PAPERS

OF THE

CANADIAN SOCIETY

OF

CHURCH HISTORY

1981

BR
140
C36
1981-
1982
EMMANUEL

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

As in previous years, the papers presented at the meeting of the Canadian Society of Church History in early June 1981 at Dalhousie University, Halifax, were of high calibre.

Professor John S. Moir read a paper on "Canadian Protestant Reaction to the Nec Temere Decree". His paper will be published elsewhere.

Also not included in this selection are the papers by the President of the Society, Prof. Tom Sinclair-Faulkner (Sacramental Suffering: Brother Andre and Spirituality in Quebec), and by Professor Keith Clifford (John MacKay and the Church Federation Association).

The remaining papers are presented herewith for the convenience of members of the Society. A limited number of copies are available and may be purchased from the treasurer, Prof. Charles Johnston of St Andrew's College, Saskatoon.

Because of the inordinately high cost of mailing we have not sent copies to members before the 1982 meetings of the Society in the hope that many of the copies can be distributed to members in Ottawa. Others will receive their copies in the course of the summer.

Thanks are due to Ms Sandra MacNevin, a graduate student in the Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill for arranging the material and expertly "doctoring" out minor flaws in the manuscripts.

The Secretary,

Prof. E.J. Furcha
FRS, McGill University
3520 University St.
Montreal, Que.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Barry Moody,	"From Itinerant to Pastor: The Case of Edward Manning (1767-1851)"	1
Ken Mufuka,	"The Christian Church Under Stress in Southern Africa Since 1960"	26
__________	"The Relative Strengths of the Christian Church in Africa Since 1960"	35
Jonathan L. Pearl,	"The Path of Moderation: The Science of Demons in Sixteenth and Seven - teenth Century France"	45
Robert T. Reid,	"Profiles in Evangelism: A Comparitive Study of Henry Alline, Joseph Dimock and Isaiah Wallace"	60
Richard E. Ruggle,	"The Canadianization of the Church of England"	79

From Itinerant to Pastor:

The Case of Edward Manning (1767-1851)

by

Barry Moody

Historians have been in general agreement that the roots of the Baptist denomination in the Maritime Provinces lie deep in the Great Awakening. It is felt, however, that by 1800, the Baptist Church had emerged from the chaos and uncertainty of the period of religious upheaval; from the secure footing of the Baptist Association, formed in that year, the denomination would expand and grow, becoming the most dynamic religious force in the Maritimes in the 19th century.

Maurice Armstrong, in the last paragraph of his significant study The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809 summed up well the prevailing view of what took place. He wrote:

> Ecclesiasticism had triumphed; the cycle of the Great Awakening was completed; the revolt against the "forms of Godliness" was ended, and the Protestant Dissenters of Nova Scotia, after their brief but spectacular flight, laid aside the wings of the spirit and settled down to orderly and unexciting growth. [1]

It was not to check the validity of this view but rather to attempt to understand the process that occasioned this paper. How did men, whose early ministerial experience was in the crucible of the Great Awakening, eventually make the transition from itinerant preacher to settled pastor of an established church? Just as importantly, how did a group of people, used to the irratic service of an itinerant, transform themselves into a church, complete with . . . 2

doctrine, practice, building, pastor and the resultant responsibilities? These were the questions that led to the present topic.

The career of Edward Manning and the growth of the Cornwallis Baptist Church were chosen as the vehicle for examining these questions for two reasons. Manning, and the church that he led, have been considered traditionally as among the most stable elements on the Maritime Baptist scene in the last century. Also, the Manning diaries, from 1807-1843, are by far the best single source extant on Baptist growth,[2] while the Cornwallis Church Records are relatively complete and well organized. If the process of change from itinerantcy to establishment is documented anywhere, it should be in the career of Edward Manning.

The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia and its immediate aftermath produced a host of dynamic religious leaders, who collectively have become known as the Baptist Fathers. Theodore Seth Harding, Joseph Dimock, Harris Harding, Thomas Handley Chipman, Joseph Crandall and Edward and James Manning would do much to mould the emerging religious forces in the Maritimes. Of these, Edward Manning was probably the most influential on the overall scene. Born in Ireland in 1767, Manning came with his parents, first to Philadelphia and then to Falmouth, N.S., about 1772. Although born into the Roman Catholic Church, Manning was greatly influenced by the preaching of the Great Awakening. For the remainder of his life, he retained a vivid picture of Henry Alline, with tears flowing, begging him to flee from the wrath to come.[3] In 1789, through the preaching of John Payzant and Harris Harding, Manning underwent a dramatic conversion. In later years he related the

details of the event:

> While hearing the Rev. John Payzant preach on the 26th of 1789 , and several young converts confessing their Lord and Master with much sympathy of soul for poor sinners and for me in particular, my heart was broken. I could not contain myself, but wept aloud and came to a decision to seek the Lord; and to use my own expression at the time, I was determined if I was lost at last to go to Hell begging for mercy. I endured much horror of mind until the evening of the 29th of the same month, when I attended a prayer meeting where I thought the Lord was present to heal, but that there was no hope for me. I was in an awful state, and thought I was literally sinking into hell. Then I saw the justice of the Almighty in my condemnation, a most astonishing change having taken place in my views of that justice. If ever I loved any object before or since, it was the eternal justice of God. It appeared to me that I could not but love it, even though it prove my eternal condemnation. The view was overwhelming. I was quite lost for a season to time-things: and when I came to my recollection, God and all creatures appeared different to me from what they ever did before. An indescribable glory appeared in everything. ... I had a great discovery of the vanity of the things of time and sense. I felt a sense of what a miserable state the world was in, and what it was to die out of Christ. ...I discovered the whole world sinking down into eternal misery, and they knew it not, blindfolded by the gods of this world.... My mind now turned upon Christians in general, and love kept increasing. My mind turned upon God. An inquiry arose in my heart, whether it would be possible that God would be infinitely condescending , or could be possessed of such a nature as to have mercy upon me. I immediately discovered that it was possible. At this discovery my whole soul was set on fire.I cried out, how loud I cannot tell. I do not recollect what expression came to my mind, or whether there was any or not. But this I know, my soul was wrapt in God's eternal love.I felt nothing but that glory. ...Then I could call heaven and earth, yea God and angels and men to witness, that I knew my Redeemer lived, and I should live also.[7]

He became a Newlight Congregationalist and in February ,1790, began an itinerant ministry that would take him all over the Maritimes and into the State of Maine.

During this period, his concern for awakening souls was paramount. Doctrine, dogma, church practice, forms of baptism - for all of these, Manning could have readily agreed with Henry Alline that they were "non-essentials." Partly as a result, like many of the Newlight preachers, Manning became entangled in the doctrinal controversies of the 1790s, supporting for a time what became known as the New Dispensation movement.[5]

In 1795, Manning accepted the call to the pastorate of the Cornwallis Newlight Congregationalist Church. E.M.Saunders later painted a picture of quiet, uneventful growth. "From the 19th of October 1795, until January 12th, 1851, Edward Manning faithfully served the Church in Cornwallis as pastor."[6] The importance of Manning to his pastorate is indicated by I.E. Bill, an early Baptist historian and himself a convert of Manning's.

> Over mountains and valley he travelled by day and by night, watching for souls as one that must give an account, until the whole township became thoroughly leavened with the doctrines he proclaimed and with the precepts he enforced.[7]

This at least is the standard view.

It is clear that in the years following 1795, Manning strove hard to put his itinerant beginnings behind him. With a large church to care for,he could not afford the long months of absence that an itinerant ministry necessitated. There were occasional trips to New Brunswick and Maine, but these were, in general, of short duration and became less and less frequent over the fifteen or twenty years following his ordination.

If Manning was changing the form of his ministry during this period, he was also moving in new directions doctrinally. The

appeal of baptism by immersion and the constitution of a church of adult baptized members became irresistable. Following the doctrinal and social upheaval of the New Dispensation movement, the Baptist position seemed secure and stable. After much personal agony, in 1798 Manning travelled to Granville to be immersed by the Rev. Thomas Handley Chipman. That Manning should do this without informing his church or asking its advice caused much adverse comment and some hard feelings.[8] In spite of this Manning continued to preside over what was clearly becoming a mixed congregation. He baptized by immersion or sprinkling, adults or infants, according to the individual's preference. However, the balance was gradually shifting away from the traditional Congregationalism toward the new, if ill-understood, Baptist position. The two factions continued to "travel together" until 1807.

In 1800, Manning was one of the key figures in the formation of the Baptist Association, although he and most of the other ministers concerned did not preside over Baptist Churches. It was in reality an association of immersed ministers, rather than of Baptist Churches. Unlike many of his fellow Baptist ministers, in the long years ahead Manning appears to have had no reservations about the stand taken at this early stage. He was now a Baptist and would not retreat from that position.

But what would all of this mean in practical terms--both for Manning and for the church that he now led? There was growing tension in the church as Manning took a firmer Baptist stand. Finally, in 1807, the rupture occurred and Manning left the church.

It is not clear from the records whether Manning departed of his own accord or if he was forced out. He recorded in his diary:

> ...it was (God) that appeared for me in a great storm of affliction when professors of Religion could not bear Sound doctrine and on that account turned my bitter enemies...with putting into my hand some share of worldly property to enable me to purchase a piece of land to build on. And put it into the hearts of many friends to assist me.[9]

It would seem no accident that the acquisition of "some share of worldly property" should coincide with his leaving the church. He now had at his disposal the means of support that made him independent of the church and allowed him to follow the dictates of his conscience. The Cornwallis Baptist Church was formed in late 1807, comprised of Manning, his wife and seven other members. This was only about one tenth of the immersed members of the New-light Church, indicating that much confusion remained in the minds of the church members.

With one brief interruption, Manning would remain the pastor of the Cornwallis Church from 1807 until his death in 1851, but it would not always be the smooth, progressive pastorate pictured by some historians. Manning himself created some of the difficulties through his inability to leave behind completely his itinerant beginnings. In addition, it clearly took the church far longer to fully accept a settled minister and Baptist doctrine than has previously been assumed. Far from a peaceful transition, Manning's years as pastor were tension-filled, acrimonious and at times debilitating, for both pastor and congregation, indicating that the road to stability was far longer, and rockier, than we have been led to believe.

The issue of ministerial support was a problem from the very beginning. As anxious as the people were to have a minister among them, the question of who would pay for his services was long left unanswered. Stretching back behind this problem were the years of irratic itinerant service to which the people were accustomed. The occasional gift to a travelling evangelist was not the same as the year-round support of a settled minister and his family. It is clear that without the income from his labour on his own farm Manning would have been forced to leave Cornwallis within a few years of the formation of the church. Such slackness cannot be accounted for by lack of numbers, for the church expanded rapdily. By 1820 there were 124 adult members, with at least double that number of adherents.[10]

The question of support was raised by Manning almost yearly. Committees were formed, recommendations were made, subscriptions were circulated but no real results were forthcoming.[11] At times, the situation bordered on disaster. Winter was especially difficult. By February or March, Manning's supply of firewood was usually nearly exhausted. Where the next load was to come from he never knew, and was on occasion forced to beg among his people.[12] By March, 1820, for example, Manning was nearly frantic. His daughter Nancy lay dying, he had only a few days of wood left and was about to be sued for £40 which he owed but could not pay.[13] On one such occasion he cried in anguish to his God:

> O Lord, thou fed Elijah by ravens, thou fed the multitude with a small allowance, and enabled Peter to catch a fish to pay the custom. Lord, now I am thy unworthy servant and am sick and in debt, and not wherewith to pay without distressing my family. O Lord, send help and relieve me. Amen.[14]

To his diary he confided his tale of woe and broken promises:

My situation as it respects temporalities is to me truly trying. For many years I supported myself except what some few individuals imparted. years ago I was obliged to sell my Dyke Lott, which was my principal support. I then told my brethren that there must be some new arrangement in regard to my maintenance. They thought so too, and made some exertions for that end, and obtained a subscription to the amount of about 30 pounds, about 2/3 of which hath been paid in produce. This has been a help but nothing to depend on for a support. About 2 years ago I made a statement to the Committee with tears, and they wept too. Then they Started afresh and obtained a Subscription to amt. near 50 pounds, about 1/4 of which is never paid. This amt. I told them at the time would not answer, and it did not meet my Views. I told them I would give them to the last of August or beginning of September to see what they could do. They met as a Committee and concluded to double the Subscription for the present year, 1818, and of that there was about 25 pounds paid. Such is the fruit of their exertions. One of them called and told me that a number of them had taken it upon them to see that I was supported, but what this information meant I never knew. And now I have it not in my power to cloathe myself nor Family, nor to pay my just debts. The cloaths I now wear is unpaid for.[15]

This problem remained an important part of the scene for most of the rest of Manning's life, frequently interfering with the carrying out of his pastoral duties. And it tended to make him rather bitter and resentful. In 1823 he could write rather sarcastically:"Lois Calkins began a contribution to get me a watch. I hardly think she will succeed. this comes close to pockets."[16]

Not only were the church members constantly behind in the minister's salary but they did little to organize the church upon a sound financial basis. The payment of the account for communion wine was usually several years in arrears and there was frequently no wood at the church, making winter services impossible.[17] It took the congregation 19 years[18] to have the interior of the church plastered and this was finally accomplished only because the mason (a Presbyterian) would accept no payment for his work![19]

Over the years, the financial problems wore away at Manning. On a number of occasions they led him to consider leaving Cornwallis but he was always prevented by his fear of what the sheep would do without their shepherd,[20] the conviction (perhaps justified) that things would fall apart without him.

By 1810, Manning had developed a very clear understanding of the financial obligations owed by a church to its settled minister. There is little indication that the church had progressed to the same point. The nature and extent of the problem make it fairly clear that there is more here than the familiar attempt on the part of a congregation to get off as lightly as possible. There seems to have been general agreement that Manning deserved what he demanded-- in fact they frequently voted him larger sums than requested. There was no quarrel with the minister over support. What seemed to be lacking was any understanding of how the desired ends could be attained. For over thirty years after its founding, the Cornwallis Baptist Church failed to organize itself sufficiently to fulfill one of the main temporal duties of a church.

People frequently gave to Manning -- turnips, a side of beef, a load of wood or a sack of grain, or occasionally money-- and often at unexpected times. However, they gave in no systematic or organized manner. On March 7, 1823, Manning recorded that, in the midst of very bad snow storms, he had enough wood to last three more days. Within a week, fifteen loads of wood had arrived in his yard.[21] The people continued to give as they had given to itinerants-- sporadically, haphazardly and "as the Spirit moved them." It proved a poor financial base on which to build a secure church.

There was clearly confusion in many minds concerning the

obligations of a church; of a more serious nature was the confusion that existed over exactly what constituted a church. The belief that the adult baptized members are the church is of course central to the Baptist position. And yet, this seems to have been only vaguely understood--if understood at all-- by many of Manning's followers. The congregation, the church members and the pewholders all at various times laid claim to supremacy. In an attempt to clarify the situation, in 1820 the church sent to the United States for two dozen Baptist Catechisms and two dozen copies of Church Articles.[22] Manning strove consistantly to impress upon his people that neither the congregation nor the owners of the pews were "the church", but rather the immersed adults who had been received by the relation of their experiences. Yet, as late as 1834, the Billtown wing of the church was torn apart over the selection of the"quarester" or choir master (they now proudly boasted a "quire".) The dispute had arisen over whether the pewholders or the church members had the right "to regulate the worship of God, especially the singing."[23] At a special meeting, the church members, not surprisingly, agreed unanimously that it was the right of the church members "to regulate the Singing in every place within its limits, & of course to choose its chorister."[24] By the end of the year, the conflict had grown so bitter that Manning would not dispense communion to the church.[25] The problem was finally resolved but that such an issue could arise more than twenty-five years after the church's founding is an important comment on the state of affairs.

Along similar lines, in 1837-40 there was a major disruption over the position of the Rev. George McDonald, who had become temporary minister in Manning's absence. After much upheaval, and many

rescinded motions, McDonald was dismissed by the church.[26] The real problem arose when it became clear that the majority of the pewholders, many of them now excommunicated for their continued support of McDonald, insisted that he be retained as minister. Who, in fact, was "the church "? Disaster was averted only by the decision of the dissidents to sell their pews.[27] Only slowly were the Cornwallis Baptists coming to grips with that important question of what constitutes a church.

Even more confusion is evident in the field of doctrine. Although only seven of Cornwallis's immersed church members followed their pastor into the Baptist Church in 1807, judging by mere numbers Baptist doctrine spread rapidly in the township. In two years, the membership increased to 65 and climbed steadily thereafter. By 1840, the various congregations of the Cornwallis Baptist Church contained 700 members.[28] A superficial glance, then, would indicate that Baptist doctrine had triumphed, that Manning had seen "the fields white unto harvest" and had reaped them.

A careful reading of the Church Records and the Manning diaries throws serious doubt on the above view. Throughout his ministry, Manning's church was plagued by doctrinal uncertainty, to the point where one must question whether the majority had any clear perception of Baptist doctrine at all.

Manning's main--an persistent--problem centered around the doctrine of election. After the free willism of the Great Awakening, the early Baptist leaders had shifted back to the basic Calvinism of their Congregationalist forerunners. Certainly, by the second decade of the nineteenth century, there could be no doubt as to where most of the Baptist leaders stood in the conflict between free will and predestination. And yet, the diaries especially are filled with

references to the recurring inroads that the free will movement made in Cornwallis. On April 30, 1819, Manning recorded:

> Went to Habitant. I addressed the people... but one woman laughed in meeting, though quite a solemn time. And when I asked her the reason she said it was because I tried to prove the Doctrine of Election. I told her it did not need much proof, that it was to be seen in all parts of the Bible. But she advised me to drop it, that it was not the doctrine of Christ. I replied that it was and that it lay at the Foundation of all Real Religion, and that it was the foundation of the Hope of every poor lost Sinner. I then reproved her for her presumption, and we parted with much dissatisfaction with each other, I believe.[29]

If this type of thing were an isolated case it would be easier to fit into our understanding of the evolution of the Baptist denomination. But it occurs time after time.

Throughout 1820-22 a free-will preacher by the name of Jacob Norton was active in Cornwallis, profoundly dislocating the Baptist Church there. Manning described him as "full of Wild Fire, false doctrine and abominable intrigue."[30] But he was clearly having an impact, Manning referring to it as "the strange fire that is in the land."[31] He was "Much exercised about this flood of false fire, and doctrine that is prevailing among the people."[32] Of a monthly conference meeting, Manning would record sadly "A number that are taken with the doctrine and the wonderful Norton attended and renewed covenant, but I fear they are not sincere, for as soon as they could get away they went to Norton's meeting."[33] Although Norton was eventually discredited as an imposter and an immoral character, Manning's wayward followers clearly did not thank him for pointing out their error. It is no wonder that, in drawing up a list of the things that bothered him about his people, he included these two:

> 5th A neglect of reading the Scriptures and other good books, so that they don't know when the

> truth is preached and when not in many points.
> 6th An itching of ears to hear strange preachers, and not being well instructed by reading are liable to be imposed upon by a nun of gifts and false zeal....34

Many other free will evangelists swept through the township--and the church--leaving doubt and confusion in their wake. The success of men like Norton, Clark Alline, Reynolds, Howard and others would perhaps suggest that Henry Alline's doctrine made a greater and more long lasting impact on the Maritime scene than historians of the Awakening have suggested or nineteenth century Baptist writers have dared admit. Jack Bumsted, in his study of Alline, has written:

> Alline's overt attack on Calvinism undoubtedly cost him a good deal of support from within the province....In his 1784 attack on Alline, Jonathan Scott undoubtedly sensed the under-current of discontent with Alline's "doctrine" and hit hard at his anti-Calvinism, obviously anticipating that a throrough exposure of the evangelist's break with tradition would turn many against him. In the long run it undoubt-edly did, and the successful heirs of Alline's evangelical thrust were the Baptists, whose position was generally Calvinistic in nature.35

It is not at all apparent that the people of Cornwallis were so concerned with the Calvinist tradition, or that they even under-stood it. Their minister was undoubtedly a Calvinist, but all of his powers--and they were considerable--could not keep his flock from wandering. In late life he wrote that he had spent thirty-five years attempting to "protect the people from the various kinds of doctrine, and the cunning craftiness of subtle, and designing men."[36] His frequent lack of success underscored the doctrinal confusion that persisted in the Cornwallis Baptist Church for nearly half a century after its founding.

The willingness of the Cornwallis people to follow new leaders--both Baptist and non-Baptist--and the frequency with which this took place, especially during Manning's absences or illnesses, would seem to indicate that at heart the people were uninterested in doctrine at all. They were Baptists because Manning had given them forceful, dynamic leadership on key occasions and Manning was a Baptist. It was a committment based on personality, not conviction. If Manning were not constantly on the spot, they would follow someone else, Baptist or non-Baptist, Calvinist or not. And it is remarkable on how many of these occasions the ring leaders were the deacons of the church themselves.

Manning knew his people well and seemed to be well aware of their failing in this regard. In writing about a series of revivals on the North Mountain, he commented:

> Howard the imposter hath been among the people, and they have had a noisy meeting. this is the criterian of religion with some people, to have a bustle, and this with them is an infallible proof that the preacher is sent of God, and that the ado is the work of God, and so they willingly are duped.37

When Manning went on an extended missionary tour of New Brunswick and Maine, the man chosen by the church as his successor was a Baptist of questionable theological soundness. Even after charges of immorality were proved (he molested several of his young parishoners on Prince Edward Island), the church refused for a time to remove him. When he finally left, he took with him an important segement of the church, forming a separate congregation known locally as McDonaldites.[38] Personality, not doctrine, seems to have been the motivating force in the religious life in Cornwallis Township.

In matters of church organization, practice and doctrine, it is

difficult to see the ordered transition to a settled church that has on occasion been suggested or assumed. Certainly part of the problem lay in the nature of the society itself, where less stability is indicated than one would perhaps expect. However, it is clear that part of the difficulty originated with the pastor himself and the way in which he attempted to lead his people.

The church over which Manning presided was, in the early years, of managable size. Although it grew fairly rapidly from its small beginnings in 1807, for some time support remained localized in the Canard region. However, the itinerant spirit in Manning did not die with his acceptance of the call to a pastorate. If obligations, both family and church, in general kept him from the long missionary journeys, the township itself offered an exciting if smaller field. Manning's diary reveals that he was almost constantly on the move, pushing his way into new areas, conversing with people of any denomination, preaching, visiting, marrying, burying. In some respects he was still very much the itinerant. He was away so frequently that his wife resorted to "illness" in an attempt to keep him at home. She frequently had "the glooms", as Manning called it, and began "dying" about 1815. She was still well enough 36 years later to walk in her husband's funeral procession!

Manning's efforts, of course, paid off in new converts and a widening sphere of influence. By 1820 his pastorate encompassed the entire township, in which he was the only settled Baptist minister. In addition, there were by this time four or five very distinct, but widely separated, areas of support. As the population of the

township grew, the area to be covered became an increasing burden. Manning could not be among the people as constantly as was necessary for a weak and still confused church. He was not always able to be where he was most needed. For example, in the middle of the Norton controversy, Manning, while preaching in a community on the North Mountain, was able to stir the people deeply. They begged him to stay until the next Sunday, but he could not because he had appointments to preach elsewhere in the township. It is not surprising that Norton should be able to make rapid strides on such an occasion.[39] In many respects Manning had the advantages of neither an itinerant, who could come and stay in a community for as long as seemed necessary, nor a settled pastor of a managable church, who was present in the community constantly. On visiting one of the areas most prone to waywardness, Manning noted with great insight:

> found the People (notwithstanding the dreadful prejudices that have existed in the minds of many) friendly and kind. Think if I could be more among the people, that their opposition to Truth would come down. 40

Although he correctly identified the problem, he proved unable to provide the solution.

When the inevitable happened and his extended pastorate began to break up into its geographic parts, Manning felt betrayed. Although by the late 1820s there were many young men entering the ministry, looking for pastorates, Manning clearly viewed this as <u>his</u> field, one and indivisible. When the Berwick Church, or 2nd Cornwallis, was carved out of the western portion of the field in 1829 and called to the pulpit William Chipman, one of Manning's deacons turned preacher, there was anger and bitterness in Manning's heart. He could only attribute the establishment of a separate church

to the intrigue of the Chipman family, the most powerful and contentious element within the Cornwallis Church.[41] He never understood what was happening in the township nor did he ever become reconciled to the breakup of his old itinerant field. Two years after the founding of 2nd Cornwallis, Manning could write of the people of that district "O that dear people, how they long for their old unworthy pastor."[42]

The nature of Cornwallis Township was being transformed during this period. People were beginning to identify with the immediate vicinity rather than the broader area. The meaning of "community" was changing along with people's needs. They demanded a church in their midst, with a pastor more readily available. This was at the heart of the conflict between Manning and David Harris, the worst of all the disruptions in the Cornwallis Church during this period. Harris, a Baptist minister, attempted to work in Cornwallis in the expectation of succeeding to the pastorate when Manning passed to his reward. Co-operation was possible for a time, but when Harris built up a following in some of the more remote areas of the field, bitter controversy ensued that raged for over six years. Clearly part of the problem originated in Manning's fear that the already inadequate financial support given to the minister in Cornwallis would be divided.[43] But there was more there than mere monetary concern. Manning failed to understand what was happening in Cornwallis, attributing the unrest to "a spirit of partyism," the intrigues of the habitually discontent.[44] Manning's dreams, which he faithfully recorded, were often very revealing. In the midst of the crisis he dreamed "that an old lady charged Mr. D.Harris with the stealing of sheep, that he was exceedingly disorderly,

and would not be silenced. I indeavoured to preserve order, but all in vain."[45] In viewing the bitterness, the confusion and the dissension, one is forced to agree with Manning that "religion is disgraced, and driven from among us."[46]

Manning's resistance to the shift to a community-oriented church is in many respects ironic. The stabilization of the Baptist Church, for which Manning worked so hard throughout his life, would have been easier to accomplish with greater contact between minister and congregation. It is probable too that a church identified with the emerging community would have found financial support more readily available. Manning's view of the broader pastorate and his determination to treat it as a small mission field to some extent helped assure the defeat of the very things that he worked so hard to attain.

Manning began his ministerial career as an intinerant preacher and perhaps in many respects never moved much beyond that point in actual sentiment. In the early years of Baptist growth he was kept at home by a young family, inadequate financial security and a large mission field at his door step. In the 1820s he was able to channel his great energies into the broader Maritime field, but without having to leave Cornwallis. For over three years, 1825-28, he was almost completely preoccupied with events in Halifax. The revolt in St. Paul's Anglican Church, the formation of the Granville Street Baptist Church and the resulting tensions and problems absorbed his energies and attention. He was clearly the pivotal figure in the early stages especially; he acted in some respects as an armchair itinerant, conducting his campaigns through the mail, by visits from the key Halifax people and the occasion trip to

Halifax.[47]

The founding of Horton Academy in 1828 and Manning's election to the presidency of the Nova Scotia Baptist Education Society provided another vehicle whereby his influence could be greatly expanded.[48] Manning found the work exciting and challenging, placing him at the forefront of the movement for doctrinal stability within the broader Maritime community.

After 1829, the breakup of his large church and the factions and bitterness that characterized this movement led Manning to re-assess his role. His only surviving child was now safely married and provided for. Mrs. Manning, while not well, was clearly no worse than she had been for the past fifteen years. The problems in the church tended to drive Manning away, only allowing for further division. In a break with the past thirty years, much of 18[illegible] was spent on missionary tours, in spite of tears and recriminations from Mrs. Manning.[49] David Harris was left free to increase his support in Cornwallis; the situation clearly grew worse in Manning's absence.[50]

A revival of major proportions in the Billtown wing of the church kept Manning preoccupied throughout much of 1833 and early 1834, but July and August found Manning once again on the road. His missionary tour took him to south-western New Brunswick, where the problems of the people moved him deeply. He wrote:

> O that I may be directed while I am in this part of this province. this people need help. the Unitarian Baptists with their anti-Christian free-willism, is spreading their delusion among this uninformed people, and there is a charming people here. 51

He had preached in the same area forty-three years before and he felt happy and useful again after the debilitating struggles of the

past few years. Should he stay and labour where he was useful? He confided to his diary:"on some acc'ts I dread to go home, and truly on some acc'ts I dread to stay away."[52] And again: "thinking much about Cornwallis. I long to go home, but truly there are things existing there that distresses me, and makes the sweat pour off of me when I think of going home."[53] Go home he did, however, to find of course that the situation had worsened in his absence. His own deacons were now in full revolt and by late fall communion had to be suspended because of the discension within the church.[54] Once again Manning left rather than face the situation.

In mid 1835 he wrote: "I find the brethren of this church are opposed to my going to the State of Maine, but they do not know my feeling, and cannot judge for me."[55] This time Manning stayed away for nearly a year, obviously enjoying himself immensely. He was flattered by the attention paid him and, although 68 years old, served as the catelyst for several revivals, preaching almost every day, travelling, visiting, exhorting. Soon after he arrived in Maine he recorded: "laid down, and dreamed of fishing, and catching fish in abundance. this I am foolish enough to think a good dream."[56] He reluctantly went home in the spring of 1836, although he was forced to ask himself "Is it duty to go to Cornwallis, and be immersed there, as in a prison, fearing a factious party in my time of life...?"[57]

It was a different Edward Manning who returned to his church this time. He had come full cycle and was once again the unabashed itinerant. He bluntly informed his deacons that

> I would preach to them all I could. I loved the people and would help them all that laid in my

> power, that I would not be absolutely bound to any people, but would go wherever I thought the Lord called me.[58]

In an open letter to the church he was even more forthright:

> ...I do feel that I am the old Pastor of this Church and I live in the affections of the Church and Congregation and the public generally (there are it is true some Exceptions)....I shall Return as soon as I can with a clear Conscience....[59]

And with that farewell, he was off once again, this time staying away for over a year. In exasperation the church finally voted to remove Manning as pastor.[60] At about the same time, Manning wrote to the church resigning his position.[61] Although Manning later resumed the leadership, it was really more as pastor emeritus than as full-time minister. He ended his active ministry as he had begun it, as an itinerant.

This paper was undertaken for the purpose of examining the trasition from itinerant to pastor, from awakened Christians to settled church. Yet, in the case of Edward Manning and the Cornwallis Church, it would appear that the transition did not take place at all, at least not before 1840. Manning remained at heart an itinerant and in many respects the Baptists of Cornwallis failed to develop the characteristics of a settled church.

Only tentative conclusions can be drawn from this study until it can be determined whether or not the Cornwallis experience was shared by other Baptist Churches in the Maritimes. If Manning and Cornwallis are typical, then clearly the period of stabilization for Maritime Baptists comes at a later date than we have been led to believe. In studying the development of the denomination, too

much reliance has been placed on the early Fathers. It is clear that there was often a wide gap between pastor and congregation, that the minister did not always reflect trends within his church. Although priding themselves on the democratic spirit of the denomination, Baptist writers have apparently been guilty of elitism in viewing their past. It is time to reassess the evolution of the Baptist Church, this time "from the bottum up." The move from revival to established church may be found to be a longer process than previously realized and the Great Awakening may achieve a new significance in our understanding of Maritime society in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Notes

1 Maurice W.Armstrong, The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809 (Hartford, Conn., 1948), p. 138

2 Manning"s diaries have been for many years in the Baptist Collection, Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S. However, they have been virtually unusable because of Manning's very poor penmanship. Thanks to Dr. Freemen Fenerty, who has painstakingly transcribed the diaries, this valuable resource is now available to scholars.

3 quoted in E.M.Saunders, History of the Baptists of the Maritime Provinces (Halifax, 1902), p. 27.

4 Ibid., pp.27-8.

5 See Brian Cuthbertson (ed.), The Journal of John Payzant (Hantsport, N.S., 1981), for the best description of this movement.

6 Saunders, p. 134.

7 I.E.Bill, Fifty Years with the Baptist Ministers and Churches of the Maritime Provinces of Canada (St. John ,N.B., 1880),p.134.

8 Ibid., p.30.

9 MS Diaries of Edward Manning, Baptist Collection, Vaughn Library, Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S., Nov. 21, 1807.

10 Saunders. p. 141.

11 See for examples, Manning's diaries, Nov. 7, 1812; Dec. 10, 1814; Nov. 4, 1817; Dec. 28, 1817; May 3, 1819; Jan. 26, 1820; June 12, 1820.

12 Manning's diary, Feb. 15, 1818.

13 Ibid., March 7, 1820.

14 Ibid., April 17, 1818.

15 Ibid., May 13, 1820.

16 Ibid., Feb. 18, 1823.

17 Ibid., Jan. 1, 1815; Oct. 11, 1817.

18 Ibid., Nov. 19, 1818.

19 Ibid., Nov. 20, 1818.

20 Ibid., June 24, 1819; Feb. 3, 1820.

21 _Ibid._, Mar. 7, 1823.

22 Acadia University, Baptist Collection, Records of Cornwallis Baptist Church (Upper Canard), Record Book I, 1816-1834, Nov. 11, 1820, p.56.

23 _Ibid._, Book II, July 12, 1834, p. 39.

24 _Ibid._, Aug. 27, 1834, p. 40.

25 _Ibid._, Nov. 8, 1834; Manning's diary, Nov. 3, 1834.

26 Records of the Cornwallis Baptist Church, Book II, Feb. 7, 1838, p.66

27 _Ibid._, May 1840, p.84.

28 _Minutes of the Nova Scotia Baptist Association for the year 1840_, pp.4-6.

29 Manning's diary, April 30, 1819.

30 _Ibid_., Oct. 24, 1821.

31 _Ibid._, Sept. 7, 18[illegible].

32 _Ibid._, Sept. 11, 18[illegible].

33 _Ibid._, Sept. 7, 1820.

34 _Ibid._, Nov. 4, 1817.

35 J.M. Bumsted, _Henry Alline_ (Toronto, 1971), pp.87-8.

36 Manning's diary, Nov. 29, 1831.

37 _Ibid._, Dec. 28, 1838.

38 For a very confusing sequence of events, see Records of the Cornwallis Baptist Church, Book II, 1836-40, pp.54-84.

39 Manning's diary, Aug. 13, 1820.

40 _Ibid._, Aug. 2, 1821.

41 see _Ibid._, Jan. to Mar., 18[illegible].

42 _Ibid._, July 26, 1831.

43 _Ibid._, April 13, 1832.

44 _Ibid._, May 22, 1831.

45 _Ibid._, Sept. 28, 1831.

46 Ibid., April 26, 1835.

47 See ibid., for 1825-1828.

48 For the founding of Horton Academy, see Memorials of Acadia College and Horton Academy for the Half-Century 1828-1878 (Montreal, 1881), pp.25-31; R.S. Longley, Acadia University, 1838-1938 (Wolfville, 1939), pp.15-22.

49 Manning's diary, May 7, 1832.

50 See ibid., Dec., 1832, Jan., Feb., 1833; Records of Cornwallis Baptist Church, Book II, Feb.-Mar., 1833, pp.3-11.

51 Manning's diary, July 13, 1834.

52 Ibid., July 24, 1834.

53 Ibid., Aug. 3, 1834.

54 Ibid., Nov. 8, 1834; Records of Cornwallis Baptist Church, Book II, Nov. 8, 1834, p.41.

55 Manning's diary, July 10, 1835.

56 Ibid., Aug. 16, 1835.

57 Ibid., May 11, 1836.

58 Ibid., June 16, 1836.

59 Cornwallis Church Records, Book II, Aug. 8, 1836, pp.53-4.

60 Ibid., July 8, 1837, p.58.

61 Ibid., Manning to Holmes Chipman, July 13, 1837, p. 62.

The Christian Church Under Stress in
Southern Africa Since 1960
by
Ken Mufuka

The question of Christian involvement in political activities, especially those which employ bloodshed as a legitimate weapon has exercised the minds of Christian leaders of every denomination in the last twenty years. The dilemma itself is not new. Two examples will suffice. When Herr Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, it soon became clear to certain German clergymen that that his murder might serve Germany of far greater wickedness than the act of murder itself. Eric Bonhoeffer conspired to murder, was arrested and died in prison. One wonders, in reflection, whether indeed his action was the supreme sacrifice to his nation.[1] At the Church of Scotland Synod held in May 1959, Lord McLeod, the Moderator encouraged that body to participate in the liberation struggle of the native peoples of British Central Africa (Malawi). He told the synod that:

> It was no good in the face of (oppression) that. . ."Healing the hurt of the daughter of my people lightly crying PEACE, PEACE when there is no peace. What we say, for the time being is that someone must speak for the Africans. We do not say it to be difficult. (And). . . if I were an African in Nyasaland, I would rather risk sedition than allow myself to be further merged with the white minority in Southern Rhodesia."[2]

This was obviously direct interference in political affairs and the church felt compelled to justify its action to its followers. The special committee set up for this purpose looked at two volumes, prepared by the Church of Scotland in 1941 and 1945 respectively. The first volume was entitled "Report of the Commission for the Interpretation of God's Will in the Present Crisis (1941)" while the second was entitled "Report on the Nature and Extent of the Church's Concern in the Civil Order." In brief these two volumes argued that in a time of civil crisis, the church was obligated to choose among the contestants the lesser of the evils and to support that side. The church must be satisfied that on the whole, the aspirations of the party which sought their support were in accordance with justice and mercy. Applied to the policy of Herr Adolf Hitler, the church had no difficulty in supporting

Britain and her allies.[3]

The application of this doctrine to Southern Africa follows along the same lines. The details of the South African situation need not detain us needlessly. But it is necessary to emphasize that in a population of 25 million (1978) only 4 million of these enjoy basic human rights, the franchise, freedom of movement over 87 percent of the country, the right to property, and the freedom to job promotion. The rest of the population, 18 million of which are Africans are condemned to a life of semi-slavery, a brutish and babaric existence similar to that described by Thomas Hobbes in Leviathan.

