INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The papers presented in this volume were delivered at the 1983 Annual Meetings of the Canadian Society of Church History held on June 7 and 8 at the University of British Columbia (Vancouver). Only one of the nine papers read at the sessions is not included in this collection. Frank A. Peake of Laurentian University presented a paper on "John Booth Good" and it will be published in the Pacific Northwest Quarterly sometime in 1984.

As usual it should be noted that distribution on such a small scale is no substitute for publication. Therefore, circulation in this form does not preclude publication elsewhere, and the copyright remains with the authors. The reproduction of these papers in this form is essentially for the convenience of members of the Society, although a limited number are available to interested persons and institutions who pay the membership fee. Copies may be ordered through Prof. C.F. Johnston, St. Andrew's College, 1121 College Drive, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 0W3.

The Secretary
Ron Sawatsky
Centre For Religious Studies
University of Toronto

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE WESTERN OUTLOOK AND BAPTIST SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY, 1908-1915

J. BRIAN SCOTT

Introduction

Canadian Baptists have been traditionally served a cornucopia of denominational pamphlets, historical sketches, statements of faith, doctrine, educational policy, ordination standards and polity as well as numerous short devotional books, pamphlets and brochures on such diverse subjects as regional Baptist history and Baptist world missions. Until recently very little critical scholarship on Canadian Baptist themes, outside the area of Baptist doctrine and theology, has been produced. With the successful Study Conference on the Believer's Church in Canada, in Winnipeg in 1978 and the international symposium, Baptists in Canada, 1760-1980, at Acadia University in 1980, a new age of critical interest in Canadian Baptist historical themes seems to have arrived.[1]

A theme in Canadian Baptist history which has been too long neglected, is Canadian Baptists and social Christianity. Initial discussion has included John Moir's exploratory essay, presented at the Acadia symposium, which analyses briefly the attitudes of the editors of the Canadian Baptist towards the social gospel movement during the period, 1879-1914. Walter E. Ellis has contributed helpful insights into the subject in a number of articles and papers which for the most part focus on other themes. Richard Allen, in his excellent treatment of the social gospel in Canada, The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-1928, comments on the role of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec in the social gospel movement from 1914 to 1928 but only marginally reflects on the Western Canadian Baptist contribution. The subject area, Western Canadian Baptists and social Christianity, remains a fertile ground for further exploratory and in depth inquiry.[2]

This study will attempt to identify a variety of themes arising out of

the Western Outlook frontispieces and editorial pages that provide valuable insights into the mood and temperament of western Baptists vis-a-vis social concerns and social issues during the period, 1908-1915. Richard Allen's concise definition of the social gospel or social Christianity as a gospel resting, "...on the premise that Christianity (is) a social religion, concerned... with the quality of human relations on this earth...(and is) a call for men to find the meaning of their lives in seeking to realize the kingdom of God in the very fabric of society,"[3] will be employed.

The existence of a social gospel emphasis in Western Canada during the period in question has been enunciated by Richard Allen and Walter E. Ellis but only in a peripheral fashion. In the Social Passion, Richard Allen states, in a summary manner, that "...the chief evidence of the social gospel in the Baptist church in 1918 lay in the West," adding that, "...by 1918 the social gospel had a decade of history behind it among western Baptists."[4] Walter E. Ellis confirms Allen's suspicions when he notes,

> In the period 1900-1930, a strong social gospel emphasis permeated Baptist circles in urban western Canada. Rhetorically positive and reformist, it soon gave way to a nondescript traditional orthodoxy in response to the bitter fundamentalist-modernist controversy.[5]

Ellis points to the negative response of western Baptists towards labour unions and organized labour in general adding the indictment,"...the social gospel reformers reverted to their own class interests and biases whenever crisis situations developed between business and labour."[6]

Ellis is correct in exposing the hypocrisy inherent in paying lip service to social reform while resisting concrete social change but he errs when his critique of the Baptist social gospellers is limited to the sphere of labour versus big business. The Western Outlook, no doubt falling prey to those same class interests and biases, applauds the actions of business leaders while vilifying the strike leaders. As early as 1908 the Outlook editors

commend William Whyte, second vice-president of the C.P.R. whose conduct deserved their commendations and their regrets that, "...his code of business ethics (was) not more generally adopted and appreciated by men in like positions of administration."[7] At the same time the Outlook editors attacked the strike leaders denouncing them as autocratic power brokers, degenerative labour politicians, etc. Apart from this obvious unwillingness to concede any positive or constructive elements within the labour movement in 1908 or for that matter in 1919, the Western Outlook rises far above rhetoric in its commentary on social concerns and social issues in both the regional arena of Western Canada as well as the larger theater of North America, Britain and Western Europe.

The legacy of Baptist social gospellers from the period, 1908-1930, is just recently receiving attention and will be discussed by this writer in a later paper. D.B. Harkness, an editor of the Western Outlook and later an executive of the Social Service Council and an editor of The Statesman, Peter G. Mode, an editor of the Western Outlook and the author of The Frontier Spirit of American Christianity, J.N. McLean, an editor of the Western Outlook and later an executive secretary of the Social Service Council of Manitoba and Dores R. Sharpe, Baptist Union superintendent in Saskatchewan and official biographer of Walter Rauschenbusch, are just a few prominent Baptist churchmen who contributed to the social reform movement in Western Canada during the first three decades of this century. Names such as A.J. Vining, W.C. Vincent, J.F. McIntyre, C.R. Sayer, F.W. Patterson, M.L. Orchard, W.G. Smalley and H.V. Speller round out the list.[8]

Prominent Baptist laymen in the political arena with strong social gospel leanings included the Hon. A.C. Rutherford, the first president of the Baptist Union of Western Canada and the first premier of the province of Alberta, the Hon. G.H.V. Bulyea, the first Lieutenant-governor of Alberta,

J.C Bowen, an Alberta Liberal leader and later Lieutenant-governor of the province and W.J. Estay, a Saskatchewan attorney-general and later Canadian supreme court justice. William Aberhart, Ernest Manning, Tommy Douglas and John Diefenbaker, figures of a later period, have served to provide a further often bizarre and usually flamboyant flavor to the subject of Western Canadian Baptist social Christianity.[9]

The Western Outlook frontispieces and editorial pages seem to suggest a pattern of social thought and social concern as well as a formula for an attendant general blueprint for social action and practice. This paper will focus on the major spheres of influence, both individual commentators and schools of social thought and action, which have helped shape a social gospel mood and temperament in the Western Outlook during the years, 1908-1915. An analysis of the frontispieces and editorial statements and commentary will serve as a vehicle to explore the depth of social gospel bias that may prove to be unique in Western Canadian religious history. Each section and subsection of the text will be treated in a chronological order to preserve the continuity and flow of the Western Outlook's treatment of social issues and concerns. The periodical title Western Outlook and Outlook will be used interchangably throughout.

PART I

WESTERN OUTLOOK FRONTISPIECES AND SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY

A Social Gospel Bias

The Rauschenbuschian Influence

Throughout the years, 1908-1915, the Western Outlook turned often to the "father" of American social gospel for advice and direction, prominently presenting a wide selection of Rauschenbuschian book excerpts, commentary and prayers on the frontispiece of the periodical. Initial statements deal with general social concerns and later focus on specific problem areas, i.e. the role of the church in the new social order and the responsibility of ministers and churchmen in Christianizing the very fabric of society and finally a concern for the retrieval of the city from the slum landlords and the purveyors of vice and crime.

Choosing a selection from Christianity and the Social Crisis, the Outlook identifies apathy as a major stumbling block hindering the ushering in of the new Christian order:

> The (Old Testament)" false prophets" correspond to those modern preachers who act as eulogists of existing conditions, not because they desire to deceive the people, but because they are really so charmed with things as they are and have never had a vision from God to shake their illusions.[10]

In the same vein Rauschenbusch states, "One of the most persistent mistakes of Christian men has been to postpone social regeneration to a future era to be inaugurated by the return of Christ."[11] Although this hope, "...still 'enshrines' the social hope of Christianity and concedes that some time the social life of men is to pass through a radical change and be ruled by

Christ,"[12] the real hope of the future is that,

> The evangelism of the future will offer fullness of life to the soul now and hereafter demand the redemption of the social life of the nations from the collective sin and promise the reign of God in justice and brotherhood.13

The bottom line for Rauschenbusch and the Western Outlook is, "The Gospel of Galilee in the twentieth century-that is what this (social gospel) movement, half unconciously, is reaching out for."[14]

A concern for the role of the church in the process of Christianizing the social order also commands the attention of the Western Outlook. The church is, "...set amid...the perplexities of a changing order," and is face to face, "...with a great new task of giving up her life to humanity."[1] She remains "...the most remarkable institution from a viewpoint of sociolog and the most inclusive institution next to the State and the home."[16] Still drawing from Rauschenbusch the Outlook sings the praises of the Christian church as the ideal vehicle for social reform:

> The Church has furnished the most important social outlet to the people, and through it people have learned to stand on their own two feet...(she) has created in us a real spiritual experience and emancipation, a realization of our moral freedom...(she) is the greatest voluntary institution, the most powerful, the most extensive, the most numerous and the richest institution, representing ideal thoughts and social fraternal relations, engaged in a social transition that is going on all over the world.17

Having applauded the church universal, the Outlook turns to the Canadian scene and exposes a shortcoming hindering the Baptist Union churches in their mission of Christianizing the social order, in the words of Rauschenbusch, "...the graft practiced by the church in underpaying their pastors, using their wives as unpaid workers, and turning them off on a pittance or on nothing when the magnetism of youth has been worked out of them."[18]

