist with an interest in social history who has dabbled in biblical studies and semitic philology and made some brief excursions into the Middle Ages. My concern, however, is more with the study of the Christian millenium as a phenomenon in and of itself than with the methodology or traditional content of any of the disciplines which may prove useful to me in this study.

I am focusing my attention in this paper on symbolic systems of belief, the conflicts within and between such belief systems and their development. Unfashionable as it may be to acknowledge in this materialistic age, I prefer to assign logical priority in my study to the ideological dimension of the societies which I shall consider (following in this the lead of a certain school of social anthropologists in particular). I do not dismiss or disregard the more overt and obvious phenomena which have been the traditional subjects of study for humanists - the social, political, economic, even technological areas so beloved of historians. I have come

to believe that a primary characteristic of the more advanced or evolved societies, to which I shall be referring, in the ancient Mediterranean and medieval Europe (if not, indeed, of all societies, including those still at a 'tribal' level) is the "search for meaning". Perhaps in a stable and prehistorical tribal society the meaning of life is a given but certainly in the societies which I have studied, in the evolved city states of classical antiquity perhaps, but certainly in the Hellenistic, Roman and Christian world states or empires, the search for meaning has become a primary - perhaps the primary - obsession in my experience. Now millenarian activity is especially associated with the restoration of "meaning" or "wholeness" to life (what else does "redemption" or "salvation" imply?)[1]; this being so, I believe that much more of the spiritual activity of the societies which I am studying (the Greco-Roman world and Christendom) has a millenial character than the customary definitions of the millenarian tradition in Christianity would allow. Definitions are arbitrary; in this instance I prefer to follow the lead of the social anthropologists who have made a special study of millenarian activities.

I

Man, Nature, History and God

"Never surely did more terrible calamities of the Roman People, or evidence more conclusive, prove that the gods take no thought for our happiness, but only for our punishment." Tacitus Histories I, 3, 9-11

(Church & Brodribb)

A survey of the human conflicts and natural disasters of his time wrings from Tacitus this cri de coeur, one of the few occasions on which a Roman, abandoning his customary icy reserve, revealed his anxious concern about the meaning of life for all to see. It is à propos for our purpose, a striking example of the universal human search for meaning; for here we clearly see man scrutinizing nature and history to determine the will of god. This anxious concern may be most acute in times of disaster - but it cannot be stilled by success; it is a search for meaning, not simply for power. Nevertheless, their success was taken by

the Romans, as success often is, as a confirmation of the correctness of the way they interpreted reality - as a confirmation of their belief system. But failure or defeat poses problems too; either we have not understood the will of god and we must change our interpretive system *or* we have not conformed to the will of god and we must change our conduct. Consciously we prefer to change our conduct and preserve intact the beliefs which give meaning to our lives; but *unconsciously*, as the social scientists have shown, our belief system often changes too - but without our conscious awareness and much more slowly. However, changes in our belief system often make it more complex, heightening our anxiety and requiring more and more extreme adjustments of our conduct[2]; these adjustments increasingly unbalance our relationship to our environment (in the case of early Christianity, as we know, they tended to lead to a rejection of the created or material world). Perhaps in such circumstances men are faced with radical alternatives; either to become increasingly dependent on an interpretive system which is the province of experts alone, or else to accept a radical simplification of their beliefs (the experience of the Zealots in the war against Rome would be an example of this latter situation). In this case, perhaps the structure of a society also becomes more simple; in the former case, with increasing elaboration of the belief system, a society of necessity becomes more complex.

For the Christian, history is measured by the spread of Christian ideology (*or* belief in Christ), its successful diffusion constituting the proof of its correctness. At the end of history, whether soon or late, stands the Kingdom of God (there is evidence that the early missionary effort in Ireland was partially motivated by this desire for the millenial kingdom - which could only come when all the world had been converted). There are barriers to the attainment of the Kingdom; among Christians there is uncertainty concerning right belief; is orthodoxy confirmed by the spirit or the law or by a combination of these (*Montanism* opted for the spirit, as charismatic Christianity in general does, *Gnosticism* and the dualist heresies for law, i.e. for theology; normative Christianity presumably lies between these extremes). Outside the Christian community there are

difficulties as well - especially in the propagation of right belief (with these difficulties are associated forcible conversion, religious wars, and perhaps even the burning of witches). And then there is the 'Jewish Problem', the profound Christian ambiguity towards Judaism as authenticator of Christianity and obstacle to the attainment of the millenial kingdom (perhaps Christian anti-semitism is associated with this symbolic conflict: alternatives offer, the conversion of the Jews of the "Final Solution of the Jewish Problem"). All these barriers to the attainment of the kingdom are Christian problems; as Professor Fackenheim has noted[3], the "commanding voice of Auschwitz" simply restates in our time the terminal problem of Christianity; can God's Kingdom be achieved by force? We should note, at this point, that while all these problems in the Christian world have a social, political or even economic dimension, they are emphatically not social, political or economic problems; conflict where it exists is symbolic conflict, that is conflict of competing belief or value systems. But this was nothing new in the Christian world.

The central element of Jewish belief is the idea of "God's progressive self-revelation to his people through history". The parting of the Red Sea, Moses' experience on Mt. Sinai give us a clue to the unique significance of the covenant: it is a universal, freely assumed moral law. From an anthropological perspective Judaism represents one extension of the reciprocal tribal society; God himself increasingly fills the role of "tribal king" and man does not "obey" man. For the Romans, as we have seen, the auspices and the <u>pax deorum</u> are central concerns; the favour of the gods is confirmed by success, that is the attainment of military,political and social power over others; in other words the attainment of a favourable <u>pax deorum</u> confirmed for the Romans the correctness of the observations which they had made, through their various systems of divination, regarding the will of the gods; but the success which they achieved, having so tangible a material correlative, was precarious in the extreme and its threatened loss bred increasing anxiety (so Tacitus interprets disaster as punishment). Again, from the point of view of

an anthropologist, the Roman Empire, the logical consequence of the Roman value system, represents an extension of the reciprocal tribe by analogy; the "city state" of Rome is more or less artificially reproduced throughout the Empire; Rome herself becomes, as it were, the "tribal king", in a community of lesser city states; her clientes, the subject states, are the tangible measure of her dignitas/auctoritas, but their "respect" is in most cases commanded, won by violence, not freely given. The "federation" which the Roman world should have been (by her own value system!), which it was in name and once had been in part, this "federation" was replaced by a redistributive bureaucracy based on military and economic might.

From this point of view we can examine the millenarian response to Rome in the Jewish environment for many Jews it was impossible for the "Kingdom of God" to co-exist with the Roman Empire without conflict (even though the existence of the Roman Empire was almost universally viewed by Jews, as we would expect, as a manifestation of divine providence). This conflict had its origins and conclusion in the period of the Second Commonwealth (ca. 170 B.C. - 70 A.D.); this same milieu is the cradle of Jewish apocalpytic and millenarianism, as it is of the Christian gospel with its view of the "world to come".[4]

As we shall see, millenial movements and beliefs have been much studied by modern anthropologists (principally as conflicts of belief systems), and with considerable profit. No one seems to have applied this methodology to our own Christian experience - at least not with any great degree of success. In his book New Heaven, New Earth, Kenelm Burridge argues that millenial activity is most common and most acute when opposing groups share the same or similar value systems (and not, as we humanists might expect, where their value systems are quite different) or where different sub-groups within the same culture and value system do not have equal control over the workings of that system or equal access to its benefits (spiritual benefits, that is!). These ideas are so striking and suggestive that they deserve to be tested against our own millenial tradition. Christian studies and anthropology will perhaps both benefit from the dialogue. In any case we westerners

should have the courage to test and examine our own tradition of millenarian experience as we have that of others. I believe that many features of religious life in the pre-Christian or non-Christian Roman Empire, as well as in early Christianity and the Christian Middle Ages, can be better understood when examined in this way.[5]

II

The Pursuit of the Millenium

Any consideration of millenarian activity in the Middle Ages must begin with Norman Cohn's Pursuit of the Millenium. Its argument is so well-known as not to require recapitulation here in detail; nor will it be necessary for my purposes to give a detailed exposition of some of the important shortcomings in Cohn's methodology. I shall content myself with some brief allusion to R. Lerner's delightful book on the Heresy of the Free Spirit; this masterpiece of historical method and expository style has demonstrated some fundamental weaknesses in Cohn's presentation of the "Free Spirit" heresy (and incidentally indicated some much more serious inaccuracies in other recent work on religious dissent in the Middle Ages). Norman Cohn has advanced a thesis which attempts to relate millenarian discontent to the social, economic and political conditions of life in north west Europe from early Christian times to Cromwell's England, and even if we must reject much of this thesis, nevertheless Cohn has challenged us, as Robert Lerner has emphasized, to look at aspects of European history that we have all neglected and to devise a methodology adequate to the study of these fascinating but must complex phenomena.