The British Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office in 1909 was told of the brutish treatment of Africans in South Africa at that time to which he replied.

> "I have endevoured to find a single example where a great body of persons like this, a whole race, has been disfranchised in democratic times. If there is such an instance, I cannot find it. That such a thing will happen I cannot believe."[4]

Recently, the British Ambassador to the United Nations was reported to have observed that in South Africa, no amount of virtue, no amount of wisdom, of learning or skills and accomplishment in the arts or sciences would uplift an African from his position of semi-slavery. The significance here is that a man is condemned or uplifted, not by his own accomplishments but by virtue of his birth. In 1900, some shrewd Scots missionaries had come to the conclusion that "no worse fate could befall the African than to be thrown aside (as in South Africa) as a useless factor in the development of the country."[5]

. . .

The present cirsis in church-state relationships is generally dated to 1960. In that year, the movement for African political independence from Europe was described by the then British Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Macmillan as having become "a wind of change." Macmillan confessed that the British government had until then failed to realize "the almost revolutionary way in which the situation would develop and the rapid growth of African nationalism throughout the African

continent."[6] The massacres by the South African police of black rioters in 1960 and the consequent banishment of all black political leadership shows that even that citadel of white supremacy was shaken by the winds of change.[7] But, as Kenneth Kirkwood has pointed out, the catalyst was the entry of communist influence into Africa with the arrival of newly independent states. Secondly, the communists, by ideology and by technical training, encouraged blacks in the white ruled states to resort to violence which is generally called "the armed struggle."[8] This point needs emphasis. Throughout their history, Christian leaders had championed various humanitarian causes, legally and within the ambit of the free enterprize system. Indeed it was because Dr. J. Philip and his friends were stalwart loyalists to the empire and to the "system" that they were so effective. South African Christians however, have to face the dilemma that by espousing needful reform, they must of necessity be seen to be on the same side with communists. The association between these two groups, which is unintentional but extremely embarassing is at the heart of the Christian dilemma in South Africa or indeed any liberal minded white.[9] We must also add another complexity. This association does not worry blacks in South Africa, who consider it a matter of the lion advising the lamb of the oppressive nature of wolf's character.[10] The Christian concience we are talking about is a minority even within the white Christian community, the great bulk of that community believing that in natural law there are those born to serve, to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, in this case the African race. Dr. Edward Norman of Oxford University, in his book on Christianity and the world order ponders and wonders whether this activist Christian minority would not be better served if they concentrated on heavenly matters rather than earthly affairs.[11] With reference to South Africa, Dr. Norman does not pronounce his fears, which I believe to be two, namely that with the advent of communist influence, the possibility of peaceful change is now ruled out, secondly, that whatever small and outdated changes may now occur will not be credited to Christian activists. I

may have misunderstood his treatise, but if my impression is correct, these are fears with which I fully concur.

* * *

The history of Christian dissent in South Africa can be traced to the indomitable Scottish missionary, the Reverend Dr. John Philip, superintendant of the London Missionary Society (1819-1863) in South Africa. Space does not allow us to detail his achievements but he is associated with the 50th Ordinance of 1828 which in brief said that all men in the Cape, black or white were equal before English courts. This is the basis of the voting rights enjoyed by blacks and coloureds in the Cape Province until 1958. What is often forgotten is that the law was passed while he was in London. He happened to call at the Colonial Office and just to make sure, he asked the colonial secretary to add a clause saying that that law could not be ammended retrospecitvely.[12] His fears were proven to have been well grounded in 1834, in 1909 in 1928 and in 1958, the last one being the successful one. One can generalize then by saying that there was no love lost between the Dutch people (Afrikaaners) and this militant wing of the Protestant churches.

The present extreme Afrikaaner Nationalist party came to power in 1948 and set up a commission to investigate the activities of these missionaries in black education. The Commissioner, Dr. W. W. M. Eiselen found the government fears more than justified. The missionaries continued to teach skills even though they knew that blacks were not allowed to practise these skills in a "white man's society." Worse still, they continued to preach the pernicious doctrine of racial equality even though the realities of the situation contradicted that teaching. Dr. H. F. Verwoed, later prime minister of South Africa told parliament that racial relations between blacks and whites were poisoned by missionary education. Missionaries caused frustrations among Africans because they roused "expectations in life which circumstances in South Africa do not allow to be fulfilled. It is therefore necessary that native education should be controlled in such a way that it should be in accord with the state policy" of white suppremacy.[13] While government

support was withdrawn from black schools run by missionary societies, white Christian schools continued to receive such support.

The banishment of the African National Congress and the imprisonement of its leaders in 1961 brought a new challenge to the Christian humanists. The black leadership of the African National Congress was almost wholly Christian and non-violent in ideology. Their incaceration meant that there was no organized voice to speak for blacks. Between 1960-1970 this duty fell upon the Anglican Church community. Leading clergymen of this church expressed themselves through the Christian Institute, a non-denominational organization and through the South African Council of Churches. We ought to mention that the English speaking clergymen were joined by some Dutch speaking clergymen, the most notable of whom was the Reverend Dr. Beyers-Naude, who in 1970 was moderator of one of the Dutch Reformed Churches. In that year, the Spro-Cas Church Commission was appointed by the South African Council of Churches from which I shall quote only the most controversial of its findings. While the Church Commission "itself cannot bring about the fundamental changes so urgently required in our society. . . we are at variance with those churches and Christians who seek to reconcile the Christian faith with apartheid." (pp 2-3)

"All too often in the past the church has regarded recommendations and resolutions as a sufficient response to the needs of men in church and society. A faith which does not issue in action is like a corpse." (p 69)

The most far reaching conclusion was that apartheid which seeks to divide mankind into groups rather than reconciliation is in actual fact heretical gospel. "It rejects as undesirable the reconciliation and fellowship which God gives us. It thus calls good evil. It re-inforces the divisions which the Holy Spirit calls us to overcome. It is thus a form of resistance to the Holy Spirit."[12] If therefore, in the event of armed conflict between the state and forces opposing it, it was incubent upon good Christians in concience not to support the state. This is the most radical departure in South Africa to the spirit of

co-existence between church and state.

I now wish to discuss the other side of the religious crisis in South Africa. The South African government naturally condemned this report as communist inspired and placed the Christian Institute under surveillance. The Reverends Theo Kotze and Dr. Beyers Naude, the Reverend G. French Beytagh, Dr. Alan Patton and the Reverend Cosmos Desmond among others were either placed under house arrest or actually brought before the courts for subversive activities. This of course can be expected. The most fearful development however is that the white congregations on the whole agreed with the position taken by the government. The Reverend Dr. Beyers Naude was expelled and defrocked by his church, the Gereformeede kerk which also suffered a decrease in membership in the ten year period of 1960-1970. The Anglican church suffered notoriety, which was heightened by the arrest of the Reverend G. French Beytagh, Dean of Johannesburgh. From a total membership of 416,472 in 1950, it dropped to 384,448 among its white adherments. This decline is the more significant in that on the whole those churches which maintained a prudent silence actually increased their membership and therefore maintained financial stability as well. The church commission referred to earlier noted with trepidation that the "whites . . . came to demand that instead of questioning their beliefs and (racial) attitudes, the church should support the status quo. In turn members come to regard their church . . . not as demanding something from them . . . On the contrary it is thought proper for the church to adapt itself to the group, not vice versa," (p 28).

But this is only one side of the coin. Among black Christians it was noted," many articulate black Christians are no longer prepared to meet with white Christians," obviously because it gives them a bad name among their followers. Generally, the missionary led black churches could hardly keep their membership, others suffered through break away churches. While this was true for them, break away churches were growing by leaps and bounds estimated at an average of 10 per cent

per annum. The Roman Catholic Arch bishop of Durban further noted that in religious as well as in political matters, the African population as a whole does not support gradualism any more. The most "articulate and determined segment of black opinion will not accept gradualism of any kind."[14]

How then does the religious and political crisis appear in the eyes of these articulate and determined blacks? They can be identified as members of the Black Peoples' Convention and the Black Students Organization, both of which have now been outlawed. Various documents, official and otherwise have been published about their perceptions of the truth. Their argument is along the following lines.

To many black people, the teacher and the priest wielded immense influence partly because of his higher income but also because of his European education which made him the go between blacks and whites. His influence actually supplanted that of the chief or the witch-doctor in urban areas. The tragedy is that their influence was associated with (sic) Christian morality and their actual power with white supremacy. The open support of government policy by the Dutch Reformed Churches and the prudent acquiescence by others inevitably led Africans to the heretical conclusion that there was such a thing as a white Christian Church and a white god. This faith was identical with racial oppression. Unfortunately, white Christians encouraged this heresy by their behavior if not their preaching.[15]

Let me now follow Steve Biko's theology for a while. The old black leadership, particularly that of Congress missed the boat by identifying with white Christianity and therefore a god dressed in a three piece suit. Secondly, white Christian leadership cannot make a significant contribution to the African struggle because they are part of the trouble. Their role is that of ameleoration. The South African system does not need ammendments but a thorough cleansing. White Christians have also placed their finger on the wrong problem, which they call racial discrimination, a view supported by the South African Council of Churches. "They tell us that the situation is a class struggle rather than a racial one," argues Biko. "We believe we know what the problem is . . . the whites are our

problem." Further, Biko is opposed to reconciliation between the races (or intergration). Intergration would imply the acceptance by blacks of white Christian values, which up to now have negated the humanity of blacks. Thirdly, Christians are naive to believe that a compromise that is acceptable to whites can be found. "we must realize that our situation is not a mistake on the part of whites but a deliberate act, that no amount of lecturing will persuade the white man to "correct" the situation. (That) all is well with the system apart from some degree of mismanagement by irrational conservatives at the top" exceeds even the bounds of acceptable naivety.[16]

In conclusion, one cannot avoid the fact that the young blacks of South Africa have already judged that:

(a) The Christian faith is inextricably linked to capitalism and racism and supports these oppressive-isms.

(b) That an alternative society will therefore have to be sought outside the Christian faith, capitalism and racism.

I will not bother this learned society with further details but I hope you will agree with me that I was justified in entitling this paper: <u>The Christian Church Under Stress</u>.

FOOTNOTES

1. Bonhoeffer E. Letters from Prison. (English translation, London 1964)
2. The Deliverance of the Church of Scotland moved by Lord George Macleod, May 1959.
3. Report on the Special Committee Anent Central Africa - (Church of Scotland, Edinburgh, May 1961) pp 11-12.
4. Colonel W. W. Seely, Commons Debates April 1909 pp 1775.
5. Life and Work in British Central Africa March 1900 p 7.
6. MacMillan H. Pointing the Way (MacMillan 1972) p 133.
7. The Johannesburg Star 14th May 1960. See also Rand Daily Mail 10th May 1960.
8. Professor Kenneth Kirkwood, Director, International Studies, Cambridge University - Oval Interview April 1976, Austin, Texas.
9. Letter of J.S. Marais, M.P. for Pinetowen, South Africa to President J. Carter of the United States (No date but written in 1978).
10. South African Nationalist of the African National Congress, Oval evidence. Name with-held. April 1978.
11. Hunt E., Christianity and the World Order (Oxford 1978).
12. Sales J. Mission Stations and the Coloured Communities of the Eastern Cape (South Africa, Balkema, 1975) pp 79-81.
13. Tatz C.M., Shadow and Substance in South Africa. (Natal University Press, 1962) p 145.
14. Hurley, D.E., Evidence of Dr. D.E. Hurley before the United Nations March 1977 No 7/77 United Nations Documents p 7.
15. PRO-VERITATE: Christian Monthly (Holland June 1977) p 9.
16. Moore B., The Challenge of Black Theology (John Knox, Atlanta 1974) pp 39-41.

The Relevant Strengths of the Christian Church in Africa Since 1960

by

Ken Mufuka

When the European Conference of Nations met in 1884 in Berlin, two themes dominated the discussions. Africa was destined to become a hinterland for European commerce and trade and each nation was anxious to share in this destiny. The second theme was that expounded by idealists and "missionary types." King Leopold of the Belgians was the champion of the philanthropists. For Belgium, he proposed a free trade area in the heart of darkest Africa whose main purpose was the advancement of the Negro race. Sir H.H. Johnston, who attended the conference, said that the delegates congratulated each other, the Italians wven weeped with joy and the English were ashamed of themselves. King Leopold, we are told, "had in fact attemp ted the regeneration of Negro Africa ..... He was haild as a man who would raise the millions of Negroes to a condition of peaceful self-government, free on the one hand, from the curse of the Arab, and on the other hand, from the alcoholizing European." [1]

Johnson mentions a fear which was not publicly discussed at the time, that Africa would fall prey to Islam. The reason was that Turkey was a member in good standing of this conference and insisted that freedom of religion should be inclusive of Islam. The fear however, did not go away. At the World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 a fear was expressed to the effect that "if things continue as they are now tending, Africa may become a Mohommedan continent."[2]

This fear is now rarely mentioned with the exception of a few United States Central Intelligence reports which confuse anything anti-American to be communist inspired. In actual fact, all the evidence is that:

(a) Africa is the only continent where Christians are increasing their numbers at a percentage rate higher than that of population growth.

(b) Statistics from Christian churches are lower than those from government records. This means that a large number of people claim to be Christians or to have benefitted from the Christian gospel who are not recognised as such in official church records.

(c) Unlike in the western world, Christian growth in Africa is still largely as a result of new converts rather than converts from one church to another.

The paradox of this essay, or rather the romance of my research is that the strength of Christian missionaries lies in the very factors which constituted their weaknesses during the colonial period. The Reverend B.T. Beetham, writing in 1967 at the height of anti-European feeling and the end of the colonial era said that:

> The day of the overseas missionary in the numbers of the past and present will soon be over....it may prove necessary for a number of reasons, not the least the implacable alliance of some missionaries with their own culture and nationality."[3]

In almost all the anti-missionary literature, one accusation stands like a sore thumb, that the missionaries were the fore-runners of the merchants and political imperialists. The marriage between mercantile interests, political and christian interests was the brainchild of the Reverend Dr. David Livingstone. The dream had been articulated at the General Conference of the Church of Scotland in 1874 by the Reverend Dr. James Stewart who proposed a missionary memorial in Central Africa worthy of Dr. Livingstone.

> ..he - (Dr. Stewart) would now humbly suggest as a truest memorial of Livingstone.....an institution...to teach the truths of the gospel and arts of civilized life to the natives of the country...which would grow into a great centre of commerce, civilization and christianity."[4]

The year 1960 marks a date-line in which the majority of African countries became independent. The temptation to despise everything European including the Christian religion, was overwhelming. Public and political "positions" taken by leaders under-estimated the resilience of the Christian churches. The secret, I believe, lies in two factors. The first is that the accusations levelled against the European missionaries were not properly interpreted. For instance, the fact that education provided by European missionaries was very rigidly "European" and made little attempts to adapt to local situations was taken at face value. The Reverand Dr. B. Mtimkulu, the first secretary-general of the All-Africa Conference of Churches found that while the leadership could focus on those institutions and social values of the colonial era that had an impact on the peoples' lives, it was not so easy to do away with them. "These institutions and values did not die on independence day. They remained, and they had become part of the fabric of life" whether the people liked this fact of life or not.[5]

An episode in Dr. Mtimkulu's life will illustrate the point. We can assume that most educated Africans will enumerate a long list of grievances connected with the European education. What is not so commonly known is that twenty years after independence, the systems of education in Africa have followed basically the same syllabi and patterns of the much hated colonial sytem. Dr. Mtimkulu suggested in Zambia that the English Form Six(the two year university preparatory period) be done away with.

"At the end of my talk," he wrote, "I was asked if I had myself been through the Sixth Form. I confessed that I had. Whereupon the speaker quickly made the retort: "It hasn't done you much harm, has it?"[6] The truth of the matter is that with all its faults Africans have realized that the Christian religion and education could not possibly harm anybody.

At this point it is necessary to examine the actual growth of the Christian curch before dealing with the second issue, that of religion as a force in favour of modernization. If we use the Roman Catholic Church in Tanzania as an example of general church growth, it is surprizing that the church has kept the same rate of growth before and after independence. It doubles its membership every twelve years. The figures are as follows:

Table 1. Roman Catholic membership.

1948	675,000
1958	1,250.000
1968	2,350,000

Source: W.B. Anderson: The Church in E. Africa (Tanzania 1974) p 146

The Reverend David B. Barrett has compiled a list of figures for the whole continent of Africa. These figures show a steady growth in the number of African Christians at a rate of 6 percent per year. Secondly, they show that when the church statistics are compared with government statistics, (a fact we mentioned earlier), the churches have persistently underestimated their own strength. The figures are as follows:

Table II. Total Christians in Africa 1965-1970.

Sub-Saharan Africa	1965	1970
Protestants	21.3%	28.5%
Roman Catholics	33.3%	44.6%

Orthodox	7.6%	8.3%
Independents	6.5%	8.7.%
Total: Churches statistics	68.7(29%)	97.2(28%)
Government statistics	97.4(32%)	126.4(37%)

A brief comparison with the actual population figures will help to underscore the fact of actual church growth on the African continent.

Table III.

	Total Population	Christians
1900	118 million	4 million
1960	275 million(estimate)	75 million
1970	346 million	97 million
2000	768 million	351 million(46% of population)

Source: Adapted slightly from D.B. Barrett - Review of Missions January 1970

Again, if we are to believe Barrett, while church statistics show that a steady incline leading to 46 percent of the population south of the Sahara by the year 2,000; the government statistics show a steady decline in numbers of non-christians (excluding Moslems) to almost zero by that year. The growth of Islam has not been due to conversions but due to natural increase in their respective populations. These facts contradict the two general assumptions, namely that Islam is growing by leaps and bounds and secondly that the association with European imperialism has been a death-blow to the Christian church in Africa. The Roman Catholic missiologist, Father Adrian Hastings believes that by the year "2,000 there will have been a widespread breakdown of the Church in Africa, simply clogged by numbers," because there is no concious planning at all to cope with the increase in numbers.[7]

Brief though the above exposition is, it should give us an appreciation of the viability of the Christian churches in Africa. We can now turn our attention to the motif that runs through this paper; the relative strength of the church. The central argument in favour of the Christian church is that it has been the mid-wife to the twentieth century. The twentieth century is associated with rapid industrialization and the rapid decline and shift of rural population. In the early fifties of this century, 95 percent of the African population was rural. Thirty-years later only 70 percent still live in the rural areas. In South Africa, almost 50 percent have migrated into the urban-mining metropolitan areas. Those who were opposed to European imperialism (as were the Moslems) saw rightly that the old family bands and structures would be doomed in the new society. "In the small face-to-face communities of the old traditional life, the extended family system with its obligations and ties was an excellent arrangement for providing security and a feeling of belonging."[8] This, some scholars have termed the moral effeciency of primitive peoples. I believe that here is the centre of our argument. The moral efficiency of the traditional society does not work in the new environment of the city and may appear even to be ridiculous. Indeed, the system works to the detriment of the "go-getter, who seeks to improve himself and use that improvement for the benefit of his immediate family. Here at once the old idea clashes with the new - the good as communal with the good as individual."[9] It is not by accident that the old medieval religion gave way to the Protestant ethos of which Max Weber has so mightily spoken of. The purpose of any religion, if we can believe B. Malinowski, consists of two things, to bring about social cohesion and to bring about mental stability. But the African traditional religion, because of its reliance on the community cannot bring about social cohesion in a technological society

that does not recognize group achievements but places emphasis on individual performance. This point should not be taken to extremes. It is of course important to be a cousin of the minister of labour. It will give the individual access to the labour market but by and by, the individual must prove his own worth alone. The struggle between the old and the new is going on in Africa and sometimes the old is grafted to the new, and so it should be.

In the transmutations that are taking place in Africa, very often the Christian church has taken over the functions of the extended family. When my father was a pastor in a mining district, our house became the centre for migrants seeking work. But only those migrants who belonged to our church and had testimonials from their previous pastor stopped by. Very frequently also, when one of these migrants entered a hospital, the name of the pastor was mentioned as the next of kin and therefore the person responsible for burial arrangements. The significance of an education is still not to be underestimated even though the Christian schools have now been forced to accept all children in their area irrespective of denominational affliliation. The Reverend W.B. Anderson wrote about the Luo country in Kenya in 1974 along this vein. Luo country is one vast poverty stricken area "from which those without an education have no way of escape." The Christian church that started work there was the Legio Maria(Legion of Mary). It brought a new spirit of freedom from witchcraft and enslaving habits, and helping the unfortunate people to stand up for their rights.[10] Obviously, the traditional habits were not aggressive enough to cope with the vicissitudes of modern day Kenya politics and lobbying for new schools, health and agricultural amenities.

An aspect of Christian enterprise and versatility became obvious during the reign of terror in Uganda between 1971-1980. A lunatic military officer,

General Idi Amin siezed power and proceeded to slaughter all possible elements. The slaughter was quite unheard of in Africa, though the incarceration of members of political opposition parties is almost universal in Africa. Since the newspapers and the audio-visual media is also in the hands of the respective governments(or effectively controlled by threats of closure and incaceration) the real problem of who will "speak unto pharoah and say let my people go" became a problem of who will bell the cat. I need not remind this learned audience that there was no problem of what to say to the "cat", but the problem arose from the fact that the speaker would in all likelyhood constitute a wholesome meal for the cat. The analogy is gruesome but I beg your permission to persue it. In the case of Uganda, according to Mr. Henry Kyemba, Minister of Health in that government, General Amin sometimes tasted the blood of his victims, an act of ablution demanded by African custom in cases of murder. Mr. Kyemba, we shall only mention in passing, was never known to have improved the health of any Ugandan citizens, but to the contrary falsified the death certificates of those whose health General Amin had terminated. Members of the Learned Conference, please bear with me for a while. I cannot pass a good story. In December 1978, Mr. Kyemba was told by a confidential source that his master, General Amin thought that he (Kyemba) had become too healthy for his own good. It is true that Mr. Kyemba escaped to Great Britain with his health intact and write the expose of which I have recounted to you. The question has not yet been answered. Under such circumstances, who and in whose name was to lift up his voice? Bishop W. Luwum, a small, tireless and fearless Anglican Bishop, wrote a letter to General Amin saying in no uncertain terms, in heaven's name, the slaughter must stop. The Bishop was matyred. The point however has been made, during the colonial as well as in the post-independence period, very often there is nobody to speak unto pharoah. It remains the

undisputable duty of the Christian church and the black leadership of that church, in the name of God, to speak out. This is the prophetic role of the church irrespective of the governments in power.

In conclusion it is important to mention that while this paper placed emphasis on the relative strength of the Christian churches in Africa, it is not implied that there are no weaknesses. We shall mention a few in passing. The major weakness throughout the colonial period was that the Christian church was associated with European imperialism and culture. For instance, in Kenya, very many Christians found a Christian wedding too expensive, an obvious contradiction in terms but no less real. It seems that there was pressure for the groom to pay for an expensive bridal gown and a ring, both of which would consume a year's salary for a peasant. These two expensive items have nothing to do with the Christian ideals of marriage. As in some Negro churches in the United States, the dress code of certain churches involves such expensive accountrements that some people find it too expensive to attend service regularly. Further as the economy takes on a more sophisticated outlook, and creates rigid monetary classes, the simple Christian fellowship of equals is being strained daily. An important minister of government insists on bringing his bodyguard into the church. Even though they await him discreetly in the cloisters, they are not as inconspicuous as they profess to be. Worse still, the minister may insist on being called the "Honourable gentleman," contradicting the very essence of equality before God. The tragedy is that this is by no means novel. In the colonial days, European Christians insisted on drinking from the communion cup first, before it was soiled by the other black members of the congregation.

The author of this paper is aware of these and other problems. However, despite these problems the Christian church has shown resilience beyond the expectations of its enemies and friends.

Footnotes.

1. E.D. Morel - Red Rubber (London 1905) p XVIII.

2. Report of the World Missionary Conference - Carrying the Gospel to all the non-Christian world Vol. I. New York 1910 p 20 f.

3. T.A. Beethan: Christianity and the new Africa (London 1967) p 158.

4. Glasgow Herald. 10th June 1874 Church of Scotland Library Reference A 360.

5. B. Mtimkulu. Beyond Independence (Friendship Press, N.Y. 1971) p 13.

6. Ibid. p 59

7. D.B. Barrett: Review of Missions Journal Jan 1970, article entitled "A.D. 2,000: 350 Million Christians in Africa." p 49.

8. B. Mtimkulu op cit p 49.

9. Ibid.

10. W.B. Anderson, The Church in East Africa(Tanzania 1974) p 148-149).

The Path of Moderation: The Science of Demons in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century France

by

Jonathan L. Pearl

Since the eighteenth century, critics and historians have looked with embarrassment and horror at the belief in and persecution of witches in France, as well as in the rest of Europe, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which has seemed to them to be either an example of the evils of traditional religious bigotry, or an odd aberration in the march of progress following the Renaissance. The definers and propagators of the learned theories of witchcraft - its reality and dangers, and the need for severe persecution of witches - have been almost universally depicted as oppressive, bigoted extremists. Historians, in the last ten years or so, have applied new approaches, including quantitative methods, to the problem of witchcraft, and have provided interesting new interpretations of the social and cultural matrix of witchcraft beliefs and persecutions—what actually took place in many parts of Europe, and the significance of these developments. But, in this process of reevaluation, little attention has been paid to the work of the demonologists, and historical views of these writers have changed very little. Recent studies describe the demonologists as the representatives of a unified social and intellectual elite, who developed and applied elaborate theories of diabolical involvement in the affairs of men as part of a broad effort to bring the masses, violent and ignorant, to heel. As a part of the acculturation of the countryside [1] by the urban

elites, witchcraft was a tool for the undermining of popular culture.

It should not surprise us that the writers of demonological works did not see themselves in this light. They perceived themselves as living in a dangerous age of violence and disorder, in which heresy had become rooted and flourished in many parts of Europe, and was, in France officially tolerated after 1598. For them, heresy was inspired by the Devil who was able, through its existence, to bring an army of demons into Europe. The demonologists lived in a world of a multiplicity of religious ideas and a variety of philosophical approaches that included skepticism and Renaissance neoplatonic magic, all of which existed through the weakness of men and their dangerous curiosity.

Demonology books were written by clerics and by dedicated laymen to defend Catholic orthodoxy and to provide an offensive weapon in the fight against devil-inspired heresy. This literature flourished between roughly 1570 and 1630. The primary concern for these writers was the definition of a correct orthodox position that would support the central doctrine of the Catholic religion and would enable preachers to teach their flocks and judges to punish those who transgressed.

The demonologists included in this study did not see themselves as extremists, but rather as learned moderates caught between major diabolically inspired errors. All the writers were concerned with skepticism and unbelief, major

enemies of religious belief. But a significant number of authors also pointed out the dangers of too much belief based on the wrong approaches, which they considered superstition. Blind credulity was perceived mainly as a problem of the common people, especially women, and could lead to dangerous consequences.

The demonologists' statements on popular credulity reveal a mixture of sincere pastoral concern and patronizing scorn for the simple peoples' ignorance. Pierre Le Loyer, in a very influential and much copied work of 1586, stated that superstition was a common vice. He wrote, "For as the impious person does not believe that there are good and evil spirits, and does not apprehend supernatural things, the superstitious person believes too easily, and from fear of evil spirits invents a thousand mad dreams in his brain ... They have a vehement fear that the spirits will seize them, so that they are afraid of the night, so that they cross themselves a thousand times as if they see something, abhor hearing Devils spoken of, and never sleep well, thinking that a thousand phantoms fly about them." [2]

The common people were likely to believe in such mistaken phenomena as the transformation of men into wolves. Several theologians took pains to refute this notion, which seemed to make the Devil equal to God through his power to create a new being in the process of the transformation. J. de Nynauld pointed out that this belief "gives all powers

to Demons (common refuge of those [who are] little instructed in the knowledge of causes), a very impious opinion." [3]

These writers, typical men of their time, agreed that women were more easily led into superstition than men. Sebastien Michaelis stated that "women are easy to all persuasions because of the natural simplicity of their sex" and this led them to be easily duped by the Devil. [4] For Valderama a Spanish Jesuit, women were more easily taken in because they were "weaker, more curious, and more ignorant than men." [5]

Writing of the need for judges to believe in witchcraft and punish witches severely, Pierre de Lancre summed up the orthodox middle position. He stated, "We should avoid the extremes. It is not necessary to line up with the Platonists who attribute everything to Demons; but one must even less hold the belief of the Pythagoreans who laugh at Demons, magicians and witches ... One must be a Christian, and hold Christian beliefs according to the Holy Scriptures and the doctrines of the Holy Fathers and confirm these apparitions, not from stories gathered from everywhere, but by visions of holy personages, by daily experience and by the testimony and confessions of witches." [6]

As de Lancre indicated, the demonologists perceived that the alarming incidence of skepticism and unbelief among the learned classes was a far greater danger than popular credulity. We know little about the extent of skepticism and unbelief in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries,

but the Catholic demonologists were convinced both of the reality and grave danger of these errors. In order to defend Christianity careful definition of orthodox doctrines was necessary. Demonology was an integral part of orthodoxy that had to be defended. The sad state of the world could only be understood as the result of the Devil's work. Demons and angels were incorporeal beings who rewarded or chastised the immortal soul of men after the death of their bodies. To scoff at the reality of angels or demons was thus to attack the crucial doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Demonology was not seen as a minor peripheral belief, but as being at the very heart of the Catholic religion.

Virtually all of the important demonological tracts of 1570-1630 were written with this problem in mind. Their writers were eager to debunk dangerous incredulity. The terms "atheists" and "libertines" were used constantly. A typical statement is by R. DuPont (1602) who wrote, "Our libertines disdain all religions and mock all that is ordered by God, having no other care than to practice the old Epicurean proverb, "Let us Drink, Let us eat and follow our desire/After Death, there is no pleasure." [7] As to the torments of Hell, Du Pont stated, "Our libertines repute all this to be fables, and say there is no evidence that Hell is so terrible; but when they are there, they will confess that the warnings were true." [8]

The Spanish demonological work of the Jesuit Father Valderama was translated into French in 1619. Valderama stated

flatly "That demons make agreements with people, all Theologians, ancient and modern, agree." [9] He too had been troubled by non-believers, reporting irritably, "I hear these incredulous atheists importune with me their jargon and their impertinent questions. They ask me, why believe in a God we've never seen? Oh, madmen without judgement ... These men are blinded by ignorance, of bad birth, subject to their pleasures, vicious, possessed by devils, who have violated all the laws of God, man and even nature, who take no account of God or of their souls and who, to give more weight to their beliefs, permit themselves to commit all sorts of impieties and have impudently sustained that the soul dies with the body, that there is no divine justice ... and no eternal punishments for their evil deeds." [10]

Pierre de Lancre was a judge from the Parlement of Bordeux who, in 1609, acted as a special one-man commission in a major witchcraft inquiry in the Basque region. According to his own testimony, which he published in detail in 1612, he sentenced six hundred people to death in that inquiry. He must have received many comments on his accomplishments, and one could suppose that they did not all agree with him. Ten years later, he published a very lengthy and impassioned work on the problem of incredulity in witchcraft. He appealed to the unbeliever, "Many people have held that there are no demons and that it is foolish to dispute and even more to believe the evil deeds attributed to them and to their supporters, witches ... But all

philosophy and theology, approved by Christians has recognized good and evil Angels ... all of which are incorporeal ... Unbeliever, I beg you to leave the error of those who do not believe in good or evil Angels ... Do you want to leave the belief of the universal church which prays for you daily." [11]

It is difficult to know who these libertines and atheists were, or how widespread their ideas were. Only a few skeptical writers like Montaigne and Charron were well known. The few who went farther, into heresy or immorality were dealt with severly, like Vanini, burnt in Toulouse in 1619. Pierre de l'Estoile recorded many executions in Paris for witchcraft, atheism and blasphemy, and attributed the crimes to the injustice and avarice of his times, and the impunity with which the blasphemies of the upper classes were commited. [12] One of the chief adversaries of the libertines and atheists, Father Francois Garasse, wrote "In writing against atheists, I do not know against whom I write: for there is no one so abandoned who has enough effrontery to declare himself an atheist ... Is it not strange only four or five who, like attendants of the Antichrist, have had enough impudence to appose themselves to the light of reason and write in horrible blasphemous words against the truth of our religion ... All the rest of the libertines, atheists, Epicureans and deists keep themselves hidden." [13]

Several writers saw the royal court in Paris as the centre of immoral living. For one G. de Rebreviettes the evil of libertinage originated there, among effeminate young nobles,

who he calls, "bearded women, who do not know virtue or courage." [14] He called them atheistic hermaphrodites: "Man, no longer man, but a horror, a plaque that infects Christian air, through its corruption wasting our minds and making them ill, without hope of cure. Man, no longer man, but a fury from Hell who gives us the cup of abomination and makes us swallow the verminous drink of atheism." [15]

For all the French denomological writers, libertinage skepticism and atheism were perceived as grave and pressing concerns. Inspired by heretical ideas and filled with wreckless curiosity, doubters and unbelievers threatened the ability of the Catholic church to fight its other opponents. Louis Richeome, a Jesuit who wrote a lengthy work in defense of the immortality of the soul stated that the Devil was the author of atheism, "Who does not believe the soul to be immortal is infidel and Godless, ... He is not Christian who injures God by his incredulity and he should be instructed by fire and torture." [16] Richeome believed that curiosity was dangerous in an age of competing ideas and could lead a person of weak belief to blasphemy and heresy. He stated, "It is necessary to believe in order to understand ... Those who follow the Christian method, which teaches belief first, see clearly the reasons and secrets of nature illuminated by a supernatural light." [17]

Of especially great concern to several writers was what they perceived as a dangerous tendency in the direction of incredulity on the part of some judges who should have been

front-line fighters in the battle against the Devil. France had no inquisition to deal with cases of witchcraft, blasphemy, heresy and atheism. All these religious matters came under the jurisdiction of the lay courts, made up of lay judges. The highest courts of the kingdom, the Parlements, were composed of judges who were of the social and intellectual elites and who were affected by all the complex intellectual, political and religious issues of their day. Their personal beliefs were important in their jurisprudence, for judges who were unbelievers or skeptics would be unlikely to take witchcraft very seriously. Modern historians have generally seen a shift in the opinion and practice of the judicial elite, from a position of almost total credulity and severity to witches, to one of uncertainty mixed with skepticism around the 1630's. But the demonologist lawyers and theologians perceived uncertainty and skepticism far earlier. In 1586 Pierre le Loyer wrote," Never have their been so many witches of both sexes who are left unpunished by the judges, who by this means establish the reign of Satan ... Many judges are up till now blind so that they deny that there ever have been witches even though the laws and all antiquity give them the lie and everyday experience silences them. Who causes this, if not Satan, who in this miserable age that we are come to, breathes the poison of his evil doctrine with which depraved and corrupted men are easily imbued and instructed." [18] Pierre Crespet, in a discussion of the evil consequences of judicial incredulity, indicated that this incredulity was well

known to his audience. He wrote, "We say now that the minister of Satan; Heretics, atheists, witches and evildoers are welcomed, prancing freely" and good people were distrusted and mocked "because of the evil arts, which are practiced with impunity in France." [19]

Judicial incredulity was extremely distressing to Pierre de Lancre. In his account of the mass trials of 1609 he argued for the necessity of publishing his experience. "The first (reason) is to lift the error of many who deny the principals of witchcraft, believing that it is only illusion and to make them see clearly that doubt and the impunity or leniency that our fathers and the Parlements have shown up till now have nourished and maintained false belief and engendered a multiplicity (of witches)." [20] Ten years later he returned to this idea, stating, "Many judges believe, as le sieur de Montaigne, that (witchcraft) is only imagination. In this category are some from the Parlement of Paris where they say that belief in all that pertains to witchcraft comes only from torture." [21] He argued that judges must believe in witches and put them to death. "If they do not put them to death," he went on, "does this not authorize witchcraft and establish it to the prejudice of the laws of God, and by means of the impunity that follows this lack of belief give the means to witches to waste, infect and ruin all." [22]

Modern readers might be tempted to dismiss all these arguments as simply a matter of rhetoric which over time had

become mandatory. Or they might regard them as nothing more than scare tactics by a group of militant believers. However a recent study by Albert Soman helps the argument that Le Loyer, Crespet and De Lancre did not invent a "soft on witchcraft" scare out of nothing. Using the records of the prison of the Parlement of Paris, Soman shows that that important court had a long tradition of moderating the punishments imposed by the lower courts in cases appealed to it. Between 1564 and 1600, the Parlement of Paris confirmed only thirty per cent of death penalties, and after 1610 only twelve and one half per cent of death penalties imposed by local courts. It also consistently lightened the non-capital punishments; torture, servitude in the galleys and whipping to which witches had been sentenced by lower courts.[23] It is possible that, to some extent this consistent tendency toward moderation was based on some degree of skepticism and even unbelief and that it was, in part at least, what stimulated the demonologists to undertake the task of defining an orthodox science of demons.