The Western Outlook isolates the city as an arena of social change where the church may begin to instigate and direct the transformation of

society into a new Christian order. A Rauschenbuschian prayer implores, "... make our city the common workshop of our people, where everyone can find his own place and task, in daily achievement building up his own life to resolute manhood...."[19] The vision of the city transformed is vintage Rauschenbusch:

> (The) vision of our city, fair as she might be--a city of justice, where none shall prey on others; a city of plenty, where vice and poverty shall cease to fester; a city of brotherhood, where all success shall be founded on service, and honor shall be given to nobleness alone; a city of peace, where order shall not rest on force, but on the love of all the city.[20]

The Western Outlook includes in typical Baptist fashion, an excerpt from Rauschenbusch condemning liquor as the pervasive evil undermining the renaissance of the city:

> But still we cry to Thee in the weary struggle of our people against the power of drink. O God, bring nigh the day when all men shall face their daily tasks with minds undrugged and with tempered passion; when the unseemly mirth of drink shall seem a shame to all who hear and see, when the trade which debauches men shall be loathed like the trade which debauches women; and when all this black remnant of savagery shall haunt the memory of a new generation but as an evil dream of the night.[21]

The final word in this Western Outlook-Rauschenbusch marriage is found under the title, For a Share in the Work of Redemption, a prayer that implores, "Lay thy spirit upon us and inspire us with a passion of Christ-like love that we may join our lives to the weak and the oppressed, and may strengthen their cause by bearing their sorrows."[22]

Other Influences

Over the period, 1908-1915, the Western Outlook drew significantly from a number of social gospel commentators who espoused an immanent transformation of the social order. The Outlook quotes William DeWitt Hyde who states that the "...demand of the hour is ethical insight...an awareness of (the) meanness and (sic) curelty and misery-producing power of specific sins."[23] Henry Frederick Cope adds, "Society has a spiritual

hunger, and the spiritual organization has a social message,"[24] and then asks, "...will the men of our day correlate the power of the church to the problem of society."[25] Francis Peabody captures the essence of social gospel "What gives pathos and power to the modern Social Question is not the economic programme which it proposes, but the human note it utters, of sympathy, pity, justice, brotherhood, unity."[26] Peabody elaborates further,

> The Social Question is the demand of human beings for a humanized life. It is the protest of character against conditions, rather than the pressure of conditions on characters. Within the Social Question...lie ethical questions of duty, compassion, humanity, service, which are the signs, not of a degenerating social order, but of a regenerated social conscience.[27]

Charles H. Rust locates the arena of social transformation in the Christian pulpit which is "...big enough to discuss any and every subject which is vital to humanity's development."[28] Rust adds that the Christian "...believes that Christianity in its principles and spirit should be applied to every phase of human life until the entire social order has been Christianized."[29] Rust is convinced that the mission of the Christian pulpit is to "...instruct men in the School of Christ so that they will go out and be constructive forces in making the social order Christian."[30]

George M. Stratton, under the title The Permanent Place of the Fighting Instinct, exhorts,

> We need anger, but anger against wrongdoing right at hand; against those in our cities who oppose justice; against men who place business above honor and country; against those who oppress the poor; against those who spread disease and vice. Against these the fighting blood must be kept hot.[31]

In the same mood an anonymous selection entitled The Unshaken Hope, decries the pillage and carnage of an unjust war an ocean away:

> We have heard of men torn and dying and we have rejoiced. We have read of women and little children who suffer in the lands of the enemy, and we have not mourned... We have seen that guns and armor destroy peace, and do

> not protect it. We have learned that they who dress in gold braid and parade to martial music are lying prophets. We have read again the page of sacred experience that they who take up the sword shall perish by the sword, and that multitudes of the guiltless shall perish with them. 32

With a renewed hope fostered by prospects of an emerging Christian order, the author proposes an alternative scenario:

> Thus, yet again, this unconquered faith in love and peace hurls forth its challenge against hate and war.... Therefore out of war shall we fight our way to peace; out of hate shall we think our way to love. The heart of man believes it. 33

The commentary continues in the same optimistic vein. Weapons of war will be used to break down the barriers that separate nations and the engines of might will carve out the highways of intercourse between old enemies. The forces of war will build channels of trade and cooperation and merchandise and fellowship will flow freely throughout the world.[34] The writer then adds,

> Thus we will believe, and thus think until we have bred peace and love and brotherhood into the blood of the children of men. Even as hate has begotten hate, and as the plans of war have overshadowed war, so shall love beget love, and the policies of peace nurture peace over the whole earth. 35

Edwin Hatch is left with the final word in a commentary entitled, Christianity Holds the Key when he passionately declares that Christianity's "...unaccomplished mission is to reconstruct society on the basis of brotherhood."[36] Hatch visualizes the following social gospel utopia:

> To you and me and men like ourselves is committed, in these anxious days, that which is at once an awful responsibility and a splendid destiny, to transform this modern world into a Christian society, to change the socialism which is based on the sense of spiritual union, and to gather together the scattered forces of a divided Christendom into a confederation in which organization will be of less account than fellowship with one Spirit and faith in one Lord, into a communion wide as human life and as deep as human need, into a church which shall outshine even the golden glory of its dawn by the splendour of its eternal noon. 37

PART II

WESTERN OUTLOOK EDITORIALS AND SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY

A Social Gospel Bias

General Themes in Social Gospel

The Western Outlook editors during the period, 1908-1915, included such social gospel luminaries as D.B Harkness, P.G. Mode and J.N. McLean, thus a prevalent emphasis upon social concerns and issues might be expected. A continuum of social commentary graces the editorial pages of the Western Outlook from late 1908 until late 1915 with a variety of topics and themes given serious consideration and analysis. General statements and commentary on the wider subject of social Christianity will be given initial attention with specific concerns such as the liquor trade, the unemployment problem and women's rights, treated later in summary fashion.

Under the title, The Message Must be Social, the Outlook locates the pulpit as the primary theater of nascent social change. The Outlook states, "This age demands the principle that it accepts for its guidance and the life which is outlined to it as the correct thing shall be in terms of society,"[38] adding that evangelists, preachers and teachers can no longer emphasize soul salvation because the man in the street "...no longer thinks of his brother in the old theological terminology of the soul." [39] The editorial goes on to stress that the man in the street is "...the concrete man whose concrete choice in the ordinary affairs of every day life are even now deciding his destiny."[40] The editor adds, "...(the) religious message that will appeal to these men must be in terms of these concrete

choices and the preacher or teacher "...will find his message to be more concrete than even the enunciation of the laws of sociology. It will arouse and create a social atmosphere that will be pre-eminently spiritual."[41]

Commenting on the church and moral progress, the Outlook states, "We must always remember that Christianity through the ages has permeated human society and it has taken to itself the science and the social customs and the methods of thought of each age."[42] Taking this argument further, the Outlook adds,

> ... a great many present day methods are socially inefficient because we have not studied the peculiar conditions surrounding our individual churches and have failed to invent or furnish the best kind of machinery to let our spiritual energy exert itself.43

Providing a social gospel model, the Outlook proposes that,

> ...time honored methods of prayer, praise and preaching...supplemented with a system of institutions, educational and philanthropic...(will) enable the church to touch in a helpful way man's physical, mental and social nature as well as his moral and spiritual being.44

Passing judgement on the church's inability to face social change, the Outlook reminds, "...(that) for years the church has been seeking to save individuals; saved individuals would save society...," [45]adding that, "...as long as slums are permitted they will have inhabitants...(and) as long as brothels are permitted countenanced vice will have its victims."[46]

Under the title, Christianizing the Social Order, the Outlook establishes a Rauschenbuschian model for a blueprint of social gospel thought and action. Pointing to Jesus as the architect of social Christianity, the Outlook reminds that Jesus blessed the children, exalted virtue, honored woman, had compassion on the weak and erring and proclaimed "...a new law of life--(the) law of love."[47] Drawing from Rauschenbusch's Christ and the Social Order, the Outlook identifies the true spirit of the teachings of Jesus as "love, democracy and fraternity."[48] Providing

proof of the spreading social reform, the Outlook states,

> ...(that) men of wealth and high social standing have been punished for their crimes against society,both by fine and imprisonment; corporations have been compelled to conduct business according to the law...corrupt political leaders have been dislodged from positions in which they felt secure...employers have been compelled to give more attention to the social needs of their employees and to share more equitably the profits of business...corruption in politics and business has been vastly reduced.[49]

Focusing on the "deceitfulness of riches" as a major social evil, the Outlook laments that, "...humankind have become obsessed of the idea of owning things, usable or unusable, needful or unneedful, just for the sake of storing and having."[50] Citing the example of one Henry Clay Frick, a New York multimillionaire, who built a house on Fifth Avenue for the sum of $ 2,000,000.00, the Outlook printed the following indictment,

> ...the day draws near when it will be considered a disgrace to have accumulated--stored away for selfish or silly uses--these immense fortunes...Henry Clay Frick will slip away into the dark, even as others and be forgotten...Fifth Avenue will change even as it has changed so greatly already..." Clay to clay, ashes to ashes," shall be read over him as if in mockery of the very name he bears but the growth of brotherhood, the love of humankind, the spread of social justice, the sense of right and truth and equity, shall make impossible the repitition of such news items in the days of our children's children, and obliterate forever the memory of such achievement as this daub of printer's ink records.[51]

"Demon Rum"

As might be expected, the Western Outlook identified the liquor traffic as the major "bogeyman" of modern civilization. It would prove redundant to treat the Outlook's commentary on "Demon Rum" at any length in a short paper. The following abstract under the heading The Liquor Traffic best describes the sentiments of the editors,