The "Free Spirit Question" is a good place to begin any consideration of Cohn. His argument in his two chapters on that subject (Chaps. 8 & 9) is very typical of Cohn's general method, and its historical weaknesses have been amply demonstrated by Lerner. In brief, Cohn asserts that there was a more or less unitary and homogeneous "Free Spirit Movement" by the Fourteenth Century, spreading over Europe from Picardy to Bohemia, from Cologne to Silesia. The links between various groups were often tenuous. But these people did keep in touch with one another;

and the Free Spirit (note the capital letters) was at all times clearly recognized as a quasi-religion with a single basic *corpus* of doctrine which was handed down from generation to generation.[6] True, Cohn has anticipated the objections (frequently made) that the movement never "existed at all outside the polemics of ecclesiastics."[7] He feels that he has overcome these "doubts" by using "all the sources available" - something which other scholars have never done, he believes. Professor Lerner has dealt adequately with this assertion; the apparent unity of the movement owes more to the structure of the orthodox reaction than it does to the beliefs of the individual free spirits; in fact there probably was no movement as such at all. And a closer and more extensive investigation of the sources only reinforces this sceptical position. This criticism is solidly based; when dealing with something as subtle and elusive as popular beliefs, it is very easy to support any view by a selective reading of the evidence. In other words, given enough material we can easily manufacture a movement or a much modern biblical theology). But it seems to me that there are more serious objections to be raised against Cohn's method because he tends to resolve millenial activity into two components: (i) a reaction to a political and social environment (which provides the "content" of the movement) and (ii) a millenial tradition (which merely defines its "form").

In his discussion of the "sociology of the Free Spirit" Cohn's characteristic method is quite obvious: this movement of the voluntary poor finds its prime audience "amongst all the disoriented and anxious elements in urban society"[8]; so far so good; with these people, as people "from the less privileged strata of the intelligentsia"[9], we might expect a spiritual discontent to give rise to a spiritual reaction. This promising line of enquiry is soon abandoned. Women, as we all know, were especially associated with the phenomenon of the "Free Spirit"; they are identified by Cohn as a focus of discontent. But notice the shift of emphasis; these "unmarried women and widows in the upper strata of urban society" had "less compelling reasons to feel disoriented and frustrated"[10]; "the number of women far exceeded the number of possible husbands," and, especially among the prosperous "medieval society offered (women) no recognized role

save marriage"[11]. Now there is a certain truth to all these statements (even if many of them are unprovable), but this approach comes perilously close to explaining a spiritual desire in terms of a social discontent - that is, it seems to "explain away" a search for meaning which is essentially spiritual. If Marguerite Porete had enjoyed a happy marriage, she would never have felt the need to be "annihilated in the love of the Creator"[12]! In the last line of this discussion Cohn goes so far as to assert, "The Millenium of the Free Spirit had become an invisible empire held together by the emotional bonds - which of course were often erotic bonds - between men and women"[13]. Their love of God was really love of man! Here we are dealing with something much more dangerous than the manufacturing of movements from misunderstood evidence. We are dealing with a whole "neo-Marxist" materialistic framework of interpretation which insists upon "reducing" spiritual phenomena to material terms (among its many other faults thus perpetuating the false dualism of spiritual and material categories so beloved of western man).

We need not pursue this criticism of Cohn at greater length. Those who remain unconvinced of the dangers of this method should looke carefully at Cohn's chapter on the "Messianism of the Disoriented Poor."[14] Here quite clearly we are dealing with a scholarly approach that tends to resolve millenial activity into (i) a reaction to a political and social environment and (ii) a millenial tradition. "The areas in which the age-old prophecies about the Last Days took on a new revolutionary meaning and a new, explosive force were the areas which were becoming seriously over-populated and were involved in a process of rapid economic and social change"[15]. This seems to suggest, whether Cohn intends it or not, that the "content" of the millenarian activity was the reaction to the social, political and economic environment, whereas "only" the form of the activity was associated with the millenial tradition. No one would deny that here spiritual and material categories of experience (if we must use this dangerous terminology) are inextricably intertwined. Cohn is certainly himself aware of both dimensions. He deserves great credit for trying to understand these phenomena, and incidentally

it should be noted, with no prejudice to Lerner, that when we have demonstrated that there never was a "Free Spirit Movement" as such, we still have not gone very far in understanding why Marguerite Porete was burned at the stake (this inadequacy is a shortcoming of much traditional history).

Yes, Cohn deserves great credit for making the attempt, but what purpose do such explanations really serve? If we explain one category of experience in terms of another, we have not really understood anything, and we have introduced the danger of an "infinite regress". The environment speaks for itself on this approach, but how do we "explain" the existence of a millenial tradition. It was obviously something inherited from the past, and Cohn appropriately gives us a survey of the traditions of "Apocalyptic Prophesy" and "Religious Dissent"[16]. But how were those traditions formed? At some point environment and belief must come together as we trace the tradition back into the past. In this case I believe they do - in Jewish life of the Second Commonwealth (or Second Temple period ca. 170 B.C. - 70 A.D.) the form and content of millenarian experience cannot be artificially resolved. And this may strike some of us as wholly appropriate, for the distinction between environment and belief, material and spiritual, will already have been recognized as a false one, doubly dangerous because in our modern world it always ends by reducing the spiritual to a function of the material. We must replace this artificial dichotomy with a different, much more holistic approach. And here, the methodologies of traditional history, however indispensible, will not be sufficient. Fortunately there are other approaches to hand.

But before we examine some of these other approaches let us glance briefly at the world of the eastern Mediterranean in the period of the Second Jewish Commonwealth. We shall achieve an understanding of Christian millenarianism in this context or not at all.[17] The givens are obvious: the historical circumstances of Jewish life. To begin with, there is of course the Jewish tradition regarding God's covenant with his chosen people; then the prophetic tradition and after the exile and the end of prophesy, the work of the Pharisees and their offspring, the Rabbinic fathers.

But always there is, too, that burgeoning growth of popular belief so redolent to its students of the whole spirit of the age, but now represented by the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic texts, Philo and a few others, and if Professor Goodenough is to be believed, the remains of a rich iconography. Then there are the political facts of life, Alexander, Ptolemy, Seleucus, the repression of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the rebellion of the Maccabees, the Hasmonaean monarchy, the Herods and always here the ambiguous relationship with Rome, the early treaties, Pompey the Great in the 60's B.C. and finally the great revolt repressed by Vespasian (to leave aside, for now, Bar Kochba). Through this all, of course, there runs the scarlet thread of Messianism and millenarian thought from Daniel through the apocryphal apocalypses and the scroll of the War from the Dead Sea to the "little apocaplyse" in the synoptic gospels and the Revelation of St. John; or again from the Maccabees and the Essenes (whoever they may be) to Jesus, Paul and the Zealots (without placing these all in the same category). What are we to make of this? Our pursuit of the Millenium has come to an end; the origin of the tradition dissolves with Daniel.[18] Perhaps we westerners, who have become so adept at analyzing "cargo cults", have never really understood our own millenarian tradition at all. Either none of this is associated with millenial activity - or it all is. I can see no middle ground.

By strict definition, at least in the historical and theological worlds, my net has been spread much too widely. On this view, well described by Cohn, "Christian millenarianism was simply one variant of Christian eschatology."[19] "It referred to the belief held by some Christians, on the authority of the Book of Revelation (XX 4-6) that after his Second Coming Christ would establish a messianic kingdom on earth and would reign over it for a thousand years before the Last Judgement"[20] and so on although as Cohn also points out this belief was always interpreted even by the early Christians in a very liberal and creative sense; and down to modern times a truly dizzying variety of changes has been rung, with every conceivable permutation and variation of the basic concepts. Nonetheless, the idea of the Christian Millenium is still reasonably limited and manageable when defined in this way. This definition certainly does not require us to include within the category of

millenarian activity all Christian belief and action (to say nothing of much of the belief of classical antiquity which is likewise excluded from consideration). There is, however, another use of the term "millenarianism" and another definition of millenarian activity. The term is used conveniently (and with some considerable justification, I would say) by anthropologists, sociologists (and some historians) as a "convenient label for a particular brand of salvationism," as Cohn puts it, going on to define millenarian sects or movements as those which "always picture salvation as collective . . . terrestrial . . . imminent . . . total . . . (and) miraculous".[21]

There is little to quarrel with here; and however disquieting we may feel this appropriation of terminology to be, I think that we shall have to admit that the social scientists are one step ahead of us in their recognition that the idea of the specific Christian millenium is associated in a profound and meaningful way with the general human experience of salvation or redemption. It is in this larger context that the Christian experience should be set, and it is this association alone which social scientists are indicating by their appropriation and use of our term. I, for one, think that the social scientists here have significant and moving insights to offer us, and I shall now attempt to report to you some of those insights, especially as they affect our understanding of millenarian activity.