The French demonologists saw their time as a dark age of violence and disorder. The Devil's hand was evident everywhere, sowing discord and doubt. On one side was the ignorant, superstitious peasantry, fertile ground for the Devil's work, who had to be taught the serious reformed Catholicism of the post-Tridentine Church. The peasants' inclination to believe in the absolute reality of lycanthropy, to believe everything said in exorcisms and to perceive themselves surrounded by demons all attributed

too much power to the Devil and elevated him, in the eyes of the simple people, to the level of God. On the other side were the educated unbelievers, influenced by the learned paganism of the Renaissance and the skepticism of Montaigne and Charron. They were seen as scoffers and mockers of the most holy doctrines of the Church. This group, the demonologists believed, threatened the unity of the Catholic Church and compromised its ability to fight its enemies. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul and the reality of Heaven and Hell had to be defended in its entirety and that included angels, demons and witches. The demonological treatises of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were designed to convert the doubter and unbelievers, or at least to neutralize their dangerous influence.

These theological and philosophical arguments did not take place in a void. Many, perhaps most, French Catholics were not reconciled to the permanent existence of Protestantism in their midst. The world was seen as a battleground between good and evil, religion and heresy. A sense of combat pervades the demonological literature. It is difficult to read it and not give some credence to the existence of a degree of skepticism and perhaps even unbelief that was serious enough to alarm the defenders of Catholic orthodoxy.

The authors of demonological tracts were not simply zealous propagators of old traditions or cynical oppressors of free-thought and popular peasant culture. They developed the science of demons as sincere embattled defenders of the faith. Their goal was to produce a theologically correct,

refined demonology, avoiding the extremes of credulity and incredulity.

The seeds of the decline of the witchcraft beliefs were present at the beginning of the flourishing of demonology, in the tepidness or outright unbelief of a minority of the elite. It may also be that the very process of defining a precise science of demons by dedicated churchmen and laymen who were themselves highly educated and sophisticated people even helped the decline of witchcraft. Witchcraft persecution did not disappear in France as the result of the scientific revolution, Cartesian rationalism or the publicity generated by the notorious possession cases of the 1630's. The process by which the views of a very small, hidden minority in 1600 came to have significant influence by 1640 is a fascinating one which has still to be convincingly described.

NOTES

1. Machembled
2. Le Loyer, 226, 7
3. Nynauld, 4
4. Michaelis, 104
5. Valderama, 311
6. De Lancre, *Incred*, 366
7. Du Pont, 7R
8. ibid., 200 v
9. Valderama, 180
10. ibid., 13, 18
11. De Lancre, 7-10
12. L'Estoile, 286
13. Garasse, *Somme*, 14-15
14. Rebreviettes, 29
15. ibid., 411-12
16. Richeome, 76, 84
17. ibid., intro.
18. Le Loyer, 526
19. Crespect, 42R
20. De Lancre, *Mescreance*, advert.
21. De Lancre, *Incred*, 353
22. ibid., 363
23. Soman

NOTES

1. Robert Muchembled, La Culture Populaire et la Culture des Elites(Paris,1978),p.300.
2. Pierre Le Loyer, IIII Livres des Spectres(Angers,1586),p.226,7.
3. J.de Nynauld, De la Lycanthropie,transformation,et extase des sorciers (Paris,1615),p.4.
4. Sebastien Michaelis, Discours des Esprits (Lyon,1614),p.104.
5. R. P. Valderama, Histoire Generale Du Monde,trans.Sieur de la Richardier(Paris,1619),p311.
6. Pierre de Lancre, L'Incredulité et Mescreance Du Sortilege Plainement Convaincue(Paris,1622),p.366.
7. R. Du Pont, La Philosophie Des Esprits(Paris,1622),fol.7R.
8. ibid.,200V.
9. Valderama, Histoire,p.180.
10. ibid.,pp.13,18.
11. De Lancre, L'Incredulité,pp.7-10.
12. Pierre de l'Estoile, Journal de L'Estoile,ed.Armand Brette (Paris,1906).
13. Francois Garasse, La Somme Theologique Des Veritez Capitales De La Religion Chrestienne(Paris,1625),pp.14-15.
14. G. de Rebreviettes L'Impieté Combatue Par Des Infideles Paris,1612),p.29.
15. ibid.,pp.411-412.
16. Louis Richeome, L'Immortalité de L'Ame(Paris,1621),pp.76,84.
17. ibid.,intro.
18. Le Loyer, IIII Livres,p.526.
19. Pierre Crespet, Deux Livres de la Hayne de Sathan et Malins Esprits contre l"Homme(Paris,1590),fol.42R.
20. Pierre de Lancre, Tableau De L'Inconstance Des Mauvais Anges Et DemonsParis,1612).
21. De Lancre, L'Incredulité,p.353.
22. ibid.,p.363.
23. Albert Soman,"Les Procès De Sorcellerie Au Parlement De Paris" (1565-1640)",Annales,July-August,1977.pp.794-796.

Profiles in Evangelism: A Comparitive Study of Henry Alline, Joseph Dimock and Isaiah Wallace

by

Robert T. Reid

In the years 1775 to 1900 rural Nova Scotia periodically experienced intense and influential revivals of religion. Intimately bound up in these revivals were three men whose lives lived in sequence span these critical times in Maritime history. Henry Alline, 1748-1784, a Congregationalist, the "apostle of Nova Scotia", beginning his ministry in Falmouth, extended the New Light influence in all of the present-day counties west of Colchester, north into Cumberland, beyond into the St. John River Valley and east to Isle St. Jean. He died on a mission to New England in 1784. Joseph Dimock, born in 1768 in Newport and who almost certainly had listened to Alline's preaching, began his ministry in 1790 and, although soon to become a settled pastor in Chester until his death in 1846, nevertheless carried on an itinerant, evangelistic outreach throughout much the same area covered by Alline. The third of the trio, Isaiah Wallace, upon graduation from Acadia College in 1855, began a varied career as home missionary, pastor, and revivalist again throughout much of the area of his predecessors until the present century.

Each of these men, although coming from different backgrounds and facing different circumstances, was in possession of that particular gift and character which saw the strengthening of existing churches, founding of new congregations, and establishing in the religious consciousness of many of the people of their day those views and principles which are known as Baptist. The differences of temperament, education, and socio-economic climate between these men was far outweighed by the remarkable similarities of their ministries. There was much of the Olympic relay race in their ministries in which the torch of Divine revelation and experience was handed from the one to the other throughout more than a century of strenuous pioneer expansion and growth in Nova Scotia. Although not alone in promoting revivals, each of the three came to symbolize in his day what vital Christian experience meant, what spiritual freedom involved and what organized religion should be about. They stood out against the established order of religion with its formality, vested interests, and neglect of the needs of the common man. In contrast, they represented that fervour, enthusiasm, and spiritual concern for the hard-pressed pioneer family which so characterized the circuit rider of frontier days. Much of what they taught, organized, and effected had secular implications for the pioneers as well. The gospel of these itinerant evangelists with its emphasis on personal liberty and expression in Christ unwittingly accorded favourably with much of the social,

economic, and political ambitions of Nova Scotians throughout the transition from a backward colony to an independent province in an independent country. The revivals, then, of Alline, Dimock, and Wallace can be viewed as remarkable convergences of human need and aspiration and Divine intention and fulfillment.

Each of these evangelists fitted into a particular evolving historical context which he influenced and which influenced him. To present anything more than a cursory survey of this historical background is beyond the scope of this paper. And what is presented emphasizes those circumstances affecting Henry Alline. It was his spiritual legacy bequeathed to him by the Great Awakening in New England which basically was the legacy of Joseph Dimock and Isaiah Wallace.

Rural Nova Scotia sociology following 1775 formed a context critical to the nature and outcome of the revivals under Henry Alline and his successors. Replacing the expelled Acadians, New England "Planters" brought with them in the 1760's a vibrant experience of revivalism from the Great Awakening under Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield in the mid 1700's. In a sense history was about to repeat itself. These immigrants, their fathers and grandfathers, had been through the struggle of pioneer life in their own land in which the split between settled clergy and laity had widened, where Calvinist theology had lost touch with the immediate experience of wilderness conditions characterized by immense exertion, equality, opportunity, exploitation, individual success, and faith in the common man. A good many of these New Englanders could remember the conflicts, resentment, and alienation between the laity and their clergy as the influence of deism and the Age of Reason fostered a sense of independence, unrest, and outright rejection of Divine Prerogatives. The hard living, hard drinking, self-reliant people had demanded a religion better suited to their own life-styles. These conditions coupled with deep unrest among the committed as to what constituted genuine church membership, those regenerate or those merely "owning the covenant", and the worsening economic situation of inflation, depression, and indebtedness prepared a people ready for the revivals of the Great Awakening. Men like Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield had spoken to the decline of morality, the increased reliance upon the external forms of religion, the rise of rugged individualism, and the democratic ideals of the common man. Although Calvinists, Edwards and Whitefield had emphasized God's love and grace rather than God's logic in justice. Theirs was a gospel of consolation rather than judgment and terror, of mercy and favour rather than depression and fear.

Presented with enthusiasm, liberty of speech and grace, in sharp contrast to the dull, dry approach of their regular clergy, whole communities yielded to the confession of personal sin, faith and freedom in the spirit. Such experiential Christianity was the spiritual legacy brought to Nova Scotia by many of the immigrants, among whose company were the family of Henry Alline and the parents of Joseph Dimock.

Settling around the coastline of South Western Nova Scotia and in larger numbers in the Annapolis Valley, these New Englanders soon revealed another legacy of their homeland background: the growing sense and skill in local self-government and their deepening distrust and dissatisfaction with colonial domination in any form whether political, economic, or religious. Great Britain ruled the province through a Governor and Council to which representation was usually by proxy as direct representation was almost impossible under the primitive conditions. Financially, the pioneer families were at best a struggling often desperate lot. Education was almost non-existent until 1811 and frequently of poor quality when dependent upon unworthy itinerant school masters. Only in the larger centres were religious institutions of any consequence formed. Besides, the Church of England was the established Church, receiving Government sanctions in terms of finances, property and clergy prerogatives. The Presbyterians fared better as they were supported from Scotland. Dissenters were only just tolerated. Lamented one Anglican missionary to Nova Scotia in 1776: "I found the lower orders of the people, nearly to a man, Presbyterians or fanatics."[1] Great distances separated small communities, and as the homesteaders moved onto their own hand, the population became even more scattered. Transportation was of the most basic, horseback for the most part on roads no better than bridle paths, or snow shoes, or by river boat. As the sea offered the easiest mode of transit communities sprang up near the shore. By 1783 Nova Scotia's population had reached about 15,000.

The American Revolution added another dimension to the already complex sociological situation in Nova Scotia. Portions of the New England population in the province went home in support of their fellow rebels, among them most of the Congregational ministers. Those settlers who remained found themselves in an extremely strained position. Regarded with suspicion on the one hand by their British government and having severed ties with their homeland on the other,

---

1. Edgar McInnis, Canada, A Political and Social History, Rinehart and Company, Inc., Toronto, 1954, p. 180.

they felt like people without a country. The sense of rootlessness contributed in no small way to their embracing Henry Alline's emotional other-worldly religion. Isolated at home politically, geographically, economically, and socially, threatened at sea by American privateers and set adrift spiritually with the departure of most of their ministers and the coldness of the established religious orders, these people with their memory of warm revivals were naturally drawn to the dedicated and enthusiastic Henry Alline. His fiery and emotional messages spoke of another order which substituted one set of tensions and pain, political and social, with another, the spiritual, for which God had provided remedy and relief in the Gospel. These revivals were a concurrence of human need and Divine provision in which peace in the spiritual crisis meant patience and forebearance in the natural. In the settling of the soul's crises and in the formation of local assemblies much of the democratic aspirations of the people were unwittingly met. As the people yielded to the Divine calling, came out, and found peace so they separated themselves from staid religious institutions and formed their own local autonomous fellowships with all the attendant searchings and resolvings of principles and polity so characteristic of political states. Henry Alline himself was an example of this. Denied political opportunity in his own county and in Halifax, he repudiated man's government and preached God's. In so doing, he created groups of people who needed shepherding and institutionalizing for the sake of growth and stability. Often he was called in on disputes and controversies, thereby fulfilling perhaps his repressed political interests.

The social-political situation changed rapidly with the coming of the Empire Loyalists. Of the 30,000 who settled in the Maritimes, nearly half settled along the Bay of Fundy and up the St. John River Valley, while the remainder filled out the coastal communities of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The majority of the Loyalists, Tory and staunch supporters of the Church of England, swelling the ranks and leadership of the Established Church, greatly stimulated its influence politically as well as religiously. Under the militant leadership of Bishop Inglis, the Anglican Church entered a period of expansion throughout the provinces. Many of the Loyalists who were Dissenters and Separatists and having more in common with the pre-Loyalist settlers joined their fellowship.

Strong political lines were being drawn between the newcomers and the older settlers. Having been roughly uprooted by the war, and having experienced

a firm closing of the door by restrictive legislation in their former home states, the Loyalist exiles were determined to preserve their lot in their new environment. They naturally regarded resident ex-New Englanders with suspicion and hostility. Being at odds with the earlier settlers over land distribution, and being at a great distance from Halifax, the seat of government and the law courts, and at a disadvantage with regard to the primitive communications of the day, there soon emerged a movement to establish a separate colony. These views, dovetailing with Britain's policy of keeping potentially rebellious colonies weak and loyal, saw in 1784 the division of Nova Scotia and the establishment of New Brunswick.

What developed in all the Maritime provinces as a result of Loyalist Tory domination in the Legislature were conflicts between the privileged pro-Church of England office holders and those seeking both more representative government and religious toleration. Throughout a good deal of the nineteenth century, the struggle between the Church of England entrenched in government and court, and the Dissenters was to be difficult and marred by religious intolerance. Against such a backdrop, the Baptist Fathers, one of whom was Joseph Dimock, though not always up to the erudition of their Anglican counterparts but every bit their equal in spiritual drive and initiative, continued the work of founding churches and institutions of higher learning, organizing Associations, Mission Boards and the Maritime Convention, and carrying on the struggle for religious freedom in all aspects of society. In the process they laid the foundations of the Baptist denomination in these provinces.

The early life histories of these revivalists, although differing in circumstances, nevertheless reveal a similar Divine moulding. Alline, born on June 14, 1748, in Newport, Rhode Island, spent his early youth in a social-economic atmosphere of a large bustling Puritan seaport. He gained some formal education, but the major impression made upon his tender soul was the oppressive weight of strict, extreme Calvinism. So exercised was young Alline in the doctrines of Divine Sovereignty, election, wrath and judgment that his youth with its natural gaiety became a sham. His family's emigration to Falmouth, Nova Scotia, in 1760 when he was twelve, meant a complete change in Alline's outward circumstances but no relief to his growing inner struggles. Denied formal education or anything like organized spiritual instruction, Alline wrestled not only with rough pioneer farming but also with his fears of death, sense of hopelessness, guilt and damnation. As he developed into a popular

leader among the youth of his area, he lived a double life with all its tensions, fears, and torments until his conversion at the age of twenty-seven.

Joseph Dimock was born to godly parents twenty years after Alline in 1768 at Newport, Nova Scotia, east of Falmouth. The same desperate, hand-to-mouth pioneer existence as Alline's was his experience as well. With no formal schooling he did manage to learn to read and to write with reasonable skill and often with moving power, although his journal reveals a regrettable lack of knowledge of the mechanics of language. In comparison, Henry Alline is seen to be all the more remarkable in his command of language, imagery and expression. As for all the early Congregational and Baptist pioneers in Nova Scotia the Bible was the textbook used for parental instruction of the young in the basics of the Christian experience. God "had placed me in a land of Bibles - committed me to the care of Christian parents - my father, a Baptist preacher who taught me the need of a Saviour and how undone I must be without him - gave me a common education though small, beyond any one of my associates in the village where I lived."[2] In addition, part of Joseph Dimock's education was a thorough knowledge of the Assemblies' Catechism. Perhaps in the area in which Alline and Dimock grew up there was a small circulating "library", for both the writings of these men hint of a background acquaintance with such classics as Bunyan's _Pilgrim's Progress_. Alline more obviously than Dimock had access to some source of books, such as William Law's _Spirit of Prayer_ and John Milton's _Paradise Lost_, which greatly stimulated his already active intellect. Joseph Dimock also travailed under the same Calvinistic burdens as did Henry Alline, and found relief through conversion when seventeen years old in 1785.

In distinct contrast to his predecessors, Isaiah Wallace, born in the Baptist parsonage at Coverdale, New Brunswick, in 1826, enjoyed much easier circumstances and educational opportunities. He attended public school, the New Brunswick Baptist Seminary in Fredericton, and Acadia College in 1851 in preparation for the ordained ministry. His early religious experience seems to have had none of the extreme spiritual turmoil Henry Alline experienced, rather he simply became increasingly aware that he was a sinner in need of salvation. However, no complete commitment was made until he was twenty-three while studying in the Brunswick Baptist Seminary.

---

2. Joseph Dimock, quoted by George Levy. _The Diary of Joseph Dimock_, Ed. George Levy, Lancelot Press, Hantsport, N.S., 1979, p. 9.

Educational, social or environmental circumstances notwithstanding, the conversion experiences of these men are critical to understanding their effectiveness in later years. For Henry Alline the inner sense of utter desolation wrought upon his sensitive conscience by an overweening Calvinism was swept away by an overwhelming awareness of Divine love and acceptance. Few descriptions of conversion crises convey such drama as does Henry Alline's recorded in his Life and Journal. Although Joseph Dimock does not give any account of his conversion it can be deduced from his Diary that it was no less traumatic and far-reaching than Alline's. For him too, darkness, sterile formality, and the frightening abyss of eternity were stark realities to be avoided at all costs in an utter abandonment to a loving and merciful God. Both men realized that the sufferings and pain of their own preconversion experiences were but the obverse experiences of an all-loving Saviour on their behalf. Although Isaiah Wallace was more reserved in his description of Divine favour at his conversion, nevertheless he knew what it was to have the fountains of his heart broken up, his head bowed, and to weep freely as a true penitent.[3]

The conversion of Alline was typical of New England Puritanism. As the faith and practice of parents and grandparents could be traced to the Great Awakening of the 1740's this is not surprising. The Allines and the Dimocks realized, taught, and expected conversions to follow the typical pattern of knowledge of God and sinfulness through church attendance, catechism, family worship and personal study; of conviction of a personal hopeless state leading to despair and fear; of grace wherein a God-given desire and will to repent and to believe in Christ meant saving faith; of combat in which doubt and despair wrestle with faith; and of assurance in which the believer finds a rest in the eternal forgiveness and security of God. Such was the pattern in general for all three evangelists. And all three realized that although conversion was instantaneous, conviction was often prolonged and assurance frequently tended to be clouded by doubt and a sense of distance from God. The fact that the intensity of the conversion experience was so real and vital enabled the evangelists in later years both to recognize the shallowness of the religious experience about them and to know and proclaim the steps leading to a genuine religious experience. The intensity and liberation of genuine conversion could not be stressed enough. For Alline it signified a departure

---

3. Isaiah Wallace, Autobiographical Sketch and Reminiscences of Revival Work, John Burgoyne, Halifax, 1903, p. 9.

from the rigid form of Puritanism as experienced in Nova Scotia which failed to emphasize the new birth. Alline and Dimock both realized that the Calvinistic conception of God as vengeful and retributive contrasted with their experience of Him as infinitely patient, loving and merciful. Isaiah Wallace would have heartily agreed. Nor did their conversion experience support that cardinal doctrine of predestination and election which so underlined man's inability to act on behalf of his own salvation.[4] Rather the opposite held true: for Alline the discovery was a mixture of regret and joy. "O what a wretch have I been to stand it out against such love. I have longed and often wondered, that God did not have mercy on me and convert me; but now I saw it was my own fault, and wondered why he waited so long upon such miserable rejectors of his grace."[5]

The conversion experience had another ramification for all three revivalists. It signified to varying degrees for each man an almost mystical, existential awareness of Deity. This mysticism was most acute in Henry Alline leading to a theology that attempted to walk a narrow line between Arminianism and Calvinism. For Alline, salvation did not depend upon any outward act of man, nor upon any decree of God but upon "the union of the inner man to" and "the turning of the inmost soul after God." Conversion is Christ's "changing and taking Possession of the inmost soul."[6] That such mysticism could lead to the charge of Antinomianism may be inferred from the statement "At the hour of Conversion the Son of God takes possession of the inmost Soul, or inmost Mind, but leaveth the fallen immortal Body in its fallen State still."[7] As revealed in his writings Two Mites, or some of the most important and much disputed Points of Divinity (1781) and the Anti-Traditionalist (1783), in revolting against the harshness of Calvinism and the too humanistic views of other critics of Calvin, Henry Alline based his thinking to a great extent on the mystics William Law, John Fletcher and Jacob Boehme.[8] His theology

---

4. These points regarding H. Alline's experiences contrasting with orthodox Puritanism are found in J.M. Bumsted, Henry Alline, Canadian Biographical Studies, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1971.

5. H. Alline, Life and Journal, Gilbert & Dean, Boston, 1806, p. 35.

6. H. Alline, Two Mites, or some of the most important and much disputed Points of Divinity, A. Henry, Halifax, 1804, p. 94 ff.

7. Ibid.

8. Maurice W. Armstrong, The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia 1776-1809, The American Society of Church History, Hartford, Conn., 1949, chap. 4.

eventually led to such a separation of body and soul that the former was to be "burnt up and dissolved" while the spiritual only was to be blessed in the resurrection.

For Joseph Dimock the mystic aspect of his conversion simply led him into a deeply personal monitoring of his walk with the Saviour and in his task of presenting the Gospel to his fellows. His impressions of both God's will and man's condition was intuitive, dependent not so much on any logic or reasoned observation on his part but upon his emotional sense.

> I never felt any relief till after I woke the next morning when I felt relieved from that weight of Darkness, but not much sence of God or souls but in dismissing of the table after breakfast I felt a heart to go to God with submission to plead for Dawning of the Day once more when in a moment the cloud burst in sunder & a small beam of light broke into mind & caused my soul to cry 'O how good God is!' O how soon was all that hardness, Darkness, torment of mind Blasphemy of heart done away...[9]

Nothing could further confirm the mystic in Joseph Dimock than his statement when he is at his Uncle's house: "...I felt a weight of truths that flow'd right from the Eternal God into my soul which he enabled me to communicate to others a sence (sic) of God..."[10]

Of the three, Isaiah Wallace was the least influenced by mystical experiences, perhaps because of his more thorough education and the more settled social conditions in which he laboured. Nevertheless, his early religious experiences, if not as dramatic as Henry Alline's, were just as intense and instructive. A dream about his father's passing pointed him to the ministry and a Sunday afternoon's walk wherein "all nature around me and above me seemed vocal with praises to God, and for the first time in my life, I had some comprehension of the language of Isaiah 55:12..."[11] continued with him throughout life. In addition, like his predecessors and all revivalists the revival itself was a mystical experience in the sense in which God was seen to act in a direct and personal way upon the souls of those seeking reality in Divine things. Always throughout his career did he look, as did Henry Alline and Joseph Dimock, for this direct experience of God in the hearts of his listeners.

---

9. Joseph Dimock, Diary, Ed. George Levy, Lancelot Press, Hantsport, N.S., 1979, p. 35.
10. Ibid., p. 62.
11. Wallace, op.cit., p. 11.

The mystical aspects of the Christian experience have always interacted with the emotional side of human nature. Upon conversion and in their Christian walk all three men enjoyed a hearty emotional life. That this is important is to note the sharp contrast between their experience and that of most of their contemporaries who held to a form of religion but missed its power. The gloom of severe Calvinism, the stagnation of the established churches, the spiritual coldness of most settled ministers, who forever read pedantic sermons on ethical topics, the sheer drudgery of the pioneer existence, the unrest and discontent of the recent immigrants, and the sense of utter isolation all but demanded emotional release. In their conversion experiences, these men rediscovered the joy and enthusiasm of the Christian Faith. They discovered the victory side of the atonement; realizing God's irresistible, irrepressible power they yielded themselves up to His will. Religion then meant a stirring of the deepest emotions, the warming of the hardest hearts, the awakening of the darkest soul to the light of God's love in Christ Jesus. Revival signified more than just the acknowledgment and removal of sin, it indicated a whole new joyful experience of God in life. This truth would have profound effects in many communities throughout the Maritimes.

When comparing the baptismal experiences of these men a possible anomaly emerges. Joseph Dimock was baptized by immersion in 1787 two years after his conversion, not by his father oddly enough, but by the resident minister of Horton, the Rev. Nicholas Pierson. Isaiah Wallace received baptism shortly after his profession of faith in 1848. But nowhere in the writings pertaining to Henry Alline is it stated he was baptized. Although instrumental in the forming of the Horton Baptist church in 1778 and a frequent preacher for its growth and edification, he was excluded from communion because he was not baptized.[12] It can only be assumed that the Horton Baptist church, practicing close communion for the first years of its existence, failed to recognize the Congregationalist custom of infant baptism and later acceptance into church membership upon the candidate's public confession of faith.

Henry Alline's insistence upon the inward light and regenerative experience of Christ led him to repudiate all outward props of religion, including the practice of baptism. Very early in his career in 1776 he had helped to form the church in Newport comprising in membership both Baptists and Congregationalists. As other churches were formed this controversy over membership, baptism, and attendance of the Lord's Table caused no little grief.

12. Armstrong, op. cit., p. 69.

> O may the time come when Ephraim shall no more vex Judah, nor Judah envy Ephraim, and that there might never more be any disputes about such non-essentials, as water baptism; the sprinkling of infants, or baptising of adults by immersion, but every one enjoy liberty of conscience.[13]

Later, Alline went further in stating that such emphasis upon water baptism was a return to fallen Adam, who tried to hide himself with an external fig leaf. The difference between sects and denominations were to be compared to the differences between the voices and looks of individuals, simply an accident of nature. It is interesting to note that later the Horton Baptist church did open its communion to Congregationalists but never felt entirely at home in the arrangement.

Joseph Dimock, as pastor of the Chester church, had somewhat similar experiences, although, as a Baptist, he was on the other side of the controversy. He had inherited a mixed Baptist and Congregationalist fellowship from the Rev. John Seccombe in 1793. Over the next eighteen years, "there came about a sifting of the membership" in which the Baptist stream emerged predominent.[14] That the process was attended by much soul searching may be read between the lines of the letter written by Joseph Dimock to the Associated Baptist churches meeting in Onslow in 1811. That these issues of baptism, church membership, and participation at the Lord's Supper continued to divide both community and church throughout the nineteenth century is attested to by the controversies in Isaiah Wallace's ministry.

Isaiah Wallace had a very settled view of baptism. While concurring with Henry Alline on his definite emphasis upon regeneration and the new birth experience, he had none of Alline's indifference as to the mode of baptism. For Wallace it was immersion and his controversies were not so much within the ranks but with those without the ranks inquiring after the meaning of baptism or opposing the Baptist work altogether. His journal is nothing if it is not a record of the classic pattern of the early church - hear the Gospel, believe, repent, confess faith, be baptized. When asked once what does baptism mean, regeneration, salvation, or what? his reply was an exposition of 1 Peter 3:21, showing that it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience."[15]

---

13. Alline, op. cit., p. 67.

14. George E. Levy in his introduction to the Diary of Joseph Dimock, Lancelot Press, Hantsport, N.S., 1979, p. 14.

15. Wallace, op. cit., p. 104.

The ministries of Henry Alline, Joseph Dimock, and Isaiah Wallace were apostolic in nature. Each man experienced a definite call to proclaim essentially that same Gospel which was to make "its way progressively into sinners' hearts in convincing their reason that there is nothing of so great importance - as religion or the affairs of their souls and another world."[16] Not only were they itinerant evangelists, but they also established churches, pastored them in varying degrees, counselled, ordained, baptized, and administered the flocks. As revivalists their aim was continually to encourage the faithful, to call upon sinners to repent and to debate as apologists with the opposition over the essentials of Divine ordained religion. The essence of their work was the actualization of a genuine conversion experience among their auditors. Their own conversions provided both the insight into the spiritual condition of the people and the standard to which others were to attain. In all of this they echoed much of the Apostle Paul in his trials, exhortations and pleadings as recorded in the New Testament.

In comparing the ministries of these three there is a progression of diversity and complexity. For Henry Alline, the main thrust was itinerant evangelism to backward, isolated communities. As a result he was involved to a certain degree with basic church founding and organization. Had he lived longer, no doubt he would have been even more involved in post-evangelistic consolidation requiring the formulation of church and inter-church organizational and doctrinal structures. These latter were very much a part of Joseph Dimock's labours. As the province and his people moved into more stable, prosperous times, Dimock spent more of his time as an active participant in established congregation and inter-congregational affairs. Although he was often absent from Chester on evangelistic tours and founding churches in Lunenburg, Sherbrooke, and St. Margaret's Bay, he also promoted and upon several occasions, chaired, the Baptist Association which was organized in 1800. Again there is little doubt that Dimock had a hand in launching in 1814 a home mission programme under the auspices of the Association. His presence and influence can be traced in other church projects such as the founding in 1827 of the first Baptist publication in British North America, the _Baptist Missionary Magazine of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick._ He was on the committee charged with looking into a jointeffort with the Presbyterian Synod to establish a seminary, the eventual Horton Academy. And later in 1838 his name appeared as one of the founders of Acadia College from which in 1855 would graduate Isaiah Wallace.

---

16. Dimock, _op. cit._, p. 33.

Of the three, the ministry of Isaiah Wallace is the most complex. He began as a teacher, jumped to colporteur work, and then in 1851 began studies at Acadia College. While there he was caught up in a work of revival which no doubt laid the experiential foundation for the main thrust of his life. "I then received a strong uplift in my Christian life, and rejoiced in renewed evidences of my acceptance with God. Whatever of success may have attended my life's work...is traceable in some degree...to that gracious renewing in 1855."[17] Then began a varied career centred mainly in his evangelistic labours for various Home Mission Boards, interrupted by pastorates in such places as St. John, Lower Granville, Berwick, and Kentville, and a stint as a teacher once again and as a fund raising agent for Acadia College. Upon having had to give up his appointment to go to Australia as a missionary under the auspices of the Maritime Baptist Convention, he worked as a missionary first under the New Brunswick Home Mission Society in northern New Brunswick, then under the Nova Scotia Baptist Home Missionary Union conducting revivals and touring the province to ascertain and report on its needs to the Union, and finally for twelve years under the newly formed Convention Board of Home Missions as their General Missionary. Even when not engaged in any pastorate or mission board, Isaiah Wallace "made many evangelistic tours in various parts of these Provinces, as Providence opened the way and my strength would permit."[18]

In promoting revivals each man's method followed a similar, basic pattern. As a basis and undergirding all their labours was the unshakeable assurance of God's love for lost men. Having themselves experienced in the most complete way redeeming grace, they spent themselves in bringing religion to the people. They were themselves in their self-consuming zeal, devotion, and courage a living demonstration of the verbal message they proclaimed. Such sacrificial single-mindedness under the most trying of personal as well as social and environmental conditions created respect and a ready ear among even the most hardened pioneers. The total disregard for personal welfare and circumstances contrasting sharply with the concerns of the settled clergy for regular salaries and "creature comforts" likewise struck a responsive chord among people walking an economic tightrope. Here were men who thought far more of souls than themselves. Coupled to zeal was mobility. Constantly moving from one community to another, the evangelist brought a freshness, an intensity, to his ministry that caught attention and quickened interest. In addition, this

---

17. Wallace, op. cit., p. 17.

18. Ibid., p. 145.

mobility spread the news of revival from community to community, thereby stimulating interest and curiosity. Also basic to the revivals of all three evangelists was the predisposition for revival among many of the people. The memory and experience of revival could be traced from the time of the Reformation through John Wesley to the Great Awakening in America to Nova Scotia with the Planters and from generation to generation throughout the ministries of such men as Alline, Dimock, and Wallace. These men assumed and tapped this "revival consciousness", fully expecting renewed spiritual vitality among people "darkened" and "back sliden".

Preaching was the main tool employed by the evangelists to effect a revival. Proof that "a feeling knowledge of redemption in the soul is to be attained"[19] was the recurrent theme, designed to garner dramatic conversions. Spontaneous and highly emotional, Henry Alline's revival messages covered such subjects as the work of grace, sin, guilt, ignorance of the soul's darkness, the burdened mind, the hard heart, the stubborn will, convictions, conversion, soul awakening, the love of God, His atoning work, and vital church membership. Gathering from his Diary, Joseph Dimock's themes were similar to those of Henry Alline. "I found some enlargement and freedom in speaking from those words...pointing out the Disordered State the soul of Man is in by nature - the glorious provision made by the Great Phycitian - on the sovereign remedy provided in the Merits of Christ for restoration of health to the soul of Man - and how this reconciled us to God..."[20] For Isaiah Wallace, "Regeneration was our theme, its Nature, Importance, and Evidences".[21] He considered preaching that lifted up Christ the most prominent factor in revival success. Echoing the Apostle Paul, Wallace affirmed that the Gospel was the power unto salvation. Like all good revivalists, including Alline and Dimock, Wallace adapted Biblical truth to the necessities discovered in local visitation. Considering the verbal skill, the breadth of Biblical knowledge, the deep prayer life, and the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it is not surprising that the preaching of these men was extemporaneous, often developing on the spot a sermon on a given text, couching in Biblical idiom their standard set of points about the need for the new birth experience.

---

19. Alline, op. cit., p. 89.

20. Dimock, op.cit., p. 40.

21. Wallace, op. cit., p. 92.

Never was preaching an isolated event. Each evangelist wove a pattern of visitation in the community, counselling with struggling souls, "praying, exhorting or discoursing, almost all the time, from early in the morning, till twelve at night."[22] This meeting with the people in their homes, conducting family worship services, attending their sick and dying brought home the Divine love proclaimed in the sermons. "I have thought that God blessed this particular addressing of individuals more than all the preaching."[23] Lay participation spilled over into the worship services where enthusiastic singing, praying, testimonies, and exhortations spread the excitement among the populace. Perhaps the most effective means of spreading the revival message next to preaching evolved out of these uproarious meetings.

Reactions to such emotional religion brought out the critics, among them settled ministers who, having their churches emptied by the revival, challenged the evangelists. Alline, Dimock, and Wallace were particularly adept in responding promptly, effectively, and invariably to the benefit of their cause. As the people often sympathized with the evangelists, publicity spread, and attendance grew. The controversies themselves, although often grieving the sensibilities of the evangelists, provided the public with an opportunity to clarify the issues. Basically for Alline, the bones of contention were what constituted genuine salvation, the nature of Divine election and mercy, his own ordination credentials, and the emotional aspects of religious expression. His most memorable confrontation was with a fellow Congregational minister, Jonathan Scott in Yarmouth, who opposed Alline's enthusiastic, liberating evangelism. Joseph Dimock faced similar issues with the exception of his ordination which was entirely in order and a deeper controversy over baptism in his home church. Yet he was able to write

> I see little jealousy among our peado Baptist minds because of the Growing Kingdom and interest of our Baptized Lord but I hope God will in mercy even grant in meekness to practice his command and to Distinguish between my Erring Brethren and their Errors to love the one and despise the other.[24]

In one notable debate with a Mr. Dogget, recorded in his Diary, the issue was over Dimock's preaching dividing the Society. This charge was a common one levelled against the evangelists but was refuted by them as they revealed their

---

22. Alline, op. cit., p. 147.

23. Dimock, op. cit., p. 46.

24. Ibid., p. 84.

opponent's motivation and ill-founded basis for confidence. The issue for Isaiah Wallace was baptism, and in some of the more remote communities he ran into determined opposition although with none of the seething hostility that Alline met with upon occasion. Wallace's encounter with a certain Church of England clergyman or his experience in Meagher's Grant stands in sharp contrast to Alline's dangerous confrontation with angry Anglicans in Windsor. The times had changed, the rude customs of a pioneer society had given way to more genteel practices, the Baptists were a viable movement and no doubt differences in temperament of the evangelists account for the more laissez-faire attitude of Wallace's time. In contrast to Joseph Dimock and Isaiah Wallace, who remained consistently orthodox in their preaching and writings, Henry Alline's opponents found increasingly controversial material in his books and writings. Alline's speculative theology, not sufficiently tempered by the education of an Isaiah Wallace or the more gentle, cautious temperament of a Joseph Dimock or by other minds of his calibre and spiritual bias, led him into water perhaps beyond his depth.