> (The liqour traffic)...is a deadly cancer eating at the very heart of civilization...(it is) the overshadowing cause of crime, pauperism, insanity, domestic infelicity,

> divorce,...broken-hearted wives, half-clad underfed children...(it) curses and blights the progeny of thousands and thousands; it destroys the nation's wealth, debauches suffrage, corrupts politics and bribes office-holders; it strikes at the foundations of real liberty under the cloak of personal license; it handicaps its victims physically and mentally, morally and socially, commercially and financially; it discounts the desirability and capability of its victims in the industrial, commercial and the professional realms; it cohabits with the gambler, the prolifigate, the white slaver; it has long had a stranglehold on the throat of state and nation through the indefensible license system.[52]

An optimistic note, depending upon personal preference, is ventured under the title Banish the Bar , "...the time is not far distant when the barroom will be as great an anomaly to American civilization as the whipping post or the block of the slave auctioneer."[53]

The Unemployment Problem

The unemployment problem also garnered the attention of the Outlook editors but for the most part it was not a high profile concern. The Outlook found it "...deplorable that in a country like Canada, with the enormous amount of work to be done, conditions should arise which leaves tens of thousands of willing hands idle and empty."[54] Commenting on the existing economic system, the Outlook states, "...there is something radically wrong with the economic system which cannot bring idle hands and idle money together."[55] Questioning the present policies further, the Outlook suggests, "...instead of this investment in citizenship for the development of our immense raw resources we are keeping the money in sterile banks and forcing able and eager men to walk the sterile streets."[56]

In a later commentary, the Outlook states, "...there is no domestic problem before the Canadian people today that is as pressing as that of the unemployed."[57] With a prophetic voice the Outlook continues,

> ...again we say, they must face the problems of unemployment and they must find reasonably satisfactory solutions

> or the people will take their candlesticks out of their places, and their problems shall others solve...the grappling with the unemployment problem in a intelligent and courageous fashion will mean more by way of social uplift to the masses and ultimate support to the dignity of the nation than many Moral and Reform conventions.[58]

Feminism: Woman's Suffrage and Women's Rights

Surprisingly, to this writer, the Western Outlook gives a seemingly inordinate amount of attention to the issue of women's rights. Beginning with a commentary entitled Feminism which gives a qualified endorsement to the suffrage movement, the Outlook states that,

> ...men as a rule are less outwardly emotional than women may perhaps be granted...how much due to difference of sex and how much due to generations of training (remains) ...history shows women are not as physically belligerent as men... (and that) women would likely throw their influence against avoidable war... (and would) not be disposed to its brutalities... (and) when (the vote) comes probably no greater evil will follow than followed the recognition of the voting right of the average man.[59]

Later the Outlook emphatically added that, "...the women's suffrage is inevitable...the movement is irresistable...," and that there are "... few problems that engage the attention of public men today in which the intelligent women of our land have not an equal concern with the men."[60]

Under the title, Woman's Suffrage, the Outlook discusses the extremist tactics of the militant suffragettes with obvious ambivalent feelings stating that the "...outrages of the militant suffragettes continue to shock the sensibilities of Canadians," but then adding "...(a) woman's place is in the home 'expresses' a beautiful sentiment but has little force with the thousands of women who have no homes,"[61] and concluding,

> ...when we ridicule the methods of the militant suffragegettes and deplore their criminal acts we are prone to forget that in their main contention they are right...when there was no agitation it never occurred to surly gentlemen to grant women the franchise. Now that she is determined to have it he demands that she proceed in a more orderly way...the leaders are not daunted by public ridicule,

> imprisonment or death. You may question their methods, but their sincerity is patent...the battle for the ballot will still be waged, with more reason and less frenzy, let us hope, but it will be waged until women are accorded the franchise.62

Discussing women's rights in the larger context of universal social Christianity, the Outlook forwards the contention that the suffrage movement is,

> ...but a phase of the world's great movement toward equal treatment of every human being...it is well that we face the issues raised by feminism with that candor and openness of mind which should be characteristic of sympathetic and forward-thinking men and women.63

Continuing in that vein, the Outlook applauds the feminist movement as,

> ...a movement which seeks to face without prejudice the questions as to the true place of women in the social organism...justice towards one section of society can never involve injustice toward any other section...only as woman has her rightful place and natural rights can the dignity of either men or women be truly preserved and cultured.64

In a later editorial entitled A Woman's World, the Outlook takes this argument much further,

> ...everywhere throughout the whole earth where men and women have acquired the elements of rudimentary thinking there is a great social unrest which is primarily and fundamentally the demand of the feminine in humanity for its rightful place in the system of human life ...liberty shall no longer be witheld...and women shall become lawmaker and priest...every sound and forward-looking mind irrespective of the sex of the body...welcomes each movement toward equity and freedom and a social system wherein nature's laws interpret the thought of nature's God for his creation...a world wherein men and women shall be citizens, equals, comrades, co-workers, lawmakers, voters, and workers-together in mutual understanding for the common weal.65

Relating the feminist movement to the Western Canadian scene, the Outlook comments on a recent defeat of a suffrage proposition in New Jersey, predicting that, "...even the present male-partisan electorate of New Jersey must pass away and with it will go another of the refuges

of prejudice,"[66] adding that,

> Baptists of Western Canada were well guided when some years ago they declared themselves in favor of woman suffrage. We believe they were the first Canadian Church to do so in regular convention and that Dr. R.H. Mode had the honor of drafting and submitting this modest but none the less epochal resolution.[67]

Conclusion

To summarize, the Western Outlook, employing a Rauschenbuschian model castigates the church for its apathy and shortsightedness and calls for it to put its house in order and return to New Testament basics, the "Gospel of Galilee," implemented with zeal and vigour in the twentieth century. Identifying the pulpit as the most important vehicle for social reform, the Outlook calls Baptist Union ministers to resist the status quo and preach a concrete message that will touch concrete men in a physical as well as spiritual context. The Outlook advises that the message of Christ, adapted to modern needs and modern situations with all its humanitarian and egalitarian uniqueness, will serve to usher in a new social order and hasten the establishment of the "Kingdom of God" on earth in the present age. Promoting the city as a common workshop or laboratory for social reform, the Outlook advocates the retrieval of urban areas from the purveyors of vice and crime; the opportunistic speculators, the corrupt city politicians and the parasitic exploiters of the vulnerable, poor and the hungry. The Outlook extends as a solution, the marriage of old and tried techniques with new and modern machinery, anticipating an emerging social order that will adopt as its constitution, the model of Jesus; love, democracy and fraternity.

Commenting on the problems afflicting both the local, national and global scene, the Outlook isolates the liquor traffic, the unemployment problem and the issue of women's rights as significant concerns. Liquor remains the all pervasive evil retarding social reform and contributing to the breakdown of modern civilization. With the advent of the "Banish the Bar" movement inroads are being made in the all consuming battle against

"Demon Rum." The problem of unemployment demands a more equitable economic system that will restore the pride and dignity of thousands of idle and able workers whose only crime is their inability to find suitable and gainful employment. Women's rights is easily the most pressing problem for the Outlook editors. Freedom and equality for all humankind must precede any Christianized social order. Until all men and women are equal partners sharing concretely in the task of societal reform, Christendom will be divided and fall far short of the utopian expectations visualized by the social prophets of the day.

The Western Outlook brings to the subject of Canadian social Christianity or social gospel, a distinctly Baptist flavor. With a focus on the general theme of Christianizing the social order, the Outlook isolates the church and pulpit as vehicles of social reform and the city as the theater of social change. Unlike other Canadian manifestations of social Christianity or social gospel, Methodist, Presbyterian and Catholic, the Western Outlook model does not emphasize the role organized labour should or could play in this impending social revolution. On the contrary, the Western Outlook model dismisses labour as a hindrance to any concrete programme for Christianizing the social order. A Calvinistic reverence for the pursuit of rugged individualism in the form of free enterprise, within reason, seems to set Western Baptist social gospel apart from its prairie counterparts. A distinctly Baptist compulsive obsession with the evils of "Demon Rum" combined with the former phenomena, serves to give an unique if not often bizarre and flamboyant texture to the Western Baptist model for societal reform. A regional denominational expression that can give rise to such a diverse cast of characters who have contributed significantly to the religious, educational and political history of Western Canada, must remain a subject of considerable research and debate.

References

[1] Recent publications treating Canadian Baptist historical themes include Barry M. Moody, ed., Repent and Believe: The Baptist Experience in Maritime Canada (Hantsport, Nova Scotia: Lancelot Press, 1980), Jarold K. Zeman, ed., Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity Amidst Diversity (Burlington, Ontario: G.R. Welch Co., Ltd., 1980), Jarold K. Zeman, et. al., eds., The Believer's Church in Canada (Brantford, Ontario: Baptist Federation of Canada, 1979). Western Baptist history has been given a predominantly devotional scrutiny in numerous short histories and historical sketches. The following short list will provide the general reader with an initial introduction to sources in Western Canadian Baptist history. J. Baker, Baptist History of the North Pacific Coast (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publications, 1912), Theo Gibson, The Granite Curtain: The Story of Alexander McDonald (Pub. by author, 1975), J.E. Harris, The Baptist Union of Western Canada: A Centennial History, 1873-1973 (Saint John, New Brunswick: Lingley Printing Company, 1976), C.C. McLaurin, Pioneering in Western Canada: A Story of the Baptists (Calgary: Pub. by author, 1939), M.L. Orchard, Time for the Sickle (Kingman, Alta.:Pub. by author, n.d.), John B. Richards, Baptists in British Columbia: A Struggle to Maintain "Sectarianism" (Vancouver: Northwest Baptist Theological College, 1977), William C. Smalley, Come Wind-Come Weather (Saint John, New Brunswick: Lingley Printing Company, 1969), Margaret Thompson, The Baptist Story in Western Canada (Calgary: Baptist Union of Western Canada, 1975).