III

'New Heaven, New Earth' : Structural Anthropology and the Millenium

Perhaps one of the major shortcomings of the traditional methodology of history is what I choose to call the "intentional fallacy" - the assumption that men are always conscious of every aspect of their world, internal or external (or at least of every <u>important</u> aspect!), that they form intentions on the basis of this consciousness, and that their actions are always related to their (conscious) intentions.[22] True quantitive or statistical history and content analysis seem to have overcome this weakness somewhat, the former by drastically expanding the field of enquiry, the

latter by its much more systematic methodology. While both these newer methodologies have their considerable advantages, they have their shortcomings too. The models which they produce are relatively unsophisticated - with the quantitive method the historical model becomes much more detailed in its content, while content analysis ensures greater accuracy of our model of reality as far as it goes. It seems to me, however, that for the study of belief systems, especially complex or elusive ones, structural anthropology offers the scholar certain tools of an incalculable value with which to supplement his more normal historical and philological methodologies.[23]

Its main virtues can be stated quite simply - structural analysis begins by assuming the unity of man's social experience; rational and irrational, material and intellectual activities, art and technology. All are examined with a view to understanding the basic underlying structure of social experience and bringing it more and more from the realm of unconsciousness to the conscious world. The salvational or redemptive experience emanating from the core of man's spiritual being with profound public consequences for the individual and the society in which the experience unfolds, and the millenarian activities which, as we shall see, this redemptive experience involves, are obvious subjects for structural analysis. Of course, a whole sub-species of anthropological literature has grown up around these subjects, but the millenarian activities which form the favourite subject of examination for anthropologists are usually contemporary or almost so, and usually found in the more "tribal" societies of Oceania (the Pacific), Africa or Brazil.

There is no reason why the same techniques cannot be applied to the historical societies of the ancient Mediterranean or of Medieval Europe. And there is one further pressing reason for us to adopt the technique of structural analysis - that technique assigns a very high value to the study of language and linguistic structure (as the underlying and ultimate structure of human experience), and as it happens, most of our evidence for millenarian activities in the Christian world comes to us in the form of texts. What could be more obvious and more challenging? Perhaps a detailed study of the language in which such a key concept as "the world

to come" was embodied can give us some new insights into the meaning of the Christian millenium, but let us first look at some more recent millenial movements and consider the conclusions of the scholars who have classified and interpreted them.

The altogether admirable study of millenarian activities by Kenelm Burridge is an especially useful guide for relative beginners through the maze of modern scholarship on the subject. The study was originally presented as a series of lectures which aims to provide "a general conspectus of the problems involved in the study of millenarian movements"[24], but, more than this, Burridge has "sought to incorporate appreciation and criticism within a specific approach and synthesis" with a view to widening "the perspectives offered by millenarian movements." In his Introduction he briefly alludes to the methodological question which we have already considered, emphasizing that the historical reconstruction of "what actually happens or happened" in these movements is the pointe de depart. He stresses, however, that the major concern of the social scientist "to show abiding logical principle in social relations"[25] causes the study of millenarian activities to assume "a prime importance" for such activities no doubt constitute a particular challenge to our general understanding of human society.

Burridge opens his discussion with an important - and I think very significant - general statement on "religion and redemption". However, curious it may seem, social scientists are rightly concerned with the "redemptive process", he argues. Religious activity he defines as referring to

> "The redemptive process indicated by the activities, moral rules, and assumptions about power which, pertinent to the moral order and taken on faith, not only enable a people to perceive the truth of things, but guarantee that they are indeed perceiving the truth of things."[26]

But Burridge goes beyond this. "Not only are religions concerned with the truth about power, but . . . a concern with the truth about power is a religious activity."[27] On this definition, of course, the Torah with its regulation of the (power) relationships among people is a manifestation of religious activity, but perhaps less obviously to us, the obsessive Roman concern with the exercise of power also belongs to the same order of experience. Burridge

makes this quite clear in the summary of his opening remarks. On the assumption that redemption or the redemptive process, the freeing of man from the many obligations which bind him in his human state, is a common human need, Burridge suggests that "millenarian movements involve the adoption of new assumptions, a new redemptive process, a new politico-economic framework, a new mode of measuring the man, a new integrity, a new community: in short a new man"[28]. But if millenarian movements involve the radical restructuring of the redemptive processes in a society, what are the social and human circumstances, the human situations which seem to require such extreme adjustments? As it happens they are many and varied and of the numerous examples which Burridge considers I have chosen several which seem particularly appropriate for the present study.

The first situation is one which involves not a single millenarian movement but a whole range of millenarian activity unfolding in cultural milieus which are similar but not analogous. The general environment is the Pacific, Oceania or, specifically, Polynesia and Melanesia, in the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries. His discussion of this material occupies a large part of his book (Chaps. 3-6), but the conclusions to which he comes - and which are especially important for our purposes - arise from a comparison of movements (in Polynesia and Melanesia) which appear similar superficially while being in essence very different. I shall summarize briefly and refer you to Burridge's book for detailed discussion and documentation.

As I understand it, most of these movements can be loosely described as "cargo cults" (although the term is more properly used of the Melanesian examples alone - see New Heaven, p.48 for this term and its application in Melanesia). The name is derived from the "cargo" or trade goods which the white men brought to Oceania. Although these material goods are at the centre of the conflict between natives and white westerners, and though they are obviously desirable and desired in themselves, their principal significance, as we shall see, arises from their symbolic value in the context of a conflict of belief systems. It is obvious that the advent of the white man with his goods, his technology, his power over man and nature was extremely

disruptive to the societies in Oceania or elsewhere which suffered his impact. If we followed the historical approach used by Cohn in his discussion of the Free Spirit and other such movements in the Middle Ages, we might say that in Oceania the social and even spiritual disruption of native society had an economic and political cause.

While it is true that these movements in Oceania had an economic dimension, it is probably false to assume that they could have been ended by greater generosity on the part of the whites, by "giving natives work" or by any economic and social policy apart from the eradication of native culture; certainly the spread of Christianity by no means prevented disruption and discontent, but that disruption took different forms in different environments. In Polynesia movements such as the Siovili or "Joe Gimlet" cult[29] certainly had the purpose of opening to the Samoans access to the wonderful goods of the Europeans - a hymn sung by Siovili's followers proclaims this with its refrain of "Necklaces, O Necklaces". And a necklace is a peculiarly appropriate object of wishful prayer for the people of Samoa. In this cult and others like it, Burridge insists, "the significance of the economic components is defined by their relation to prestige and integrity, not simply by virtue of their scarcity or becoming scarcer"[30]. "Herein lay the value and significance of European goods: they could be exchanged", and to this day even (but not uniquely) tins of fish are important to Samoans not for consumption principally but as a means of exchange.[31]

So far so good. Even where it appears to be most concerned with material goods, this Polynesian cult conceived of the millenial kingdom as introducing the Samoans to the status system of the Europeans. The conflict between the followers of Joe Gimlet and the whites was largely a symbolic one. But Joe Gimlet and his followers were never very extreme - this movement and others like it in Polynesia were pretty tame affairs that tended simply to fade away and even at their height were none too dramatic. In fact, as Burridge notes, "Polynesia and Australia account for very few millenarian movements"[32]. The reason for this is not far to seek. "Polynesians had highly sophisticated hierarchical political systems and religious organizations and ideas, and

Australians had rudimentary political systems but developed and complex religious notions". In short, to anticipate a general conclusion, Polynesians (and Australian natives) had tenaciously held traditional value systems that were very unlike the European ones. Quite other was the situation in Melanesia.