Much of what would be in an assessment of the ministries of these three revivalists has already been said. Basically all three were evangelists first and church organizers second. Had Henry Alline lived longer and addressed himself to the problems of the emerging congregations they would have not either collapsed or gone over to the Baptists. Intent upon winning souls and reacting strongly to the formalism of existing churches, Alline failed to develop any coherent, thorough church principles and polity which would have provided structure to the increasing groups of new converts. It was not that he did not have any principles of church organization; he had, but they were not thought through sufficiently or applied in any consistent manner. An example was his concept of membership. Although he firmly believed in regenerate membership, and this based upon new birth or crisis conversion, yet he did not carry through the logic that regeneration implies the decision of a maturing adult and that therefore infant baptism was out of order. To dismiss this difficulty over baptism as being "a non-essential matter" was simply to sweep the problem under the carpet and to bequeath controversy and schism. Another concept not thought through was finances. It was one thing for an itinerant bachelor to live off any free will offerings given him, but quite another to support a stable, ongoing ministry necessary to consolidate and develop the work. Recalling the often bitter disputes within the standing churches over finances, Alline opposed any formal contract between churches

and ministers and mandatory giving which infringed upon the freedom of conscience of the individual. Without a consistent, adequate financial structure, married clergymen in particular could not function effectively. There were other weaknesses and gaps but it is interesting to note that just these difficulties were dealt with satisfactorily among the evolving Baptist congregations and associations during the ministries of Joseph Dimock and Isaiah Wallace. It is in Dimock's time that the Baptist Association, for example, sought to pay itinerant home missionaries to service the churches along the South Shore, and Isaiah Wallace certainly enjoyed sufficient pastoral and missionary support in his ministry.

These difficulties notwithstanding, Henry Alline's ministry had a profound effect upon the religious climate of his day. His message like that of his successors had an anti-authoritarian ring which had a levelling affect upon the class-ridden Established Church and society of his day.

Speaking out against war and the ensnarements of this world, Alline helped defuse a potentially explosive situation during the American Revolution. By emphasizing the process of self-election over and against that exclusive election of God in Calvinism, this evangelist kindled the fires of personal, spiritual freedom which inaugurated a more democratic Church. Simply, Henry Alline set afoot an evangelical pietistic movement which "survived, prospered, and grew to become a basic component of the Canadian ethos and way of life until well into the twentieth century."[25]

It remained for Henry Alline's successors to continue to promote and to adapt this movement to the new society emerging from the frontier. As has been noted in the description of Joseph Dimock's ministry, both evangelism and church founding prospered with the new element of the Baptist Association evolving. Joseph Dimock joined that company of capable men including James and Edward Manning, T.H. Chipman, Harris Harding, and Joseph Crandall now known as Baptist Fathers. That this tradition was abundantly deepened and extended under the ministry of Isaiah Wallace is best attested to by Dr. A.W. Sawyer's testimonial in a circular promoting Rev. Wallace's <u>Autobiographical Sketches</u>: "This book...will show how churches were planted and weak churches strengthened in the discouraging circumstances of former years by the labours of self-denying and godly ministers of the Gospel."[26]

---

25. Bumsted, <u>op.cit.</u>, pp. 100-101.
26. A.W. Sawyer, Circular promoting Isaiah Wallace's <u>Autobiographical Sketches</u>, Wolfville, N.S., July 1, 1902.

An inscription on Henry Alline's gravestone in Northhampton, New Hampshire, states: "He was a burning and shining Light, and was justly esteemed the Apostle of Nova Scotia." They were all, Henry Alline, Joseph Dimock, and Isaiah Wallace, shining lights and apostles of Nova Scotia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alline, Henry, Life and Journal, Gilbert and Dean, Boston, 1806.

______________, Two Mites, on some of the most important and much disputed Points of Divinity, A. Henry, Halifax, N.S., 1804.

Armstrong, Maurice W., The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809, The American Society of Church History, Hartford, 1948.

Bill, Ingraham E., Fifty Years with Baptist Ministers and Churches, Barnes & Company, Saint John, 1880.

Bumsted, J.M., Henry Alline, Canadian Biographical Studies, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1971.

______________, Origins of the Maritime Baptists, a New Document

Dimock, Joseph, The Diary, Ed. George E. Levy, Lancelot Press, Hantsport, 1979.

James, William, The Varieties of Religious Experience, William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., Glasgow, 1977.

Levy, George E., The Baptists of the Maritime Provinces 1753-1946, Barnes-Hopkins Ltd., Saint John, 1946.

McInnis, Edgar, Canada, A Political and Social History, Rinehart & Company, Inc., Toronto, 1954.

Moir, John S., The Church in the British Era, McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., Toronto, 1972.

Payzant, John., Journal, Ed. Brian C. Cuthbertson, Lancelot Press Limited, Hantsport, 1981.

Rawlyk, George A., "From Newlight to Baptist: Harris Harding and the Second Great Awakening in Nova Scotia", Repent and Believe, Ed. Barry M. Moody, Lancelot Press Limited, Hantsport, 1981.

Saunders, Edward Manning, History of the Baptist of the Maritime Provinces, John Burgoyne, Halifax, 1902.

Stewart, Gordon and Rawlyk, George, A People Highly Favoured of God: The Nova Scotia Yankees and the American Revolution, MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., Toronto, 1945.

Wallace, Isaiah, Autobiographical Sketches and Reminiscences of Revival Work, John Burgoyne, Halifax, 1903.

The Canadianization of the Church of England

by

Richard E. Ruggle

When the <u>Canadian Journal of Theology</u> was launched in 1955, Gerald R. Cragg ventured that some people would deny that such a phenomenon as Canadian theology exists. When he surveyed the field, he was cheered by the recognition that in recent years Canadians had been participants rather than spectators. He could only point, however, not to the achievements of the past, but with guarded optimism towards the mature theology which might develop in the future. When churchmen speak of Canadianization, they often use the future tense. (1)

An anonymous editorial in that initial volume both hedged and affirmed the possibilities for an indigenous theology: "although Christianity is not Canadian but universal, and although there cannot be a Canadian theology in the sense of a Canadian system of doctrine, the eternal quality of truth is to be reached, not by seeking to abstract ourselves from our existence, but by relating ourselves to it." (2) A quarter century later, the <u>CJT</u> had been dead some years, and its disciples were still debating whether or not it had experienced a resurrection in <u>Studies in Religion</u>. The United Church Committee on Theology and Faith produced an anthology of <u>View-Points towards a Theology of Nation</u>, and one of the contributors echoed that earlier editorial. He avoided "the adjectival phrase 'Canadian Christian,' because there is no <u>Canadian</u> Christianity." But he too wrote that Christianity must be concretely embodied by people in the groups (like nations) in which they find themselves. (3)

Labels like the 'American heresy' or 'continental theology' have been as misleading as they have been helpful: they point to particular aspects of a church's thought, but the very act of pointing makes a charicature out of a characteristic. Canadian Anglicans have lacked the charicature--indeed both as Canadians and Anglicans they suffer the double identity crisis of their larger bodies. When they do attempt to define themselves, both tend to do so in terms of compromise. They both travel the <u>via media</u>, or, as has been suggested of at least one, the <u>via mediocris</u>. (4) It is the intention of this paper, not to try of suggest a peculiar ethos for Canadian Anglicans, but to trace their growing self-consciousness as an independent member of the body of Christ, insofar as a member can be independent.

Among the few memorials to Canadians in St Paul's cathedral in London is a bust of Sir John A. Macdonald which records his boast, "A British subject I was born; a British subject I will die." For the prime minister who did so much to forge the Canadian nation, as for the majority of his anglophone contemporaries, Canadian identity emphasized rather than denied the imperial connection. Political autonomy could be achieved without repudiating the British heritage. In a similar way, the Anglican church in the colonies could attain self-government, while stressing its British roots.

Though this paper will concentrate on the growth of ecclesiastical independence of Canadian Anglicans, that only represents a technical coming of age. Institutions, moreover, do not mature; only individuals do. Even in individuals the adolescent vacillation between rebellion and dependence takes on more subdued forms, so that the 'passages' continue throughout life. If Canadians and Anglicans have identity crises, it is only because they are human.

Another of the St Paul's memorials, to Lord Thomson of Fleet, describes him as coming "from nowhere." It seems an unconscious example of Northrop Frye's description of the geographic disorientation which affects our psychology: "To enter the United States is a matter of crossing an ocean; to enter Canada is a matter of being silently swallowed by an alien continent." (5) The Canadian question, he suggests, is not just "Who am I?" but "Where am I?" English Canada has been part of the wilderness, then of North America and the British Empire, then of the world--but never for long enough for its traditions to be founded on them.

The Church of England on this side of the Atlantic had long been an episcopal church remote from bishops. The question had often been raised. Archbishop Laud may have intended to send over a bishop, as part of his plan to bring New England into conformity with the established church. Towards the end of the 17th century, lieutenant-governor Francis Nicholson of Virginia (who would become governor of Nova Scotia in 1712) wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, "Unless bishops can be had, the church will surely decline." (6) Almost as soon as it was founded, the SPG proposed appointing suffragans, who could more easily be removed if the experiment failed. A later initiative won the support of Queen Anne, and a bill was prepared for parliament. Her death ended the plan, but the same year a legacy of £1,000 from Archbishop Tenison was designated towards the support of a colonial bishop when one should be appointed. At mid-century, Bishop Sherlock of London urged the government to relieve him of the burden of colonial jurisdiction. Petitions from the colonies from the start of the 18th century onwards, and especially from clerical conventions after mid-century, reiterated the desire for colonial bishops. (7)

In 1783 a group of Loyalist clergy, many of whom would settle in the remaining British colonies, presented to Sir Guy Carleton their plan for a bishopric in Nova Scotia, which would serve as a rallying point for refugees. (8) The first desire of the British government, however, was to appease American sympathies. Not only was Seabury consecrated in Scotland (1784), but White and Prevoost were consecrated by Canterbury (1787) before arrangements were finally made for the establishment of a colonial episcopate, and Charles Inglis consecrated as the first colonial bishop (1787).

Much of the pre-revolutionary agitation had presumed the possibility of the episcopate functioning as a spiritual office--to confirm, ordain and supervise church order--without requiring state support or assuming coercive powers over the

laity. The southern colonies had grown so used to running their own affairs that the church there disavowed itself from New England's promotion of the episcopal cause. Though North Americans might regard episcopal authority as a good thing, they were wary of being given too much of a good thing. So although the erection of an episcopal see in Nova Scotia was intended to complete the transfer of the establishment to the colonies, it was a modified establishment. Inglis would be supported by the government, and work in close connection with the governor and legislature; but he was not given a seat on the Legislative Council (yet Mountain would be given a seat in Quebec six years later), nor was he styled 'Lord' Bishop.

The church in the American colonies had long survived without resident bishops. Now that one had been appointed to Nova Scotia, others would follow, as dioceses were divided and new areas were opened. Though the number of sees tended to proliferate, on the American rather than the British model, (9) the vastness of the country meant that bishops were still geographically distant. 19th century church history was once regarded as the story of epic episcopal visitations, with records of the bishops "finding" churches in the settlements along their way. The colonial clergy usually served two distant masters--their bishops, and the societies which supported them (the SPG, the CMS, the Colonial Church and School Society)--as well as their congregations. And they often displayed a disregard for any master: Duncan of Metlakatlah would resist the efforts of the CMS and of Bishop Ridley to control him. When Lord Dalhousie referred to Stewart as "the head of the church," an Irish clergyman replied, "Some of the ecclesiastical subalterns scarcely consider him the little toes." (10) Strachan felt the wave of immigration from the "Sister Isle" accounted much for the lack of respect towards authority. His present-day successor, Lewis Garnsworthy, has noted the continuing dichotomy between his people's "very high doctrine of episcopacy" and their "very low practice of it," though in his view the office requires him to make decisions, and not become "just a clothes-hanger for a few episcopal clothes." (11)

Conflicts over authority have always brewed within the church: Ignatius of Antioch would not so frequently have urged loyalty to the bishops in his letters, if that loyalty had been an accepted fact of life. In BNA, at the same time that the episcopate was expanding, a balance was developing in favour of synodical government, along American lines. It came to fruition first in the diocese of Toronto, in 1853, when the assembly of clergy and laity presided over by John Strachan declared itself to be a diocesan synod, and petitioned the legislature to remove any doubt about its legality.

This movement towards democracy had grown up over the past decades out of financial necessity. SPG grants to Upper Canada were to be terminated; the clergy reserves were being abolished; and the formation of rectories was only an amelioration. Though it found the voluntary principle

distasteful, the Church of England would have to rely on its members for support. And there was a grudging admission that if she was to use the laity's money, she would have to give the laity a voice in determining how the money would be used. Bishop G.J. Mountain tempered his opinion that it was reasonable for them to have a voice in synodical deliberations, with the confidence that the laity "will not, on their part, seek to usurp more than their place." (12) It was wishful thinking.

When Herbert Binney was appointed to Nova Scotia in 1851, he was not only the first native Canadian to become a bishop, but also the last crown appointment. (Machray's appointment to Rupert's Land in 1865 is not really an exception, for the Hudson's Bay territory did not then have even colonial status.) Once diocesan synods had been recognized as legal entities, a vehicle had been provided for the local election of bishops. Still, Strachan had to convince the Governor-General that it was appropriate for the synod to choose a bishop, when Huron was divided from Toronto in 1857. (13) The Globe chuckled at the prospect of John Toronto presiding at an episcopal election; and Strachan himself would put limits on the laity: should they twice reject the person who led in the clerical ballot, they were instructed to switch their vote to the clergy's choice. In the event, Benjamin Cronyn won on the first ballot, so Strachan's instructions were not put to the test.

It was the first episcopal election within the empire, and was seen as a landmark. Mockridge said that bishops were no longer to be government officers, while T.E. Champion spoke of Cronyn as the first bishop to be appointed in "the emancipated Anglo-Canadian Church." (14) The process was not, however, an unqualified success. The experience of politicing at the election of Cronyn, and of Travers Lewis in Ontario (1861) had disturbed many people. At the start of the Huron election, an attempt had been made to bypass the process by referring the selection to the bishops of Quebec, Montreal and Toronto, but Strachan had refused to entertain the motion. There was a weightier challenge in 1864, when a memorial sought to allow the majority of synod at the next vacancy "to exercise its discretion as to a direct election or a reference to the Governors of the Church at home." (15) Strachan again rejected this opportunity to return to the old ways, expressing his pain that the memorialists should wish to neutralise the power of self-government which had been won by the church in the colony.

The divisions reflected in the elections had been between low and high churchmen, and though the laity tended to be evangelical, so far agreement had been met. When, however, it came to an election in the heartland rather than the hinterland of Toronto diocese, the case was different. At the Huron election, Strachan had sought to favour Bethune by his request for the laity to support the clerical candidate in the case of a stalemate. There was no suggestion of such enforced unanimity when a coadjutor was to be elected

in Toronto in 1866. In ballot after ballot, Provost Whitaker of Trinity College led with the clergy, while T.B. Fuller led with the evangelicals. Only when Whitaker withdrew did Bethune gain a majority. By forcing the capitulation of a candidate, or of his supporters, the laity could sway an election. As recently as the election for a suffragan bishop of Niagara in 1980, Dean Joachim Fricker had a majority in the first ballot, among both clergy and laity. But as other candidates withdrew, the new lay votes were attracted to Clarence Mitchell, while Fricker continued to lead with the clergy. The laity refused to change, and Fricker withdrew, allowing Mitchell to be elected on the seventh ballot. (16)

The lay voice could be influential in synods, not just in elections, but in initiating reforms. It was the laity who inspired the movement for prayer book revision at the start of the century, and carried it over episcopal roadblocks. The choice of bishops by popular election rather than by appointment has produced an episcopal bench that tends to be more pragmatic and pastoral than theological (in contrast to England), and that bias seems to be reflected in the Canadian church at large.

When the bishops of BNA met together in 1851, they had urged the formation of synodical government, not just on a diocesan, but also on a provincial level. The inaugural sessions of the legally recognized synods of Quebec, Montreal and Toronto in 1859 passed resolutions petitioning the Queen to appoint a metropolitan bishop for the ecclesiastical province of Canada. Huron refused to follow suit, claiming the time had not yet come for such an action. Letters patent were issued to Fulford as Metropolitan, giving him power to convene provincial synods. Huron delegates did attend the first provincial synod of Canada in 1861, though they withdrew in protest. Three factors fed Huron's hesitations.

One was a fear that the new provincial body might erode diocesan privileges. The Quebec delegates to that synod were also instructed to safeguard diocesan rights. Canadian Anglicanism has a strong diocesan bias which tempers the power of larger bodies like provinces and later the General Synod. Thus the experimental liturgies of the 1960s and 1970s progressed at different paces under the various restrictions of the different dioceses. Even doctrinal matters are subject to diocesan strictures. Where the Presbyterian Church in Canada would enforce its stand on the ordination of women, General Synod action on the same question or on communicating the baptized is permissive, to be done at the discretion of the bishop. Pensions were a diocesan responsibility, and though moves at reciprocity and a widening General Synod pension plan have taken place, this has been a factor in limiting mobility from one part of the country to another. The efforts to retain diocesan control have not always been successful. When the rector of St Peter's, Hamilton was acquitted early in this century by a civil court in a paternity suit (the mother withdrew her accusation), a diocesan court tried to evict him from his parish. When he appealed to a higher church court,

Niagara tried unsuccessfully to change the canon which would allow such an appeal.

Local particularism was also a factor in Huron's objections to the provincial synod. Such local feeling helped change the original intention that the metropolitan office should be linked to the see of Montreal, as the English primacies are tied to the sees of Canterbury and York. By 1879, when Medley became Metropolitan, the office was no longer tied to one see. (17)

The third cause of Huron's worries about provincial government was the threat it posed to the evangelical cause. Their fear had substance. Fulford died when the provincial synod of 1868 was in session, and the Lower House nominated Machray to be his successor. Three of the four remaining members of the Upper House refused to assent to the nomination, even when it was sent back to them a second time, because Machray was an evangelical. (18) The evangelicals had been concerned from the start that a provincial synod might serve to thwart their movement. As D.C. Masters has stated, Huron had become an "Evangelical preserve. It was to the Evangelical movement what the Province of Quebec is to French Canadian nationalism. In the minds of Huron Evangelicals any menace to diocesan rights was likely to be regarded as a menace to the position of Evangelicals." (19)

The formation of a provincial synod, despite the hesitations, weakened the hold of Canterbury over Canadian dioceses. Fulford's letters patent expressed in vague terms that he was to be "subject...to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and subordinate to the Archiepiscopal See of the Province of Canterbury." The other bishops now came under the jurisdiction of the Canadian metropolitan rather than of Canterbury.

As the link to Canterbury was diminishing, that to the crown was disappearing. Although Cronyn had been elected as bishop, it had still been thought necessary to obtain letters patent from the Queen before he could be consecrated. Two missionary bishops--Mackenzie of Zambezie and Patteson of Melanesia--were consecrated without patents in 1861. Mackenzie was consecrated in Cape Town, the first bishop to be consecrated in a colony; the following year Lewis would be the first to be consecrated in BNA. In the complicated legal battle between Bishop Colenso of Natal and his metropolitan, Colenso felt the crown would provide the only neutral tribunal, and appealed to it on the basis of his crown appointment. The Privy Council decision (1865) held that letters patent created "ecclesiastical persons" but could give no jurisdiction within a colony with its own legislature. (20) That is, the law recognized him as a bishop, but not as a bishop _of_ anywhere. The New Zealand bishops recognized their anomalous position, and immediately petitioned the Queen for permission to surrender their patents. Archbishop Longley received permission from the Colonial Secretary to consecrate bishops for the self-governing colonies without patents. The Secretary (Lord Carnarvon)

later wrote Fulford that they would not be necessary for the consecration of A.N. Bethune as assistant bishop of Toronto (1867), or of future Canadian bishops. (21)

As the final separation from Canterbury and the crown was taking place, Canadians were looking for a new way to express the wider unity of their church. Before the Colenso case, Fulford had looked forward to a representative meeting of the Anglican communion. After Colenso, there seemed a new urgency about the matter.

There was, however, another motive. In 1864 (after the Essays and Reviews judgment, but again before Colenso), Bishop Lewis urged a council to combat the heresy of the day: "a national council of the English Church, with representatives from every Ecclesiastical Province of the Empire, should meet under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury and reaffirm the Catholic doctrines now endangered." (22) Only thus could Anglicans be reassured about the literal inerrancy of the bible, and their hope of hell. It was the colonial fear of isolation, and their terror at the higher criticism, which led to the first Lambeth Council. Archbishop Longley had rejected the idea that such a gathering should be a legislative one, enabling it to be inclusive of the whole Anglican communion, rather than just of the imperial church.

It had been the creation of an ecclesiastical province, rather than the formation of a General Synod in 1893, which marked the independence of the Canadian church, though 1893 did underline the fact. The new Canadian House of Bishops decided that each Metropolitan should be dignified by the title of Archbishop. The assigning of that title had been discussed at the previous Lambeth Conference (1888), but left unresolved, since the Archbishop of Canterbury (E.W. Benson) disliked the idea. Benson was annoyed when the Canadians decided to go ahead. Machray sought to placate him, assuring him, "The reverence and precedence given so lovingly to the See of Canterbury as the Mother Church of the Church of England would be none the less if as in the case of Rome Your Grace were still styled Bishop and the Metropolitans of Daughter Churches--Archbishops." (23) But he acknowledged that the creation of provinces and metropolitans was a separating step, and that Rupert's Land was "by those changes somewhat more severed from the See of Canterbury, to which we strove to nestle as closely as possible--but our fortunes are indissolubly connected with those of the rest of Canada...." He left unspoken the conflict between the two men about jurisdiction in British Columbia. (24) The titles symbolized the independence of the Canadian church, and in England the Guardian congratulated her on being the first of the daughter churches of the communion to take the step.

John Moir has said that the mission status of the Church of England had involved such a strong dependence on the mother church "that the umbilical cord seemed almost to be made of iron." (25) But it was not one simple cord

which bound together the two bodies; there were many threads which would be cut, while others remain. Long after the curtailment of support to the older parts of Canada had encouraged the structural independence of the Canadian church, the British societies continued to fund work in the west and north. Only the outbreak of the second world war prompted the Canadian church to take over financial responsibility for all its mission work. The poverty of the Canadian church prompted ecclesiastical independence on one hand and continued financial support on the other. The Anglican image of itself as a national church, which lay behind its early attempts at establishment, led it to over-extend itself; while its presumption that it could indeed be present throughout the country led it to hold aloof from the union conversations early in this century, which might have led to its participation in a more truly national body. The English church had provided many bishops for Canada, though _pace_ Porter, few in this century. (26) It provided university teachers long after comparable non-Anglican institutions no longer relied on foreign sources for their staffs. The Fellowship of the Maple Leaf in the first third of this century sponsored the immigration to the praries of public school teachers who would, in the words of its motto, "Keep Canada Christian and British." The Archbishops' Appeal brought clergy to serve on the Railway Missions and in missionary districts; and the diocese of the Arctic still depends heavily on British clergy to supply her needs.

The modern world disowns the past, and in this respect the Anglican Church of Canada is very contemporary. She shares the faddish embarassment at her past involvement in missionary activity, while wondering at her people's lack of enthusiasm for work beyond the local focus. And the British heritage of which she was once so proud now makes her blush. When William Bothwell was Dean of Montreal, he deprecated his church's penchant for gaiters and regimental flags--it needed, he said, to develop a Canadian character. (27) But he went on to lament that it was too small to produce a liturgy or a strategy of its own. His solution was to draw closer to the American church. He hadn't noticed that, like the wolf in sheep's clothing, appearance does not neccessarily match substance. By now, even the appearance of the Canadian church is becoming more American. Under southern influence, cassock-albs are replacing traditional attire, and bright banners draw the eye away from battle honours. In architecture and liturgy, British examples are forgotten for American ones. The weight of American influence has overpowered the balance, upsetting the _via media_ between the old and new cultures. But perhaps this is simply the modern way of becoming Canadian.

Notes

1 "The Present Position and the Future Prospects of Canadian Theology," _Canadian Journal of Theology_, I, 1 (April 1955) 5-10.

2 "The Purpose of the Journal: An Editorial," Ibid., 1-2.
3 H. Martin Rumscheidt, "A Theology of Nation: A Position Paper" in Graham Scott (ed.), More than Survival: Viewpoints Toward a Theology of Nation (Don Mills: Canec Publishing, 1980), 54-66.
4 Northrop Frye, The Stubborn Structure (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), 282.
5 Ibid., 281-5. Frye is writing as an Upper Canadian, suggesting that Canada has no Atlantic seaboard.
6 T.E. Champion, The Anglican Church in Canada (Toronto 1898) 6.
7 W.W. Manross, A History of the American Episcopal Church (New York 1950), 154-171.
8 Judith Fingard, The Anglican Design in Loyalist Nova Scotia (London 1972) 14.
9 Robert Machray, Life of Archbishop Machray (London 1909) 397.
10 Quoted in Richard Ruggle, Some Men and Some Controversies (Erin 1974) 89.
11 Ibid.
12 Address to Wycliffe College Alumni, 6 November 1974.
13 Sir Edmund Head's instructions were to designate a clergyman "after consulting with the Bishop and other authorities of the Church in the Colony." Cf. S.W. Horrall, "The Clergy and the Election of Bishop Cronyn," Ontario History, LVIII, 4 (December 1966), 205-220.
14 Champion, Op. cit., 11.
15 Quoted in J.L.H. Henderson, "Episcopal Elections and the Memorialists of 1864," Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society (September 1950).
16 Niagara Synod Journal, 1980, table facing K-2.
17 The centre of Canadian Anglicanism moved westwards from the original inclusive see of Nova Scotia. Mountain of Quebec had been offered the office of Metropolitan, but turned it down because of his age--some of his supporters, unaware of his refusal, thought he had been sleighted. When the General Synod was formed in 1893, the church headquarters was located in Toronto. A memorial from the diocese of Qu'Appelle to the 1921 General Synod, to move the offices to Winnipeg, was unsuccessful. The feeling that central Canada is unaware of the problems of other parts of the country has often been expressed in the church.
18 Life of Machray, 154.
19 D.C. Masters, "The First Provincial Synod in Canada," Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society, IV,4 (June 1962), 3.
20 Cf. Peter Hinchcliff, The Anglican Church in South Africa (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1963) 96-7.
21 21 November 1866. Quoted in John Moir, Church and State in Canada 1627-1867 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1967) 264.
22 Ontario Synod Journal, 1864, 230.
23 Quoted in D.M. Schurman, "The First Archbishops in the Canadian Church," Journal of the Canadian Church Historical

Society, V,1 (March 1963).

24 Life of Machray, 397.

25 The Church in the British Era (Toronto: Ryerson, 1972) 190.

26 Cf. David Nock, "Anglican bishops and indigenity: John Porter revisited," Studies in Religion, 8,1 (1979) 47-55.

27 William Bothwell, "The Anglican Church of Canada," Anglican Dialogue, II,3 (Summer, 1963) 62-71.

PAPERS OF THE

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

presented during the

LEARNED SOCIETIES MEETING

in

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

1982

Introductory Remarks

Once again the Canadian Society of Church History at its annual meeting during the 1982 Learned Societies meetings in Ottawa decided to publish its papers presented to the Society meeting on June 8th and 9th, 1982.

The papers reflect in a remarkable way the exciting variety of emphasis and historical focus of the members of our Society. One paper deals with Sebastian Franck, a historian in the sixteenth century. Another, explores developments within Pietism in Scandinavia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some papers focus on important personages within Canadian church history and one deals with a recent schism among Jehovah's Witnesses.

A total of eight papers were read during the two day meeting. Three of these are not reproduced here. They have been submitted for publication elsewhere.

As in the past, we consider the articles the property of the scholars who presented them. Therefore each person is free to submit his/her paper for publication elsewhere.

The papers will be available to members attending the 1983 meetings of C.S.C.H. in Vancouver and an effort will be made to mail them to those persons who are unable to attend the June meeting of the Society in Vancouver. We trust that members will accept this inconvenience on account of the ever-rising cost of postage which makes it virtually impossible to send the collected papers to every member.

Cordially,

E.J. Furcha
F.R.S., McGill University
Secretary, Canadian Society of Church History

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Presidential Address: Thomas Sinclair-Faulkner, Dalhousie University, Halifax:

Brother André and Spirituality in Quebec.

Joseph Ban, McMaster University College, Hamilton, "How Does the Historian Establish 'an Obvious Fact'?" Case Study: "Was John Bunyan a Baptist?".

Vincent Erickson, University of New Brunswick, Hinrich Jansen and His Times: Explanations into the Development of a Pietistic Revitalisation Movement.

Brian Fraser, Glebe Presbyterian Church, Toronto , The Pre-War Career of T.B. Kilpatrick, (Not available for this publication).

E.J. Furcha, F.R.S., McGill University, Montreal, The Paradoxon as Hermeneutical Principle: A Re-examination of Sebastian Franck, Published in Spirit Within Structure, Festschrift for George Johnston, editor E.J. Furcha, (1983).

Stewart D. Gill, University of Guelph, The Canadianisation of the Scottish Church: The Reverend William Proudfoot and the Canadian Frontier, 1832-1851.

James Penton, University of Lethbridge, The Recent Schism Among Jehovah's Witnesses and the Birth of a New Movement, (Not available for this publication).

Ron Sawatsky, Doctoral Candidate, Religious Studies, University of Toronto, Unholy Contentions about Holiness: The Canada Holiness Association of the Methodist Church.

SACRAMENTAL SUFFERING

Brother André's Spirituality

A paper presented to the joint
meeting of the Canadian Catholic
Historical Association and the
Canadian Society of Church History
at the University of Ottawa
on Wednesday, 9 June 1982.

Tom Sinclair-Faulkner
Department of Religion
Dalhousie University.

SACRAMENTAL SUFFERING: BROTHER ANDRÉ'S SPIRITUALITY

One of the things that makes any account of Brother André's life and work so fascinating is the way in which the most elementary observations seem to contradict each other. For instance, Brother André is celebrated as a miraculous healer, yet he himself suffered physical disabilities and ailments that hampered him all his life. For instance, Brother André left his peculiar mark stamped indelibly on the Oratory that he inspired, yet his favorite statuette has nothing in common with the statuettes of Jesus, St. Joseph, the Blessed Virgin and Brother André himself that are today marketed through the gift shop of the Oratory. For instance, thousands of pilgrims come to the Oratory every year seeking one of the miracles for which it is renowned, and most of them leave bearing the same burden that they brought with them on arrival. Yet their faith, and particularly their faith in the Oratory and Brother André, remains as strong as before, if not stronger. How can these things be?

The contradictions remain if we understand Brother André's life to be shaped by a spirituality of miracles, but they disappear if we see that his life was instead shaped by a spirituality of suffering.

When the Church began its official investigation of the case for the beatification of Brother André four years after his death in 1937 at the age of 91, the investigators prepared a list of questions to be put to those who had known the famous founder of St. Joseph's Oratory of Montréal. Joseph Pichette, the first person to be interviewed, responded to the first 49 questions with answers that provided 20 pages of testimony.[1] The fiftieth question, however, was the one that touched on the miracles associated with Brother André, and the reply to that question alone covered a further 20 pages.[2]

Above all it is the miracles that draw our attention to the story of Brother André. They fascinate and titillate us. Sometimes it is the detailed account of a healing observed by certified physicians, such as that reported in the Annales de St-Joseph in 1927 when a woman suffering multiple afflictions including pyretic fever, a severed spine and tetanus attacks, was cured in the course of performing a novena under the patronage of St. Joseph.[3] Sometimes it is the sheer number of healings attributed to the intercession of St. Joseph by grateful correspondents to the Oratory: for example, more than 15,000 healings claimed for the year 1928.[4] Sometimes it is the bewildering variety of favors acknowledged by the thousands who sent their written testimonies to the staff of the shrine: in 1913 near the beginning of the Oratory's fame notice was taken not only of recovery from illness and wounds, but also of a successful amputation and adjustment to an artificial limb. A heretic was converted, a family saved from a fire, a potential defendant managed to avoid being brought to trial, one man found a job, another managed to hang on to one, a young man earned a degree, a nun's students did well on their examinations, a mother had an easy childbirth, and a businessman made a nice profit in the sale of some real estate.[5]

During the years 1910-1962 the Oratory received about ten million letters.[6] From the first publication of the Annales, the official organ of the Oratory until 1944 when the name of the magazine was changed to L'Oratoire, the editors regularly reported the number of letters received. During the early 1920s about 50,000 letters arrived each year, and in 1928 the total number was 172,549.[7] By 1936, André's last year of life, the number reached the the formidable total of 205,662.[8] But how many of these letters

acknowledged God's gracious granting of a favor, sometimes a healing but more often some other desirable thing? During the 1920s only 9-11% of the letters mentioned a miracle. Still more surprising is the fact that during the years 1933-1937 only 7% of the letters referred to a healing or some other favor miraculously granted to the writers.[9] That is to say, during the worst years of the Great Depression, an economic disaster that weighed with particular heaviness on the urban francophones of Montréal, there was a small but significant reduction in the proportion of letters reporting miracles. Yet the total number of letters increased each year after 1920.

The remarkable fact to which I wish to direct our attention is not the miracles of Brother André but rather the startling effectiveness with which he and his Oratory dealt with the actual experience of human suffering in all its forms during the first half of the twentieth century, primarily among the common people of Québec. The miracles on which Brother André's notoriety is founded ended human suffering among the relatively few pilgrims who were blessed by some divine intervention in their lives, but the vast majority of pilgrims found consolation in Brother André's spirituality. It was not a spirituality mediated by systematic statements, written or spoken, for Brother André was functionally illiterate and theologically unsophisticated. But his practice and encouragement of the cult of St. Joseph were the means by which he undertook to make sense of the fact of human suffering as it was manifested in his own experience, in that of the pilgrims who sought him out, and in the reports of the tribulation of the world as they reached the Oratory resting on the slopes of Mount Royal.

Brother André's practice and encouragement of the cult of St. Joseph constituted his sacramental spirituality of suffering, and it was this contribution to the religious life of the people of Québec, mediated through the Oratory on Mount Royal, that was shaped most directly and clearly by Brother André himself. None of the other contributions of the Oratory to the religious life of the Québécois -- the pilgrimages, the trade union events, even the miracles -- none of these bore his personal stamp unamended by others and none were so dear to his own heart.

Before I can begin to substantiate this claim I need to make clear what I mean by "sacramental spirituality". In particular "spirituality" is a slippery term that has come into vogue in recent years and is generally taken to refer to something more refined than the popular devotions practiced by persons as uncouth as Brother André, known neither for his eloquence nor for his writings, let alone for his theological refinement. In the course of a helpful survey of the historical evolution of the term, however, Walter H. Principe has proposed that "spirituality" be defined in a manner that is both more broad and more precise than its present usage suggests. Like some of the sociological terms that I shall be resorting to elsewhere, Principe's definition purchases some of its precision at the price of becoming ponderous, but it is so apt to my purposes as an historian trying to make sense out of a controversial subject that I would rather quote Principe directly than try to reword him. "Spirituality", then, is

> the way in which any person understands, and lives within his or her historical context according to that aspect of his or her religion, philosophy, or ethic that is viewed as the loftiest, the noblest, the most calculated to lead to the ideal or perfection being sought.[10]

It follows that what distinguishes spirituality from mere piety is not the refinement of the practitioner but her deliberate and persistent effort to live her life according to what is understood to be the best in her tradition. Therefore a highly trained theologian who sets his foot on the mystical path, as John of the Cross did, may commonly be understood to have a spirituality. But John's relatively uneducated mentor, Teresa of Avila, may also be understood to have a spirituality, as Teresa herself argued when she cautioned a would-be spiritual director, armed with his theological credentials, that "the Lord is perhaps making some old woman better versed in this science than himself, even though he be a very learned man."[11]

As I shall demonstrate below, Brother André's encounter with human suffering issued in an authentic spirituality that shaped, more or less effectively, the Oratory and through it the people of Québec. It was a way of life, the product of reflection and practice, not merely a body of ideas; and it was shaped by André's own highest tradition, the imitation of Christ in his passion. Furthermore André's understanding of suffering was that it is properly regarded as sacramental, though "sacramental" is my formulation rather than his. He was an unlettered man, concrete in his expression and inclined to favor practice over analysis, but as an outsider I find it helpful to characterize his position with a word that has played an important though controversial role in the Catholic tradition.

There are seven sacraments celebrated by the Catholic Church. Enumerated by Peter Lombard in the twelfth century and

developed by Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century, they were subsequently adopted formally by the Councils of Florence (1439) and Trent (1545-63). Not surprisingly they served as a handy reference point by which one could distinguish a Catholic from a Protestant: most Protestants limited the sacraments to precisely two (baptism and the communion meal) while the Council of Trent declared that the true number is "seven, no more and no fewer."[12]

Both Catholics and Protstants made use of Augustine's definition of a sacrament as "the visible form of invisible grace" and held that the sacraments had been instituted by Jesus Christ as he was revealed in the New Testament. The sacraments were understood to be symbolic actions which were effective because they were the sacraments (<u>ex opere operato</u>), not because the ecclesiastical officer who administered them was a worthy person. The only provisos were that the recipient be appropriately repentant and faithful, and that the sacrament be celebrated, as the Council of Trent put it, by those who intend "to do what the Church does."

And so the sacraments were given definitive shape : two among most Protestants, seven among Catholics. Whether a sacrament is symbolic or real, whether there is any difference between "symbolic" and "real" -- these are questions much debated by Christians. There is, however, agreement that each sacrament is or should be a vivid dramatization of a real and important spiritual event. In baptism, for instance, the old life is drowned, the new life is nourished by living waters, and the baptized person emerges from the event, sprinkling or full immersion, as a member of the Church.