[2] For further discussion of Canadian social Christianity or social gospel see, Richard Allen, "The Social Gospel as the Religion of Agrarian Revolt," in Ramsey Cook and Carl Berger, eds., The West and the Nation (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), Richard Allen, ed., The Social Gospel in Canada (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975), Richard Allen, ed., Religion and Society in the Prairie West (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1974), Stewart Crysdale, "Social Awakening among Protestants, 1872-1918," in Stewart Crysdale and Les Wheatcroft, eds., Religion and Canadian Society (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1976): 191-206, Stewart Crysdale, "The Sociology of the Social Gospel: Quest for a Modern Ideology," in Stewart Crysdale and Les Wheatcroft, eds., Religion and Canadian Society (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1976): 423-433, Walter E. Ellis, "Gilboa to Ichabod: Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms among Canadian Baptists, 1895-1934," Foundations 20 (1977): 90-126, G.N. Emery, "The Origin of Canadian Methodist Involvement in the Social Gospel Movement, 1890-1914," The Bulletin #26 (1977), Brian Fraser, "Theology and the social gospel among Canadian Presbyterians: A Case Study," Studies in Religion 8 (1979): 35-46, W.W. Judd, "The Vision and the Dream," The Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society 8 (December 1965), W.H. Magney, "The Methodist Church and the National Gospel," The Bulletin #20 (1968), John S. Moir, "The Canadian Baptist and the Social Gospel Movement, 1879-1914," in Jarold K. Zeman, ed., Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity Amidst Diversity (Burlington, Ontario: G.R. Welch Co., Ltd., 1980): 147-159.

[3] Richard Allen, "The Social Gospel and the Reform Tradition in Canada, 1890-1928," The Canadian Historical Review 69 (4) (December 1968), pp. 381-382.

[4] Richard Allen, The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-1928 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 70.

[5] Walter E. Ellis, "Baptist Missions--Adaptation to the Western Frontier," (Unpublished study paper for the Symposium on Canadian Baptist History at McMaster Divinity College, 1982), p. 15.

[6] Ibid., p. 4.

[7] Western Outlook (hereafter cited WO), October 15, 1908, p. 2.

[8] Walter E. Ellis, "Baptists and Radical Politics in Western Canada, 1920-1950," in Jarold K. Zeman, ed., Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity Amidst Diversity (Burlington, Ontario: G.R. Welch Co., Ltd., 1980), pp. 164-165.

[9] Ibid.

[10] WO, May 15, 1908, p. 1 (excerpt from Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis).

[11] WO, September 15, 1908, p. 1.

[12] Ibid.

[13] WO, October 16, 1911, p. 1 (excerpt from the Congregationalist)

[14] Ibid.

[15] WO, March 15, 1912, p. 1.

[16] WO, July 15, 1913, p. 1.

[17] Ibid.

[18] WO, March 15, 1913, p. 1.

[19] WO, July 1, 1912, p. 1.

[20] Ibid.

[21] WO, July 1, 1914, p. 1.

[22] WO, January 15, 1913, p. 1.

[23] WO, November 1, 1910, p. 1.

[24] WO, November 1, 1911, p. 1.

[25] WO, July 15, 1912, p. 1.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] WO, April 15, 1913, p. 1.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] WO, March 2, 1914, p. 1.

[32] WO, January 1, 1915, p. 1.

[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] WO, September 1, 1915, p. 1.
[37] Ibid.
[38] WO, October 1, 1909, p. 4.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.
[42] WO, January 1, 1910, p. 2.
[43] WO, May 15, 1911, p. 2.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] WO, March 1, 1913, p. 15 (quoting from Walter Rauschenbusch, Christ and the Social Crisis)
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.
[50] WO, December 1, 1915, p. 2.
[51] Ibid.
[52] WO, February 1, 1914, p. 2.
[53] WO, April 1, 1914, p. 2.
[54] WO, May 1, 1915, p. 2.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid.
[57] WO, July 1, 1915, p. 2.
[58] Ibid.
[59] WO, February 15, 1909, p. 2.
[60] WO, January 15, 1913, p. 2.
[61] WO, May 1, 1913, p. 2.
[62] WO, August 1, 1913, p. 2.
[63] WO, May 15, 1914, p. 2.
[64] Ibid.
[65] WO, July 15, 1915, p. 2.
[66] WO, November 1, 1915, p. 2.
[67] Ibid.

"That's the B.C. Spirit!": Religion and Secularity in Lotus Land

Bob Stewart

It does not usually take long for a person moving to British Columbia to discover that - religiously - this is a province unlike other parts of Canada. Upon crossing the Rocky Mountains, many people trade their Bibles for hiking boots, skis, sailboats, and other paraphernalia of the good life. Sunday mornings are for the worship of nature, and the cultivation of the healthy body, rather than for the worship of God. There was a time when I worried about that.

Back in 1975, I wrote a paper on a variety of dismal trends in the United Church in B.C.; I wondered whether we would recover. The prognosis looked bad: Between 1925 and 1975 (if we consider population growth) the membership of the United Church in Vancouver had declined by 57%. Between 1960 and 1975 the B.C. sunday school membership had declined from 75,000 to under 20,000; in Vancouver the sunday school decline was from 25,000 to under 5,000 members.

The effect of putting together this long funeral procession for the United Church in B.C. was somewhat cathartic. It provided the occasion for a few discussions, after which I put it away and stopped worrying.

When I was asked to present something at this Society meeting, with the thought that it would be good to do "something on the United Church in B.C.", it seemed natural that I should resurrect my old paper of eight years earlier at least as a starting point. But it became quickly evident that my previous existential crisis had passed, and that if I was to try again to make sense of the United Church in B.C., I should attempt to examine the broad religious culture of this province, and place the United Church within that, rather than to continue to rummage around in the United Church Yearbook statistics. It seemed necessary to compare the broad religious culture of B.C. with that of the rest of Canada, and to examine our religious character in B.C. in the context of a highly polarized society -- a broad polarization that permeates most aspects of our political and social life.

Perhaps the broadest indication of the tone of our religious life comes to us from the Canadian Gallup Poll. In the most recent poll that gives us a regional breakdown (June, 1980), we find that British Columbians are by far the least inclined to attend a church or synagogue:

Gallup Poll (June 28, 1980): "Did you attend a church or synagogue in the past past seven days?"

Atlantic Provinces	43%
Quebec	44%
Ontario	32%
Praries	35%
British Columbia	21%

National Average 35%

In another Gallup Poll done on the relevance of organized religion, B.C. was again leader of the pack:

Gallup Poll (May 31, 1978): "Is organized religion a relevant part of your life at the present time or not?"

	Yes	No
Atlantic Provinces	60%	40%
Quebec	66%	34%
Ontario	50%	50%
Prairies	46%	54%
British Columbia	37%	63%

	Yes	No
National Average:	52%	48%

It is interesting that we find the same phenomenon in the United States as in Canada. In a 1980 American Gallup Poll on Church/Synagogue attendance, the following percentages had attended in the previous seven days:

East	40%
Midwest	45%
South	42%
West	29%

U.S. National Average: 40%

Thus, while we can see that the magical properties of the Rocky Mountains are not so great in the U.S. as in Canada, the pronounced secularization of those who venture west across the Rockies remains significant in both countries.

The secularity of British Columbia is further confirmed when we examine the Canadian census material for 1971 and 1981; let us examine the statistics for those whose religious preference in these two censuses is for "No Religion":

"No Religion" by Canada and the Provinces, 1971 & 1981*. Numbers and % of Populatio

	# in 1971	# in 1981*	% in 1971	% in 1981
Canada	929,575	1,788,995	4.3%	7.4%
Newfoundland	2,280	5,605	0.4	1.0
P.E.I.	1,095	3,240	1.0	2.7
Nova Scotia	19,185	34,335	2.4	4.1
New Brunswick	11,885	19,685	1.9	2.9
Quebec	76,685	132,935	1.3	2.1
Ontario	343,685	620,815	4.5	7.3
Manitoba	42,490	76,285	4.3	7.5
Saskatchewan	34,090	60,255	3.7	6.3
Alberta	108,410	260,015	6.6	11.7
British Columbia	287,115	568,170	13.1	20.9
Yukon	1,625	4,680	8.8	20.3
N.W.T.	1,025	2,970	2.9	6.5

*The 1981 census material on religion is preliminary; it is possible that when the data is published in its final form it will be somewhat different than found here. Thus all religious census data for 1981 in this paper should be used with care.

What is immediately striking in this table is that 20.9% of all British Columbians have a preference for "No Religion". This is nearly triple the national average, a ratio which B.C. also maintained in 1971. I think that we need to try to explain this feature of religion in British Columbia before we can begin to get at understanding the peculiarities of the United Church in B.C. The deeply secular character of B.C. is, however, only one side of a religious polarity which exists in this province.

In his paper on Walter Ellis given earlier to this meeting of our Society, Bob Burkinshaw suggests that B.C.'s Conservative protestant population has become proportionately larger since the 1930's than in any other province in Canada.

While B.C. is clearly Canada's leading "secular playland", it may also be true that B.C. is Canada's leading "Bible belt". We have seen that the "No Religion" group in B.C. is now very large. How does it compare with the other religious groupings? And what are the trends for the more conservative Protestant groupings in B.C.? The following table gives us these trends:

British Columbia: Selected Denominations, Numerical & % distributions, 1971 & 1981.