Time does not allow me to give you examples from the Melanesian context; suffice it to say that Melanesia is the home of the "cargo cult" par excellence. It is here, notes Burridge, "that we find not only the large bulk of Oceanic examples, but also the most bizarre "[33]. A particularly good example is the cult of Mambu who appeared as prophetic leader of his movement in 1937 in the Madang district of New Guinea. This movement and others like it are known for their collections of myths (both "bizarre and esoteric"; so Burridge, New Heaven p.63) and no less for the extreme action which they counseled. Mambu's followers were to strip off and bury their old (native) clothes, undergo a ritual of baptism and engage (we are told) in promiscuous sexual intercourse before donning European clothes and entering on a new life which incidentally involved a policy of systematic non-co-operation with missionaries and civil administrators. This ritual reminds us of the Christian rites which probably influenced its form, but such rituals are probably common to most extreme millenarian movements (think of the charges made against the free spirits and their admitted practices). Similarly the Mambu myths, however exotic and bizarre, are "formulations with the same kind of doctrinal force in relation to basic assumptions as, for example, the Book of Revelations, or St. Paul's letter to the Corinthians," as Burridge notes.[34]

More to the point, and returning to the general conclusions which Burridge draws for this study, we may observe, that, in contrast to their Polynesian brothers, the Melanesians, so Burridge notes,[35] with their mainly democratic and egalitarian political systems tended to be prudish, obsessional, suspicious and much given to wrestling with their consciences. Notoriously hard-headed and pragmatic, addicted to business and trading, the rather piecemeal and opportunist religious ideas of the Melanesians may be set against the more solidly founded and systematic spiritual life of Australians and Polynesians." The general conclusion fairly leaps

off the page at us - these Melanesians who reacted so severely to the arrival of the white man and his value systems were in fact much more like the white westerners than were their Polynesian brothers. These Melanesians, "notoriously hard-headed businessmen and pragmatists, were those who were most susceptible to millenarian activities"[36]. Of especial importance in this context were the "competing prestige systems (i.e. of whites and Melanesians) characterized by a common involvement in the self-same assumptions together with a relatively privileged access to the rewards and benefits of the assumptions on the one hand, and a relatively under-privileged access on the other"[37]. The opposition was less pointed, as in Polynesia, when it involved a conflict between two different measures of man (the qualitative and the quantitative , ibid. p.48). The conclusion which will be of use to us emerges quite clearly. We can expect more acute conflict between competing value systems when they are similar, less acute when they are dissimilar. Very superficially, and I am only suggesting this as an hypothesis when we observe the very acute and painful conflict of value systems which took place between Jews and Greco-Romans under the Maccabees or during the Jewish revolt which left its legacy in Daniel, the apocrypha and the tradition of Jewish messianism in popular Judaism after Bar Kochba, or again when we observe the similar painful conflict recorded in the Christian milieu, especially but by no means exclusively in the Book of Revelations, perhaps we should attempt to compare Roman and Jewish (or Judaio-Christian) world views with the intent of determining the extent to which they overlap or are similar. As I have already suggested at the beginning of this paper, I believe that there is a considerable similarity. Both Jews and Romans believed that the divine manifested itself pre-eminently through history, a casual assertion which it would take a lifetime to document! But this is the direction in which Burridge's theoretical conclusions direct us. And perhaps such an approach would explain some aspects (especially the spiritual or ideological) of the conflict between Romans and Jews which the customary social, political, economic or even cultural categories of the historians leave relatively untouched.[38] These insights from Burridge's work, however much light they may ultimately throw on the origins of Christianity in the millenarian activity of the

ancient world, scarcely help us to understand the development of smaller scale internal millenarian movements within Medieval Christendom, movements of the sort which Cohn examines. But Burridge has other examples and another model to offer which perhaps does contribute to our understanding of medieval millenarianism; to this other model we must now briefly turn.

In this case Burridge is concerned to demonstrate how millenarian activity can occur in other contexts than the "colonial" situations which we have been considering. This case "enables us to appreciate . . . how a conflict . . . need not be outer-directed but may be inner-directed"[39]. We must go back to an early stage in the religious development of India and examine the origins of the sect known as the Jains. In the traditional Indian value system society, at least in its upper levels, was composed of two castes, the Brahman and the Kshatriya, respectively the "sacerdotal academics" and the "political bosses" as Burridge describes them.[40] Both groups shared the same spiritual ideal, the attainment of a state in which the soul was released from the "bondage of finite life" and was absorbed "into the absolute all-being"[41] but "as a matter of axiom, only Brahmans had access to this release." Only they could live the life of grace which would allow them to attain it, while the others, the Kshatriya, were distracted "by the cares of the world" as we would put it. At some early point (6th-5th centuries B.C.?) this situation became unsatisfactory. Even before Mahavira, the Jain reformer, appeared, other prophets had preceded him, for the most part from the Kshatriya, who had "rejected the main tenets of the Brahmanical scheme," while some opted for materialism or fatalism[42]. At this point society in Northern India, quite apart from these theological troubles, was undergoing a series of economic adjustments. A new mercantile class was emerging which, while using the "managerial techniques" of the Kshatriya, would not in fact hold political office. It was precisely this situation which saw the rise of Jainism.

The Jains were to be a composite class borrowing much from their ancestors the Kshatriya, although they were not warriors or "political bosses". More important, perhaps, for our purposes, and this marks their theological break with orthodox Hinduism, they believed "that given an adherence to certain observances,

moksha (i.e."release") was available to all and not just to Brahmans"[43]. In our terms they were to be "in the world but not of it", and in fact the sect is known as paradoxical. Originating among warriors, the Jains were non-violent; aristocrats by origin, they became merchants; although unworldly on principle, they have always been extremely wealthy as a group. We can consider the foundation of this sect as a kind of millenarian activity; but we are quite clearly dealing with a conflict - not now between two value systems, however similar or dissimilar, but within a single value system - and it is a conflict over the access to benefits. We should note in this case that they are first and foremost spiritual benefits. I believe that we have here a paradeigm by which we may better understand the evolution of sub-sects within Christianity such as the free spirits.

Many of the free spirits, we are told, were from the "middle class", whatever that may mean (at least they were not by any means all impoverished). Whether or not they were women (but perhaps especially if they were), they seem to have felt excluded from full participation in the spiritual life of the church. No suitable orders were open to them (and especially not to the women). Men and women both may have been educated above the ordinary level, although they certainly were not trained in any formal sense in theology. In any case it is quite clear that all these beguines and beghards really wanted was to live a life of Christ-like poverty in some form of community modelled on the convents of the religious - they aspired to be and often were, in fact, lay or "third orders". Churchmen who observed their spirituality were content to allow them to live as they chose, and most "free spirits" seem to have been quite orthodox. Other clerics saw them as threatening the monopoly which the church maintained over ecclesiastical organization (or more significantly over spiritual benefits, "grace"). Here again this is not the time or place to undertake a detailed investigation of the applicability of the "Jain Model" to an analysis of the social and spiritual situation which gave rise to the "Free Spirit Movement", but I think that the appropriateness of this model is quite apparent, superficially at least.

An "explanation" of the "Free Spirit Movement" along these lines would seem to me to have the great merit of putting spiritual concerns at the heart of what was, after all, a spiritual movement, while allowing ample scope for all the social and political questions which are associated with the origins of this phenomenon. But since I have committed myself so far to unsubstantiated hypotheses and irresponsible suggestions, I would go further and suggest that we have here in the theoretical framework provided by Burridge's analysis of the Jain sect as the product of a special and highly sophisticated type of millenarian activity, an analytical approach which may allow us a much more profound understanding of the context of ideological conflict and development which gave rise to a whole host of historical phenomena analogous to the "Free Spirit Movement". There are, of course, the other movements which Cohn considers, early medieval messiahs, peasant crusaders, taborites, and the like. But perhaps it would be worthwhile to apply the "Jain Model" to an analysis of the development of the mendicant orders on the one hand and the protestant reformation on the other, both social phenomena associated with access to the fullest spiritual benefits of Christian belief and both associated in one way or another with the "democratization" of that access. As with the Jains, so with St. Francis and perhaps even the protestant reformers, the question at issue originally at least was not so much one of dogma - although in both cases it had dogmatic implications - but one of how most effectively the new class of educated and powerful bourgeois were to participate more fully and more directly in the life of the church.

These anthropological studies of millenarian activities obviously have much to teach us about our own millenial tradition. One part of my purpose in this paper will have been accomplished if I have been able to suggest some lines of enquiry, in part perhaps rather new, which might lead to a greater understanding of the tradition of Christian millenarianism. But there is one way in which the Christian tradition differs from the cases which we have been considering. Millenarian thought in the Christian (and Jewish) context is thousands of years old. The myths in which the Christian tradition expresses many of its essential millenial conceptions are themselves very diverse in origin,

drawing on many different cultural traditions in antiquity. Then they have been handed down from culture to culture over the generations, and in the process of development and transmission the myth stock of the millenial tradition has been translated from language to language. It is understandable that many of the most important concepts associated with the Christian Millenium will have undergone distortion or development as they passed from language to language. The "Kingdom of God" is one such concept - the phrase can obviously acquire different connotations in different cultures. In that case probably the denotation remains rather clear.