Protestants generally observe the sacraments but tend to stress the importance of the Word (in preaching, in Bible study, etc.) in their religious practices. Catholics, on the other hand, tend to cultivate a "sacramental imagination"[13] and have found that seven sacraments are not quite enough. As a result a whole class of ritual objects and practices known as "sacramentals" has arisen among Catholics and been sanctioned and shaped with varying degrees of success by the hierarchy. The sacramentals include the making of the sign of the Cross, the telling of the Rosary, the Stations of the Cross, the use of purple vestments during Lent and Advent, etc.. It would not do to draw too clear a distinction between Catholics and Protestants at this point, of course, since Protestants have their own sacramentals (e.g.,the Geneva gown) and they share some sacramentals with Catholics (e.g.,the saying of grace before a meal). But clear or not the distinction is there. Indeed, far from undermining the sacramental imagination of Catholics, Vatican II encouraged this Catholic tradition by urging the faithful to see the Church in Christ as "a kind of sacrament or sign of intimate union with God, and of the unity of all mankind. She is also an instrument for the achievement of such union and unity."[14]

Standing as he did in the Catholic tradition it was natural for Brother André to take a sacramental approach to suffering. In particular he fastened on two practices common in Québec: anointing the ill and dying with consecrated oil,and performing the Stations of the Cross.

During the Middle Ages it became Catholic practice to administer the sacrament of Extreme Unction to dying priests: using vegetable oil blessed by an ordained person, preferably a bishop, the priest would ritually anoint the man in the last stage of dying.

Soon the practice was extended to all dying Catholics, but it was not until Vatican II that the sacrament was officially spoken of as the Anointing of the Sick rather than Extreme Unction, recovering its earlier, broader function of conveying God's grace to those who suffer from any illness or injury, not only to those who are close to dying. However the use of consecrated oil in rituals designed to comfort all who suffer some physical ailment continued informally throughout the history of the Catholic Church, side by side with the formal sacrament administered by priests. Brother André was one of those who habitually obtained consecrated oil from a priest, then ritually administered it to those who suffered in the hope that the gesture would serve as a vehicle of God's healing grace, spiritual and physical. Had André cared to formulate what he was doing he would have described it as a humble sacramental, not a sacrament, for only a priest may administer a sacrament. But the impact that his anointing had on those present was generally so extraordinary that André himself frequently and with some asperity reminded people that he was not a priest.

Brother André instituted a still more dramatic ritual of suffering, however, in the Chemin de la Croix that he led at the Oratory every Friday evening in the company of his friends, almost all of them devout Catholic laymen. The English translation is "Stations of the Cross," a phrase which unhappily lacks the French emphasis on dynamic reenactment implied by "chemin" or "way." The Stations of the Cross were not André's personal invention, of course, but he set his peculiar stamp on them at the Oratory.

The Stations of the Cross are a distinctively popular form of devotion in the Catholic tradition, finding their origin in the practice of pilgrims who visited Jerusalem and traced out the path that Jesus took from his condemnation by Pilate through to his entombment. In the later Middle Ages the Franciscans encouraged their urban flocks to practice the devotion in a variety of forms until at last in the nineteenth century the Church standardized it with fourteen Stations. Catholic churches generally feature the fourteen Stations of the Cross in pictorial or sculpted form running around the interior wall but sometimes, particularly where a steep hill is available to recall the climb up Golgotha, the Stations are recreated outdoors as they have been at the Oratory of St. Joseph since [illegible]. L[illegible] and Advent are seasons when Catholics are most likely to undertake the Stations of the Cross, but under Brother André's leadership it was a weekly event. He himself preferred to make the Stations of the Cross on a daily basis but was not always able to do so.

The Stations of the Cross present the Passion of Christ (literally "the suffering of Christ"), unrelieved by a happy ending or even promises of one. The person who undertakes the Stations of the Cross moves slowly from one to the other, pausing each time to meditate on the particular sorrow presented: Jesus being scourged, Jesus stumbling for the first time under the weight of the cross, St. Veronica wiping Jesus' face with her veil, Jesus' death on the cross, etc.. Every effort is made to recapitulate in all its variety the suffering of the Passion, dramatizing it and relating it to the life of the person or persons who have come to meditate, perhaps under the leadership of an exhorter who directs a group along the way.

Neither called nor trained to preach or to officiate at a sacrament, Brother André nevertheless was free to lead people along the Stations of the Cross and to direct their devotions there with his speeches.

As a means of focussing the Christian's imagination on suffering, few religious practices can rival Brother André's weekly public direction of the Stations of the Cross in the Crypt of the Oratory. J.S. Bach's St. Matthew's Passion may be a greater work of art but the people who attended Brother André's hour-long meditation as he circled the dim sanctuary of the Crypt could not have been more stirred by Bach than they were by André. But why should I refer to Bach at all in commenting on Brother André's Stations of the Cross?

It is because both the Stations of the Cross and Bach's St. Matthew's Passion have fallen out of favor in recent times as religious devotions. Both trace the same path in the same way, examining the sufferings of Jesus in his last hours and relating them to the lives of their audience, ending at last with the sombre image of Jesus laid to rest in the tomb, dead. The St. Matthew's Passion is familiar to most lovers of classical music, but how many have heard it performed as part of a religious service rather than as a secular entertainment? or used their recording of the St. Matthew's Passion as a vehicle for their private devotions? The Stations of the Cross are necessarily part of the interior decoration of every Catholic Church, but how many Catholics have recently undertaken the Stations of the Cross, let alone practiced them regularly? The Stations of the Cross focus on the "passion" or suffering of Christ, and they are therefore not a form of meditation to which modern folk are easily drawn.

Technological advances of the past three centuries have given us the means and the inclination to mask suffering. Our funeral practices often create the illusion that the dead one is "only sleeping"; our pain-killers are readily employed to cover the least symptom of distress, and those who disdain pain-killers are suspected of being "masochistic" (at least by those who do not care for precision in their speech). Early Protestants like Mathias Grünewald (whose crucifixion panel on the Isenheim altarpiece has been described as "the most Protestant painting ever achieved"[15]) and J.S. Bach himself lived in an era that preceded our age of technological mastery and it is no accident that they were so successful as artists who, from time to time, focussed on the suffering of Christ and its implications for Christians. But more recently some Protestants have become popular as devotional leaders by virtually ignoring the Crucifixion and its revelation of ultimate suffering: I think, for example, of Bruce Barton's inspirational book, The Man Nobody Knows, continuously in print since 1927[16], and the various "Christian athlete" movements of the present day.

Anyone who has visited both Protestant and Catholic churches knows that Protestants characteristically prefer to display the Cross rather than the Crucifix, dwelling on the hope of the resurrection implied by the empty Tree rather than on the reminder of suffering that is the twisted form of Jesus nailed cruelly to its place. Nevertheless it is not only modern Protestants whose attention has tended to wander from the Crucifixion as a symbol: I think it fair to claim that the most prominent symbols at gatherings of Catholic charismatics today are soaring doves, white robes of triumph, joyful and happy music. As an

historian who is loathe to say, "Clearly the record shows that the Christian tradition is precisely thus-and-so...," I hesitate to dismiss any of these modern practices as departures from what is legitimately called Christianity, but I note that the historical record is full of persons who have no such scruples. Consider, for example, the words written by Gerard Manley Hopkins to his father: "Those who do not pray to Him in His Passion pray to God but scarcely to Christ."[17]

Of course these are only typically modern inclinations, not absolutes, and I do not mention them in order to sneer at them but rather to emphasize how strange the practices fostered by Brother André must seem to most modern folk, Christian or otherwise. Not only did he draw attention to the suffering of the sick by anointing them and to the suffering of Christ by leading public meditations on the Stations of the Cross, but he also said the Rosary, often several times each day, and urged others to join him. This too is a practice falling out of favor with Catholics of our day, and perhaps it is therefore worth reminding ourselves that the central triad of the simple and repetitive prayers of the Rosary is devoted to a meditation on the Passion.

André's lay followers carried the saying of the Rosary 99 steps further by performing this sacramental on their knees as they ascended the long cement staircase (now mercifully padded with wooden boards) that climbs the mountain from its foot to the entrance of the Oratory. There are other Catholic shrines where pilgrims ascend a staircase on their knees while saying a prayer of one sort or the other, all taking their original inspiration from the Lateran Basilica in Rome where 28 marble steps are popularly understood to be the very steps that

Christ trod following his condemnation by Pilate in Jerusalem. But few Catholic shrines invite pilgrims to such heroic efforts as the 99 steps of the Oratory of St. Joseph. The experience of ritually climbing them on one's knees is bound to draw one's attention to the fact of suffering, no matter what prayers one may choose to recite during the ascent.

In a reminiscence published five years after André's death his Superior, Father Albert Cousineau, C.S.C., made it plain that it was no accident that Brother André's favorite sacramentals dwelt on the theme of suffering.

> He was fond of meditating on the sufferings of Our Lord, particularly while performing the Stations of the Cross in union with St. Joseph... St. Joseph led him to Jesus, to suffering Jesus. And from there to his own meditation on the passion, the performance of the Stations of the Cross, devotion to the holy Face, to the most holy Eucharist...[19]

The holy Face, of course, is the bleeding head of Jesus crowned with thorns, and the Eucharist is the feast in which the bread becomes a body that is broken and the wine becomes blood that is spilt. Serving as a bridge for André between Joseph and Jesus was Mary, Father Cousineau tells us, "particularly under her title of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows... in her life of suffering and sacrifice."[20] The Father Superior expressed doubt that André understood this chain of relationships in a way that was conceptually clear but the Superior was sure that André's practice was correct.

Let me try to give conceptual clarity to André's most personal expressions of his spirituality of suffering. To do so I must recognize that I am interpreting the non-verbal actions of a man who was not given, so far as we know, to theological reflection of any kind, let alone to

written analysis of his own religious behavior. Furthermore I am personally an alien to this man's religious tradition: I am a liberal Protestant raised in another language by people who have learned to mistrust the Catholic enthusiasm for images, and I am trying to understand with sympathy the religious expression of an illiterate man who was never separated from certain images. And finally I am trying to understand a popular figure whose chief interpreters are themselves influenced by what they wish to find in Brother André's spirituality: I refer not only to the lay people mentioned on the first page of this paper who buy the cheerful statuettes that define the tone of the Oratory's gift shop today, but also to historians of Brother André who are responsible to a hierarchy that has severely modified or forthrightly rejected particular elements of Brother André's spirituality.

The evidence that I want to consider consists of the images and statues that were closest to Brother André, and the use to which he put them. First of all there are the Stations of the Cross that ring the sanctuary in the Crypt of the Oratory. The Crypt has been in use since 1917, and it is here that Brother André led his weekly public meditation on the Stations of the Cross. We have already seen that this particular sacramental is a graphic, dramatic event in which the participants not only focus their attention on the Passion of Jesus Christ, including his painful scourging, his desertion by his friends, his weary ascent of Golgotha and his death, but also make connections between the suffering that the participants have experienced and the suffering that they have inflicted on others.

But the Crypt contains more than the Stations of the Cross. It is dominated by the statue of St. Joseph, a kindly father-figure holding the Christ Child in his arms, standing over the altar. It is

the same image of St. Joseph that stands in the outside niche over the entrance to the original chapel as it was modified in 1910, and it is the same image that dominates the walls of Brother André's private living quarters above the original chapel. There are other ways in which Catholics represent St. Joseph but we know that this particular image was dear to Brother André. What part did it play in his spirituality? For one thing we know that he was often discovered at prayer in the Crypt, on his knees or prostrate on his face below the altar with his hands stretched out towards St. Joseph's image. People occasionally stumbled over him there because the incidents occurred at times when the Crypt was in darkness and supposedly deserted.[21] Before I interpret these facts, let me add one other.

In the display of Brother André's sparse possessions that the museum of the Oratory offers is one statue, no more and no less: a plaster image of Jesus immediately following his scourging before Pilate. Jesus' hands are bound with cords, the crown of thorns is on his head, and blood flows freely from his many wounds. His head is bowed and he is plainly seen to be suffering. The same 35-cm. statue appears in the life-size diorama showing Brother André in the office where he met pilgrims to the Oratory, and this time the statue rests on the counter behind which André stands. We know that it was André's custom to keep this statue concealed beneath the counter or in a desk drawer. When challenged by the obstinacy of an unrepentant sinner he would bring the statue out of hiding and use it to illustrate what sometimes amounted to an hour-long description of Jesus' suffering.[22] We also knew that a similar statue, modified only by the addition of chains and a canopy, stood on the table beside Brother André's bed in his

private living quarters.

I think that it is possible that "St. Joseph led him to Jesus, to suffering Jesus," as Father Cousineau said shortly after Brother André's death (see page 13 above), but the pattern of Brother André's possessions and actions suggests an additional possibility. I think it most unlikely that there was no connection between the suffering of Jesus, represented so graphically in André's favorite statue and in the Stations of the Cross, and the nurturant figure of St. Joseph. It is hard to imagine the kind of schizophrenic state of mind that would permit someone to hold these two images simultaneously and constantly before himself without making a connection. But it seems most likely to me that André's frequent practice of the Stations of the Cross, his attachment to the statuette of Jesus Scourged, and his effort to reach others through the proclamation of Jesus' suffering (both during the Stations and during visits to his office) show that he understood suffering to be a fact of life which everyone could recognize. Let them admit their own suffering, then recognize that God too suffers, in the person of Jesus in his Passion, and they could come to see that salvation comes through suffering, not in spite of it.

St. Joseph does not lead Brother André to the suffering Jesus so much as he follows the suffering Jesus. Jesus in his Passion achieves a solidarity with suffering humanity that made it possible for Brother André and his disciples to make a connection between their own suffering lives and God, and this promised that ultimately suffering would be overcome. But the Jesus who heroically accepted suffering has no

energy to end the suffering of himself and of others here and now: Jesus hangs painfully on the Cross, or stands with head bowed before Pilate, or points to the wounded heart within his own breast, but he never takes children on his knee, never opens his arms to sinners, never lays a healing hand on a leper's brow -- at least, not among the icons that Brother André kept near to himself. The role of nurturant comforter is reserved for St. Joseph. When Brother André ended a day in which he had exhorted people time and again to see that Jesus suffers in redemptive solidarity with us, and then crept surreptitiously into the Crypt to prostrate himself for hours before the statue of St. Joseph holding the Christ Child in his arms, I suspect that Brother André was in effect asking St. Joseph for the parental support that would allow André to grow into the kind of person strong enough to follow in the footsteps of Jesus who redeems the world by accepting the world's suffering, just as St. Joseph's parental support for Jesus in his childhood made it possible for Jesus to grow into the man that he did.

There is negative evidence to support this view of Brother André's spirituality. Not only does Jesus not appear in a nurturant role in André's icons, but neither does the Blessed Virgin Mary. His favorite image of the Virgin shows her, like Jesus, pointing to the wounds in her heart, pierced by seven daggers which represent the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin.[23] This particular devotion achieved its height in the eighteenth century under Pope Benedict XIII but was practically eliminated during the reforms of the 1960s.[24] As a form of meditation

it resembled another of André's favorites, the Rosary of the Holy Wounds, a devotion set out in a pamphlet that Brother André promoted.[25] It is clear that in his spirituality Jesus and Mary demonstrate that suffering is a fact of life and that they enter into it redemptively, but it is St. Joseph who offers to help us grow up, to develop from immature children of weak faith into mature adults who can imitate the Jesus who suffers.

The hierarchy also saw St. Joseph as a powerful protector, but not as the nurturer who strengthens a weak, immature person until that person is ready to play the adult role required of one who would imitate the Christ who suffers bravely. Instead St. Joseph is the Protector of the Church, and his Oratory is the rock against which the enemies of the Church dash themselves in vain. For example, just three months after Brother André's death Mgr. Georges Gauthier, coadjutor archbishop of Montréal, issued a circular to the clergy of his diocese aimed primarily at denouncing the threat of communism in Montréal and abroad, and ending with the words,

> All the cares, all the distresses of our great city have been battering like a wave against the promontory where St. Joseph has chosen to build his house... What an honor and what an encouragement it is to us that St. Joseph stretches out his powerful arms over our city to bless it and to protect it![26]

The basilica that was completed after Brother André's death is dedicated to this St. Joseph who protects and rescues the Church from suffering. To reach the basilica one must leave the Crypt and climb farther up Mount Royal, at last entering the huge space beneath the dome of the Oratory where one discovers stained glass windows commemorating a variety of miraculous deliverances from calamity. St. Joseph turns back a British fleet in 1711 and again in 1776; St. Joseph ends an epidemic of typhoid in 1847 and rescues a ship threatened by icebergs

in 1639; St. Joseph causes the Iroquois to retreat in 1630 and the English to fall back in 1690. Considering the number of times that typhoid, the Iroquois, the English, etc., were victorious in the history of French-speaking Catholics in Canada, one is struck by the fact that St. Joseph is presented as one who ends suffering among Catholics, not as one who prepares Catholics for suffering.

The St. Joseph whom Brother André honored certainly ended suffering for some Catholics: it was to St. Joseph that Brother André gave the credit when people were miraculously healed. But most of those who came to St. Joseph in their suffering, including Brother André himself, did not obtain an end to their suffering. Instead they obtained the paternal care of a saint who would help them to grow into the kind of adult who could imitate Christ in his suffering. In Brother André's spirituality, St. Joseph prepares the faithful for suffering, he does not abolish suffering. That task is reserved for Jesus, and it is not one that we may hope to see accomplished in this world where suffering must be accepted as the fact that it is.

The prominence that has been given to the miracles of healing that are associated with Brother André obscures the central fact of suffering in his spirituality, but his lay friends were quick to point out that he devoted as much attention to the sufferings of Jesus and Mary as he did to the power of St. Joseph in whose name Brother André sought healing.[27] And during the official investigation by the hierarchy undertaken in the period 1941-1949, one of them remarked on a fascinating pattern among those who came to Brother André for relief from suffering:

> Those who are healed quickly are either those who do not have faith or those who have little faith, so that they might have faith; while those who already have a firm faith are not healed quickly, since the good God would rather test them, make them suffer, in order to sanctify them still more.[28]

Brother André himself, who suffered stomach pains constantly, was the most obvious example of the truth of this observation, but it applies as well to people like his friend, Mr. Azarias Claude.

Azarias Claude was a butcher who had come to know Brother André sometime during 1907-1908. His wife had frequently visited the then-primitive Oratory but Azarias himself was openly sceptical of the whole enterprise until Brother André personally prevailed on him to come for a visit. Azarias returned again and again, eventually becoming André's most frequent chauffeur on visits into the nearby towns. Early in their relationship, Brother André noticed that Azarias's hand was partially paralyzed, apparently due to an accident, and the following conversation ensued:

> "Would you like to have this hand work as well as your other?"
>
> "Brother André, if the good God has some favors to do for me, there must be plenty of others more important than this for the salvation of my soul. My arm doesn't bother me, and I can work. Why it's been (like this) for almost fifteen years, and I'm starting to get used to it."
>
> "Do you understand what you are saying? Have you thought about it?"
>
> "No, I've never thought about it, because I've never had any reason to think about it."
>
> "Then in that case you'll keep your arm just as it is now. Later, something else will come up that is more important. You may have some suffering ahead of you; never forget that sometimes suffering is necessary."

And André concluded the conversation with a long reflection on the sufferings

[29] of Jesus in his Passion. And when, several years later, Azarias suffered an illness that thrust him into a coma for three days, he was to regain consciousness only when Brother André had come to sit beside him. In the days of recovery that followed Brother André shared with his friend the two books of prayers that meant the most to him: the Prayers of Saint Gertrude and The Rosary of the Holy Wounds, both focussed on the sufferings of Jesus. The one miracle that was accorded to this close companion of André was a recovery that permitted him to pursue his meditations on suffering.

While Brother André would never have denied God's sovereign ability to relieve suffering one has the impression that André felt that it is both normal and desirable for an adult to suffer. Consider the following conversation that a well-to-do woman had with Brother André when she complained of her deafness:

> "Madame, you have a good husband?"
>
> "Oh, very good, Brother André!"
>
> "Children?"
>
> "Wonderful children!"
>
> "Money?"
>
> "Certainly, Brother; Providence has permitted us to lack for nothing."
>
> "Then, Madame, you surely are in need of something to put up with, for the love of the good God."

Recalling the incident later in an interview with Archbishop Gauthier of Montréal, the woman remarked, "If it had been anyone else who'd said such things to me, I'd have been driven into a rage!"[30]

Furthermore there are hints that Brother André understood there to be a "givenness" to suffering that fixed the amount of it that exists in the world. Jesus recognized that the devils that he drove out of the

madman had to go somewhere, and so he sent them into the herd of Gadarene swine. In a more sinister story that nevertheless affirms the same law of conservation of suffering, a man who was ill came to Brother André and demanded a cure "at any price." "Ah," replied Brother André, "At that price you shall be cured. Go." The man was healed, but his young daughter suddenly and inexplicably went insane.[31]

Lest it seem that Brother André was calloused in his perception of the suffering about him, let me stress that he sought to offer what consolation he could whenever he could. To some he would say, "God will have all His eternity in which to comfort you." And his friend Azarias Claude reports one of André's comments that suggests that André was sensitive to the incomprehension of those who continued to suffer because a healing miracle was denied to them.

> The people who think they are the most unhappy are the happiest. Those who suffer have something to offer to God... And when they manage to endure successfully, that is a miracle that keeps repeating.[32]

Nor did he spare himself. He denied that he asked Saint Joseph to put an end to the stomach pains that plagued him, insisting, "It's a good thing to suffer. It makes you think. You feel better after suffering."[33]

In the strict meaning of the term, "masochism" is sexual pleasure stimulated by pain. André's love of suffering was not masochistic: what he treasured was suffering with the power to transform because it is related to the transforming power of the Passion of Jesus Christ. When a sufferer complained to Brother André of a head ailment, André would point to the crown of thorns. If someone's legs were injured, André drew attention to Christ's staggering under the weight of the Cross. Was it a heart attack that one feared? Remember the lance that pierced the side of Jesus.[34] His motives were the same as those of the sixteenth-

century physicians who paraded their patients before Grünewald's painting of the Crucifixion before admitting them to hospital for treatment and, according to the testimony of André's lay friend, Joseph Pichette, the approach was efficacious:

> I never brought a sick person before Brother André who did not return satisfied. Some were healed. Others died a short while later, but Brother André had given them comfort.[35]

The persistent pattern of Brother André's life reveals a genuine spirituality of suffering; that is, an effort to live according to what he understood to be the Catholic understanding of suffering, conditioned as it was by the times in which he lived. But it was also a spirituality in the larger sense: a pathway that he explored himself and then successfully invited others to tread. His spirituality was a spirituality that others embraced, albeit one that the modifications of others sometimes obscured. We may conclude by comparing his spirituality to that of others who have shaped the ways in which twentieth-century westerners have confronted suffering. In particular I want to consider the so-called "positive thinkers", as well as St. Thérèse de Lisieux and Martin Luther King, Jr., all of whom have had a profound effect on large numbers of people in our era because they have persuasively addressed suffering as a practical, religious problem. Like Brother André they have all initiated popular movements in our day. To see him in their context is to sharpen our perception of what is peculiar about his contribution to modern religious living.

For an understanding of the practitioners of "mind cure" I am indebted to The Positive Thinkers. Religion as Pop Psychology from Mary Baker Eddy to Oral Roberts by Donald Meyer.[36] Here Meyer

argues that the practitioners of "mind cure" are members of a school that developed in response to the needs of those in the nineteenth century who felt helpless to overcome or even grapple with the suffering that they experienced. The practitioners include Mary Baker Eddy and the Fillmores in the early years, Bruce Barton and Norman Vincent Peale in more recent days. In ways whose differences reflected the experiences and contexts peculiar to each they all invited people to recognize their weakness in the face of suffering (usually a generalized malaise, not a specific crisis) and to rise above the suffering by immersing themselves in a power that transcends the chaotic world. Meyer sees this as a form of "religion as therapy, as cult of reassurance, as psychology of peace and positive thinking."[37] People become patients who must seek relief by giving up the struggle for wholeness, thus collaborating "willingly in the process of self-disintegration, under the highest of auspices, God."[37]

Certainly Brother André attracted a wide, popular following similar in many respects to the Victorian housewives and petit bourgeois who responded to "mind cure", and Brother André practiced a resort to a kind of therapy: the nurturant protection of St. Joseph. But this was never intended by Brother André to be a permanent refuge. The sheltering arms of St. Joseph were meant to cradle the child who has not yet reached adulthood; and they were meant to welcome back the adult who had been, for the moment, overwhelmed by the suffering that existence brings. But St. Joseph's task was to strengthen the Christian so that he or she might return to the world to live as one who walks in the way of Christ in his Passion. As Meyer reminds us, the positive thinkers

have often harked back to William James as one of their founders, but James could scarcely be called an advocate of "mind cure". He described two kinds of people: the "healthy-minded", including the positive thinkers, who deny the reality of suffering; and the "sick souls" whose understanding of reality is broad enough to include the fact of suffering, and who know that that fact must be faced rather than denied.[38] Surely Brother André must be grouped with the "sick souls", the ones who know more of reality than do the positive thinkers.

To see Brother André's spirituality contrasted with that of the positive thinkers is to make more acceptable the gruesome object that is the most notorious and the least celebrated relic of the Oratory: his heart, the ancient organ that kept his frail, pain-ridden body alive for almost 92 years, cut from his chest shortly after his death in 1937, and now reverently displayed in a glass container mounted on a somberly decorated pedestal in the museum above the Crypt. Uncouth though it be, the heart is a vivid reminder that Brother André's way was a way that grappled with suffering.

St. Thérèse de Lisieux (1873-1897) lived the obscure life of a Carmelite nun in northwestern France but the publication of her Autobiography swiftly made her the most popular saint in twentieth-century France.[39] Brother André was much drawn to her story, and his admirers have frequently compared the two. Both were renowned for their miracles, though both put greater stock in the propagation of their particular devotions (André to St. Joseph, Thérèse to Jesus) than in the miracles. Both advocated a "little way" that was apt for the

humble who might find it hard to identify with heroic practitioners of the Christian faith whose qualities set them apart from most people. Both practiced a spirituality that could be followed in everyday settings, as opposed to spiritualities that belonged in the desert, on the mountain top, in the palace, on the battlefield, etc.. Both understood that miracles might be worked to attract those who lacked a strong faith, and both expected trials rather than miracles for those whose strength was strong and mature. Yet there is at least one important difference between their spiritualities.

Thérèse lived her brief life among Carmelites devoted to the strenuous way of perfection that could only be followed by one prepared to make heroic efforts of self-denial. That this strenuous asceticism may legitimately be criticized as an unfortunate exaggeration of the reforms that Teresa of Avila introduced among the Carmelites in the seventeenth century does not change the fact that by the 1890s it had come to be seen as a barrier to salvation, at least in the eyes of young Thérèse de Lisieux. "I am too small for the hard stairway of perfection," she said. She spoke instead of having found a spiritual elevator: abandon yourself to Jesus and he will lift you to heaven itself with no effort on your part.[41] Some may judge her metaphor to be a bit precious, but it should not blind us to her revolutionary insistence that the way of perfection is within the reach of everyone, not reserved for spiritual athletes alone.

Brother André too knew that the way of perfection is meant for everyone, but it is significant that the only elevators at the Oratory begin above the Crypt, that portion of the Oratory that was completed during André's life and which bears most clearly the stamp of

his spirituality. The Crypt is reached by 99 steps which pilgrims have learned to mount on their knees, and there is certainly no elevator available. Both Thérèse of Lisieux and her seventeenth-century predecessor, Teresa of Avila, spoke of the possibility that God might exercise his prerogative to raise a soul swiftly through many degrees of perfection at once, but there is no record that Brother André ever discussed this option with any of the people whom he counselled. One did not have to be a spiritual athlete in order to follow the way that Brother André mapped out, and one might frequently have recourse to St. Joseph in order to catch one's spiritual breath, but one should not expect Jesus to provide a shortcut on the way to perfection.

Of course, Thérèse of Lisieux knew suffering in her short life. Both she and Brother André were orphaned early in life and suffered serious physical ailments, but other elements in their respective biographies combined to create significant differences in their prayer life, their friendships and their spiritualities, as I show elsewhere.[41] It is sufficient to say at this point that Thérèse walked the way of suffering because she was secure in Jesus; André walked the way of suffering so that he might approach Jesus, with the help of St. Joseph to prepare him for the long, difficult way and to renew his strength when the way became oppressive.

Thérèse and André valued suffering because they could learn what they thought were valuable lessons from it and because they could offer their suffering to God as a way of enlightening the religious ignorance of others or of relieving the sufferings of others. In short, they saw suffering as redemptive, and in this respect they were like Martin Luther King, Jr..

Dr. King fashioned a mass movement that used passive non-violence as an instrument of political and social change, training his followers to set their health and lives at risk so that the American public conscience might be moved to alter the conditions that deprived American blacks of their rights. Speaking to a crowd of 250,000 gathered at the Washington Monument on 28 August 1963, he said,

> I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations, some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells, some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the victims of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.[42]

But this did not mean that King saw all suffering as something to be borne willingly because it may be turned to redemptive purposes. The sufferings of which he spoke in the lines given above was suffering that had been deliberately sought out by those who had thoughtfully and deliberately embraced passive non-violence as the best means by which social reform might be obtained. On the other hand, the suffering imposed on black Americans by racist laws and traditions was not redemptive suffering. When the white clergy of Birmingham, Alabama, publicly urged the blacks of that city to avoid confrontation and to endure a little longer the injustices inflicted on them, King responded with his best remembered piece of writing, the classic "Letter from Birmingham Jail" of 16 April 1963.

> There comes a time when the cup of endurance runs over, and men are no longer willing to be plunged into an abyss of injustice where they experience the bleakness of corroding despair.[43]

Suffering of this kind must be rejected, not endured.

Another important difference between Dr. King and Brother André is that King expected to see the fruits of redemptive suffering harvested in this world, "on this side of Jordan" as the spirituals of his people put it. He told the crowd at the Washington Monument that he aimed to see at least some of the suffering in this world transformed:

> I have a dream that one day down in Alabama with its viscious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification — one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.
>
> I have a dream today.[44]

One is tempted to explain the difference by arguing that King was involved in politics while André had nothing to do with politics, but in fact it is not true that André understood spirituality to be a purely individualistic affair divorced from politics. It is true that he was much less sophisticated about politics than King was, and as a result he was occasionally used by politicians who were shrewder than he in such matters.[45] And it is true that Brother André revealed no personal interest in the ultramontanist movements of his day that sought certain political reforms from religious motives. But he spoke of political matters in both the narrowest and the broadest senses of that term, and he did so at important junctures in his life.

In his dying hours Brother André spoke sadly of the sufferings of the Pope in the face of world events, of the social disruption caused by Communists, of the disastrous civil war in Spain. The "positive thinkers" mentioned on pages 23-25 above never referred to such matters and may be said to be genuinely and completely apolitical, but not so

Brother André. He also spoke of institutional matters (which I consider to be "political" in the broadest sense), including the needs of his own Congregation of Holy Cross and the plans to complete the physical structure of the Oratory. But in only one instance did he say that he expected an end to difficulties, this side of the Second Coming: he announced that he was sure that the Oratory would be completed.[46] And why not? The Oratory was the place to which weary Christians might repair in order to become the kind of adults who might imitate Christ in his suffering. The Oratory was not meant to end suffering.

Martin Luther King, Jr., initiated a popular religious movement that aimed to end or at least to reduce suffering in the world. "Free at last!" is what they said at his funeral, and it is true that both he and his followers expected full freedom to be possible only in an existence that transcends this one. But "Free at last!" was also King's rallying call in a spiritual struggle that expected to see some empirical results, an end to much of the suffering in this world. As I show elsewhere,[47] there were some who saw the Oratory as a place from which social reform might begin, but that was not apparently Brother André's vision. The last words that he uttered on his deathbed illustrate his conviction that the Christian is called to suffer. They reflect a character shaped for the imitation of the suffering Christ by the nurturant care of St. Joseph, but they are the words of an adult who walks that pathway without the shield of St. Joseph to protect him from life as it really is. And they do not promise that the result of suffering will be a better world or a better existence in the here-and-now. They are words that simply summarize Brother André's spirituality, the way of living that a Christian must follow:

"Que je souffre! Mon Dieu! mon Dieu!"[48]

*** *** *** *** *** *** ***

NOTES

1. Neither the Summarium (1084 pages), the later Summarium suppletivum (56 pages), the Mémoire Claude nor the archdiocesan file on the Oratory were made available to me in the course of preparing this study. But Étienne Catta has quoted directly and extensively from them in his monumental work, Le Frère André (1845-1937) et l'Oratoire Saint-Joseph du Mont-Royal (Montréal: Fides, 1965) and I have made grateful use of his study without necessarily drawing the same conclusions. I am, of course, grateful to both the Oratory and to the Archdiocese of Montréal for their patient and generous assistance to me while I consulted the holdings in their archives that are open to the general public.

2. Bernard Lafrenière, C.S.C., vice-postulator of André's cause, in a paper presented at the Oratory in 1976 as part of the preparations for the fortieth anniversary of Brother André's death. Copy made available to me through the courtesy of the author.

3. Annales de Saint Joseph, 16e, no. 3 (février 1927), pp. 67-9.

4. Annales de Saint Joseph, 18e, no. 3 (mars 1929), pp. 92-3.

5. Annales de Saint Joseph, 2e (1913), passim.

6. Catta, Le Frère André, p, xxiii.

7. Annales de Saint Joseph, 18e, no. 3 (mars 1929), pp. 92-3.

8. Annales de Saint Joseph, 26e, no. 2 (février 1937), p. 72.

9. My calculations are based on figures published annually in the monthly issue of the Annales de Saint Joseph for February or March of each year.

10. Walter H. Principe, C.S.B., "Toward defining spirituality," a paper presented to the XIVth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religion (University of Manitoba, 19 August 1980), p. 8.

11. The Autobiography of St. Teresa of Avila, translated and edited by E. Allison Peers (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Image Books, 1960), p. 326.

12. The material on the sacraments is drawn principally from Raphael Schulte, "Sacraments," in Karl Rahner (ed.), Encyclopedia of Theology (New York: The Seabury Press, 1975), pp. 1477-85, and "Sacrament" in F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (eds.), The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (ODCC) (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 1218-9.

13. See David Tracey, Blessed Rage for Order, chapter 9, and Langdon Gilkey, Catholicism Confronts Modernity, chapter VII, both published by The Seabury Press in New York in 1975.

14. See Lumen Gentium, chapter I, article 1, in Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (General Editor), The Documents of Vatican II (New York: America Press, 1966).

15. Ronald Goetz, "The Creature's Creation: Is Art 'Helpful' to Faith?" The Christian Century, Vol. 99, No. 11 (31 March 1982), p. 369.

16. Bruce Barton, The Man Nobody Knows (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, [illegible]).

17. Letter to his father (16 Oct. 1866) in Poems and Prose of Gerard Manley Hopkins, edited by W.H. Gardner (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 167.

18. Tradition has it that the mother of the Emperor Constantine found the steps in Jerusalem and brought them to Rome.

19. Annales de Saint Joseph, 31e, no. 1 (janvier 1942), p. 12.

20. Ibid..

21. See the testimony of witnesses entered in the Summarium or reported from private interviews by Father Catta in Le Frère André, pp. [illegible]-47.

22. Summarium (Catta, Le Frère André, p. 638).

23. Father Cousineau's testimony describes this picture as André's favorite representation of the Virgin. See note 19 and page 13 above.

24. ODCC, p. 1265.

25. Testimony of P. Corbeil in the Summarium (Catta, Le Frère André, p. 530).

26. No. 78, circulaire de Mgr l'archêveque-coadjuteur au clergé du diocèse (14 avril 1937), Mandements. lettres pastorales, circulaires, et autres documents publiés dans le Diocèse de Montréal depuis son érection, tome 18e (1940), p. 535.

27. See, for example, Mme. Guérin in L'Oratoire. 38e, no. 7 (juillet-août 1949), p. 238.

28. M. Robert's testimony in the Summarium (Catta, Le Frère André, p. 602).

29. From the Mémoire deposited by M. Azarius Claude in the confidential archives of the Oratory, and quoted extensively in Catta, Le Frère André, pp. 706-18.

30. Reported in two different versions by Catta, Le Frère André, p. 600, based on interviews conducted in 1958 and 1962.

31. Annales de Saint Joseph, 30e, no. 10 (octobre 1941), pp. 300-1.

32. Quoted by Catta, Le Frère André, p. 589. The emphasis appears in the original: "un miracle de chaque jour."

33. From reports by Père Deguire and A. Claude cited in Catta, Le Frére André, p. 865.

34. Summarium (Catta, Le Frère André), p. 599.

35. Ibid..

36. Donald Meyer, The Positive Thinkers. Religion as Pop Psychology from Mary Baker Eddy to Oral Roberts, revised edition (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

37. Ibid., pp. xii and xix.

38. Ibid., p. 317.

39. The Autobiography of St. Thérèse of Lisieux, translated by John Beevers (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Image Books, 1957).