	# 1971	# 1981	Increase/ Decrease	% 1971	% 1981	% points +/-
Adventist	7,190	9,015	+ 1,825	0.3%	0.4%	+ 0.1
Anglican	386,670	374,055	- 12,615	17.7	13.6	- 4.1
Baptist	64,840	81,850	+ 17,010	3.0	3.0	even
Ch. & Miss. All.	5,610	7,975	+ 2,365	0.3	0.3	even
Chr. Reformed	11,460	14,785	+ 3,325	0.5	0.5	even
Greek Orth.	20,525	21,645	+ 1,120	0.9	0.8	- 0.1
Jehovah's Wit.	42,315	31,520	- 10,795	1.9	1.2	- 0.7
Lutheran	120,335	122,395	+ 2,060	5.5	4.5	- 1.0
Mennonite	26,520	30,895	+ 4,375	1.2	1.1	- 0.1
Mormon	12,670	16,740	+ 4,070	0.6	0.6	even
Pentecostal	35,225	55,095	+ 19,870	1.6	2.0	+ 0.4
Presbyterian	100,945	89,810	- 11,135	4.6	3.3	- 1.3
Roman Catholic	408,330	526,355	+ 118,025	18.7	19.2	+ 0.5
Salv. Army	11,885	12,275	+ 390	0.5	0.5	even
United	537,570	548,360	+ 10,790	24.6	20.0	- 4.6
No Religion	287,115	568,170	+ 281,055	13.1	20.9	+ 7.8

While several smaller religious groups are left out of the above table, there are several things that can be seen. First, the "No Religion" group is now the largest "religious" body in B.C., larger than the United, Roman Catholic or Anglican churches. While the United Church preference figure actually rose by 11,000 in 1981 over the 1971 census figure, as a proportion of the total B.C. population, it dropped by 4.6 percentage points. While it is clear that the Pentecostals have made great gains in the 1970's, rising by 20,000, at the same time the Roman Catholic population grew by nearly 120,000 preferences. The deep decline of the Jehovah's Wittness support from 42,000 to 31,000 is likely a

reflection of the internal conflict that this group has experienced in the 1970's. Many of the departed Jehovah's Wittnesses have likely migrated to various conservative Protestant groups.

The main and obvious fact of the above table is that overall, the more liberal mainline Protestant churches tended to lose ground, and the more conservative Protestant churches tended either to stay even or to make modest to strong gains. While much more detailed work will be done on this as more census data is released, this table does demonstrate a trend of steady growth of some of the conservative Protestant and Roman Catholic populations, and, on the other side, a dramatic increase in those choosing the secular "No Religion" option.

In the next few pages of this paper I will examine some of the variables that are often used to explain the secularity of British Columbia. It is sometimes suggested that the high "No Religion" response in B.C. can be explained by the ethnic populations, especially the oriental populations who are said to favour "No Religion". And indeed, at first glance this does seem to be a significant variable: British Columbia: "No Religion" by Ethnic Groups. Percentage Distribution for Canada, 1971 & 1981 and British Columbia, 1981.

Ethnic Group	Canada % 1971	Canada % 1981	B.C. % 1981
British	5.4%	8.9%	20.3%
Chinese	*	56.8	63.7
Dutch	8.2	10.9	20.3
French	1.1	1.8	14.6
German	5.6	8.0	15.5
Italian	1.3	1.4	6.3
Japanese	*	27.7	36.6
Jewish	3.3	3.7	12.3
Native Indian	2.7	7.3	14.4
Average:	4.3	7.3	20.9

* In the 1971 census data, the Chinese and Japanese groups were lumped with other "Asian" groups; 22% of the "Asians" said they had a "No Religion" preference in 1971.

Several points can be drawn when we compare the "No Religion" and the ethnic variables. First, 63.7% of the Chinese population in B.C. prefered "No Religion."

But the Chinese "No Religion" population in B.C. was only 61,785 out of a total non-religious population of 568,170. If the entire Chinese population were removed from the statistics, it would only reduce the B.C. non-religious population by two percentage points, to about 19%. While the oriental population is a slight factor, it is far from sufficient to explain the difference between B.C. and the rest of the country. Second, we see that it is the ethnic groups from traditionally Catholic countries (Italy and France) that have the lowest "No Religion" response. This is also the case when we saw the distributions of "No Religion" by the provinces: the provinces with the highest Roman Catholic populations - Quebec, New Brunswick and P.E.I. - had the lowest "No Religion" rates. Third, and perhaps most significantly, if we compare the percentage distributions between Canada and B.C. for 1981, we can see that there is a significant difference between the religiosity of all of the groups depending on their geography, rather than their ethnic bacgrounds alone. In Canada, 1.8% of the French are non-religious; in B.C. it is 14.6%. In Canada, 1.4% of the Italians are non-religious; in B.C. 6.3% are. So while one must recognize that those of Roman Catholic background tend not to join the non-religious category as easily as do Protestants, there are still other elements that need to be added to the statistical stew before we can begin to see what it is that makes B.C. a religiously peculiar place.

Unfortunately, from this point we will have to make do without the 1981 census data, as only the most preliminary religious demographic data has so far been released. But if we examine the 1971 census data, we might yet begin to make sense of B.C.'s religious - or non-religious - peculiarity.

One revealing dimension is that of looking at the age structure of the religious groups in British Columbia:

Percentage Distributions of Selected Religious Denominations by Age Groups, Canada and B.C., 1971.

	Total	0-14	15-34	35-54	55+
Canada: Total	100%	29.6%	31.9%	22.3%	16.1%
Canada: No Religion	100	27.4	40.5	21.7	10.4
B.C.: Total	100	27.9	31.1	22.9	18.1
B.C.: Anglican	100	23.7	29.2	23.2	23.9
Baptist	100	28.2	29.0	21.4	21.3
Lutheran	100	25.9	27.1	26.2	20.8
Mennonite	100	31.2	30.0	20.9	17.9
Pentecostal	100	34.0	30.9	18.4	16.6
Presbyterian	100	19.2	24.2	24.6	32.0
Roman Catholic	100	33.0	31.9	22.6	12.4
United	100	28.0	30.8	23.2	18.0
No Religion	100	29.1	37.6	21.3	11.9

The first, and obvious fact is that the "No Religion" group is the highest in the 15 to 34 age range, and the lowest in the 55+ age range. So, very predictably, the non-religious population is predominantly the younger families and single individuals in their twenties and thirties. We can see that the Roman Catholic and Pentecostal bodies who had a higher proportion in the 15 to 34 age range, shared with the non-religious group the highest increase in growth between 1971 and 1981 as we saw earlier. Nevertheless, while the age structure of the non-religious population in B.C. tells us that an inordinate number are between 15 and 34, with the implication that they stand a very good chance of being a growing enterprise, nothing in the age structure explains the proportional difference between B.C. and the rest of the country. Before leaving the age group chart, I must say I was somewhat suprised to see that the Presbyterian Church in B.C. had nearly double the provincial average population 55 and over (i.e. 32%, as compared with 18%).

It is generally accepted that one of the significant variables regarding the "No Religion" response is the urban-rural factor. City folks are more inclined t secularity; country folks are more rooted and perhaps more conservative in their

religious preferences. And indeed, when we compare the urban and rural populations in both Canada and B.C. for 1971, we find that it is generally true as the following table demonstrates:

Percentage Distribution of "No Religion" responses for Canada and B.C., for Urban and Rural Areas, 1971.

	Canada	B.C.
Total Population	4.3%	13.1%
Urban Regions	4.6	13.2
Population 500,000+	5.7	15.3
Rural Regions	3.5	12.9
Rural: non-farm	3.7	13.1
Rural: farm	2.9	11.5

While the above table demonstrates that urban people are more inclined to the secular than are rural people, the remarkable feature is how little the differences are within British Columbia. The rural non-farm population is identical with the total population. What is striking is not the differences within B.C., but rather the differences between B.C. and the rest of Canada: the rural, farm population in Canada is only 2.9% non-religious; in B.C. it is 11.5% non-religious.

The rural-urban dimension also touches on the question of our B.C. "Bible belt". At least some of our Fraser Valley areas were far from swept up in revival, at least in 1971. In Surrey Municipality, while 2.2% of the population were Pentecostal in preference (B.C. average: 1.6%) the "No Religion" population was 13.2%, also higher than the B.C. average of 13.1%. Langley Municipality had a much higher Pentecostal response in 1971: 3.3%, but again, the non-religious percentage was above the provincial average: 13.5%. The point I wish to suggest is not to deny the evident growth in the conservative Protestant population in several centres within the Fraser Valley; it is only to suggest that right within the heartland of the "Bible belt" there is also an even stronger wave of secularity that is overtaking the rural areas of the province just about as much as it is rising in the more urban regions. The urban-rural differences may help to explain the growth of conservative Protestant groups within particular regions or provinces, but they do

not begin to help us understand the differences in degrees of secularity between B.C. and the rest of Canada.

One possible explanation for the secular climate of B.C. is that it is related to the very high degree of migration and mobility in the population of B.C. In fact, parallel to the increasing secularity of Canada as we move from the east coast to the west coast, is the increasing ratio of both migrants into the province and migrants from one municipality to another within the province, as well as people moving within a municipality. Within each province, however, the numbers of people migrating and moving has also been on the rise between 1956 and 1976, as the following table suggests:

Percentage Distribution of Population Age 5+ by Migration, Canada & Provinces.