I believe that the situation is quite otherwise with the concept of the "World to Come", a subtle, elusive and very sophisticated idea which undergoes marked development from one culture to another. I intend to examine quite briefly the history of this concept in Hebrew and Greek, suggesting some further lines of enquiry into the linguistic history of the phrase. But as I do that I shall have another ulterior purpose to fulfill - as I have already indicated, one of the shortcomings of traditional historical enquiry seems to be that it is often not sufficiently sensitive to the role which language plays in human life and thought. Here structural anthropology to some extent shows us another way of investigating the fundamental structures of any belief system. Modern linguistics follows that up, providing us with a methodology sufficiently sophisticated and reliable that it allows us to analyse the vast stock of linguistic conceptions which surround a complex phenomenon like early Christianity without our making the mistake of simply reading our own preconceptions into the data at hand.

IV

The "World to Come"; New Perspectives on Language and Culture in the Millenial Context.

I think that I need make no apology for emphasizing the importance of language and an awareness of language (in the fullest sense) in our study of the Christian millenarian tradition and of the related belief structures (or "myths", following the terminology of Buddige). It is self-evident that Christian beliefs are intimately involved with the written word - that is an inheritance, of course, from the Jewish context with its unique concern for

"the Book". The Jewish case introduces a salutary reminder - the written word may be all important but it is not all since it is accompanied by an oral or "popular" interpretation which, standing in dynamic tension with the written word, complements it and contributes to the whole tradition. So it is among Christians - the tradition is expressed in hagiography, oral and written, in popular prayer and liturgy, exegesis and theology as well as in the scriptures. The gospels are indispensible but they are not the whole tradition. As we might expect, this being so, philology has always played an important part in Christian scholarship. And, reasonably enough, it is to philology that we must turn for a better understanding of many aspects of the Christian millenium, among them not least the "World to Come".

But there is much more to "biblical language" than this. As I have already indicated, structural anthropologists have assigned a central place to linguistics in the structural analysis of society.[44] Not only is linguistics the most scientific of the social sciences, it is indispensible as a methodological base for the others (so Levi-Strauss, Structural Anthropology pp.31-32). It has proven invaluable to anthropological fieldwork, true enough, but the development of structural analysis in linguistics ("structural linguistics") makes it much more than a tool for fieldwork. Structural linguistics will certainly play the same renovating role with respect to the social sciences that nuclear physics, for example, has played for the physical sciences"[45]. According to Troubetzkoy the significance of the structural method is found in its four basic operations: briefly it shifts study from conscious linguistic phenomena to unconscious infrastructures; it deals not with terms as individual entities but with the relations between them; it introduces in Levi-Strauss' terms the concept of system, that is, demonstrable system; and it aims at discovering general laws. A great claim perhaps, but one which appears not without foundation even to this amateur. We shall soon examine some of the more specialized scholarship which applies these insights and others of the same sort to biblical and early Christian studies.

If we are to apply to the Christian millenarian tradition some of the techniques of analysis, some of the insights which Burridge has reported and developed in the study of more modern

millenarian activities, we must be prepared to do "fieldwork" at first hand. All the early Christian (and the medieval "free spirits" for that matter) are no longer available to us in person, but fortunately they have left us a body of texts which incorporate considerable historical details of their experience, and, more importantly, scriptures, whether canonical or otherwise, from which we can reconstruct their belief system (or "myth system") in general terms and often in very considerable detail. Modern structural and linguistic anthropology encourages us in this study by showing us where to look and suggesting to us how the myth systems expressed in the Christian texts may reveal some of the basic and largely unconscious infrastructure of the Christian belief system. Here traditional philology - the methodology on which we have been raised in the Humanities - comes into its own. It alone, but, even more than this, our old friend philology, often dry as dust and without much significance when it becomes an end in itself and not simply a means, will be rejuvenated in the course of this study if we are successful in bringing our age-old tradition into a fruitful dialogue with some of these methodologies.

Linguistic analysis, as applied to biblical and Christian studies especially, is very complex. The best that I can do is to give you an overview of some of the significant recent work - and exciting it is indeed - while referring you for further edification and delight to the work of the scholars whom I shall mention. I believe that this technical _excursus_ will not be without its utility if it is put into the form of a simple _Forschungsberichte_. It requires no genius to recognize that language and culture are closely intertwined. In Canada especially we should be aware that the essence of the French or English world view, whatever that may be, is in some special way associated with the French or English language. But stated in such a simple "popular" form ideas like these are perhaps more dangerous than useful. Many modern biblical scholars, beginning perhaps with a modernized version of the belief that Hebrew was pre-eminently the "language of God", have pushed this popular attitude to language and culture to the brink of absurdity if not over it. "The retention of the reduced vowel in Hebrew," we are told, "is 'parallel' to the shadowy continuance of the soul

after death and to the maintenance of the dead man's name through the levirate marriage". As we shall see, much of the work of James Barr, a scholar, the significance of whose work it would be difficult to exaggerate, has been directed to refuting just this sort of popular heresy in the field of biblical studies.[46]

However perilous it may be to speculate about the relationship between language and culture, it is necessary for us to do so and linguists especially have developed a whole literature on the language-culture question. Perhaps the most important formulation of this question in modern times is known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. It is simply one striking formulation of the principle of "linguistic relativity", associated with the impressive, if erratic scholarship of two American linguists, Benjamin Whorf and Edward Sapir. But for anyone interested in the modern literature on the subject, the work of these two is a logical place to begin. Whorf described his "new principle of relativity" in the following terms:

"(This principle) holds that all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated."[47]

It is impossible for us to discuss and evaluate, however briefly, modern theoretical conceptions of the relationship between a culture and the language in which it is expressed; suffice it to say that the question has a long history in biblical studies, that it is a question which is very vulnerable to muddled thinking, and that whatever our views may be of the general relationship between language and culture, they will profoundly affect our study of the Christian belief system.[48] Let me now just indicate some other linguistic dimensions of the study of the Christian belief system, its origin and development.

Whatever we may conceive to be the unique qualities of one culture or another and however unique we may consider one or another language to be in its expression of a world-view, reasonable men, I think, can agree on a simple operating assumption: comparable idea structures or systems of belief will not be expressed in exactly equivalent terms in different languages. Any language is at least theoretically capable of expressing any idea, but the more complex the idea structure or belief system the

more likely it is to suffer serious distortion as it moves from one language to another. For instance the idea of a "hammer" can easily be conveyed in almost any language, in all probability; probably too any language can devise an adequate translation of "helicopter"; but an abstract idea such as the "dialectic of history" is another matter altogether. Perhaps few native speakers really understand such terms in their own language - how much more difficult to translate them! Yet I am afraid that the latter situation prevails with a concept such as the "World to Come". In fact we must admit that many of the concepts associated with the Christian belief system are quite untranslatable (in a relative sense, of course). Yet what is more obvious than the fact of their having been translated! Here we are confronted with "the problem of cultural transmission across language barriers". At the level of general semantics, meanings of words for the same "things" in different languages rarely coincide completely. From the point of view of structural analysis, complex ideas, to say nothing of systems of belief are structures which can be translated only with great difficulty when someone sits down to do so intentionally; at the level of popular belief especially, the elements of the complex structure which are closest to the native structures of the recipient language/culture group are the ones which will be most emphasized in the course of transmission across a language barrier. Not to way that they will be totally misapprehended, but some distortion will result. This, I think, is obvious. Ever since Jerome set out to render the Hebrew Bible more accurately into Latin, Christian scholars have been aware of this problem. In fact, it was an awareness which they had inherited from their Jewish predecessors. Since the translation of the _Tanak_ into Greek for the first time in the Septuagint, Jews had sought more accurate renderings of the substance of the original, and not in Greek alone but even in the different dialects of Aramaic. In any case, we are heirs to a scriptural tradition which began with Hebrew and Aramaic, then passed through Greek and Latin (and even Syriac) on its way to the languages of modern Europe. We can ask, without any prejudice, in regard to this scriptural tradition (to say nothing of the larger belief system of which it is only the most formal part) - what has come down to us across the frontiers

between linguistic and conceptual worlds quite clearly, what in more distorted form? I had hoped to be able, at this point, to follow some millenarian concepts right down the language chain and I have assembled some of the evidence with which to do so. The task is one of literally staggering proportions, and although I intend eventually to trace down at least some key ideas (such as the "World to Come") all along this line of cultural transmission, for the present I must be content to present to you, however, briefly and inadequately, a survey of some of the very impressive modern scholarship dealing with the ancient biblical languages and particularly with the transmission of Hebrew and/or Aramaic ideas to the Greek-speaking world.