40. Jean-François Six, Vie de Thérèse de Lisieux (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1975), pp. 307-9.

41. See my manuscript, "The Shaping of Brother André's Spirituality of Suffering."

42. "I Have a Dream," in The Negro in Twentieth Century America, edited by John Hope Franklin and Isidore Starr (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), p. 145.

43. "Letter from Birmingham Jail," in Franklin and Starr, p. 198.

44. "I Have a Dream," p. 146.

45. See my manuscript, "Brother André and the Politics of Labor."

46. Albert Cousineau, "Derniers moments du Frère André," Annales de Saint Joseph, 26e, no. 13 (mars 1937), p. 99.

47. See note 45 above.

48. Cousineau, "Derniers moments du Frère André," p. 100.

*** *** *** *** *** *** ***

"How does the historian establish 'an obvious fact'?

CASE STUDY: "Was John Bunyan a Baptist?"

Joseph D. Ban, Ph.D.
Professor of Christian Ministry
McMaster Divinity College
McMaster University
Hamilton,Ontario, Canada

Was the author of Pilgrim's Progress and The Holy War a Baptist? Macaulay considered these two works to be the finest allegories ever written. Whether the creator was a Baptist or a Congregationalist does not appear to be a question of great importance. At best, it would seem to be a scholar's diversion. Yet, this apparently simple question tests the historian's scientific tool kit. More importantly, it provides valuable insights into seventeenth century Separatist theology and ecclesiology.

John Bunyan, 1628-1688, is generally considered, especially in English-speaking North America, to have been a Baptist preacher. The majority of literary critics, both here and in the United Kingdom, also consider Bunyan to have been a Baptist. Inasmuch as such critics deal primarily with Bunyan's creative products, they depend upon historians to provide the basic biography of the author. British writers, both Baptist and Congregational, claim Bunyan as one of their own.[1] To add to the confusion, some Baptist writers have refused to acknowledge Bunyan as a Baptist pastor or Bedford as a Baptist congregation. While the basic fact appears easy enough to establish, finding supportive evidence and proof turn out to be more difficult.

The research on this question has involved examining what original

Copyright, 1982, Joseph D. Ban.

sources were available in the libraries of Oxford, including the Bodleian, Mansfield College and the Angus Collection at Regents' Park College. I regret that time allowed only a cursory examination of the vast riches of the British Museum in London and the libraries in Bedford, England. This essay traces the development of the biographies of Bunyan from the earliest to the recent period. Lack of biographies certainly is not the problem. Within a decade of his death, an anonymous writer prepared a "Life and Actions of Mr. John Bunyan from his cradle to his Grave." Published in 1698, this was prefixed to the spurious third part of The Pilgrin's Progress. In 1700, a different version appeared, the anonymous author claiming to have been a friend of Bunyan's. The factual material for these early biographies came from Bunyan's own Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners, which, while rich in spiritual insights and psychological disclosures, is scanty in terms of precise, personal details. Autobiographical writings are limited to Grace Abounding and a personal account of his imprisonment not published until 1765, seventy-seven years after his death. Thus the historian has no word from Bunyan on personal matters. For example, what was the name of his first wife? We do know that she brought two books to their household and their titles, namely The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven and The Practice of Piety.[2] Nor does Bunyan provide adequate information about the names or number of his children.

Another biography appeared in 1787, purportedly by a "friend of the gospel". The nineteenth century brought biographies of Bunyan by Joseph Ivimey (1825), Robert Southey (1830), Robert Philip (1839),

G.E. Sargent (1848), Macaulay (1853), George Offor (1862), James Copner (1874), J.A. Froude (1880), Edmund Venables (1888). John Brown's John Bunyan: His Life, Times and Work (1885) by its excellence in research of original records quickly established itself as the standard biography. Important studies in the twentieth century include W. Hale White (1905), C.H. Firth (1911), R.H. Coats (1927), G.O. Griffith (1927), G.B. Harrison (1928) not to be confused with Frank Mott Harrison who, that same year, revised John Brown's biography of 1885. More recent and authoritative biographies include Henri A. Talon (1951), Roger Sharrock (1954) and Richard Greaves (1969). This does not exhaust the list, as a glimpse at the catalogue in the Bunyan Meeting Library will disclose.

Apparently, no biographer had questioned Bunyan as being a Baptist until the appearance of John Brown's work in 1885. Brown's biography, revised by Harrison, remains the definitive study to the present day. Brown was pastor of Bunyan Meeting in Bedford for forty years, from 1864 to 1903. Brown found parish records that appeared to indicate that two of John Bunyan's children had been christened after the date when Bunyan had joined the Bedford congregation. If Brown's surmise were proven accurate, serious doubt would be cast upon Bunyan's status as an anti-paedobaptist.

Within the year, Brown's question brought a published response from across the Atlantic. Thomas Armitage, in his A History of the Baptists, published in New York in 1886, devoted sixty-five pages to a detailed refutation of Brown's conclusions regarding Bunyan's religious connections. The controversy continued in the pages of the religious press. The Freeman: Organ of the Baptist Denomination on August 3,

1888 carried a chapter from a book newly published by a British Baptist attacking Brown's argument. Brown, in turn, launched his attack upon Armitage in the pages of The British Weekly for January 18, 1889. A reply to Brown's article from a Nottingham correspondent appeared February 8, 1889 echoing Armitage's arguments in substance. Contradicting Brown, Armitage concluded that the christened child was the offspring of John Bunyan, Jr. This conclusion fits with a hearth tax record also uncovered by Brown. Armitage and others insist that what we do know about the author, the senior Bunyan, would indicate that just two years out of prison, with his personal financial affairs in a shamble, the elder Bunyan was in no position to pay such a tax. The tax-payer and property-owner was John Junior who conveyed the property to a granddaughter, Hannah, the apparent last survivor of the author of Pilgrim's Progress.[3] W.T. Whitley reviewed the evidence and summarized the affair in this way: "Legal demonstration there is none. The moral probability is extremely high that the man whose child was christened in 1672 was not the Elder of the Gathered Church, but the son John Bunyan junior."[4]

John Brown, a Congregationalist of the nineteenth century assumed that his newly uncovered evidence was proof that one of his predecessors, John Bunyan, was not a Baptist but a Congregationalist two hundred years earlier. Geoffrey Nuttall in his fine study of Visible Saints: The Congregational Way, 1640-1660 states, "'The Congregational way', as it was then called, is not to be taken as in all points identical with what is now (writing in 1957) known as Congregationalism, though this has evolved from it and possesses much in common with it. It is larger

than any denomination in the modern sense. It is, rather, an interpretation of the gospel and a doctrine of the Church."[5] J.W. Ashley Smith provides a useful perspective on what was taking place in Bedfordshire in Bunyan's lifetime. While this phrase is lifted from Ashley Smith's discussion of a history of the dissenting academies, his comment is a reflection upon an earlier time when he speaks of a period "long before the original Congregational movement had separated on the Baptist issue and so at a time when the spiritual predecessors of the Particular Baptists were denominationally indistinguishable from the Congregationalists."[6]

Thus we need to examine how the author and preacher John Bunyan understood the gospel and something of his doctrine of the church and sacraments. Let us approach this matter in three steps: first, Bunyan's initiation into the Bedford religious community; second, the succession of early pastors and their tradition at the Bedford meeting house; third, Bunyan's controversy with the Particular Baptists over the issue of open communion.

Bunyan records his own spiritual pilgrimage in his Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners printed in 1666. It is a record of an individual wrestling with his doubts and remorse; the catalogue of a long travail marked by recurring despair and innumerable crises. This spiritual diary demonstrates a long period of stress filled storms occasionally relieved when divine love broke through the dark of the psychological clouds. Bunyan recounted how he had come to where three or four women were "sitting at a door in the sun, talking about the things of God".[7]

Talon describes the critical value of the affirming community in these words: "membership of a group where his talents as a preacher were called upon helped Bunyan to regain his balance and to reflect the radiancy of the peace he had won."[9]

This brings us to the succession of pastors and their common tradition at the meeting house in Bedford. The first was John Gifford, who, according to the record, "was the main instrument under God, in gathering them into Gospell-fellowship". Bunyan called him "holy Mr. Gifford." Gifford left his mark upon many congregations in Bedfordshire. This remarkable man certainly left an indelible impact upon Bunyan's life and thought. Gifford counselled as a principle of the believers' fellowship together "Faith in Christ; and Holiness of life, without respect to this or that circumstance, or opinion in outward and circumstantiall things." Gifford's insistence that "union with Christ is the foundation of all saints communion: and not any ordinances of Christ, or any judgement or opinion about externals" was reflected in Bunyan's own writing of Water Baptism No Bar to Communion.[10]

John Gifford left a personal testament in which he cautioned the members of the Bedford congregation against divisions over externals. "Concerning separation from the church about Baptisms, laying on of hands, Anoynting with Oyls, Psalmes, or any externals, I charge everyone of you respectively, that none of you be found guilty of this great evil." Gifford recognized the fissiparous tendencies of independent congregations and sought to prevent unnecessary occasions for break-aways. Gifford and his successor John Burton were moderate Baptists.[11] The evidence suggests that under Gifford and Burton, the Bedford congregation

administered believer's baptism to those who desired it, but this was not a condition for communion with the church. Only with Ebenezer Chandler, who succeeded Bunyan, did the congregation begin permitting infants to be baptized. In a letter, dated February 23rd, 1691, Chandler wrote:

> In pursuance of your request, I have here written an account of what the Church hath agreed for since my coming among them, that if I continue I may have my conscience clear towards God, and peace and comfort in my being with you.
> ...Again, with respect to baptism, I have my liberty to baptize infants without making it a business to promote it among others; and every member is to have his liberty in regard to believers' baptism, only to forbear discourse and debates on it that may have a tendency to break the peace of the Church.
> ... We do not mean to make baptism, whether of believers or infants, a bar to communion.

While this evidence appears to have been overlooked by John Brown, F.M. Harrison in his 1928 revision of Brown's work corrected the oversight.

In 1672, after twelve years in prison, Bunyan was released. He was asked to serve as pastor of the Bedford congregation. In that year, he wrote A Confession of My Faith. It expressed his theological convictions with clarity. Near the end of it, he stated his belief that it was not proper to make the baptism of an adult by water the condition for admission into Christian fellowship. Bunyan stated his position in these words: "I believe Christ hath ordained but two (Ordinances) in His Church, viz., water baptism and the Supper of the Lord: both of which are of excellent use to the Church in this world; they being to us representative of the death and resurrection of Christ; and are, as God

shall make them, helps to our faith therein. But I count them not the fundamentals of our Christianity, nor grounds or rule to communion with saints . . . It is possible to commit idolatry even with God's own appointments . . . To make that the door to fellowship which God hath not; yea, to make that the including, excluding charter, the bounds, bar and rule of communion; when by the words of the everlasting testament there is no warrant for it; to speak charitably, if it be not for want of love, it is for want of knowledge in the mysteries of the kingdom of Christ."[13]

It was the faith professed that made a person worthy for communion, not any outward act or religious ritual. Bunyan quoted St. Paul: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter." (Romans 2:28-29) Bunyan similarly distinguished between the spirit and letter of baptism. "He that believeth in Jesus Christ . . . and is dead to sin . . . hath the Heart, Power and Doctrine of baptism; all then that he wanteth, is but the sign, the shadow, or the outward circumstance thereof."[14]

It was not surprising that in an age of printed tracts and theological controversy, Bunyan's credo should inspire quick and heated response. Henry D'Anvers was the first to assault Bunyan's position in a tract on baptism in 1673. Other 'strict-communion' Baptists from London joined in the attack. That same year, Thomas Paul and William Kiffin went into print with Serious Reflections. Bunyan replied to Kiffin and the others

with his Difference in Judgement About Water Baptism No Bar to Communion printed in 1673. Bunyan vigorously denied that he was belittling the ordinance of Baptism. He wrote "All I say is, that the Church of Christ hath not warrant to keep out of their communion the Christian that is discovered to be a visible saint by the word, the Christian that walketh according to his light with God . . . Shew me the man that is a visible believer and that walketh with God, and though he differ with me about baptism, the doors of the church stand open for him and all our heaven born privileges he shall be admitted to them."[15]

In its title, the third of Bunyan's contributions to the controversy, reflected the author's desire for harmony. In 1674, Bunyan's tract, Peaceable Principles and True was published. Sometime afterward, Kiffin was back in print with his Sober Discourse of Right to Church Communion, of which the earliest copy extant was printed in 1681. Bunyan referred to the various attempts made by the stricter Baptists of London to dissuade him from his more open views. "Assault, I say, upon this congregation, by times, for no less than 16 or 18 years, yea, myself they have sent for, and have endeavored to persuade to break communion with my brethren."[16]

As pastor in Bedford, Bunyan remained loyal to the liberal tradition inaugurated by Gifford. As such, the Bedford church was one of a group of Particular Baptist churches that shared a strict Calvinist theology common, as well, to Presbyterian and Congregational congregations of that time. Many of the Particular Baptists were strict, practicing closed-communion, limiting fellowship at the Lord's Table to those who had been baptized as adults upon profession of faith, normally by immersion.

Bedford, however, from its foundation had been an open-communion congregation allowing all who had experienced the saving knowledge of being in Christ, to join at the solemn communion table. Bedford was open communion and it was open membership. For Bedford and for Bunyan, no truly converted Christian, whether baptized or not, should be barred from fellowship and communion. They accepted unbaptized believers provided that such persons demonstrated authentic repentance and an understanding of God's plan and work of salvation in Christ. The Bedford congregation was not alone in their practice. Broadmead Church in Bristol treated baptism as an open question after 1653, though by 1674 most of the members were baptized, yet the church was not exclusively Baptist until 1733. Henry Jessey (d. 1663) church at Southwark in London was another such congregation. The consequence of this was to place Baptists such as Bunyan and Jessey outside the mainstream of the Particular Baptists.

According to Baptist historian A.C. Underwood:

> The controversy explains a great deal. It accounts for Bunyan styling himself as a Congregationalist in applying for licenses under the Act of Indulgence of 1672. Those applications do not prove that Bunyan had adopted infant-baptism; they assert his neutrality on the question. The controversy also explains why Bunyan is claimed by both Congregationalists and Baptists; why his Bedford church finally became pedobaptists and why to this day the Bedfordshire County Union includes both Congregationalists and Baptists. More importantly still, the controversy explains why the man whom all the world knows, had so little influence upon his fellow-Baptists in his own lifetime.[17]

Michael Watts has called Bedford "the most famous of all open membership churches."[18] The congregation still exists as The Bunyan Meeting. The effort to accommodate Baptists and paedobaptists in the same living fellowship has proven divisive at times. When a pastor was converted

to Baptist views in 1773, for example, a part of its Congregational membership seceded. Similarly, twenty years later, nineteen Baptists left when a Congregational minister was appointed. Today the congregation retains the Gifford-Bunyan tradition. Members are not identified on the church roll by denomination. The Church is a full member of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland and remains in full fellowship with the United Reformed Church, formed in 1972 by a Union of Congregationalists and Presbyterians. The Bunyan meeting gives financial support to the Baptist Union and the United Reformed Church and their missionary societies. All that the modern information sheet available to visitors states is that Bunyan was "converted under Gifford's ministry."

The Puritan leader Richard Baxter in 1675 wrote:

> There are two sorts of men called Anabaptists among us: The one sort are sober Godly Christians, who when they are rebaptized to satisfie their consciences, live among us in Christian love and peace; and I shall be ashamed if I love not them as heartily, and own them as peacably, as any of them shall do either me or better men than I, that differ from them. The other sort hold it unlawful to hold communion with such as are not of their mind and way, and are schismatically troublesome and unquiet, in labouring to increase their Party. These are they that offend me, and other lovers of peace."[19]

Richard Greaves argues that "it is, in fact, pointless to attempt to identify (Bunyan) as either a thorough-going Baptist or a staunch Congregationalist in the light of his liberal views on the subject of baptism and church membership."[20] Greaves draws his reader's attention to the reply given by Bunyan when his critics pressed him to declare to which group he actually belonged. Bunyan responded: "Since you would

know by what Name I would be distinguished from others; I tell you, I would be, and hope I am, a Christian."[21]

In conclusion, what can be said about John Bunyan with great certainty? We certainly can say that John Bunyan was a Christian of great compassion, solidly Calvinistic in his theology. Evidence for this is in his own writings, from Grace Abounding down to his tracts in the controversy with Kiffin and the other strict Baptists.

We can also say with some certainty that he was baptized by John Gifford, as attested to by tradition, a tradition supported by the interchange between Bunyan and Kiffin and documented in the literature of the open-communion controversy. As Greaves concludes, "As far as baptism by water was concerned, Bunyan was thoroughly at one with his Baptist controversialists,"[22] especially in Bunyan's insistence that only those should be baptized who had "received the Doctrine of the Gospel" and who had convincingly demonstrated this by their confession of faith. The validity of the Gifford-Bunyan postion was recognized in the appendix to the Regular Baptist Confession of 1677, also adopted by the Assembly in 1689, that read: "We are not insensible that as to the order of God's house and entire Communion therein, there are some things wherein we as well as others are not in full accord amongst ourselves, as for instance, the known principle and conscience of divers of us that have agreed in this confession, is such that we cannot hold Church Communion with any other than baptized believers, and Churches constituted of such, yet some others of us have a greater liberty and freedom in our spirits that way, and therefore we have purposely omitted

the mention of things of that nature, that we might concur in giving this evidence of our agreement, both among ourselves and with other Christians, in those important articles of the Christian religion mainly insisted on by us."[23] Bunyan, however, was not a signatory to this Confession. In resolving this question of affiliation, it is necessary to remember that Bunyan's ministry took place before the Congregationalists and Baptists emerged as recognizable denominations. It is also significant to recognize that he pastored a church that in its polity and ecclesiology resisted the pressure to be denominated as either Congregational or Baptist. In his ecumenical spirit and his evangelical zeal, Bunyan was marching to a different beat than his foes in controversy.

ENDNOTES

[1]Albert Peel, A Hundred Eminent Congregationalists, 1530-1924. London: The Independent Press, Ltd., 1927; John Waddington, Congregational History 1567-1700. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1874; W.T. Whitley, A History of British Baptists. London: Charles Griffin & Company, Limited, 1923; A.C. Underwood, A History of English Baptists. London: The Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, 1947, 1970.

[2]John Bunyan, Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners, par.15.

[3]Thomas Armitage, A History of Baptists. New York: Bryan, Taylor, & Co., 1887, p.496.

[4]W.T. Whitley, "The Bunyan Christening, 1672", Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, Volume II, 1910-1911, pp.255-263.

[5]Geoffrey Nuttall, Visible Saints: The Congregational Way, 1640-1660. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957, p.vii.

[6]J.W. Ashley Smith, The Birth of Modern Education, The Contribution of The Dissenting Academies. London: Independent Press, Ltd., 1954, p.200.

[7]Grace Abounding, par.37.

[8]Robert Philip, The Life, Times and Characteristics of John Bunyan. London: George Virtue, 1839, p.207; Robert Southey, The Pilgrim's Progress With a Life of John Bunyan. London: John Murray and John Major, 1830.

[9]Henri A. Talon, John Bunyan. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Published for the British Council and the National Book League, 1956, p.10.

[10]John Bunyan, Differences in Judgement About Water-Baptism No Bar to Communion. London: 1673.

[11]John Jukes, A Brief History of Bunyan's Church. Bedford, 1849.

[12]John Brown, John Bunyan (revised by Frank Mott Harrison). London: The Hulbert Publishing Company (Limited), 1928, p.236.

[13]A Confession of My Faith, Offor, Vol. III, pp.604,613.

[14]Works, II, 609.

[15]Works, Offor, III, pp.617,641.

[16]Works, Offor, II, 618.

[17]A.C. Underwood, A History of English Baptists, p.104.

[18]Michael R. Watts, The Dissenters From the Reformation to the French Revolution. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, p.319.

[19]Frederick J. Powicke, A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter, 1615-1691. London: Jonathan Cape, Ltd., 1924, p.227.

[20]Richard Greaves, John Bunyan. Appleford, Abingdon, Berkshire: The Sutton Courtney Press, 1969, p.22.

[21]Peaceable Principles and True, Vol. II, p.103; cf. 'Do not have too much company with some Anabaptists, though I go under that name myself.' Heavenly Footman, Works, Offor, Vol. III, p.383.

[22]Greaves, John Bunyan, p.23.

[23]George Gould, "A Discourse Delivered in St. Mary's Chapel, Norwich: The Baptists in Norwich and Open Communion". . . 3rd June 1860. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1860, p.2. (Angus Collection, Regents' Park College, Oxford University, File box: 5d6 item z.). See also Ernest Payne, Fellowship of Believers. London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1952, pp.77f.

LANGE HINNERK AND HIS FOLK

Vincent O. Erickson
University of New Brunswick

A fairly complete record is available in the state archives in Aurich and in Groningen, as well as in published materials of the early 1740's which makes it possible to see the environment, the life, and the activities of Hinrich Jansen, a religious leader in Freepsum, East Frisia, in perspective. While Hinrich Jansen is by no means a stranger to those interested in the religious history of East Frisia and the Netherlands, new interpretations can be made about the pietistically oriented revitalization movement of this tall and handsome charismatic leader and the relationship of this movement to both the established Reformed Church of the day and to the secular authorities. A longer version of this paper which was presented at the meetings of the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Netherlandic Studies in London, Ontario, in 1978 has been published in the July 1981 issue of _Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift_. The shorter version here presented hopes to point out some of the major findings and to provide a summary for readers who may not have access to the longer version.

The Weihnachtsflut and its Aftermath

The career of Hinrich Jansen, the Freepsum farmer, becomes meaningful only if it is seen within the context of the disasterous Weihnachtsflut and of the events following the catastrophy of 1717. The flood continued to have reverberations on regional economics for three decades or more. The rebuilding of the dikes, itself, took only six years, but the debts the farmers acquired through having to replace their livestock and other goods, and to provide for their daily needs in the bad years when no crops could be raised on the salt-drenched soils, were great.[1] Even a greater hardship proved to be the exorbitant dike and drainage assessments which the farmers had to pay for years to cover the costs accrued in making the land arable again. Between the years 1717 and 1750, many farmers were reduced to pauperism.

In 1727, soon after the dikes were rebuilt, another misfortune occurred. This was civil war in East Frisia, the Appelkrieg.[2] Loyalties were divided between those faithful to the Luthern Count of East Frisia, Georg Albrecht, and the Calvinist aristocrat, Heinrich Bernhard von dem Appelle, of Gross-Midlum a village in the Krummhörn, the area north of Emden in western East Frisia. While most of the Krummhörn farmers supported von dem Appelle, all suffered financial losses because of the

war, just when many fields were beginning to produce a crop again. Tensions remained high between the two groups and, although winner, the count was powerless and could not turn his renitent Krummhörn farmers into loyal subjects again.

A third factor, minor in comparison with the other two, was the unusual weather conditions in East Frisia in 1739-1740.[3] In 1739 the grain harvest was poor. During the winter of 1739-1740 many cattle perished in the stables of hunger. After two bad seasons the farmers seems to have been exceedingly anxious about the prospects of the third. Anxieties were high. Under such conditions people are prone to turn to a leader who appears to have special links with the supernatural. Hinrich Jansen appears to have filled this need.

<u>Conditions in Freepsum</u>

In addition to the general situation outline above which pertained to the entire Krummhörn, some more local events applied specifically to the Reformed community of Freepsum during the years 1717-1741 when Hinrich Jansen was formulating his religion.

The behavior of the Freepsum clergy was such that many members of the community found it difficult, if not impossible,

to see the clergy as a role model to be emulated.[4] Lambertus Swarte, pastor between 1718 and 1725, was removed from office because of fleischlicher Vergehen (adultry or rape). Walrich Reining, his successor, was an alcoholic and because of slandering involved in court cases. Jansen was among the parishioners who expressed a dissatisfaction with this pastor.[5] No complaints seem to have been lodged against Reining's successor, Johann Jacob Munnig (1733-1740), an older man who perhaps chose to allow matters to follow their natural course in the community. He died in office.[6] Choosing a successor for Munnig brought friction into the community, as two factions existed. One favored Theodorus Weerman, the other-a smaller group of which Jansen was a member - did not.[7] Weerman was invited as pastor. After he arrived, ecclesiastical action in Freepsum and personal attacts against Jansen increased in intensity.

In addition, the Freepsum church experienced fiscal problems[8] which contributed to a weakening of community solidarity. The church appears to have become unusable following the flood of 1717, and the pastor was forced to make his rounds to the dispersed farms and there to conduct services to which only the closest neighbors could attend.

Although the entire Krummhörn was experiencing harsh times following the Christmas Eve Flood of 1717, we see that Freepsum

had additional problems. It is in settings such as this that religious movements arise. They represent dissatisfaction with existing conditions and suggest ways of providing relief for the distraught and disillusioned individual by suggesting relief from these wrongs.[9] For Hinrich Jansen this appears to have begun to take shape in 1730 or 1731, because the former year is the last time his name is recorded in the Freepsum church books.[10] If children were born to him and his wife after this date, the couple refused to allow them to be baptized.

Hinrich Jansen, the Man

As closely as can be determined, Hinrich Jansen was born around 1685, possibly of Lutheran parents.[11] By 1724 he was in Gross-Midlum attached to the von dem Appelle estate.[12] In that year he made the successful bid on the lease (1725-1730) of the Grashaus Coldeweer in Freepsum, one of the count's many domains. By early January 1727, Jansen was already in arrears on the payment of his taxes,[13] but this was paid by June. In 1729 he was behind in the payment of his rent. He wrote a letter to the count in polished High German expressing his inability to pay both taxes and rent on a farm which apparently had yet to produce a crop following the flood. By December 1731, Jansen was put in custody for non-payment of his bills.[14]

Soon he had escaped from prison, but his property was sold at public auction to cover his debts.

By 1733 a new leaser for Coldeweer had been found. This man was freed from the responsibility of having to pay diking and drainage assessments. Meanwhile, at the age of 47 or 48, Jansen returned to Freepsum to work an unidentified farm. Nevertheless, he does not appear among the village Interessenten.[15] By 1735 Coldeweer was leased to yet another person Hinrich Hansen, who unlike his predecessors became a successful farmer, Jansen being now virtually penniless. The two men were and remained enemies. As strongly as Hansen supported Pastor Weerman, Jansen reproached him.

If conditions were bad on the East Frisian Marsh, they were worse in Freepsum but disasterous for Jansen. By 1740 his religious movement was well underway, to which Weerman and Hansen were leading opponents.[16] There were numerous other persons in near-by villages, moreover, who -- feeling that the world did not treat them correctly -- had become Jansen's followers and attended the pietistically oriented house assemblies which he called. Collectively his followers became known as the Lange-Hinnerks-Volk.

The Lange-Hinnerks-Volk and Their Activities

By 1733-1734, if not earlier, Jansen began to hold conventicles. Pastor Hessling, who died in 1734, makes reference to the house assemblies Jansen held in Grimersum.[17] Hessling disliked these conventicles because they advocated the collective ownership of property. He was also disturbed because of the rumors he had heard of Jansen having committed adultery.

Other Krummhörn clergy, Garbrands of Manslagt and Eilshemius of Uttum, supported Jansen's house meetings, suggesting not only that they involved edifying discussion of the Bible but also that the character of those who attended was above reproach.[18]

Reports came to the authorities that a woman who attended Jansen's meetings had become mentally ill because of it. Pastor van Santen of Grimersum said, however, that he knew of a case in which a woman gave up her suicidal tendencies because she attended these conventicles.

By 1739, Emden's Calvinist church fathers became concerned about the impact Jansen was having in their parishes.[19] The clergy were asked to make visits to those who attended Jansen's meetings and to try to get these persons back into the fold. Among the most frequently mentioned was a Peter Diedemann, Jansen's second in command, who worked as a cobbler in the city of Emden.

In some villages of the Krummhörn Jansen's followers had an even greater impact in their communities than they did in Emden. His followers attended services in the community church only to create disorder. They interrupted the clergy during the sermons, prayers and the administration of the sacrements with statements like "Lier, you are damned," or "You present no truth" and then would leave the church in a noisy huff.[20] Jansen had come to be seen by his followers, numbering in the hundreds, as a special messanger of God, and because of his prophecies as a reformer.

The Consistory of Emden called him before them to write a statement of his beliefs. This he did in his Annotatien, a document written in Dutch of some sixteen hand written pages, each passage documented with appropriate Bible verses.[21]

Some of the main points of Jansen's beliefs are summarized as the following:[22]

1) What the Bible tells is the imagination of man. The Bible tells things not as they are but as man imagines them to be.

2) God is the life and the single power of all creation. All things come through him and must return to him.

3) The Trinity does not exist. Christ is only a saint, not the spiritual son of God. It is absurd to say that the Holy Ghost is the third part of the devine being.

4) Christ has not existed since the beginning of the world but only since the time he was conceived by Mary.

5) Everything which happens, both good and bad, is dependent upon God's wishes and actions.

6) Man has no free will. Everything man does is really done by God himself through the human medium. If a man commits murder, it is really God doing it. Man only imagines that he himself performs the act.

7) Good angels are the souls of persons who were blessed before they died: devils are only the souls of bad persons.

8) Sins and the like consist only in that man imagines that he has sinned and fails to recognize that the evil act has come from God.

9) If a believer falls into sin, it is God working in him to make the sinner more modest.

10) Prayer, the sacrements, religious orders, and all religious institutions are useless things.

11) The only religious truth is that which comes through devine inspiration. God selects certain people to act through. These are believers and children of God and are the ones who teach and believe only like Hinrich Jansen.

12) It is useless and a hypocrisy to ask for revelation and grace before God saves one.

13) The Protestant church is undergoing a very dark period. It needs a reformation, for the Babylonian hore sits upon the throne.

14) All heathens and Jews will eventually be saved. In the future there will be no godless persons.

15) The believers and followers of Hinrich Jansen will take control within a short time, and the clergy and others who oppose him will be flailed to death.

Following the presentation of the Annotatien, Jansen was again called before the Consistory, and attempts were made to get him to recant. It was to no avail ! In despair the Consistory turned to Carl Edzard, Count of East Frisia. On May 10, 1740, the count appointed Pastor Weerman of Freepsum to instruct Jansen on the principles of acceptable Christianity, and to report back the results.[23]

As Weerman met with no success, and as Jansen refused to change his views when questioned by a special commission established at the capital in Aurich, the count on August 31, 1740, presented a judgment that Jansen must leave East Frisia within eight days and never return.[24] Jansen, in turn, declared that he would leave only if his Heavenly Father revealed this to him. Jansen also prophesied that within four years East Frisia would become a waste land and that "Baal's followers" (all those who were not Jansen's followers) would be beheaded.[25]

Within a short time Jansen was escorted to the Knock placed in a small boat to cross the Dollart - the bay which separates Germany from Holland - to Termunten. Before long, however, Jansen was back, carrying the message that he had received a prophecy which told him to come home.[26]

In November 1740 the authorities captured Jansen at Middelstewehr, and he was again exiled to Groningen. Jansen now claimed that only 1 1/2 years remained before "it would end in fire and murder."[27]

By February of the next year Jansen was again in Freepsum. In March he was brought to Aurich and put in prison. The count now formulated a plan to guarantee that Jansen would never return. He wrote a letter to the authorities in Groningen to enquire as to the cost of trial and detention there.[28] The return report must have been satisfactory, because in April the count sent a directive to the administrators in Amt Emden, the administrative district of which Freepsum is a part, saying that Jansen's property was to be seized and auctioned off to pay for costs resulting from his capture and banishment.[29]

By the summer of 1741, Jansen had been escorted to Groningen. On August 26, 1741, he was imprisoned at Jacobus Scholten's <u>Tughthuis</u> in the city of Groningen.[30] Jansen's second in command, the cobbler Peter Diedemann of Emden, had already been exiled to Groningen in April, 1741. Diedemann maintained his freedom in rural Groningen for about ten months propagating his "Spinozistic and other pernicious beliefs" at Wildervank.[31]

On January 12, 1742, Diedemann appeared on trial at Zuidbroek in the Oldambt and, too, was sentenced to prison. Jansen died in the Groningen prison in 1751. His deciple died there in 1757.

The Decline of the Movement in East Frisia

With the two leaders effectively removed from East Frisia, the followers of Jansen became less disruptive to the traditional religious life of the communities in which they lived. Nevertheless, the movement continued to simmer in the Krummhörn for a number of years, especially in the former Uckowallist strongholds of Grimersum and Wirdum. In one particularly well-documented case, two of the followers of Jansen were sons of an Uckowallist who had converted to the Reformed church in 1696 upon marrying a woman of the Calvinist faith. In 1744 one of these young men experienced an unusual death by lightening. His brother, also a Jansen follower, who formerly had not permitted his children to be baptized, saw this as a sign of God and took a change of heart. When his next child was born a few months later, the parents not only allowed the infant to be baptized, but in church the father publically recanted his former doctrinal errors.[32]

In the following years the movement continued to lose momentum. Nevertheless, a 1779 publication carried the following observation about the Lange-Hinnerks-Volk:[33]

> There was a certain Hinrich, a farmer.... who founded a sect, of which now and then a few families still adhere --- partially openly, partially secretly, but now in general are Spinozists and Pantheists.

When Bartels, the general superintendent of the East Frisian church, sent letters to Krummhorn clergymen in 1889 to determine what, if anything, remained of the Lange-Hinnerks-Volk, he received replies that not only did some of the oldest parishioners remember hearing about them from grandparents, but also that the spirit of the movement still remained in some farm families.[34]

Notes

1 Cf. Gerhard Ohling, "Kulturgeschichte des Krummhörn," In Jannes Ohling,ed.,*Die Acht und ihresieben Siele* (Pewsum: Selbstverlag [I, Entwässerungsverband Emden, Sitz Pewsum], 1963), pp. 75-82.

2 Cf. Heinrich Schmidt, *Politische Geschichte Ostfrieslands* (Leer: Gerhard Rautenberg, 1975 [Volume V of *Ostfriesland im Schutze des Deiches*]), pp. 318 ff.

3 Cf. Tileman Dothias Wiarda, *Ostfriesische Geschichte* [Band VIII] (Aurich: August Friedrich Winter, 1798), p. 96.

4 Cf. Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv in Aurich, Dep. LIII, Bartels Nr. 51 [Sammelband betr. Lange Hinderk, R. Bluhm, Ecclesiastica, gedruckte Miscellen].

5 *Ibid*. Cf. Peter Friedrich Reershemius, *Ostfriesländisches Prediger-Denkmal* ... *reformirten Prediger* (Aurich: 1774), p. 75.

6 Reershemius, pp. 75 and 209.

7 Bartels, Dep LIII Nr. 51.

8 Cf. Niedersachsisches Staatsarchiv in Aurich. Dep.LIII, Bartels Nr. 8 [Handschriftliche Materialien u. Zusammenstellung zur ostfr. Kirchengeschichte].

9 Anthony Wallace, Religion: *An Anthropological View* (New York: Random House, 1966), p. 34.

10 Archive of the Parish of Freepsum, Kirchenbuch von Freepsum 1713 - pp. 7, 9.

11 Cf. Anon. "Summarische Nachricht von einer in Ostfriesland entstandenen Rotte neuer Schwärmer und Libertiner," in *Acta Historico-Ecclesiastica*, Vol. 5:2 (1740), p. 14.

12 Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv in Aurich, Rep. 28, Nr.239a Item 84. [Coldewehr 1724-1742].

13 Ibid., item 20.

14 Ibid., item 53.

15 Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv in Aurich, Rep 28, Nr. 3508. [Meentebuch von Freepsum 1731-1805]. The *Interessenten* were men who, because of their property or wealth, participated in decision making activities pertaining to the community. They occupied village and church positions such as that of mayor, church warden and overseer to the poor and selected the pastor and the schoolmaster.

16 General superintendent Bartels, "Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Pietismus in Ostfriesland und den benachbarten Landschaften," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* Vol. 5 (1882), p. 285.

17 Bartels, Dep. LIII Nr. 51.

18 *Ibid.*

19 Archive of the Parish of the Reformed Church of Emden (Neue Kirche). Kirchenratsprotokolle der ref. Kirche Emden. 1738-1740, p. 104a.

20 Anon. "Fortsetzung des Berichts von der in Ostfriesland unlängst entstandenen Rotte neuer Schwärmer und Libertiner," in *Acta Historico-Ecclesiastica* Vol. 5:6 (1741), p. 216.

21 Two copies are still in existence. They are at the Niedersachsisches Staatsarchiv in Aurich: Dep LIII, Bartels Nr. 51 and in the Privatarchiv von Stiekelkamp.

22 Cf. also Menno Smid, *Ostfriesische Kirchengeschichte*. Weener: H. Risius, 1974 [Volume VI of *Ostfriesland im Schutze des Deiches*], p. 378f.

23 Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv in Aurich Rep. 28, Nr. 3500 [Emder Amtsprotokolle 1738-1752], p. 132.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 152.

25 *Acta Historico-Ecclesiastica* Vol 5:2 (1740), p. 23.

26 *Acta Historico-Ecclesiastica* Vol 5:6 (1741), p. 213.

27 Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv in Aurich, Rep. 28, Nr. 3627, Vol. III [Greetsieler Amtsprotokolle], p. 581.