	Non-Movers	Movers (W/in a Municip.)	Migrants
Canada:			
1956-61	54.6%	25.2%	20.2%
1966-71	52.6	23.5	23.9
1971-76	51.5	23.4	25.1
Nfld:			
1956-61	72.5	17.9	9.6
1966-71	65.9	16.9	17.2
1971-76	64.9	18.1	17.0
P.E.I.:			
1956-61	71.2	13.7	15.1
1966-71	66.5	14.2	19.4
1971-76	60.1	15.1	24.7
Nova Sc.:			
1956-61	65.9	18.3	15.8
1966-71	61.0	19.6	19.4
1971-76	58.2	20.0	21.8
New Br.:			
1956-61	66.6	17.6	15.8
1966-71	61.9	19.6	18.6
1971-76	57.2	20.8	22.0
Quebec:			
1956-61	55.6	27.5	16.9
1966-71	55.3	24.4	20.3
1971-76	54.7	23.6	21.7
Ontario:			
1956-61	52.1%	26.0%	21.9%
1966-71	50.7	24.3	25.0
1971-76	50.7	24.1	25.2
Manitoba:			
1956-61	56.2	24.7	19.0
1966-71	54.2	23.8	22.0
1971-76	52.1	27.6	20.3
Sask:			
1956-61	60.5	20.6	18.9
1966-71	58.9	20.2	20.9
1971-76	56.0	20.4	23.6
Alberta:			
1956-61	47.7	26.1	26.2
1966-71	48.5	24.3	27.2
1971-76	44.4	25.4	30.2
B.C.:			
1956-61	47.1	25.9	27.0
1966-71	42.7	22.8	34.6
1971-76	42.3	22.7	35.0
Yukon/N.W.T.:			
1956-61	31.6	29.8	38.6
1966-71	24.2	34.6	41.2
1971-76			38.6

What we are trying to get a sense of with this table is the degree of "rootlesness" that populations in different provinces of Canada experience. And we can see that as one moves from the eastern seaboard to the west coast,

and then up to the Yukon and the North West Territories, there is a dramatic increase in migration and movement. While only 34.1% of the Newfoundlanders and 41.8% of the Nova Scotians moved or migrated in the period from 1966 to 1971, the B.C. and Yukon/North West Territories percentages are 57% and 76% respectively.

Let us further examine the migrant population (i.e. those who moved from either one municipality to another, or from one province to another.) In this we will compare the migrants in the age 20-35 age range with all migrants, and compare these with broad religious groupings:

Migrant Population, Total & Age 20-34, by Religious Groupings, Canada, 1966-71.

	All Migrants (5+)	Migrants, Age 20-34
Canada, total pop.	23.9%	39.8%
Roman & Ukran. Cath.	21.6	35.8
Principal Protestant *	24.5	41.3
No Religion & others	30.7	48.9

* Principal Protestant is Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Presbyterian & United.

In this table we see that not only are there a great many more migrants proportionately in the period from age 20 to 34, but also there is a greater ratio of "No Religion and Others" migrating than in the other religious groupings. While no comparable table for such British Columbia groupings is available, I have no doubt that the ratios on such a table would again be very high. Further, a more detailed breakdown of religious groups would have been very useful, but was not available. I think that the point can be made that B.C. has the highest migration and moving rate among all the provinces, the Yukon and N.W.T., as territories, being the exception. We have seen that the "No Religion" group is both the highest in B.C., and that there is a greater ratio of "No Religion" responses in the age 15 to 34 group. The proposition is quite simply that the "No Religion" group is made up of a high proportion of highly migratory young families and single individuals.

Many people who move to British Columbia are struck by the fact that everyone they meet has come from somewhere else. For example, I cannot think of anyone in my friendship circle that was born in B.C. except myself. And many who have come here never quite get the feeling that they have "settled in". Their home, or at least their "roots", are somewhere else. Perhaps many people have come to B.C. precisely to get away from their roots, which will often include some kind of previous church activity. And the climate, both in terms of the enjoyment of the weather and the outdoors, and in terms of our cultural mood, permits a great deal of freedom to take or leave religion, and a great many migrants to British Columbia choose to leave it behind when they come here. There are many alternative ways of spending a Sunday morning in B.C.

At the same time we do have our Bible belt seeming to grow stronger with each passing year. This does not conflict with the high degree of secularity within the province. In a climate that provides for freedom from one's roots, there are those who find that such freedom produces great quantities of vertigo; such people desire a religious life and committment that is clear and unambiguous. Many conservative Protestant groups have grown strong by providing sanctuary from the world of relative values. Perhaps it is the very secularity of B.C.'s culture that provides a seed-bed for the more conservative Protestant groups. In fact, it is this deep polarity that characterizes both our religious culture and all of our social and political structures. In B.C. politics, the Liberal and Conservative parties are not endangered species: they are extinct. Our labour - management polarities are infamous across the nation. The indicators of a transient, anomic society are also suggestive of our condition, with B.C. leading the way in the suicide and alcoholism rates among the provinces. The deep polarization at the heart of our life in British Columbia has been a long-standing feature of our history.

Other than the native Indian people of B.C., we have a short history as an immigrant people going back little more than 125 years. Our first immigrants were gold-seekers, and they set the pattern: we came to this region seeking our fortunes in the resource industries, exploiting the land and the seas rather than coming as families of "settlers". With our exploitation of the staple resources, we came to live in single-industry towns, mining camps, bush camps and fishing villages. There were few things that would make us want to settle down, and without the prerequisites for establishing deep religious roots, the transient population has always had a strong secular spirit. Unlike in most parts of the country, neither the major universities nor the schools were founded by the churches. Our argument here is that in B.C. the organized religious institutions are much more marginal to our political and social life than one would find in other Canadian provinces. And while there may be several dimensions which interact to generate the spirit of secularity which predominates here, such as the ethnic mixture, a lower than average Roman Catholic presence, a highly urbanized population, I suspect that it is our long history as a highly mobile, transient, and rootless people that provides the basis for both our predominating secularity and, at the same time, the propensity -- for those who can't stand the rootlessness -- for buying into varieties of "born again" religion that can provide at least gravol for the bumpy ride through life, if not total freedom from the perils of modernity.

In such a polarized religious climate, what does the United Church offer? Is there any real middle ground upon which it can play a useful role? It would seem to me that for many liberal Christians there is little ground upon which to stand. They are marginal observers between warring so-called "secular humanists" and "born again" crusaders, and are attracted to neither party. But in this polarized climate the mainline churches like the United Church seem now to be in limbo, and not so obviously in a state of decline that they were in a few years ago.

Looking at the United Church from the inside, from the picture the statistics in the Yearbooks paint, there is a growing vibrance in the past several years. Much of the terrifying decline in membership of the 1960's and early 1970's has levelled off. If we look at the givings of the resident church membership, we can see a steady increase, even in constant dollar terms in these highly inflationary times. In B.C. the average annual offering is now $235.00, a modest sum, but a considerable improvement over ten years ago. While the membership continues to decline slightly (as the membership rolls are often more rigorously kept than they were in the past), the average weekly attendance at services is growing steadily, and this state of relative health was certainly not apparent in the ten years prior to 1975, the period I focussed on in my earlier look at the United Church in B.C. The present statistical tables, while not included here, leave me with some grounds for believing the United Church has a future in B.C.

Still, there is a question of what kind of future, given the marginality of the middle ground in all and any mediating institutions in a polarized society. I have no doubt that many mainline church members will in the coming years join either the ranks of the conservative Protestants, or will decide that they no longer have need of any organized religion, and will join the non-religious when the census-taker comes around. Somehow, this whole process does not worry me as it once did.

Nevertheless there is, I believe, something deeply rotten at the heart of the religious culture of British Columbia. We rather pride ourselves on living in a west coast paradise, yet it is a paradise that is on the economic rocks. And in the midst of this some of the most culturally accommodating churches are to be found among those conservative Protestant bodies that manage to preach an Amway gospel of success that in the end seems to me to ironically legitimize the comfort-seeking, self-indulgent lifestyle of a "California North" that is no

longer able to relate to the grim poverty that many of her citizens now experience. If there is a civil religion in B.C., it could be understood by a careful exegesis of the phrase "That's the B.C. Spirit!" "That's the B.C. Spirit!" is a phrase that our present government started plastering on all of its mega-projects in 1982 when we began to wonder if they could ever be paid for. "That's the B.C. Spirit!" is a phrase that affirms the indomitable hedonistic spirit that denies the nightmare of those who can't afford a Jacuzzi yet. The very day I began to think about what I would say here about religion in B.C. there was a wonderfully evocative headline in Vancouver's morning newspaper: "Small Families, 3 Baths: That's the B.C. Spirit." It informed us that the census showed B.C. leading the way with the smallest families and the most 3 bathroom houses in the land. We seek our comfort from bothersome child-raising, and we lay at ease in our multiple hot tubs. Surely we are the chosen.

Alexander Scott and the Reformation of 19th-century Britain

by J. Philip Newell, B.A., B.D., Ph.D.

Alexander Scott, heretic, theologian, educator and social reformer, is an almost entirely forgotten 19th-century historical character. A study of his life and thought is of significant value in and by itself, but he is worthy of being exhumed from the past primarily because he is a window into an age of reformation. Scott is an indicator of the direction of much 19th-century British Christian thought. He reflects in his life and theology, for instance, the transition in 19th-century British Christianity from a limited view of Christ's atonement to a confident declaration of God's universal love. In this and in otherareas Scott's often unorthodox convictions signalled a coming change. For this reason, foremost of all, he is worthy of our attention.