There has been a veritable spate of such work in recent years, but, to my mind at least, much the best of it has been produced in the post-war period by a small group of British scholars. A place of honour should go to Matthew Black whose book, _An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts_ (of which the first edition appeared in 1946; the much revised third edition of 1967 was reprinted in 1971), not only surveys all previous modern work on the subject (Part I, _The Approach_), but also presents a systematic discussion of _Syntax, Grammar and Vocabulary_ (in Part II) and _Semitic Poetic Form_ (Part III). No one could read such a book without vastly extending his awareness of the extent to which Aramaic underlies the New Testament tradition and deepening his understanding of the effects of the Aramaic original.

Somewhat different in emphasis is the work of James Barr. His _Semantics of Biblical Language_ (Oxford 1961, reprinted 1962, 1967, 1969) deals with some of the larger questions of great methodological importance which we have already mentioned" "Whether there is a relation between the religious structures found to exist within one particular linguistic group and the linguistic structure of the language of that group; and further . . . whether and how the transference of religious structures and thoughts to another linguistic group is affected by the change of linguistic structure involved in the use of a new language."[49] After a survey of work on the contrast between Greek and Hebrew thought, Barr undertakes a general discussion of linguistic/semantic methodology as

applied to the area of biblical studies. Here already he is particularly concerned to combat the "unsystematic and haphazard nature" of modern attempts to relate theology to biblical language, and he points out the failure of many modern scholars to examine the Greek and Hebrew languages as a whole and to relate their special theories to a general semantic method or to general linguistics.[50] What results from this methodological failure, he alleges, is a widespread preference for a neo-Humboldtian idealism strangely compounded with a spurious "ethno-psychology"[51] which assumes on the basis of a general aquaintance with Hebrew and Greek that there are special characteristics associated with each language (found even in the grammar of the language) which distinctively belong to the "Hebrew" or "Greek" "mind", and then proceeds to impose these assumptions on the evidence.

The bulk of Barr's Semantics consists of a detailed exposition of the dangers of this naive pseudo-science. He gives numerous illustrations of the dangers and even absurdities to which this approach can lead.[52] By way of a general and more common illustration of the defects of this method Barr gives, as an English example faced by church-goers quite regularly in sermons, the "popular" etymology of "holy" as equivalent to "whole" or "healthy". It is not enough for the preacher to abuse his congregation with the etymology, he proceeds to exhortations to conduct which are as misleading as his science is faulty; a humorous example but the fallacies implicit here also make their appearance in more learned circles.[53] Barr's bête noir, however, is Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testaments (Stugggart 1933-) and his book concludes with a very critical examination of "Some Principles of Kittel's Theological Dictionary". Not to mince words, Barr seems to believe that many modern biblical theologians, such as the authors of the articles in the Theologisches Wörterbuch (but by no means only them) have manufactured new systems or structures of belief which owe more to their own preconceptions than they do to early Christianity, by a random and methodless raiding of a grab-bag of disparate fragments of belief. This is a grave charge and probably one with much substance, although Barr's righteous indignation may have carried him rather far in his criticism, as David Hill would have it.

Hill's book on Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings : Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms (Cambridge 1967) Hill has reproved some of Barr's excesses (see especially pp.1-14) and defended the methodology of the Theologisches Wörterbuch, emphasizing the importance of the etymology and background of crucial word/concepts such as "lutron" and its cognates. But I for one believe that Hill has not really disposed of the substance of Barr's criticisms (he does, in fact, admit the merit of many of them, e.g. ibid. p.1). For anyone who aspires to understand the structure of a complex belief system and to trace subtle shifts of emphasis or distortions arising when one language (or even dialect) attempts to absorb concepts from another, these methodological objections which Barr has raised are all-important. In his other book, Biblical Words for Time (SCM Press, 1962) Barr focuses the criticisms which he has developed on the modern scholarship which purports to expound the various biblical concepts of time. In this connection he has particular criticisms to make of the interpretations which have been applied to the Hebrew word "olam" and the Greek word aiōn. These modern interpretations (of Oscar Cullmann and others) and Barr's criticisms of them especially concern me, as these are the two words used to denote the "world" (in the phrase the "World to Come") in Hebrew and Greek respectively, and I wish to close this already over-long presentation by sharing with you some ideas on the development of the concept of the "World to Come" - a crucial concept in Christian millenarianism.

As I have already indicated the procedures which Barr criticizes in detail in Biblical Words for Time are specific examples of the tendency of scholars to build "a structure from the lexical stock of the biblical languages, . . . (on) the assumption that the shape of this structure reflects or sets forth the outlines of biblical thinking about the subject"[54] - a process which Barr has elsewhere described as the "hypostatization" of biblical concepts[55]. In the case of the time concept the structure has been built "from two or three words which are fairly close in meaning or which commonly relate to the same subject or theme"[56]. For Oscar Cullmann the two significant words are kairos and aiōn.[57] It is worth noting here that, from the point of view of the biblical theologians, "the New Testament belongs . . . entirely or almost

entirely to the solid block of Hebrew thought, and thus the whole Bible stands in monolithic solidarity against Greek thought" (as described by Barr, Biblical Words pp. 11-12.

This view, at least when stated so baldly, is patently ridiculous. However much of the Greek of the New Testament, or of the Septuagint before it, was infused with Hebrew "content", it was intelligible to Greek speakers - and was to that extent at least non-Hebrew. This is an important point, for Cullmann believes that the observations which he makes about the meaning of aion are observations about a Hebrew concept. For Cullmann the word aion denotes a duration or extent of time, limited or unlimited (this is probably fairly accurate, as far as it goes; see Barr, ibid. p.47; aion never in fact means a point of time) in contra-distinction to kairos which denotes a point of time (see Barr Biblical Words p.47f. for this summary). Together these terms serve in the New Testament to characterize "that time which is filled out by the salvation history"[58] - in other words the whole "New Testament view of time", The weaknesses of Cullman's theory are disguised by two procedures which Barr excoriates: (i) the concept method and (ii) the use of transliterated Greek words in place of translation (for this and what follows see ibid., pp.50-63). This leads to a procrustean treatment of a language's lexical stock - the "concept" not the lexical stock is important; but the "concept" is the result of "hypostatization of linguistic phenomena" (so Barr, ibid., p.58 & n.1 with reference). This hypostatization leads to the second fallacious procedure - the substitution of a trans-literated Greek word for a translation. Having invented a "concept", Cullmann must give it a distinctive name, a transliteration from the Greek. The use of kairos or aion in this way makes no sense in Greek or English. This is all really incidental to our purpose but it shows us why we must treat with the utmost suspicion the work of the biblical theologians. For Barr is certainly correct in dismissing Cullmann's interpretation of aion.

Briefly, Cullman argued that aion means (i) unending time forward or backward, i.e. eternity, (ii) the limited period of time between creation and the eschatological drama, (iii) periods of time limited in one direction but not in the other viz. (a) ek

tou aionos, where aion refers to the period before the creation and (b) the aion mellon, the period which "extends beyond the end of the present aeon".[59] This is, of course, nonsense. As Barr notes, usages (ii) (this aion) and (iii,b) (the aion or "world to come") depend on the late Hebrew use of olam and the Greek aion (more properly the order should be reversed, as we shall see), and the rest is just an arbitrary classification of the conventional usage of some phrases common in biblical Hebrew (and subsequently Greek as well). It is unnecessary to continue with Barr's criticism of Cullmann and his ilk. It would be more enjoyable and profitable for us to discuss Barr's insights into "Hebrew Words for Time and Eternity"[60] (ibid.) and "Vocabulary Stocks for Time and their Translation"[61] to say nothing of his general theological and methodological conclusions; but time does not allow it and my present interest is somewhat different - not in time but in the "World to Come"!