28 *Op. cit.* Emder Amtsprotokolle, p. 183.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 185.

30 Staatsarchiv Groningen, Archieven Hoge Justitie Kamer, Inv. Nr. 2 F2 Registratie boeken van opgenomen tuchtelingen... 1670-1814, p. 57.

31 Staatsarchiv Groningen, Rechterlijke Archieven, Nr. Vss Crimineel Prothocol van het Oldambt 1719-1768, p. 124.

32 Anon. "Fegter III, des Stammes Geerdes, aus Wirdumer Neuland in Ostfriesland," in *Deutsches Geschlechterbuch* Vol. 59 (1928) p. 47, footnote 24. Cf. also Bartels, *op. cit.* 1882, p. 284.

33 Anon. *Ueber den Religionszustand in den Preussischen Staaten seit der Regierung Friedrichs des Grossen*. Vol 4 (1779).

34 Dep LIII, Bartels, Nr. 8.

The Canadianisation of a Scottish Church: The Reverend William Proudfoot and the Canadian Frontier

by Stewart D. Gill

In reference to the Presbyterian aspect of the Scots experience in Canada, Professor John S. Moir has written that "of the endless themes begging for investigation only a handful have been examined".[1] One of the themes which has been written about at a considerable length is that of the Canadianisation of the churches in Canada, however, it is the kind of controversial subject which begs constant revision.[2]

Professor Stanford Reid has emphasized the "Scottish Protestant Tradition" in Canada, especially in the Presbyterian church, as being essential in shaping the Scotch-Canadian.[3] He goes so far as to suggest that "since the Scottish Protestant tradition in the past has made men strong to do great things, perhaps it is time that Scots began to look back to the rock whence they have been hewn to renew their strength and the spiritual vitality upon which their forefathers drew with such effect".[4] Professor Moir, however, has suggested that perhaps we have hidden ourselves in the rock of Scottish tradition for too long and should be more aware of the distinctive Canadian features within churches.[5] This paper is an attempt to look at the extent to which one man and the Canadian frontier may have had an influence in creating a Canadian church out of a "Scottish tradition".

One cannot deny that the religious experience has been important in the creation of the Canadian, however, as the young professor, Solly Bridgetower, expresses in Robertson Davies' Leaven of Malice:

> Why does a country like Canada, so late upon the international scene, feel that it must rapidly acquire the trappings of older countries - music of its own, pictures of its own, books of its own, (to this one could add a religion of its own) - and why does it fuss and stew, and storm the heavens with its outcries when it does not have them? [6]

The simple answer is the desire for a national identity, and a sense of belonging and history. "For does not the strength of a state much consist in the quantity and quality of its national feelings so thickly generated, and so genially nourished, as by imagination bringing back the very dead - the good and the great of former ages - and brightening up from oblivion the incidents, events, changes, revolutions, customs, manners, morals, poetry, and religion that constituted the life of our ancestors, and gave them a distinctive character among nations?"[7]

Confederation did create Canada as a "supreme act of faith" but it also created the role of nation builder for the historian, that few have resisted.[8] Unfortunately, the study of nationalism is like a muddy river, and even with a pure source it quickly tends to become silted in the mainstream of nationalist thought.

The Reverend William Proudfoot, a missionary of the United Secession Church of Scotland in south-western Ontario, has been portrayed as an example of a Scottish immigrant, in mid-nineteenth century Upper Canada, who was aware of a developing sense of Canadian identity.[9] This interpretation of Proudfoot has grown out of his call for a native ministry and the creation of a Canadian church as expressed in a letter which he wrote, in 1846, to David Anderson, one of the deputies of the United Secession who visited Canada during the summer of 1846:

> I should not be surprised if you return home without knowing that Canadians have a national character of their own. England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany and France, and the United States have each contributed a portion of its own national character to the Canadian, and the compound made of these elements is unlike them all. Now to full efficiency in Canada a minister must be a Canadian. An imported preacher is a foreigner, and never will enlist in his favour the sympathies of the general community.
>
> It has been a great hindrance to our success that we have kept up the Scotch character. We are too Scotch - our habits, our brogue, our mode of sermonising are all too Scotch. The thistle is everywhere seen; we have effected no lodgement in the public mind... As at present constituted our mission is a foreign affair. And it will be so till we employ the country-born, divest it of Scotch character and make it Canadian.
>
> I beg that you will also take into consideration that

> the connection of Canada with Britain is merely a question of time. The whole course of events since I came to the country and especially since the rebellion has been towards a separation from the Mother country and what will become of the principles of the Secession if that event should take place and we have not a native ministry. 10

He was not the first British clergyman to voice an opinion on the need for a native ministry or British clergy who were willing to adapt to the highly fluid society of Upper Canada. By and large, as a response to the lack of a supply of British missionaries, the Anglicans and other Presbyterian bodies had voiced similar concerns about theological education in the colonies and had reacted, as would Proudfoot eventually, by setting up Canadian seminaries.[11]

The creation of an independent Canadian school of divinity is an important step in defining the creation of a Canadian church, however, it is only a symptom of a developing sense of independence and part of a process that can be divided into three themes. First, the idea of Canadianisation is conceived and then the idea of Canadian ecclesiastical independence is received or accepted by the church. These are really an interpretation or manifestation of the third factor which is to believe in, and become a "Canadian" churchman or a member of

a "Canadian" church. John Moir describes the process as "psychological Canadianism", and it is, in reality, a search for identity.[12]

The first manifestation of the idea of Canadianisation in Canadian churches usually came about in the call for a seminary for the education of native clergy. The problem of recruiting and educating native ministers was one which was foremost in Proudfoot's mind. Within a month of arriving in Canada he was already writing of his solution for the problems faced by Presbyterians:

> The only legitimate way of curing the evil (as far as I see) is to educate a race of ministers so far above the common level as that they shall give a tone to the public mind and thus by the goodness of the article beat out of the field all half-bred adventurers. (The Methodists.) 13

Initially, until 1836, he held out some hope that the church in Canada could be served by an increase in the recruitment of Scottish missionaries but increasingly he became more disillusioned as the number of ministers willing to leave Scotland remained small.[14] A feeling of superiority among Scottish theologians had persuaded them to dismiss the idea of educating youths from the colonial backwoods for the Presbyterian ministry

and the Church of Scotland was especially dogmatic on this point by refusing to recognise any minister not trained in a Scottish university.[15]

In 1844, at the May meeting of the Missionary Synod, the Committee of Education finally recommended the creation of a Canadian divinity school. Proudfoot was appointed as the first professor and, with some apprehension, he accepted, fearful that a refusal would hold up the creation of the school.[16] Based upon his own theological training in Scotland, he expressed the view that the new Divinity Hall provided as good if not better training than that given anywhere, including the home of the secession.[17] It is obvious, however, from his letter to David Anderson in 1846, that the effect of the new Hall was not like the coming of spring after a long Canadian Arctic winter, and it was not the church's deliverer from its overt Scottishness.[18]

In 1849, at the Synod meeting it was decided to take advantage of the change in status of King's College, in Toronto, whereby it became a provincial university, to allow the church's students to attend the university for a liberal arts education.[19] Proudfoot, it was argued would then be free to concentrate solely

upon the teaching of theology. The prospect of a less arduous schedule did not appeal to the reverend professor who opposed the move from London to Toronto on several grounds.

Through the Draper Bill, which initiated the creation of the University of Toronto, he saw the Anglicans maintaining an unfair advantage over all other denominations, in their possession of Upper Canada and King's College. "The whole of the difficulty," he argued, "has come out of the Episcopalian sect believing that the University was made for them and not for the country... and this bill (the Draper Bill) is so framed as to secure to them all that they have got and send the other denominations to seek."[20] Rather meekly, the Church of Scotland also opposed the creation of the "secular" university, expressing no faith in an educational institution created on a non-religious basis.

He opposed the move to Toronto partly because of the expense that would be incurred in moving, but also out of a concern for the welfare of his London congregation which would be without his ministry. The health of his students was also uppermost in his mind, as classes would commence to meet in August which was a particularly unhealthy month in Toronto. His principle

reason for not moving was a general unwillingness to uproot himself from a daily routine, which is not unusual for a man in his sixty second year.[21]

While in London there were never more than four students enrolled in the school at any one time and, consequently, the college could not fill the requirements of the growing mission in Canada. After the move to Toronto there was no great increase in enrolment and, therefore, in the 1855 session there was only one student of the fourth year in attendance, two of the third, three of the second, and four of the first.[22] In 1856, there were thirteen students enrolled but not one of those in first year courses was a Canadian. On a comparative basis, however, the Hall graduated twenty six students in the period 1844 to 1861 while Queen's only produced fifteen ministers for the Church of Scotland in twenty five years.[23] Unfortunately, nativeness, like successful churches, cannot merely be counted in terms of numbers but to what extent did the graduates conceive of themselves as being Canadian and did this show forth in a spirit of independence?

The Church in Synod, after Proudfoot's death in 1851, had no conviction that the next Professor of Theology should be

one of their own number. The spirit of independence that had flowed through Proudfoot did not touch the governing body of the church but rather, they thought, that it would be in the best interests of the Canadian church to consult with the Scottish Synod and, on their recommendation, appoint an influential person from Scotland.[24] Dr. John Taylor, minister of Auchtermuchty, was judged "a person peculiarly fitted, from his many and varied attainments, to discharge the onerous and very responsible duties of this important office."[25]

Although the Canadian church did not appoint a Canadian or Scottish-Canadian professor, the creation of Divinity Hall to train a native ministry can be seen in the light of the kindling of an awareness of the necessity to be independent. Without financial self sufficiency, however, the church could hardly claim to be independent of the mother church. At the 1844 meeting of the Missionary Synod, Proudfoot presented a letter from Dr. McKerrow of the United Associate Synod in Scotland outlining new plans for the financial support of the church in Canada.[26] The Scottish Church had provided grants directly to Canadian ministers but, with the new plan, the money would be paid to the Canadian Synod and distribution of the funds was placed in their power.[27] By 1855, the Canadian Synod could finally call itself self-supporting and while it expressed its thanks to the

the Scottish church it also conveyed its reluctance to accept further financial aid from a mother which it had outgrown.[28]

One of the best expressions of a developing sense of autonomy was William Proudfoot's Presbyterian Magazine which was founded in 1844 to give expression to the Canadian church's views. In the first edition the editors presented their reasons for publishing in the belief that the United Secession in Scotland approached closer to the Apostolic Standard than any other church and that they had a duty, not only to remain faithful to the truth of the gospels and the "iteration of the great principles of the Christian Faith" but also "to indoctrinate the numerous young persons in their Churches, that their faith may not be the faith of habit and prejudice, but of enlightened conviction."[29]

The principle of voluntarism was also expressed in the first edition of the magazine in the sense that the church should remain independent from all outside influences. Voluntarism, as Proudfoot understood it, "is one of those simple but powerful principles which bring about vast revolutions." To be sure, the principle of voluntarism is the key to understanding the secessionists in Upper Canada and the final test as to what extent Proudfoot was "Canadianised" and his church was equipped

for the conditions that it met on the frontier would appear to lie in the attitudes, like voluntarism, with which they tackled problems.

If Proudfoot conceived of his church as having to be different from its parent body to be effective in North America and the church responded by adopting measures which asserted its independence from the Scottish church was it merely an outward recognition of the need for change or was there a transformation of the spirit into a belief that the Atlantic did make a difference and that a new set of values were required? Was Proudfoot outwardly attempting to be Canadian while his heart and soul were still spiritually Scottish?

The issue upon which the church took its strongest voluntarist stand was over the clergy reserves but as this has been well documented elsewhere attention will be given to other issues.[30] The secessionist, United Presbyterian Church, according to John Moir, led the way in supporting a provincial secular system of education devoid of religious teaching.[31] Proudfoot, in a letter to the Warden of the London District, responded to the latter's assertion that religion and education were inseparable in the following fashion:

> A common school is a school for all. A school which the children of all may attend. But the children of all cannot be sent to it, if any particular system of belief is to be taught. Religion in general is professed by nobody. Every person who makes a profession of religion (is) professing the religion of a sect. And the religion of that sect is the whole of religion to him.
>
> I agree that there is a knowledge and a principle necessary to man's acting his part as a rational and accountable being, but I deny that knowledge and principle ought to be taught at a Common School. At a Common School, education, in the sense in which you understand it, ought not to be given, but the means of "acquiring it", which you say is not education but which I maintain is all that can be taught satisfactorily to the children of all denominations, and all that ought to be taught at schools supported out of the public funds and intended to be a public benefit. 32

In the letter, Proudfoot took the voluntarist stand of secessionist church in his view that the state should be responsible for public education but that there could be no common religion. He was fearful that Egerton Ryerson and his Methodist cohorts intended that religion should be taught in all common schools and that they ought to direct the superintending. God, Proudfoot would have insisted, did not intend to lead every man by the same road in Canada, and, although critical of some denominations, especially the Methodists, he justified denominationalism since he believed that it was best for churches to

maintain, and contend for the truths which they had attained. In time, he argued, according to the orderings of Divine Providence, circumstances would occur which would "bring together all who love the truth, and remove whatever of blindness may adhere to them."[33] There was no room in Proudfoot's mind for subservience to a state's political or religious system, especially in matters of public education.

It was a common saying amongst seceders that "the Church of Christ ought to be the freest society on earth." This was indicative of the democratic spirit embodied in the Secession Church and one which had an effect upon Proudfoot. In Scotland, secessionists while not identifying themselves with any political party or condoning any attempt to overthrow the government "whenever it thought that great principles were endangered, such as the existence of national or personal freedom, or the maintenance of national purity, then it let its voice be heard with clear strong accent not only in Church Courts, but through its representative men on political and public platforms."[34]

Proudfoot expressed his political views openly in newspaper articles, letters and in his diary and soon after his arrival in Canada he emerged as one of the leaders of the radicals in south-western Ontario. He was never a fence sitter but always

managed to remain aloof from partisan politics and from such a position could be critical of all sides. A good example of his vitriolic prose can be found in the draft of an article which he wrote for the London Inquirer:

> To hear many talk one would be led to suppose that the curse of a family compact is peculiar to Canada - that it has been engendered and reared up to maturity by causes which exist no where else. But the fact is, that there has ever been, and is, and ever will be, a family compact in every country. It is observed with characteristic sagacity by Jefferson "The parties of Whig and Tory are those of nature. They exist in all countries, whether called by these names, or by those of aristocrats and democrats - cote droit and cote gauche - ultras and radicals, serviles and liberals. The suckly, weakly, timid man fears the people, and is a Tory by nature; - the healthy strong and bold cherishes them, and is formed a Whig by nature." The Reformers must lay their account with the determined hostility of that faction, the great enemy to improvement any where. All sorts of working above ground and under will be resorted to by them. There cannot be a greater delusion than to suppose that they will abandon one iotta of their exclusiveness, till it is wrenched from them. Hitherto they have contrived to spread the belief that they only are attached to British principles and that all that differ from them are rebels while it is well known that in most instances they are profoundly ignorant of it, and that they affect attachment to it, only that they may enjoy the advantages of exclusiveness. Were the government of Britain to touch their emoluments they would curse it to its face.
> Reformers beware of them. 35

Perhaps not surprisingly, the article never appeared in print because, according to the editor, it did not express enough praise for the governor.

He did not approve of many of the government's policies and while he would not actively promote rebellion, at the same time, his rhetoric did little to discourage those already set on such a course in 1837. In the insurrections of that year several of his congregation and friends had to flee Canada, and his nephew, James Aitchison, was sent into exile.[36] The free thinking and independence that residents of the south-west demonstrated distinguishes them from the rest of the province and it is not surprising that the strongest roots of Ontario Grittism were dug deep in the soil of the early American and, among British immigrants, Scottish settlers.[37] Among the Scottish settlers, however, a distinction must be drawn between adherents of the Church of Scotland and the secessionists. Peter Russell has suggested that the reaction of the Kirk's clergy to the conditions that they encountered on the frontier was to turn them towards conservatism.[38] He writes:

> These Clergy (the Church of Scotland) saw the emigrants, especially their Scottish countrymen, in a crisis of cultural transmission. The sense that the settlers (or more often their children) were about to slip out of civilised ways produced a pressing sense of the need not only to organise congregations, but to found librarries and promote schools. It was that emerging program of state-funded cultural inststutions which drew the Church of Scotland clergy and laity to the provincial executive which shared their goals, if not their ideas of the necessary means. 39

While Proudfoot and the secessionists were no less interested in the well being of their Scottish flocks, the idea of voluntarism was always predominant. In terms of social control one of the prime concerns of all churches was the debilitating effect of drink. Russell portrays Proudfoot as a vigorous promoter of temperance societies in order to demonstrate that he was in sympathy with his Church of Scotland contemporaries who emphasized the importance of controlling moral and social decay.[40] Contrary, however, to Russell's portrayal, he was no ardent supporter of temperance societies and recorded in his diary a dispute that he had with one of his parishioners expressing his contempt for such organisations:

> I insisted that the temperance society is founded upon an insufficient basis, a basis upon which a moral action should not be left to rest - the will is that the subscriber pledges himself upon his honour. Now I maintain that if it is a moral duty it should rest on the word of God, but the society pledge itself to be temperate only on the fear of man. I insisted moreover that the church ought to have taken up the subject and that the gospel is able to accomplish that and every other morality and that it is wrong to overlook "the gospel". Further, that the order in which God acts is first to awake the church and that then the rod of his strength goes out of Zion and subdues the people but the temperance society on the wordly principle of honour would do what God does by the gospel. I found it difficult to make him comprehend that I was no advocate for the drinking of ardent spirits,

> and he and the family appeared to think that I was a friend to intemperance. - From this I see that it is useless to attempt to make country people understand nice distinctions, I got nothing but suspicion for my pains. I might have known this before. 41

Proudfoot did not represent the consensus of opinion in the United Secession Church in Canada or Scotland, where the temperance movement did not get underway until he had left for the colonies.[42] It was during the 1830's that the movement gained momentum under the leadership of John Dunlop in the west of Scotland.[43] Proudfoot's congregation in Scotland was in Pitrodie, in the eastern half of the country, and since he departed for British North America in 1832 it is possible that he had not much knowledge of Dunlop. It is not surprising, therefore, that he saw the societies in Canada as American imports and, like revivals, he believed they should be dismissed as "more inclined to affect the emotions than win the heart and mind for Christ."

In contrast to the Church of Scotland, the secessionist church was most successful on the frontier and was at its strongest in south-western Ontario. In the North American context the debate over the influence of the frontier on the development of society has a long history, starting with Frederick Jackson

Turner's proposal that new settlers' ideas were tested on the frontier and by a process of Darwinian selection the strongest, or best adapted, to a frontier situation survived.[44] S.D. Clark suggested that the thesis could be applied to Canada; while Kenneth McCrae, a disciple of Louis Hartz, attempted to show that the ideas of settlers were modified by the Canadian frontier experience.[45] Professor J.M.S. Careless, in contrast, has stressed the importance of cities in the development of Canada and played down the influence of the frontier.[46] He has stressed the interaction of the metropolis with its agrarian hinterland as the true instrument of change, while Michael Cross, in the 1960's, disputed both the frontier and metropolitan theories, to suggest that far from the frontier promoting radicalism, as Careless and the frontierists basically argued, in its isolation social and political conservatism were born.[47] Peter Russell has recently followed Cross's thesis and applied it to the Church of Scotland on the frontier.[48]

According to Russell, the frontier in Upper Canada, before 1840, shaped the Church of Scotland clergy and threw them into the Conservative family compact camp.[49] For the established clergy the problem of social control was uppermost and the ans-

wer appeared to lie in attempting to maintain the Scottish character. The clergy, therefore, promoted the idea that ethnic reality could primarily be found in the Church of Scotland. Even Proudfoot could not deny the fact that the Presbyterian church, of whatever ilk, had a limited appeal, restricted to those from Scotland and, to a lesser extent, Northern Ireland.

Although Proudfoot was responsible for initiating the idea of a school to raise up a native ministry, at no time did he deny the ideology or theology of the Secession church. While he conceived of a Canadian church and this idea was received by the secession synod and a Canadian divinity school was created and financial autonomy was gained, the principles still at work were those of the Scottish Secession. He was aware of the necessity of reaching outside of a Scottish community while also conscious of his own limitations to do so, in his retention of Scottish ideas and accent.[50] He believed in the necessity of a Canadian church but, having examined his ideas for the new church it can be stated that, he, like the Church of Scotland clergy he accused of being more interested in setting up "the Kirk in the Colony as to make Christians", was concerned with the establishment of the secession.[51]

The secession, with its voluntarism and ideas of democracy, was most suited for the pioneering period of south-western Ontario. By the 1840's, however, Canadian society became more integrated and consolidated, as Professor Careless writes, "as frontiers of settlement were filled in, pioneer conditions passed away, and the organizing role of towns and the business community expanded."[52] As society matured so did the Secession Church which became more open to the idea of union with other churches, in particular the newly formed Free Church.[53] Proudfoot was in the forefront of the movement for union and although it was ten years after his death before it took place, through his Divinity Hall he helped ensure that his church was able to evolve and merge into the mainstream of Canadian Presbyterianism. One man could not make a Canadian church out of a "Scottish tradition" but the Reverend William Proudfoot attempted to point the way, because, in his view, the church was not built upon nationalism but on the Rock of Ages.

NOTES.

1. John S. Moir, Enduring Witness: A History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (Toronto, 1974), p. xii.

2. George Brown, "The Early Methodist Church and the Canadian Point of View", Canadian Historical Association Report, 1938 (Toronto, 1938); N.G. Smith, "Nationalism in the Canadian Churches", Canadian Journal of Theology, IX, April, 1963; articles in John Webster Grant, ed., The Churches and the Canadian Experience (Toronto, 1963); John S. Moir, "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches", Canadian Historical Association Papers,1966; W. Stanford Reid, "The Scottish Protestant Tradition", in Reid, ed., The Scottish Tradition in Canada (Toronto, 1977).

3. W.S. Reid, "The Scottish Protestant Tradition", in ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 134.

5. J.S. Moir, "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches", Canadian Historical Association Papers, 1966.

6. Robertson Davies, Leaven of Malice (Toronto, 1964), p. 173.

7. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, Vol. XXII, November, 1827, p. 552.

8. This is best expressed by what could be called the Toronto School of historians who have produced numerous biographies and histories of "national" significance, eg. Harold A. Innis, The Fur Trade in Canada (Toronto, 1977), Donald Creighton, The Empire of the St. Lawrence (Toronto, 1956), John A. Macdonald (2 vols., Toronto, 1974), J.M.S. Careless, Brown of the Globe (2 vols., Toronto, 1974).

9. N.G. Smith, "Nationalism in the Canadian Churches", Canadian Journal of Theology, IX, April, 1963, p. 120.

10. William Proudfoot to David Anderson, 1846. Presbyterian Church in Canada Archives (P.C.C.A.), William Proudfoot Letters.

11. J.S. Moir, Enduring Witness, 63, 86, 87.

12. J.S. Moir, "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches".

13. William Proudfoot Diary, September 19, 1832. William Proudfoot Papers, D.B. Weldon Library, Regional Collection, University of Western Ontario.

14. A particular problem was the recruitment of Gaelic speaking ministers and this led to the enlistment of William Fraser from Nova Scotia. See the manuscript, the diary of the Reverend William Fraser, in the United Church Archives and printed in the Transactions of the London and Middlesex Historical Society, Part XIV, 1930.

15. George Patterson, History of the County of Pictou (Montreal, 1877), p. 343.

16. Proudfoot Diary, joint entry for May 22-24, 1844. Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.

17. William Proudfoot to David Anderson, 13 July, 1846. P.C.C.A.

18. Ibid.

19. Minutes of the Tenth Session of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada, Wednesday 6th June and Thursday 7th June, 1849. United Church Archives.

20. On the University Question see J.S. Moir, Enduring Witness, pp. 114-119.

21. Notes of journey to Toronto, 2 August, 1850, Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.; Proudfoot to R.H. Thornton, 19 June, 1850, Proudfoot Papers, P.C.C.A.

22. Rev. Robert Small, History of the Congregations of the United Presbyterian Church From 1733 to 1900, vol. 1, (Edinburgh, 1904) p. 164; Minutes of the Nineteenth Session of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada, Appendix II (Toronto,1855), p. 153.

23. J.S. Moir, Enduring Witness, p. 117.

24. Rev. John McKerrow, History of the Foreign Missions of the Secession and United Presbyterian Church (Edinburgh, 1867) p. 215.

25. R. Small, History of the Congregations of the United Presbyterian Church, pp. 163, 164.

26. Minutes of the Third Session of the Missionary Synod of Canada, 2 October, 1844; United Church Archives.

27. Ibid.

28. Minutes of the Synod of the Nineteenth Session of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada, 8 June, 1855; United Church Archives.

29. The Presbyterian Magazine, vol. I, No. I, January, 1843, p. 1. The success of the church did not lie with the magazine because within one year it had been discontinued and Proudfoot commented: "It was too dear, and many of the articles were too heavy."

30. J.S. Moir, Church and State in Canada West (Toronto, 1959); Alan Wilson, The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada; A Canadian Mortmain (Toronto, 1968).

31. Moir, Enduring Witness, p. 122.

32. Proudfoot to the Warden of the London District Council; Miscellaneous Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.

33. The Presbyterian Magazine, vol. I, No. I, January, 1843, p. 4.

34. Rev. David Woodside, The Soul of a Scottish Church or the Contribution of the United Presbyterian Church to Scottish Life and Religion (Edinburgh, n.d.) p. 208.

35. Draft of article for London Inquirer in the Miscellaneous Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O., dated 1838.

36. F. Landon, An Exile from Canada to Van Diemen's Land (Toronto, 1960); Proudfoot Diary, entries from 14-18 January, 1839 concerning appeals to the governor for the release of James Aitchison, U.W.O.

37. Colin Read, The Rising in Western Upper Canada, 1837-8 (Toronto, 1982).

38. Peter Russell, "Church of Scotland Clergy in Upper Canada: Culture Shock and Conservatism on the Frontier" Ontario History, June 1981, pp. 88-111.

39. Ibid., p. 93.

40. Ibid., p. 105.

41. Proudfoot Diary, 14 November, 1832, Proudfoot Papers, U.W.O.

42. Stewart Mechie, The Church and Scottish Social Development, 1780-1870 (London, 1960), pp. 81-99.

43. Ibid. For temperance movements in Canada see William H. Elgee, The Social Teachings of the Canadian Churches (Toronto, 1964), pp. 135-159.

44. Frederick J. Turner, The Significance of the Frontier in American History (Fascimile of Original: Ann Arbor, 1966). Presented to the American Historical Association in 1893 the paper revolutionised American history and led Turner to elaborate the thesis in The Frontier in American History (New York, 1928).

45. S.D. Clark, The Developing Canadian Community (Toronto, 1948); Kenneth D. McRae, "The Structure of Canadian History" in Louis Hartz, The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia (New York, 1977).

46. J.M.S. Careless, "Frontierism, Metropolitanism and Canadian History" Canadian Historical Review, XXXV (1954), pp. 12-19, The Union of the Canadas: The Growth of Canadian Institutions, 1841-1857 (Toronto, 1977).

47. Michael S. Cross, "The Dark Druidical Graves: The Lumber Community and the Commercial Frontier in British North America to 1854" (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1968) Microfilm copy P.A.C. For coverage of the main frontier themes in Canadian history see Cross ed., The Frontier Thesis and the Canadas: The Debate on the Impact of the Canadian Environment (Toronto, 1970)

48. Peter Russell in Ontario History, June 1981.

49. Ibid.

50. William Proudfoot to David Anderson, 13 July, 1846.

51. Proudfoot Diary, 19 September, 1832; U.W.O.

52. J.M.S. Careless, The Union of the Canadas, 1841-1857, p. 150.

53. James A. Thomson, "Proudfoot and the United Presbyterians: Research into the Proudfoot Papers" (M.Th. Thesis, Knox College, 1967)

"UNHOLY CONTENTIONS ABOUT HOLINESS": THE CANADA HOLINESS ASSOCIATION AND THE METHODIST CHURCH, 1875-1894

Prepared by Ron Sawatsky

for the 1982 Annual Conference of

the Canadian Society of Church History

June 8, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. REV. NELSON BURNS 4

III. THE CANADA HOLINESS ASSOCIATION 12

IV. "HERESY. . .THIS STIGMA, THIS ODIUM" 19

V. CONCLUSION 26

VI. FOOTNOTES 30

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY 34

VIII. APPENDIX 1 36

"UNHOLY CONTENTIONS ABOUT HOLINESS":
THE CANADA HOLINESS ASSOCIATION AND
THE METHODIST CHURCH, 1879-1894

I. INTRODUCTION

It is noteworthy that the last three decades of the nineteenth century were a period of religious ferment within the churches in Canada, the United States and England. A very important manifestation of this religious unrest was evidenced in the dramatic upheavals surrounding a new surge of interest in entire sanctification and Christian perfectionism.[1] This Wesleyan legacy was primary in the development of a significant number of holiness associations which served to foster the growth of these sentiments. These non-denominational holiness associations initially continued to operate within the existing denominations but then gradually became alienated from them to such an extent that between 1893 and 1907 twenty-five separate holiness denominations were formed.[2] Often the break with the existing denominations involved formal church trials and expulsions of these "lovers of holiness".

Among the Canadian Methodists the formation of the Holiness Movement Church under the leadership of Rev. Ralph C. Horner in 1895 is one of the most prominent examples of this phenomenon in Canada. Horner's trial and deposition from the Methodist ministry in the Ottawa Valley in 1894 has already been analyzed by several scholars.[3]

But there are other significant Canadian manifestations of holiness or Christian perfectionism in the late nineteenth century which have to date received little serious attention. Recent research in this field is beginning to show the inaccuracy of the tacit assumption that the Hornerites were the paradigm of this phenomenon in Canada.[4]

This paper will attempt to provide a means to broadening our understanding of holiness associations in Canada through a discussion of the Canada Holiness Association and its efforts to promote the cause of Christian holiness in southern Ontario; this association through its leader, Rev. Nelson Burns, precipitated a crisis among the Ontario Methodists after 1879. Analysis of the life of Nelson Burns and of the heresy trials of Burns and his close associate, Rev. Albert Truax, as well as a brief discussion of the battle of words between the Methodists' Christian Guardian and the Expositor of Holiness, the journal of the Canada Holiness Association, will help reveal the central issues that were raised in the public debate.

Among the Presbyterians a "brush fire" of holiness sentiment in the Galt region in 1888 was extinguished by the formal suspension of seven members of Knox Church in Galt; these "contumacious" Presbyterians were directly influenced by the Canada Holiness Association. Although the Galt heresy case is of considerable interest here time will not permit more than a passing reference to it.

It is important, at the outset, to note that the official position of the Methodists was not against the doctrine of holiness. Brian Ross has pointed out that Horner was not expelled from the Church because of holiness heresy but rather for his resistance to the authority of the Church to place him into a preaching circuit instead of officially appointing him as one of their evangelists.[5] Yet, it should also be noted that even though the Methodists, superficially at least, all agreed that Wesley taught holiness, there was (and still is!) considerable dispute over what he really meant by the term. Much of the disputation between the radical holiness proponents and the rest of the Church, as described in this paper, had its roots in this problem.

II. REV. NELSON BURNS

By his own admission Nelson Burns considered himself to have a sensitive nature.[6] His autobiographical account of his life which was unfortunately never completed because of his untimely death in 1904 at age 70[7] is replete with self-deprecatory sentiments. Yet, on the other hand, Burns had much of which to be proud, especially in his youth.

Burns was born of Methodist parents in the town of Niagara (Niagara-on-the-Lake) on March 22, 1834. His father was of Irish birth and his mother was United Empire Loyalist or as Burns would have it, of Pennsylvania Dutch descent.[8] Niagara High School, University College and Genesee College (near Rochester) were the schools where Burns received his education. To say that he was an outstanding student is to understate the truth.

When Burns entered University College in 1854 he did so with a Natural Sciences scholarship.[9] He continued to receive that scholarship for each of the four years prior to receiving his BA in 1857. During his third year he received a special prize in mathematics. In his final examination for his BA in Natural Sciences he ranked first in five out of ten subjects. That same year he received a silver medal in "Chemistry with Zoology and Botany".[10] With his usual modesty he described his graduation as follows:

> I enjoyed myself well as a student, and whilst not conspicuous for scholarship according to my own thoughts, seemed to stand well in the estimation of my teachers. This was evinced, greatly to my surprise, when at the close of my fourth year, I was selected

> to carry the mace before the chancellor and sit at his right hand during the convocation, an honor accorded to the party who, in the estimation of the faculty, was considered the best student of the year.
> In harmony with this I was called upon by Dr. McCaul, the president of the University, to reply to the toast to the honor men of the University, at the annual dinner. Hence it is evident that my career as a student, on the whole, was satisfactory.[11]

In his Autobiography Burns stressed that he experienced considerable ambivalence while deciding on his ultimate career. After his university training he immediately became a teacher. As he described it, the biggest difficulty for him was the choice he had to make between teaching, law school or the Methodist ministry.

As a teacher Burns seems to have been a reasonably good success. After one and one-half years in Welland as headmaster of the high school he transferred to St. Thomas where he was the principal of the high school for three years. During his time at St. Thomas Burns continued to struggle with his ambivalence about his future; his sense of calling to the ministry was growing stronger.

> As to teaching, I was convinced that it was not my life work. . . . All these forces acting on me, and the call being a clamorous one to select my life-work, . . . , I finally yielded the point and proclaimed my intention of entering the ministry. But even then I received small encouragement from either pastor or people; so that I had to forge my way to the front, unbacked by any, the sole, compelling force being my conscientious convictions, my full belief that God had called me to such a life, and a feeling of certainty that any other life attempted would be a miserable failure.[12]

Thus in 1862 Burns was appointed to the Smithville circuit in the London Conference of the Methodist Church. The next year he was received on trial and moved to Holland

Landing.[13] Cookstown and Erin circuits then followed in the annual lists of appointments.

An incident while serving the Erin circuit in 1865 gives an insight into the young minister's idealism. Burn's was invited to address a tea-meeting in the area. He decided to make the speech entirely entertainment and leave out any references to religion. He did so well that a visiting minister from a neighboring circuit invited him to speak at a similar gathering on his circuit. Burns described the meeting as follows:

> A number of previous speakers had got on a similar vein, and fun and frolic were rampant. Meanwhile the character of the meeting descended to pretty low depths. At first I thought I would excuse myself from taking part. . . : but upon second thoughts I made a desperate resolve: I concluded I would let myself down to the level of the meeting and then bring up its tone to a more dignified position. The work of letting myself down I found comparatively easy, but when I attempted to bring the meeting up I proved a failure; . . . . Still, I note the fact that the effort I did put forth was successful, and it seems to lend countenance to the thought that if at any time I had thrown off the trammels of conscientious conviction, I might have pursued the role of popularity in the pulpit with a measure of success.[14]

After his ordination at the Conference in Montreal in 1866 Burns' career as a minister, at least in terms of preaching circuit appointments, was of dubious distinction. He was appointed to the Galt circuit but after preaching there several times withdrew with the consent of the local board. Burns stated that he did not meet their expectations as to popularity![15] He was offered another circuit but declined because of a sore throat; the throat affliction was in his words "virulent".

> The conviction I obtained was that the whole incident had a relation to the fact that I had failed to carry out, as the leading thought of my ministry: preaching, testifying and conversing on the subject of holiness; in fact, making it the chief end and object of my life.[16]

Burns' return to the emphasis on holiness had been a gradual one. A holiness "experience" which he had had as a result of reading Phoebe Palmer's, Faith and Its Effects,[17] when he was only fourteen, was still important to him in spite of the fact that he claimed he had subsequently lost the experience. During the first five years of his ministerial probation, he had become more and more occupied with the need to evangelize and bring other persons to the experience of holiness. After his ordination, the holiness emphasis virtually supplanted all other emphases in his ministry.

After declining another circuit Burns returned to teaching, first at Port Dover and in 1868 as the high school principal in Milton.

In 1876, at his request, the London Conference appointed Burns to the Camlachie circuit; he served there as minister for three years.[18] During this time, and earlier, while still a school teacher in Milton, Burns carried on an active work in holding revival/holiness meetings in the surrounding churches. He soon developed quite a reputation as a holiness preacher. Opposition to this sort of activity from within the circuit increased until Burns resigned his post under pressure in 1878. At the Annual Conference that same year Burns was granted

supernumary status in the church. From that time on, he was never again on the list of active ministry of the Methodist Church.

Upon his departure from the circuit ministry Burns again returned to teaching. He set up a boys' boarding school in Georgetown but it did not do well. For two years the venture was plagued by such financial insecurity that it was on the brink of disaster. Burns was ready to close it down but he received a definite word from God as follows:

> Stay in Georgetown, pay cash for everything, and the first day you fail to have the money to run the institution on a cash basis you may close it.[19]

Since the time of his conversion as a youth, Burns had been systematically attempting to discover how a Christian can know the will of God and live by it, daily. Each crisis in his life was handled in such a way as to achieve a sense of his responding to the direct guidance of God in his personal choices. The Georgetown incident was, by Burns' own admission, the final crisis which was to determine the ultimate validity of his newly developed doctrine of "Divine Guidance" as <u>the</u> means of direction in a believer's life.