Alexander John Scott was born on 26 March 1805 in Greenock, Scotland.[1] His father was a leading minister of the National Kirk and belonged to the increasingly rigid Scottish Evangelical party, which accentuated the hard lines of Westminster Calvinism in its doctrines of limited atonement, predestination and the total depravity of man. At the age of thirteen Scott left Greenock to study at Glasgow University. In Glasgow Scott increasingly became aware of the conditions of the poor, in sharp contrast to the rising standards of the middle classes. Here he witnessed in his second year a political uprising of sixty thousand workers calling for 'Liberty or Death'. Scott lived in an age of revolution and began his university career amidst cries of freedom for all, the vote for all, and education for all. While a sense of the equality and oneness of humanity emerged everywhere in the socio-political realm, the Scottish Kirk as yet remained entrenched in a doctrine of election.

Scott graduated M.A. in 1824 and proceeded immediately to his theological

studies at Glasgow Divinity Hall, where he was surrounded by the rising stars of Scottish Evangelicalism, including Robert Candlish and James Begg. Although he met with nothing broader in Glasgow than the Kirk's Westminster Calvinism, Scott began to doubt the orthodoxy of his day.

Notwithstanding these in embryo objections to the Kirk's theology, Scott became a licensed preacher within the Church of Scotland in 1827. It was around the time of his licensing that Scott met Thomas Erskine, the mystic laird of Linlathen, by this stage a noted lay heretic. In his earliest publications, Erskine, as a lone voice in Scotland, proclaimed the gospel message in terms of a divine pardon offered to all people.[2]

A second friendship of note at this time was with the minister of Row parish, John McLeod Campbell, now recognised as one of Scotland's greatest theologians. Campbell was immediately impressed by young Scott, and invited him to preach in Row. Scott pointed Campbell and his people to the humanity of Christ alone as the place where God's nature is revealed.[3] This is the first recorded instance of Scott's lifelong emphasis on the incarnation, an emphasis which, although almost entirely lacking at this point in British Christian thought, was to become prominent in both Established Church and Nonconformist theology by the end of the century. In Scottish theology at this time the doctrine of the incarnation was dragged in only to lend a certain sufficiency to the vicarious sacrifice on the cross. Scott, on the otherhand, in opposition to the reigning Westminster Calvinist notion of God as a predestinating Sovereign whose righteousness was satisfied by the penal substitution of his Son for the elect, taught that the loving humanity of the incarnate Christ was the central and crowning revelation of God. 'The humanity of Christ is that which translates the ineffable language of the Most High into man's native tongue,'

contended Scott.[4] 'In the humanity of Christ, in human thoughts, human feelings, human joys and sorrows, God looks out and articulates Himself to us with a distinctness and a home impression beyond what any other form of manifestation can possess; and seeing Him we emphatically see the Father.'[5]

A corollary of Scott's conviction that God had revealed himself in the humanity of Christ was a belief in the universal love of God. Against the Westminster Calvinism of his father, his theological instructors, and the vast majority of the National Kirk, which limited the love of God to the elect only, Scott, in his earliest preaching, contended that Christ's unlimited love is the very image of the Father's love for all humanity. 'How is God disposed towards us?' asked Scott. 'He that hath seen Jesus hath seen the Father.'[6] No one believing Christ to be the crowning revelation of God can doubt that the Father loves all people and wills their salvation.

Soon Campbell also, in his pastoral care of the parish of Row, began to assure his people of the pre-eminently loving nature of God.[7] Instead of a spiritual posture of subjective self-examination and doubt, fostered by Westminister Calvinism's doctrine of election, Scott and Campbell encouraged an objective confidence in the loving moral character of God as revealed in the humanity of Christ. The early preaching of Scott and his friends was among the earliest of signs in 19th-century Britain of an emerging acceptance of the catholicity of God's love. By the end of the century this 'heresy' was to have become orthodoxy.

It was around the time of Scott's early preaching that he began to seriously doubt whether he could conscientiously continue his ministerial career, when the Kirk's

Westminster Confession of Faith denied the universality of God's love. He decided to relinquish the idea of ministry and instead took up the study of medicine in Edinburgh. In the summer of 1828, however, Scott again joined Campbell for a few months on the west coast of Scotland. The parish of Row was becoming a rallying point for the disaffected, and, during these summer months, inquiring students began to gather around Scott and his friends. They were joined by Edward Irving, the romantic and apocalyptic minister of the Scots Kirk, in Regent Square, London. It was during Irving's time with Scott and Campbell that he also was converted to a belief in the universality of God's love.[8] And Scott was now persuaded to join Irving in London at Regent Square, on the understanding that he was to be theologically unrestricted.

Soon Scott and his friends were subjected to sharp criticism, for the orthodoxy of their day rested almost entirely on the theology of the 17th-century Westminster divines,[9] a theology which made no room for a belief in the universality of God's love. 'Do you know that this doctrine is looked on as a heresy by almost all the teachers of religion in this country,' Erskine asked his sister in 1828, 'and that a directly opposite doctrine is preached?'[10] Virulent opposition began in 1828. Andrew Thomson, the leader of the Evangelical party, accused them of having 'propagated doctrines which belie the word of God most odiously - which reason repudiates as inconsistent and mistaken - which break the constitution of the gospel into pieces, and substitutes for it freaks of fancy and unwholesome paradoxes - and which introduce into religion all that is silly and bigotted and presumptuous.'[11] Thomson represents, perhaps exaggeratedly, the formidable opposition and hostility of the establishment against this young and small group of reformers.

While the controversy over the universality of God's love began to rage, Scott, in his search for a vital Christianity, developed a Spirit emphasis which was to have explosive consequences. A thirst for the living and spontaneous characterised Scott's entire life and thought. 'There was an exuberance of living, instant thought in the man,' wrote one of his friends. 'His words partook somewhat of the fine confusion of immediate, formative life.'[12] In one of Scott's first publications he had concentrated on the experiential and Spirit-inspired nature of Luther's religion. This, he said, rather than Luther's emphasis on Scripture, was the 'energetic' reforming principle: 'One living man with the Spirit dwelling in him and speaking by him is more to a country than thousands of Bibles.'[13] It was this search for the dynamic that attracted Scott to the early Church, characterised as it was by charismatic life. The charismata demonstrated the vitality of the early Christian body, and should, Scott believed, characterise any Church that is inspired by the Spirit. Scott persuaded Irving and others to seek the charismatic life of the primitive Church, and early in 1830 on the west coast of Scotland, as a direct result of Scott's preaching, extraordinary phenomena began to occur which some believed were a resurgence of the New Testament gifts of the Spirit.[14] A number of people spoke, wrote and even sang in 'unknown languages'. Others claimed also to have been healed. Clearly, extraordinary things were taking place, and, regardless of how these events are to be interpreted, cures of some description seem to have occurred.[15] The charismatics came under hostile fire from the ranks of the orthodox, and were slandered also by the secular press. The Evangelical journal of the Scottish Kirk called them 'a coterie of sillies.' 'If they should not be condemned for their impious pretensions,' said the writer, 'they should be pitied

for their insane illusions, and looked after by their friends.'[16] The extraordinary phenomena soon began to spread to other parts of the country, and within the year charismatic utterances were interrupting the services at Regent Square in London and causing widespread controversy.

Scott soon rejected the phenomena as inauthentic and as the product of religious hallucination. He painfullyparted company with Irving and the movement which his preaching had in no small way inspired. Regardless of whether or not these charismatic occurences are perceived as having been of the Spirit, Scott's theological emphasis on the charismatic life of the early Church is of considerable interest as one of the earliest intimations of modern pentecostalism, which was not fully to emerge in the Western Church until the turn of the 20th century. Furthermore, Scott's theology of the Spirit can be said to have anticipated the Spirit emphasis which since his day has become increasingly evident in nearly every major branch of the Christian Church.

A few months before the burst of charismatic activity in Scotland, Scott had received a call to the Scots Kirk in Woolwich, just outside of London. Given Scott's image as an unsafe theological dissident it is somewhat surprising that he was almost unanimously elected to Woolwich. After his acceptance of the call Scott applied to the London Presbytery for ordination, for as yet he was licensed only to preach, and not ordained to celebrate the sacraments. Scott's 1830 ordination examinations before the London Presbytery became the centre of controversial attention in the London newspapers.[17] His doctrine of Christ's human nature called forth criticism from the Presbytery and was reported with hostility in the London Times. Scott and Irving had,

for some time, been teaching that Christ's human nature, although sinless, was that of all humanity. In radical opposition to the orthodoxy of the day, which emphasised Christ's divinity to the almost total neglect of his humanity, Scott taught that Christ shared a common brotherhood with mankind. Christ's human perfection was due not to a nature other than ours, he said, but rather to the constant indwelling of the Holy Spirit. 'He is just as emphatically man as he is emphatically God,' Scott argued against the Docetic tendency of his age. 'He excels us, not in that He is less truly man than we, but that He is man in very truth.'[18] Scott's theology of the humanity of Christ was an early indicator of the coming reform of an inadequate, and largely Docetic, Christology in 19th-century Britain.

A concomitant to Scott's incarnation emphasis and his stress on the full humanity of Christ was a nobler understanding of humanity in general than that expressed, for instance, in the Westminster Confession's doctrine of the total depravity of man. 'The Incarnation, if it mean anything at all,' he later wrote, 'is a coming closer to man, a bringing the Divinity and humanity nearer to one another, a making the divine not to be present, <u>beside</u> the human merely, but <u>in</u> the human; a making the human to be divine by being entirely penetrated with the light of God.'[19] The Spirit of God works in the spirit of man by entering into union with humanity. 'What is most human becomes the most divine: what is most divine, the most human.'[20] The Infinite, he said, is 'consubstantiated with the human.'[21] Again Scott's thinking can be seen to have anticipated another aspect of late 19th-century theology, in its more exalted understanding of mankind.