Barr himself gave the clue as to where to find sounder opinions on the background of the Hebrew word/concept olam,used in the Hebrew expression for the "World to Come" (ha olam ha ba). Not only did the classic Hebrew grammar of Gesenius-Kautszch correctly understand the usage of olam in most of its forms, but an excellent modern study on the very subject of "Das Wort 'olam im Alten Testament"[62], as Barr himself noted[63] said everything that needs to be said about the meaning and significance of the word - on the sound basis of a complete study of some 440 instances of this work in one form or another in the Old Testament. The conclusions of that study can be stated in general terms quite simply which for us, with our interest in the "World to Come", however, merely sharpens the problem. In almost all cases in the Old Testament olam can be "adequately represented . . . by 'remotest time'" (so Barr, summarizing Jenni; Biblical Words p.68). It is most commonly used in the descriptive phrases me olam ("from or since the earliest time") and le olam ("to the farthest time, forever") or in construct phrases such as berit olam ("the eternal covenant") where it has a simple adjectival force. The plural form olamim which occurs rather frequently in these phrases is simply an intensive plural of emphasis and not an extensive plural of number.

Most important, however, is Jenni's negative conclusion.[64] "With the exception of certain uncertainties of detail it can be concluded that in the Jewish literature of the pre-Christian period, the new meanings 'aeon' and 'world' occur at the most very rarely, but in any case are not common." But in this meaning, expressed in Greek by aion, the word we translate in the phrase the "World to Come", olam refers to the messianic or millenarian kingdom, known henceforth quite as well to the Jewish tradition as ha olam ha ba. And this precisely is the problem - olam is an important word in the Tanak, but only in descriptive phrases, never really as a substantive in its own right, simply a word widely used in speech and prayer as equivalent to our word "eternal". In the Septuagint it was very regularly translated by the Greek word aion. Now aion in descriptive phrases could easily convey the meaning "to or from the remotest time" and it was probably so understood by the readers of the Septuagint, by the Jews at least. In the New Testament aion quite as clearly is used to mean "world", whether ho aion ho toutos, this world of grief and sin or ho aion ho mellon, the coming world of truth and righteousness, in short the "Kingdom of God" whether here on earth or in some other dimension of reality. But here is the final problem - aion has acquired this special meaning (an age, a world age, one of many world ages, this world and the world to come) sometime around the time of Christ (say between ca.100 B.C. and 100 A.D. at the latest); this new meaning is so overwhelmingly present that it swamps the rather colourless Hebrew olam, which from now on refers (not only in normal everyday Hebrew and Aramaic, but even by reflex in the Tanak) not to the remotest time or even to an indefinite period of time, but to this world (ha olam ha zeh) and the better one to come (ha olam ha ba),

The puzzle remains. We cannot explain, as Cullmann does, the development of this concept by reference to special Christian concepts of time which were in some ways always mysteriously present in Hebrew. But if we follow the more sober and reliable methodology of Barr and others, we have no obvious easy explanation of the origin of this crucial millenial concept, the "World to Come". And here, I think, the kind of enquiry into millenarian activities on which

I reported in the first part of my paper shows us the way to a more satisfactory understanding. That approach also makes sense of the only other information which we can bring to bear on this new meaning of olam/aion - the overwhelming and increasingly widespread association of aion with the aeons of the ancient Gnostic dualism, with its rejection of "this world" as evil. The anthropologists might suggest that this new idea of a millenial kingdom, a better "World to Come" (expressed in the widespread belief in a succession of aeons and thus not confined to Christians alone) arose as a result of a conflict between similar value systems in which some group(s) felt excluded from the benefits open to the dominant group. There had to be a better "world to come" because this present one, the Roman empire, caused many of its inhabitants (people who were committed to value systems which seemed to have been defeated) a profound despair. The spread of the doctrine of aeons, of that ancient Gnostic dualism to which I have already referred, testifies to exactly that situation. Some time around the time of Christ men, in the partially Hellenized eastern Mediterranean, began to feel a great Weltschmerz, a sense of alienation, anomie or rootlessness in the world in which they lived (and, of course, all late ancient religion, especially Gnostic dualism, but other areas of religious and spiritual life as well, was imbued with this profound pessimism - it scarcely requires documentation).[65]

From the anthropological point of view the situation is quite clear. The dominance of one value system in the Roman empire and the defeat of other rival systems of belief caused widespread despair (a despair which eventually infected the dominant culture as well!) and produced by way of reaction a general belief in a better "world to come". Of course, only followers of Christ knew that the new world had been proclaimed at his resurrection. Ask me why they felt the need of a new world, ask me why they suffered from such despair, and I will respond by asking you what is the meaning of Christ in History? I do not know for sure; but despair I do know, Welstschmerz ancient and modern. I intend to look more closely into that despair because there, if anywhere, is to be found the meaning of the "World to Come".

FOOTNOTES

1. The use of the term "redemption" by social scientists in the context of a study of millenarian activity is defended in very strong fashion by Burridge (New Heaven pp.4-8 esp.p.6); I shall return to this as well at a later point.

2. I believe that this is perhaps the case in both Jewish and Roman systems. Noth's amphictyonic theory suggests that the Yahwist idea acquired a strength proportionate to the early success of the Jewish amphictyony gathered in the worship of Yahweh. When the tribes of Israel came into conflict with the empires of the east and no longer simply with the near neighbours who were their approximate equals in strength, the Yahwist conception was threatened; it was in this context that the prophetic spirit as we know it found utterance.

   As for the Romans, their anxious concern to maintain the pax deorum, it has often been suggested, led to an increasing elaboration of cult (with the introduction of new rituals and deities) and especially of the augural rites which were uniquely concerned to determine the will of the gods (this latter point is much more difficult to demonstrate). The validitity of their whole belief system was confirmed by the Roman success in arms; but anxiety increased nonetheless; they now had more to lose. See R.T. Scott Religion and Philosophy in the Histories of Tacitus. Cf. Burridge, New Heaven, New Earth, p.76, for a comment on the role which millenarian movements play in the development of a society "from the more simple to the more complex".

3. E.L. Fackenheim God's Presence in History : Jewish Affirmations and Philosophical Reflections (New York Univ. Press 1970). Fackenheim uses this phrase as the title of his third chapter. It is true, and appropriate, that Prof. Fackenheim addresses his book especially to Jews; his especial concern is with Jewish survival. But his book has no less importance for Christian readers, for Christians too must ask: " at Auschwitz

9. Ibid. p. 159.
10. Ibid. p. 160.
11. Ibid.
12. R. Lerner, op. cit. p. 1, for the phrase attributed to Marguerite Porete.
13. N. Cohn, op. cit. p. 162.
14. Ibid., Chap. 3, pp. 53-70. Note especially, in addition to the passage quoted below, the consistent emphasis, throughout the first subsection of this chapter ("The Impact of Rapid Social Change"),on the crucial role played by social and economic factors in triggering millenial activity; first we are told that the "agricultural society of the early Middle Ages . . . (was) relatively unreceptive to the militant eschatology of the unprivileged" largely because of the communal nature of the peasant village and the support which peasant life received from custom. "So long as that network (of social relationships) remained intact peasants enjoyed not only a certain material security but also - which is even more relevant - a certain sense of security" etc. There is probably more truth in this; but note what follows. This situation begins to change with the increase in population and commerce from the 11th century onwards (paraphrased); in the newly enlarged cities "the spectacle of a wealth undreamt of in earlier centuries provoked a bitter sense of frustration" "disorientation" followed amongst journeymen and casual laborers. This disorientation and other similar disruptions "acted on these people with peculiar sharpness and called forth reactions of peculiar violence." And note the next sentence. "And one way in which they attempted to deal with their common plight was to form a salvationist group under a messianic leader". Even allowing for theories of "relative deprivation" this approaches outright misrepresentation!

15. Ibid. p.53.
16. Ibid. Chaps. 1 & 2.
17. This context is the locus of other important millenarian activities apart from the Christian. Jewish Messianism, above all, harks back to this period; it is now quite clear that Bar

did the grave win the victory after all, or, worse than the grave, did the devil himself win." (ibid. p.75).

4. Of course, at the beginning of the Second Commonwealth the conflict for the Jews was not with Rome (which was, in fact, at this time a benevolent "friend"), but with the Hellenistic Kingdoms, particularly that of the Seleucids. But shortly after the time of the Maccabees the Romans took their place as the ultimate "successor state" of the Seleucids; and, in any case, the essential conflict here is that between tribal city states and a dominant imperial system; the imperial system, which I have described as Roman, was earlier found in the Hellenistic world, from which the Romans acquired it in one way or another (i.e. partly directly, through adoption and imitation of administrative and military technology, and in part indirectly through reaction to the challenge of the Hellenistic powers, especially Pyrrhus, Carthage, Macedon and Syria). For the whole climate of repression and resistance in the Hellenistic east, see the excellent book of Samuel K. Eddy, The King is Dead; Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C. (Univ. of Nebraska Press 1961).