For three days he struggled with the problem.

> The call was upon me to accept this communication as the veritable word of God to me, and by this act to decide the whole question. Moreover, it implied that in accepting it I must also take the attitude to God of giving up myself absolutely to his personal control for the rest of my life, be the consequences what they may. The wording of the covenant with God which I seemed to be called on to make was, as far as

> I can recollect, as follows: I covenant to accept God as my only guide absolute to the close of life, with the understanding that this covenant must be binding upon me to the judgment day, no matter what may be the apparent result during life; should my obedience lead to any or all forms of erratic conduct, or even make shipwreck of my moral or religious character, still I must carry out all Divine instructions, and let others judge from my history of the value of a life of obedience after this sort.[20]

Although literally on the brink of financial collapse every day, the school did survive on a cash only basis for about nine months. Burns finally decided to close it at Easter time; he attributed the failure to his wife. Apparently she was unable to handle to extreme insecurity of such a style of life and this so seriously jeopardized her health that she was on the verge of complete mental and physical collapse. Burns decided that this was the word of God for him to close the school. His faith in the principle of Divine Guidance was, however, unshakeable. Clearly God had something else in mind for him.

One important event should be noted at this point in the study; it was the publication of a book which Burns authored, Divine Guidance or The Holy Quest. It was published in Brantford in 1889 by Rev. T.S. Linscott, a Methodist minister, a strong supporter of holiness and the Canada Holiness Association and owner of the publishing firm, the Book and Bible House.[21]

Since the book was in large measure one of the causes for Burns' eventual expulsion from the Methodist ministry, a brief summary of its major ideas seems appropriate here.

The first seven chapters are basically an attempt to prove that the idea of divine guidance in a scriptural way does exist. Examples from the Old Testament and the New Testament are used to illustrate the patterns of communication between human beings and God. According to Burns, John the Baptist declared the main reason for Christ's coming was to "make it possible for the Holy Spirit to come and abide in the world in some fuller sense than ever before."[22]

How did Burns define "Divine Guidance"?

> It is some intimation to our consciousness by the Holy Spirit whereby we know that we are taking that course in all things, from moment to moment, which is the best possible under the circumstances and is therefore pleasing to God, and satisfactory to ourselves. Less than this could not be Divine guidance, and more than this can hardly be desired.[23]

The remainder of the book deals with a variety of aspects of the doctrine of "Divine Guidance". What is the "manner" of "Divine Guidance"? It could be dreams, visions, voices, impressions, reasoning processes, intuitions, providences, human helps or Scripture passages. What is the "scope" of the doctrine? Burns here makes a somewhat unclear distinction between the <u>gift</u> (baptism) of the Holy Spirit and <u>walking</u> in the Spirit.[24] Apparently <u>baptism</u> must precede and lead into <u>walking</u> in the Spirit; there must be consciousness of being directly led by the Spirit in order to experience "Divine Guidance".

Burns also addresses the critics of "Divine Guidance"

directly.[25] Some object to the doctrine because it seems to teach individual "infallibility". Burns sees the concept as a regulatory device for the true believer even though there are problems when persons who only <u>think</u> they are under "Divine Guidance" misuse their assumed infallibility.

Another complaint is that the doctrine depreciates the Bible and allows for antinomianism. Burns argues that the true believer does not need rules since the believer is always in tune with the Divine guide who operates on a "living law". The Bible, according to Burns, is really only a <u>testimony</u> of God but the Spirit is the individual's guide. This does not destroy Biblical authority but rather regulates it.

The book, as a whole, is clear, well organized and interesting. Burns does not do as well while defending the doctrine from criticism as he does while expounding on the doctrine itself. It appears from the later writings of persons like Albert Truax that the book virtually became a doctrinal textbook for the Association.

III. THE CANADA HOLINESS ASSOCIATION

The Canada Holiness Association (hereafter C.H.A.) was formed in October of 1879. A Methodist minister stationed in the village of Brussels (London Conference), Rev. James Harris, placed a notice in the <u>Christian Guardian</u> announcing a holiness convention in his church. Approximately a dozen ministers and lay-men attended.[26] Nelson Burns was asked to preach the first sermon. It set the tone for the rest of the convention as Burns emphasized the importance of seeking and accepting holiness. Burns later recounted some of the significant events at the meeting:

> Towards the close of the convention Mr. Harris proposed the organization of an association. The response to his proposal was very decidedly in the affirmative, seeing we were all acted upon by a high-tide convention, and the possibilities concerning propagating the subject of holiness after this definite form seemed very bright and encouraging.[27]

Burns was elected president (he remained in this post until his death in 1904). It appears that most of the leaders in the C.H.A. were Methodists even though the Association was officially independent and interdenominational. Geographically, the C.H.A. apparently operated primarily in central Ontario, including the Niagara Peninsula and the area between London and Toronto.

The C.H.A. from its founding was self-consciously an association of persons who were interested in promoting the cause of Christian holiness among Canadian Protestants. Until 1894 there does not appear to be any attempt on the part of the C.H.A. leadership to start a separate

denomination. For example, when The Expositor of Holiness was begun in 1882, the back cover featured the following in each succeeding issue:

OUR PLATFORM

> Catholic in Spirit--Loyal to Bible Truth--Avoiding Controversy which Engenders Strife--Whilst Thoroughly Wesleyan in Doctrine, yet not Sectarian--Hence suitable to the Lovers of Holiness in every Denomination.[28]

The C.H.A.'s public activity was primarily twofold: its publication of the Expositor of Holiness, and annual conventions and camp-meetings. The Annual conventions were four days of meetings held at different locations in the C.H.A.'s "territory" each year.[29] The majority of the time was spent in hearing devotional and instructional addresses by invited speakers or leading C.H.A. members. The business of the C.H.A. was usually transacted in one session during the course of the meetings.

The camp-meetings were also held annually in summer and were occasions where holiness experiences could be celebrated and shared among persons who were usually quite widely scattered.[30]

The role of the camp-meetings and the annual conventions in helping promote group solidarity and genuine interaction between persons of similar beliefs should not be underestimated. It was at these gatherings that "batteries were recharged" in preparation for the return to the "lukewarm" churches of which all were members.

As a monthly magazine The Expositor of Holiness (hereafter Expositor) played an extremely important role in

the promotion of holiness sentiments especially for the C.H.A.'s adherents. Burns became the editor at its founding in 1882. He regularly published articles on a variety of points of view on a given issue in the interests of finding the "truth". One would expect that his academic background was an influence on this effort to appear objective. Articles or letters which were decidedly critical of Burns or the C.H.A. were usually annotated by him.

The Expositor as the main mouthpiece of the C.H.A. was frequently used as a means to convey official positions on issues. For instance, it is interesting to note that the C.H.A. leadership consciously stressed its avoidance of creedalism. Albert Truax addressed the creed issue directly in 1889:

> As to a formal creed, we have none. As an association, our business has been not to make creeds but to live up to the creeds which we already have. Our creed then is the creed of all orthodox denominations. There is one article, . . . to which all these denominations subscribe; . . . they believe in doing right, in living holy lives.[31]

In 1892, Burns published a special issue of the Expositor in which he attempted to summarize the development of the C.H.A.'s theological stance. The issue was entitled "How To Keep Converted"[32] and it received considerable negative as well as positive response. Burns summarized the distinctive position of the C.H.A. as follows:

> 1. This movement, as its main object, professes to teach and illustrate how to keep converted.
> 2. It is not a holiness movement after the pattern of the modern holiness movement; the severance between those two movements is now completed.
> 3. It in no way discounts conversion. We claim to have found nothing higher or grander than this

experience. Our only distinctive teaching is concerning the method of continuing in that gracious state.
. . . We believe that Jesus taught that when the Holy Ghost came on the day of Pentecost, He, although a Spirit, was to take the place of a personal Christ to every believer . . . . We, as members of this Association, profess to have put this teaching of Jesus Christ into practice, . . . We do know and do the perfect will of God, that is, we have learned how to keep converted.[33]

The most interesting part of Burns' statement is the allusion to the modern holiness movement and the apparent break between it and the C.H.A.

Burns summarized the process of the break with the rest of the holiness movement (the holiness "creed" movement) in the December 1891 issue of the Expositor under the title "Is It A New Departure?". His discourse, although somewhat lengthy, clearly shows the reasons for the division and as such merits repetition here. The tone of his account is much softer than one would expect but it is still accompanied by a good measure of strident rhetoric.

. . . in the second year of the Association's life, we (Burns) attended one of the great holiness camp-meetings, under the auspices of the National Holiness Camp-Meeting Association, and led by the late Rev. J. S. Inskip. We were received kindly, nay, cordially, were even asked to preach . . . .
The following summer, in preparing for our first camp-meeting, we did our utmost to secure some of the leaders of that movement to come and help us . . . expecting . . . they would, virtually take charge and direct the whole meeting.
Also we assumed an exchange with most of the holiness periodicals then published, and freely utilized their contents without the slightest suspicion that our writings would ever be put under a ban by them.
Thus it will be seen that we acted in all good faith in our attitude towards (them) . . .
But . . . as all our labors were placed under the direct control and supervision of the Holy Spirit, we followed where He, and not they might lead.
. . . And as time went on we were called on to

investigate, one after another, the questions left in a loose, unsatisfactory condition by all holiness writers, such as dress, mistakes, physical manifestations, righteous living, inbred sin and faith cures. But as we proceeded with our investigations we found that said periodicals objected, and finally . . . they all, without exception, repudiated our work as heretical in the extreme, and, indeed, were not very choice in the terms used to characterize it.

But when this attitude was definitely assumed by them we realized . . . a call . . . upon us not only to re-examine the foundations of our own faith, but to more closely scrutinize theirs. This examination we carried on openly, not only in our writings, but also in our public gatherings.

. . . The result has been startling, indeed, for without exception, they all fail before the test of having lived holy lives, no matter how carefully and faithfully they may have carried out their formulated doctrines and rules and regulations for holy living.

. . . Their whole creed, from foundation to copestone, is simply and only an elaborate effort to climb into a righteous life by legalistic effort.[34]

Since Burns disagreed with much that the holiness "creed" movement espoused, his views on "physical manifestations", when compared with the intense emotionalism of someone like Ralph Horner, are almost predictable.[35] Burns took the position that shouting, hysterical laughing or ecstatic prostrations are phenomena which are common to all religious groups where emotional excitement is high. Therefore, these were definitely not signs of superior piety nor were they to be encouraged as effective contributions to religious services.[36] Burns' strong opposition to emotionalism earned him wide criticism from the advocates of holiness in North America since these persons usually tended to emphasize emotion in their experience.

Not only was the C.H.A. rejecting its natural ties with those with whom it had the most in common theologically, but the debate within the Methodist denomination was also warming up.

There were two major periods in which the holiness question was addressed most vociferously in the Christian Guardian. The first coincides with the rise of the C.H.A. in the early 1880's until 1886. The second period coincides with the Burns and Truax heresy trials in the first half of the 1890's.

A brief look at Albert Truax's defense of Nelson Burns who was under attack from the Guardian will give some insight into the debate during its most acrimonious period, in 1891.

In the July 22, 1891 Guardian Dewart, the editor noted that the teaching of Burns particularly as contained in Divine Guidance was "dangerous and misleading". Albert Truax responded forcefully in the August 1891 issue of the Expositor.

> Now Mr. Dwart should have the very best reasons for making the statements he does, and the strongest proof of the truth of his charges, but for some unaccountable reason he gives his readers neither one nor the other.[37]

Truax went on to analyze Dewart's criticisms point by point. They were, in fact, the ones that Burns had anticipated in his book--disparaging Scripture and infallibility. Truax reiterated a defense that was very similar to that of Burns.

However, on August 19 Dewart published an editorial which referred to parts of Truax's letter in defense of Burns. Truax replied to the editorial in the September issue of the Expositor. He faulted Dewart's interpretation of Burn's book.

> The Doctor seems to think words have a rigid, fixed and invariable meaning, and, therefore, need no explanation or interpretation. Strange, indeed, for a nineteenth century editor.[38]

Truax complained that Dewart either only thought he knew what the Association was teaching or he was deliberately misrepresenting it. In both instances, however, Truax maintained that the "defender of the truth" (as Dewart apparently thought he (Dewart) was) was unable to defend the truth when he did not or could not know it.

> Of course, when a member of the Association claims to know and teach the truth, he is at once dubbed <u>oracle</u> and <u>infallible</u>. But when Dr. Dewart knows, defends and teaches truth, he is--well, what in the name of common-sense is he anyway?[39]

It is obvious that the C.H.A. leadership began to feel its progressive alienation from fellow Methodists as the controversy deepened. Two things which occurred in the early months of 1893 help to measure the intensity of the feelings.

First of all, the <u>Expositor</u>, which had until that point been printed at the "Office of the <u>Christian Guardian</u>, Temperance Street, Toronto" (since 1882), was now printed by "W.S. Johnston and Co., The Art Printers, Toronto.[40] No reasons were given for the change.

Secondly, an important clause was removed from the official "Our Platform" which was always on the back cover of the <u>Expositor</u>. By April of 1893 "Avoiding Needless Controversy which Engenders Strife" was missing. Also "Loyal to Bible Truth" now simply read "Loyal to Truth".[41]

But the final struggle was still to come.

IV. "HERESY . . . THIS STIGMA, THIS ODIUM"

Following the 1889 publication of Divine Guidance, Methodist objections to Burns' doctrinal views began to gain strength. Although several informal attempts were made earlier, it was only in 1893 that specific charges were laid against Nelson Burns at the annual Guelph Conference; Burns was at that point in England on a two-month visit to promote the cause of holiness.[42] Consideration of the case was postponed until 1894 in order that he might be present. Nevertheless Burns made no effort to defend himself even in 1894 except to write a letter entitled "My Apology" to the Conference leadership. (A copy of the letter has not been preserved.)

Four charges were laid against Burns:

> 1. He holds and teaches that the Holy Scriptures are non-essential; he impugns and discredits the Word of God, and affirms that it is not the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of faith and practice.
>
> 2. He holds and teaches a view of Jesus Christ, which makes his divinity practically non-essential, and while declining to declare his accord with the view of the Divinity of Christ held by the Methodist Church, he has assailed that view.
>
> 3. He holds and teaches as the essential of the Gospel, the fanatical doctrine that a Christian may and should know the Will of God in all things affecting him, exclusively by direct revelation and guidance of the Spirit, as well as Christ or the Apostles know it, and repudiates all other guides.
>
> 4. He ignores the leading doctrines of Methodism, treating them as non-essential, and declaring in substance that his theory of guidance is the whole Gospel. He asserts the insufficiency of Wesley's teaching and example, because it did not include his fanatical doctrine; he also declares that Methodism has no satisfactory answer to the crucial problem of how to live right. He asperses the sincerity and integrity of Methodists and Methodism, repudiates rules and regulations for religious exercise, and

> his teachings have produced dissatisfaction and discussion prejudicial to the Methodist Church in several places.[43]

The charges were sustained and the conference of 1894 adopted a motion stating that Burns be deposed from the Methodist ministry. The conference also attempted to show its leniency by allowing Burns time until the end of the conference sessions to retract his views (to the satisfaction of the Conference). By this time, however, Burns was apparently not inclined to make even a token effort at healing the breach.[44]

The fact that Burns did not attend his own trial effectively prevented the Methodist Church from really taking a serious look at Burns' concept of Divine guidance. It fell to Burn's close associate, Rev. Albert Truax, to be the one who more exhaustively tested the C.H.A.'s doctrines in the Methodist church courts.[45]

Truax, a minister in the Niagara Conference, had been ordained in 1887 following the customary four year probation. He had spent the year 1885-86 in Montreal as a student at the Wesleyan Theological College.[46] After his ordination he regularly received an annual circuit appointment under the Niagara Conference until 1893. He had joined the C.H.A. by 1883 and by 1892 he appeared as its Vice-President.[47] By that time he was already an important and regular contributor to the Expositor.

In May of 1893 a letter which raised doubts on the "religious character and doctrinal teachings" of

"Brother" A. Truax of Courtland Mission was read at the Tilsonburg Conference of the Norwich District. A committee was named to investigate.[48]

The committee met and formulated eight separate charges against Truax. Each charge, which was a general statement on a given issue, was supported with a number of specifications of when and where the offense had taken place.

The trial was held in St. Catharines on June 5, 1893 during the Niagara Methodist Annual Conference. The Toronto Globe reported extensively on the trial in its June 6th issue. The Report began by discussing the scope of the C.H.A.'s influence. The reporter stated that since the C.H.A. had

> . . . not only been able to elude the efforts of the orthodox to crush it but that is has spread to an alarming extent establishes the cleverness of its apostles and the danger which threatens the church. Throughout the greater portion of western Ontario it has its adherents and its teachers. There are many Methodist churches especially in the rural sections of the district indicated who have found their influence impaired and their energies fettered by the existence of an element within their fold strongly sympathizing with the "new light".[49]

The article went on to discuss the "theory of divine guidance" according to Burns and Truax and then reprinted the eight charges and specifications in full. (Considerations of length will permit only the notation of the charges.)

> 1. In his public teaching he has assailed the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.
> 2. He has disparaged the authority of the holy Scriptures.
> 3. He claims to know the will of God by direct

revelation of the spirit as well as Christ or the apostles.

4. He attacked the doctrine of eternal punishment.

5. In his preaching he has omitted to present the leading doctrines of the Methodist Church.

6. He has in nearly every sermon denounced all creeds.

7. He has made light of the duty of prayer, and his teaching and example have led others to do the same.

8. His influence has been very prejudicial to the church and its customary means of grace.[50]

Truax, of course, pleaded not guilty to the charges. After a lengthy examination and consultation the findings were presented. Truax was found guilty of all charges but the fourth (regarding the non-existence of eternal punishment).

The eighth charge is particularly interesting because it included a list of nine specifications regarding Truax's prejudicial influence on the church. The Globe reported the specifications and the committee's findings as follows:

> (1) His teaching tends to unsettle the faith of believers--found guilty. (2) Two prayer meetings have died out because prayer was discouraged by the pastor--reason assigned not sustained. (3) He has ridiculed in church and in public places, as shops, the experience given in class meetings, thereby discouraging many from attending them--sustained as regards church. (4) He has burlesqued and heaped scorn on evangelistic revival services--not sustained. (5) He has publicly attacked the language and sentiments of hymns in our hymn book--found guilty. (6) He has recommended the people to read anything they liked--the burden of proof was that he would not disapprove if guided by the Spirit. (7) He has declared that Sunday is no better than any other day, and that the people could read newspapers on Sunday if they like; it was nobody's business--found guilty. (8) He has publicly attacked in his pulpit the editor of the Christian Guardian (sic) and charged the editor with having libelled him, so that he (Truax) could secure pecuniary damages--the committee found that this specification was unimportant. (9) He has circulated tracts that are exceedingly mischievious in the tendencies of their teaching--found guilty.[51]

Truax was suspended for a year; the judgment noted that he would be expelled if he did not renounce his heretical views within that year. Within a week an appeal was launched by Truax through Rev. T.S. Linscott who was counsel for the defendant. The grounds of the appeal were that the "prosecution was irregular and illegal, manifestly unjust and rendered it impossible. . .to have a fair and unprejudiced trial."[52] A hearing before the Court of Appeal of the Methodist Church was granted and the date set for late October 1893.

In the meantime Truax began airing his feelings in the Expositor:

> Heresy! what a dread thing it has been in the past--how it has been used as a lash, a thumbscrew, a torturing instrument, to force men into conformity with the mighty. . .majority. How men otherwise strong have quailed before this threatened charge, this stigma, this odium. And what a veritable bogie it is, what a mere scarecrow, when one dares to look it squarely in the face. . . . So far from believing that either suspension or expulsion can impair my usefulness or hinder my work, it will simply open a wider door to a more extensive field.[53]

The appeal was heard in Toronto on October 26 with Rev. Albert Carman, the Methodist Church's General Superintendent presiding over the full court. The case was presented and after a short deliberation the court sustained the appeal. Although this meant that Truax would receive another trial, the court rebuked Linscott for the tone of his appeal--it was too disrespectful of the Conference and District authorities. A new trial date with the Niagara Conference was then set for Novemeber 27, 1893.

Prior to the second trial Truax wrote a letter to the Committee of Trial in which he acknowledged receipt of a package containing a summons, the charges and other documents related to the case. After stating that he had only read one page of the contents, Truax indicated that he would not appear at the trial nor would he ask anyone to represent him. Also he noted that he had earlier already accepted preaching engagements for the days of the trial. But more importantly,

> . . .judging from my former trial you would not only require my presence in the evening which would prevent my preaching, but you would keep me up all night as well which would not be good for my health.[54]

Toward the end of the five-page letter Truax raised what he considered was the crux of the matter.

> The church must meet me on the straight issue or not at all. I frankly admit teaching Christian righteousness, that is, that men can be holy as Jesus, and know the will of God concerning themselves as well as He. I will answer no charges on side issues. If the Church will enact a farce it must do so without my assistance.[55]

The trial was held in spite of Truax's absence. Articles by Truax in the March, April and July 1893 issues of the Expositor were important pieces of evidence for the prosecution. This time there were also eight well-supported charges. They were virtually the same as those of the first trial except for the eighth charge. It concerned Truax's involvement in the illegal sale and disposal of the church building and property of the Zion Church in Courtland Mission.

The findings of the Committee were presented on November 29. The charges and each of the specifications for the first seven charges were, without exception,

sustained. With reference to the eighth charge the Committee found that Truax had erred and violated church law in the sale of the Zion Church but that it was unable to find sufficient evidence to convict him of "falsehood". The Committee voted unanimously to suspend Truax until the next Ministerial Session of the Niagara Conference.[56] At that session he was officially expelled.

V. CONCLUSION

It is clear that the Burns and Truax heresy trials were taken very seriously by the Methodist Church. It was under considerable pressure because of the relatively large amount of publicity that each side in the controversy had managed to generate. The vested interests of either faction had run deeply within the Church. The problems created by the C.H.A. were serious and demanded decisive action. It was the <u>Guardian's</u> editor, Dewart, who perhaps summarized the main issue most succintly:

> All such trials are unpleasant and undesirable. The question is not, however, whether a man should have liberty to believe and teach what he chooses. This all admit. It is whether a man shall teach with the authority and endorsement of the Church, doctrines which the authorities of the Church hold to be unscriptural and unsound.[57]

Harold W. Pointen has noted that the break with the Holiness associations was not a break with the emphasis on holiness in the Methodist Church. It was, rather, more a result of the "unholy contentions about holiness".[58] Since the Church was determined to fulfill its role as guardian of true doctrine, its response to the C.H.A. was predictable. It had to remove the Burnsite heresy from its ranks, like a doctor excising a tumour.

The life of Nelson Burns provides us with an interesting case study of a dominant personality. Burns' self-expressed tendency toward sensitivity in his youth was later apparently replaced with an uncompromising idealism, even dogmatism, which was responsible for much of the opposition that the C.H.A. encountered. Undoubtedly

Burns was intelligent, perhaps brilliant, as evidenced particularly in his university studies and even his later writings.

At the beginning of his long term as editor of the Expositor he may have felt considerable willingness to dialogue with those who had countering points of view. But toward the end of our period of study, just prior to Burns' expulsion from the ministry, the willingness to debate was increasingly submerged under the weight of strident rhetoric which unabashedly declared the veracity of the doctrine of "Divine Guidance".

The inexorable process of alienation from both the Methodist Church and even other holiness movements presents a fascinating glimpse into the rise of a dissident movement. Certainly for the C.H.A. this process was not without its internal controversies. Even a solid C.H.A. supporter like T.S. Linscott was apparently not prepared to acquiesce totally to Burns' leadership. A letter from Linscott which strongly disagreed with Burns' antinomianism in an article on "Jesus and the Law" was published in the last extant issue of the Expositor (February 1894).[59]

There is no doubt that the principle of "Divine Guidance" was the cornerstone of the C.H.A. doctrinal position. In fact, this doctrine with its logical out-croppings provided the primary impetus for the expulsion of both Burns and Truax from the ministry in the Methodist Church. According to Albert Truax at the time of his trial,

both he and the Niagara Conference were well aware ". . . that the charge in the indictment was the one concerning Divine Guidance (Charge III). All others were the mere results of this cardinal error, the fruits of this bad tree."[60] The Church obviously knew that the disagreement was an important one. In its defense of orthodoxy it gave a decidedly negative response to the C.H.A.'s understanding of holiness.

Perhaps another comment that could be made in conclusion relates to the problem of effectiveness. Earlier in his career as a minister Burns addressed this problem from one perspective by suggesting that popularity in the pulpit necessarily involved unacceptable compromise of certain basic principles. Nelson Burns was one who did not easily make concessions in his beliefs. There is little doubt that his concern was not for effectiveness but rather faithfulness.

When he died in 1904, Burns was not a popular person. The bottom corner of the last page of the June 16, 1904 edition of the Globe included a column entitled "Died"; it had six entries. One of them read:

> Burns- On Tuesday morning, June the 14th, at his late residence, 26 Homewood avenue (sic), Rev. Nelson Burns, B.A., aged 70 years.
> Funeral private.[61]

But the biography of Nelson Burns had one final postscript which provided further negative evidence for his critics. The controversy centred on Burns' claim of his own right to choose to end his life quickly and painlessly rather than to endure a lingering, painful death--in other words, euthanasia. (Although Burns died

from an attack of angina pectoris, he did have a severe form of sciatica throughout much of his later life.) Albert Truax revealed this incident in an appendix to Burns' Autobiography. He noted that Burns had not decided to shorten his life in spite of considerable pain.

> He simply claimed the right to shorten it, and his claim was admitted by God. As to putting it into effect, he would not do this until God told him to do so. He gave God liberty to tell him, but no such word was given; and as a matter of fact Mr. Burns finally chose to let nature have free course.[62]

In his death, even as in his life, Nelson Burns and his followers were still surrounded by contentious issues!

FOOTNOTES

[1]S.D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971 (1948)), P. 368-424. Clark's account of the impact of several holiness movements in Ontario and Quebec is interesting and well documented although at points inaccurate. For example: On page 369 he states that Horner was closely associated with the Canada Holiness Association. I have been unable to find any evidence to support this view. Also Sydney Ahlstrom's comprehensive study of religion in the United States documents similar contemporary happenings in that country.

[2]Gordon F. Atter, The Third Force (Caledonia, Ontario: Acts Books, 1970 (1962)), p. 19.

[3]See Brian R. Ross, "Ralph Cecil Horner: A Methodist Deposed, 1887-1895" Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society, Vol. XIX, Nos. 1-2, (March-June, 1977), P. 92-103.
Also Harold W. Pointen, "The Holiness Movement Church in Canada", unpublished BD Thesis, Emmanuel College, Victoria University, March, 1950.

[4]Conversation with Gerald Hobbs of Vancouver School of Theology. Hobbs has recently embarked on a major study of holiness movements in Canada.

[5]Ross, P. 103.

[6]Autobiography of the Late Rev. Nelson Burns, B.A., published under the auspices of the Christian Association, Toronto, nd., P.7&8. Note that Albert Truax appears to be the one who prepared the book for publication.

[7]"Died", Globe, Thursday, June 16, 1904, P. 14.

[8]Autobiography, P. 5&6.

[9]University of Toronto, Class and Prize Lists, 1853-57.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Autobiography, P. 11.

[12]Ibid., P. 12.

[13]Ibid., P. 35.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid., P. 36.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid., P. 8.

[18]George H. Cornish, Cyclopedia of Methodism in Canada, Vol. I. (Toronto: Methodist Book and Publishing House, 1881), P. 643.

[19]Autobiography, P. 60.

[20]Ibid., P.61&62.

[21]Linscott, Born in England, was engaged by the Bible Defence Association to defend the Bible against the attacks of British secularists; he came to North America and was ordained by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1875. He retired in 1879 while in Brantford where he also took charge of the publishing firm Bradley, Garretson and Co. Linscott is also the author of several books. See: Morgan, Canadian Men and Women of the Time, 1912 Edition.

[22]Nelson Burns, Divine Guidance Or The Holy Quest (Brantford, Ontario: The Book and Bible House, 1889), P. 37.

[23]Ibid., P. 63.

[24]Ibid., P. 97.

[25]Ibid., P. 231-257 (Chapters XXV and XXVI).

[26]Autobiography, P. 66&67 and the Expositor of Holiness, Vol. XI, No. 5, November 1892, P. 130-132. These both give the best available accounts of the founding of the C.H.A.

[27]Autobiography, P. 67.

[28]Expositor of Holiness, Vol. I, No. 1, July 1882.

[29]See Appendix 1 for a list of conventions from 1879 through 1893 as compiler by this writer from information in the Expositor of Holiness, the Christian Guardian and Burns' Autobiography.

Harold W. Pointen states that the C.H.A. held conventions in Smith Falls (1892), Newington (1894) and Queen's Line (1894), and that Ralph Horner took a prominent part in the Smith Falls Convention. My research to date would contradict rather than confirm this. The geographical area is not the one in which the C.H.A. was normally working nor does the Expositor of Holiness ever mention Horner's name. The Rev. J. McD. Kerr from Toronto, a Smith Falls participant, started a separate holiness periodical The Holiness Berean in 1890 but has no organic link with the C.H.A. (See Burns announcement of the new magazine in the Expositor of Holiness, January 1890, P. 190.) The conventions in the above named

locations were likely held under the auspices of some other holiness association(s); the Maritimes did have a separate association at one point.

[30]See Appendix 1 for a list of the C.H.A. camp-meetings. Note that the first one was held in 1883.

[31]Expositor, Vol. VIII, No. 5, November 1889, P. 118.

[32]Ibid., Vol. XI, No. 5, November 1892.

[33]Ibid., P. 131.

[34]Ibid., Vol. X, No. 6, December 1891, P. 142&143. See also Burns' further discussion of the problems with Wesley Park (in Niagara Falls, Ontario) and the dispute between "Palmerism" and "Burnsism" as he records it in his Autobiography, P. 109-117. Even James Harris, the virtual founder of the C.H.A., separated himself from Burnsism to such an extent that in 1894 he was the one who seconded the resolution which expelled Burns from the Methodist ministry. (Autobiography, P. 118.) No doubt there were other defections from the ranks as well.

[35]Ralph C. Horner's Reminisences is filled with account after account of emotional experiences connected with entire sanctification.

[36]Autobiography, P. 114.

[37]Expositor, Vol. X, No. 2, August 1891, P. 34.

[38]Ibid., Vol. X, No. 3, September 1891, P. 66&67.

[39]Ibid., P. 67.

[40]Ibid., Vol. XI, No. 10, April 1893, see front cover.

[41]Ibid., back cover.

[42]Expositor, March 1893 (P. 247), April 1893 (P. 276), May 1893 (P. 285-288). William Pointen states erroneously that illness prevented Burns from appearing before the conference ministerial session. Burns did have a protracted health problem (la grippe) in December 1891 through February 1892. (See Expositor, January 1892, P. 182-185.)

[43]Christian Guardian, June 16, 1894, P. 361. No transcript of the trial proceedings has as yet been found.

[44]Ibid., According to Burns, Rev. James Harris was the one who seconded the motion for Burns' expulsion from the ministry. (See footnote #34). The Guardian does not name Harris but rather a Rev. Dr. Willoughby as seconder.

[45] In the Expositor of January 1894 Burns remarks that Truax on trial was in a double sense representative of the C.H.A. He was an official officer in the C.H.A. (vice-president) and he held beliefs which were similar, indeed identical, to those of the C.H.A. (more precisely Burns). In fact, chronologically, Truax's trial was completed before Burns' trial.

[46] George H. Cornish, Cyclopedia of Methodism in Canada. Vol. II (Toronto: Methodist Book and Publishing House, 1903), P. 289-290.

[47] Expositor, Vol. X, No. 10, April 1892, P. 264.

[48] Niagara Conference, Norwich District Minutes, 1884-1895, P. 207.

[49] Globe, "The Truax Heresy Case", Tuesday, June 6, 1893.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid.

[52] "Appeal by Rev. A. Truax to Rev. D.G. Sutherland, Ex. President of the Niagars Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, Hamilton and also to Rev. James S. Ross, New President. Re: Norwich District Meeting vs. Rev. A. Truax." Papers in the Albert Carman papers, Box 5, File 21C, United Church Archives, Toronto.

[53] Expositor, Vol. XI, No. 12, June 1893, P. 320, "The Truax 'Heresy'" by Albert Truax.

[54] Document in United Church Archives, Toronto as Methodist Church--Court of Appeal, Box III, File #53.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid., File # 52, "Findings and Decisions of the Committee of Trial re Rev A. Truax."

[57] Guardian, June 6, 1894, "Editorial Jottings" by E.H. Dewart, P. 360.

[58] Harold W. Pointen, P. 74. Pointen is quoting an anonymous writer.

[59] Expositor, Vol. XII, No. 8, February 1894, P. 222.

[60] Ibid., Vol. XII, No. 1, July 1893, P. 9, "The Truax Case Again" by Albert Truax.

[61] Globe, June 16, 1894, P. 14.

[62] Autobiography, P. 133. Article entitled "Mr. Burns' Last Experience" by Albert Truax.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. UNITED CHURCH ARCHIVES (TORONTO) COLLECTIONS AND DOCUMENTS

Albert Carman Papers, Box 5, File #21c
Box 6, File #24a
Box 20, File #132

Methodist Church - Court of Appeal, Box III, File #52 and File #53.

Niagara Conference, Norwich District Minutes, 1884-1895.

II. THESIS

Pointen, Harold W. "The Holiness Movement Church in Canada", unpublished BD Thesis, Emmanuel College, Victoria University, March 1950.

III. PERIODICALS AND ARTICLES

Expositor of Holiness, Vol. I, No. 1 (July 1882) to Vol. XII, No. 8, (February 1894).

The Christian Guardian, various issues from 1879 to 1895.

Globe, "The Truax Heresy Case", Tuesday, June 6, 1893.

Globe, "Died", Thursday, June 16, 1904, p. 14.

McLennan, J.C. ed. "The Literary and Scientific Society-- A Fiftieth Anniversary", University of Toronto Monthly, Vol. IV, No. 5, (February, 1904), p. 135-138.

Ross, Brian R. "Ralph Cecil Horner: A Methodist Sectarian Deposed, 1887-1895", Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society, Vol. XIX, Nos. 1-2, (March-June, 1977), p. 94-103.

IV. BOOKS

Atter, Gordon F. The Third Force. Caledonia, Ontario: Acts Books, 1970 (1962).

Autobiography of the Late Rev. Nelson Burns, B.A., published under the auspices of the Christian Association, Toronto, nd.

Burns, Nelson. Divine Guidance or The Holy Quest. Brantford, Ontario: The Book and Bible House, 1889.

Clark, S.D. Church and Sect in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971 (1948).

Cornish, George H. Cyclopedia of Methodism in Canada Vol. I. Toronto: Methodist Book and Publishing House, 1881.

Cornish, George H. Cyclopedia of Methodism in Canada Vol. II. Toronto: Methodist Book and Publishing House, 1903.

Grant, John W. The Church in the Canadian Era, Vol. III of A History of the Christian Church in Canada. ed. John W. Grant. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1972.

Jones, Charles Edwin. Perfectionist Persuasion. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Jones, Charles Edwin. Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

The So-Called Heresy Case at Galt. Toronto: Imrie & Graham, Printers, 1889.

University of Toronto, Class and Prize Lists, 1853-57.

APPENDIX 1

C.H.A. CONVENTIONS & CAMP-MEETINGS

1879 1. Convention in Brussels, Ontario (October)

1880 2. Convention in Georgetown. (Nelson Burns invites)

1881 3. Convention in London. (Sec/Tr Colling invites)

1882 4. Convention in Toronto. (Bloor St. Meth. Ch.)

1883 5. Convention in Dundas. (Oct. 23-26)

1. Camp-mtg in Grimsby Park.

1884 6. Convention in Beamsville. (Nov. 12-14)

2. Camp-mtg in Grimsby Park (Aug. 5-12)

1885 7. Convention in Galt. (Nov. 10-13)

3. Camp-mtg in Wesley Park (Aug. 8-17)

1886 8. Convention in Tilsonburg. (Oct. 5-8)

4. Camp-mtg?

1887 9. Convention in Brantford. (Feb. 20-23, 1888)

1888 10. Convention in Toronto. (Feb. 12-15, 1889) Temperance Hall

5. Camp-mtg in Wesley Park (July 17-27)

1889 11. Convention in Hamilton. (Apr. 22-25, 1890) Zion Tabernacle

6. Camp-mtg in Wesley Park (Aug. 23-Sept. 1)

1890 12. Convention in Guelph (or Galt?) (Feb. 17-20, 1891)

7. Camp-mtg in Niagara-on-the-Lake (Aug. 29-Sept. 5)

1891 13. Convention in Toronto. (Mar. 29-31, 1892) YMCA bldg.

8. Camp-mtg in Niagara-on-the-Lake (Aug. 18-27)

1892 14. Convention in Brantford. (Jan. 23-26, 1893) WCTU Hall

9. Camp-mtg in Burlington (July 27-Aug. 1)

1893 15. Convention in Toronto. (Feb. 27-Mar. 1, 1894)

10. Camp-mtg in Wesley Park (with changed name?)