5. This is perhaps a not altogether untimely undertaking in view current Christian self-examination - especially in Latin America and the "Third World"; cf. G. Gutierrez A Theology of Liberation; History, Politics and Salvation (Eng. ed. New York 1973); and for our purposes especially pp. 220-232 "The Political Dimension of the Gospel", pp. 232-238 "Faith, Utopia and Political Action".

6. N. Cohn, The Pursuit of the Millenium (Ed. 2, Oxford Univ. Press 1970) p.172.

7. Ibid. p. 149; cf. for what follows R. Lerner The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages (Univ. of California Press 1972)

8. N. Cohn op.cit. p.157.

Kochba and his followers represent only the tip of an iceberg. And the defeat of the "Son of the Star" (or "of the Lie", as you will have it) by no means put an end to the messianic expectation in Judaism - overt but elusive in the popular tradition which later produced the Kabbalah, partly obscured but always disturbingly present in the "Rabbinic tradition". See G. Scholem, The Messianic Idea in Judaism (New York, 1971) esp. pp. 1-36. But I suggest that there are many more social movements which have a millenarian component in this part of the Greco-Roman world than most of us would expect, e.g. slave revolts (Sicily and Asia Minor), mystery religions and early Christian heresies, to name only a few.

18. See Scholem, op. cit., esp. pp. 6-7; it is a puzzling and, as yet, unexplained phenomenon to him why the message of the prophets, "knowledge which could hardly be proclaimed with sufficient loudness and publicity" should have become "secret" in the apocalypses, attributed pseudonymously to "the heroes of biblical antiquity" and conveyed only "to the select or initiated". I belief that all this would be much less puzzling if we could see it in the context of millenarian activities the world over.

19. N. Cohn, op. cit. p. 15 Introduction.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Of course, these assumptions arise from the characteristic pragmatic approach to history and its primary concern with the explicit as Levi-Strauss puts it (see below); they are necessary qualities for a science which aspires to demonstrate more than suggest. "History" is perhaps not to be criticized for the shortcomings implicit in its methodology; historians, however, can be criticized for confusing their particular discipline with the subject of study and their methodology with reality itself. A phenomenological approach seems more useful in some circumstances.

23. For the relationship between history and anthropology see C. Levi-Strauss, Structural Anthropology Chap.1 pp.1-27 esp. p.24:

"It would be inaccurate, therefore, to say that on the road toward the understanding of man, which goes from the study of conscious content to that of unconscious forms, the historian and the anthropologist travel in opposite directions. On the contrary they both go the same way. The fact that their journey together appears to each of them in a different light - to the historian transition from the explicit to the implicit; to the anthropologist transition from the particular to the universal - does not in the least alter the identical character of their fundamental approach. They have undertaken the same journey on the same road in the same direction; only their orientation is different. The anthropologist goes forward, seeking to attain, through the conscious, of which he is always aware more and more of the unconscious; whereas the historian advances, so to speak, backward, keeping his eyes fixed on concrete and specific activities from which he withdraws only to consider them from a more complect and richer perspective. A true, two-faced Janus, it is the solidarity of the two disciplines that makes it possible to keep the whole road in sight."

24. K. Burridge, New Heaven, New Earth (Oxford Blackwell 1969) Preface p.vii.

25. Ibid. Introduction p.2.

26. Ibid. pp. 6-7

27. Ibid. p.7.

28. Ibid. p.13.

29. Ibid. pp. 22ff.

30. Ibid. p.25

31. Ibid. p.26

32. Ibid. p.40.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid. p.63.

35. Ibid. p.40.

36. Ibid. p.48.

37. Ibid.

38. If we make an exception of the conflict between the Seleucides under Antiochus IV and the Jews in the time of the Maccabees, perhaps we can suggest the Greek culture, the Greek value system, generally provoked less hostile reaction among Jews,

and, generally speaking, potentially could have, and indeed did have, a greater influence on Judaism than did the Roman value system _precisely because_ the Greek view of man, time, history, god etc., was so very different from the Jewish. Not to deny that there was conflict between Greeks and Jews (Alexandria gives us more examples than we need), but the nature of the conflict (following Burridge's suggestion) between different "measures of man" meant that it was ultimately much less acute and thus more fruitful in the long run. How many Jews ever learned Latin or thoroughly Romanized themselves (and remained Jews)? The available evidence suggests that very few indeed did, compared to the vast number of Diaspora Jews (or even Jews in Palestine) who adopted Greek as their _lingua franca_. See H.J. Leon on the Jewish community in Rome for evidence of this crucial cultural dimension; H.J. Leon _The Jews of Ancient Rome_ (Philadelphia JPS 1960).

39. Burridge _op. cit_. p.95.
40. _Ibid_. p.87.
41. _Ibid_.
42. _Ibid_. p.90.
43. _Ibid_. p.93.
44. In his collection of studies on the subject of structural anthropology, Levi-Strauss assigns a whole section of four chapters to language and kinship; this subject is given pride of place in his book, and the book as a whole serves well as a general introduction to structural anthropology and to structural analysis in linguistics and anthropology in particular, useful not least because it guides the novice reader easily through the maze of the prolific scholarly literature; see C. Levi-Strauss, _Structural Anthropology_ (Eng.ed. Penguin 1968).
45. _Ibid_. p. 33.
46. The quotation is from J. Barr, _Semantics of Biblical Language_ (Oxford University Press 1961) p.45. n.1, paraphrasing A.R. McAllister in _Interpretation_ 14 (1960) pp. 421-32, esp. p.421. - For another view of this subject, with restrained criticism of Barr's position, see D. Hill _Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings_:

Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms (Society for New Testament Studies; Monograph Series No. 5 Cambridge 1967), esp. pp. 1-14.

47. This brief statement of the "new principle" I owe to S. Chase, author of the Foreword to Language, Thought and Reality; Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf (MIT Press 1956) p.v; he appears to be quoting Whorf but gives no reference; for an interesting and readable summary of the work of Whorf with some discussion of his significance and of his relationship to Sapir see the Introduction to the same collection (written by J.B. Carroll). Be it noted that Whorf had a considerable interest in Hebrew (associated with his interest in religion); see Carroll Introduction pp.7f and passim; cf. J. Barr Semantics p.77.

On the Sapir-Whorf hypotheses in general the following may also be consulted with profit:

E. Sapir Culture, Language and Personality ed. D.G. Mandelbaum (Univ. of California Press 1949)

B.L. Whorf Four Articles on Metalinguistics (Washington 1952)

H. Hoijer (ed.) Language in Culture: Conference on the Interrelations of Language and Other Aspects of Culture (Univ. of Chicago Press 1954) esp.pp. 47-81 F. Fearing "An Examination of the Conceptions of B. Whorf", 92-105, H. Hoijer, "The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis"

P. Henle (ed.) Language, Thought and Culture (Univ. of Michigan Press 1958).

48. For a discussion of the problems associated with semantics and the relationship of those problems to "biblical theology", it is now necessary first of all to consult James Barr The Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford 1961) esp. Chaps. 1-3; 8-10. But see also the judicious discussion of Barr's views in D. Hill Greek Words (Cambridge 1967) esp. pp. 1-14 with its defence of Humboldtian idealism (esp. pp. 10f.) and the methodology of the TWNT (pp. 12.f; cf. Preface) and criticism of Barr's approach by implication as "mechanistic" and "positivistic".

49. Barr op.cit. p.1.

50. _Ibid_. p.21.
51. _Ibid_. p.22.n.2.
52. For one such illustration see above n.46 and the text there.
53. Barr _op.cit_. pp.111-114.
54. Barr _Biblical Words for Time_ (SCM Press 1962) p.16.
55. _Ibid_. p. 58 & n.1.
56. _Ibid_. p.17.
57. See O. Cullmann _Christus und die Zeit_ Zooliken, Switzerland 1946, translated as _Christ and Time_ London SCM Press rev.ed. 1962.
58. Barr _Biblical Words for Time_ p.47.
59. _Ibid_. p.73
60. _Op.cit_. Chap. IV.
61. _Ibid_. Chap. V.
62. E. Jenni _Zeitschrift für die Alt Testamentliche_ Wissenschaft pp. 197-248; 65 (1953) pp. 1-35.
63. Barr _Biblical Words for Time_ p.65 & n.4. cf. pp.66, 69.
64. Jenni _op.cit_. p.34.
65. Those who are inclined to doubt the existence of this ancient and late ancient despair (that is,I assume, those who have not made a study of this period of antiquity) might with profit look at the following books (to name only two distinguished ones which come to mind):
    H. Jonas, _The Gnostic Religion_ (Eng. Ed. Bonston 1958) and
    E.R. Dodds, _Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety_ (Cambridge University Press 1965).