Prolonged discussions in presbytery over the humanity of Christ ensued before

large crowds of spectators and reporters. In the autumn of 1830 Scott intensified the conflict by stating to Presbytery that his conscience would not allow him to sign the Westminster Confession of Faith as an expression of his own faith, as every candidate for ordination was required to do, for the Confession denied the essence of Christianity; it limited the love of God to the elect.[22] Scott's case was referred to the highest court of the Scottish Church.

In May 1831, Scott appeared in Edinburgh before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and asked to be tried by the Word of God alone, and not by the Kirk's creeds and confessions.[23] The appeal to Scripture as opposed to tradition, and particularly the appeal to the gospels, was to become a marked feature of the reformation of 19th-century British theology, and it is not inaccurate to say that the reformers generally were more directly Scripturally oriented than their opponents. It must be said, however, that the defenders of orthodoxy,for the most part, were men who believed their Confessions and traditions to be based upon the Word of God. While recognising something of a scripture versus tradition opposition, therefore, it is important to relativise that antithesis.

The doctrines of the Westminster Confession to which Scott objected before the General Assembly were, he said, contrary to the Word of God as contained in the Scriptures. Scott's friend, Campbell, had contended that the doctrine of God's universal love was reconcileable with the Confession of Faith. Scott, however, was asserting, much more radically, that doctrines in the Confession were actually 'contrary to the Word of God'. Such a direct assault upon the theology of the Church's Confession was unprecedented

within the National Kirk. His most serious objection was directed against the Confession's attempt to limit the love of God to the elect. This he regarded as a negation of the Gospel. There were other points of objection, including Scott's protest against the Confession's Sabbatarianism. His theology of the universal love of God did not allow him to regard Sunday as a day of legalistic observance designed to satisfy the rigteousness of an omnipotent sovereign. Scott's attempt to de-puritanise the Kirk's legalistic observance of the Sabbath and to declare Sunday as a day of celebrating the resurrection was the first theological sign of the anti-Sabbatarian reforms of late 19th-century Britain.

The members of Assembly interrupted Scott's speech, and claimed that 'it was unworthy of the dignity of the Assembly',[24] to sit and hear a preacher of the gospel argue that the Church's Confession of Faith was false. It was the duty of ministers not to innovate, 'but to explain the Word of God agreeable to the standards of the Church.'[25] Scott pleaded for toleration, an attribute almost entirely lacking in the dogmatic atmosphere of the Scottish Kirk at this time. The leaders of the Church found it impossible to mix theology with charity, and refused even to discuss Scott's theological convictions. The Assembly immediately and unanimously deposed Scott from the ministry and prohibited all ministers of the Kirk from ever 'employing him to preach in their pulpits.'[26] Scott's plea for toleration went unheeded, as did more over the next few years, but Scott's was only the first of a flood of requests over the next fifty years for theological toleration, which, before the end of the century, were to produce a much broader theological climate, in which Declaratory Acts, for instance, were passed to relieve ministers from a strict adherence to every article of the Confession.[27]

Years of isolation followed the Assembly of 1831. Scott returned to his congregation in England, the majority of whom followed him to an independent chapel in Woolwich. While feeling isolated, Scott and Campbell chose not to officially join another denomination, for every Church in Britain at this time was hemmed in by doctrinal and confessional restrictions, and not one Church unequivocally declared God's love for all humanity. Scott and his friends also believed that , in truth to their conscience, they should not attempt to divide the larger Churches by beginning a separate denomination. For the next couple of years Scott lived in relative seclusion in Woolwich where he preached on Sundays and offered weekly public lectures on a vast range of subjects, moving from theology to poetry to science to socio-political thought, attempting to hold all things together in relation to his belief in God. Within a few years he began to lecture to larger audiences in London and elsewhere in Britain, continuing his early message of the universal Fatherhood of God and the full humanity of Christ. In an attempt to counteract mid 19th-century orthodoxy's tendency to divorce divinity from humanity and God from the natural world, and as a direct result of his theology of incarnation, Scott increasingly emphasised the immanence of God. The aim of the entire universe, he said, is to reveal God, to communicate the Father's spirit to man's spirit. God wears an expressive look in creation for the soul of man to see and feel. Humanity, Scott said, 'holds manifold communion with a mind uttering itself in all surrounding nature.'[23] This immanentist stress paralleled a similar strain within the romanticism of his day, but was clearly consistent with Scott's incarnational emphasis, and can be seen to be related to the increasing tendency of 19th-century theology to emphasise a redemption of the world

over a redemption from it.

Scott's emphasis on the immanence of God in the created order positively influenced his approach to science, for to learn of nature was to learn something of God. At a time when scientific development, and particularly evolutionary thought, was threatening many religious minds, Scott was concerned to hold together religious and scientific knowledge. 'If there is one God,' he asserted, 'there can be but one source of truth.'[29] There is no incompatibility between true religion and true science. Scott encouraged the Church to ally itself with all truth. 'Be assured,' he said, 'there is a harmony in all truth, a mutual dependence. All its lines converge. There is a point, in which meeting, they lean one upon another; and he who will try to do without any of them will find that the rest must suffer.'[30] Scott's public lectures on science and religion prepared at least a section of the religious public for the conflicts which were to ensue in the post-Darwinian controversies, and can be seen to have been instrumental in the eventual acceptance of the evolutionary principle by the majority of British Christian thinkers.

Scott's search for unity between religion and science was typical of his approach to every aspect of life. Whether in poetry, politics or philosophy Scott did not exclude his Christianity, for God was to him 'the Being on which all being rests, the Intelligence according to which all things have their law,' and 'the illumination by which each thing is beheld.'[31] Scott encouraged a broadly interested and confident Christianity which could offer a unique perspective in every department of life. 'I know not,' he said, 'with what religion has nothing to do.'[32]

Scott's search for unity was also applied to the state of the British Churches, which

were sorely divided at this time. He criticised the majority of Scottish Presbyterians and Dissenters and Evangelicals of England for not even desiring unity, and, while he applauded the Anglo-Catholic emphasis on unity, felt that a unity based upon an external ecclesiasticism was not a real oneness. The Church's unity is not achieved by bringing people under the same roof, by making them repeat the same creed, or by making them recognise the same external government. Rather, the real unity of the body of Christ is constituted by the Spirit, just as the unity of the natural body is constituted by the principle of life. The Church's oneness is essentially to be a 'unity by life', said Scott, rather than a unity by form.[33] Scott's call for a united Church without uniformity was among the earliest signs of a movement which was to gain some ground in the late 19th century and emerge in the early 20th century as the ecumenical movement.

Even greater than the unity of the Church was for Scott the unity of humanity. If others will be 'Roman Catholics or Anglo-Catholics, be you Human Catholics,'[34] he said. Scott's call for a catholic humanity reflected the increasing tendency of many 19th-century British Christians to not only seek a greater communion with non-British Christians but also to recognise a common humanity with the people of other religions.

Gradually Scott enlarged his English circle of friends, and became a personal link between many of the theological reformers of Scotland and England. Perhaps the most important of his English theological friends was Frederick Denison Maurice, who was to make major contributions to the reformation of 19th-century British theology, and who was deeply indebted to Scott.[35] Always, however, there was to be a significant degree of disagreement between the two men, the faithful Episcopalian taking

a higher view than did Scott of the visible Church, its sacraments, and the authority of the ordained. Scott was always critical of Anglicanism's, and particularly the Oxford Movement's, dependence upon ecclesiastical authority, and its disregard for the individual conscience. Scott had develped, by this stage, a theology of the spiritual conscience, which closely resembled both Schleiermacher's and Coleridge's concepts of spiritual consciousness. The conscience, distinct from man's understanding was for Scott a universal faculty in man, capable of receiving the eternal voice which calls man to unite with God and presents to him a character which it commands man to be. 'Man may know,' said Scott, 'when that is presented to him, from which he dare not be out of communion, under penalty of being out of communion with God.'[36] This spiritual eye in man is not infallible, but humanity is bound to make the most of it. 'We cannot do without it,' said Scott. 'There is a region - and the highest of all regions of our inquiry and of our practical demeanour in this world - in which, if we have not this guidance, we have none. For it is no answer to say - "We have God, we have the Bible, we have the Church." I say not one of these is to be read, otherwise than by the spiritual faculty within us.'[37] Any attempt to place the Church, its sacraments, or the ecclesiastically ordained between God and an individual's spiritual faculty Scott regarded as 'idolatrous'. The conscience has an absolute and boundless right over man, and it is a false liberalism which forgets that over this God-given faculty, we have no rights whatsover. 'We are not to believe any thing because we like,' said Scott. 'We are to believe because we are bound to believe.'[38]

Late in 1846 Scott moved from Woolwich to London, hoping thereby to be closer to

the heart of the capital's theological, literary and political life. On Wednesday evenings he would open his London home to literary and theological friends such as William M. Thackeray, Thomas Carlyle, John Ruskin, Maurice and Francis Newman.[39] Scott wrote for The North British Review and, on Sunday evenings, preached at a Literary Institute in central London. It was at one of Scott's Sunday evening sessions in 1849 that the young Scottish poet, George MacDonald, at this stage a theological student, first encountered Scott. MacDonald and fellow theological students would sneak away from their college on Sunday evenings to hear the still widely suspected Scott expound his Christian faith. From this time forward MacDonald repeatedly and unhesitatingly spoke of himself as a disciple of Scott's.[40] Within a number of years Scott's theology was being reproduced in MacDonald's prolific writings, the young poet-novelist having picked up Scott's distinctive emphases of the universal Fatherhood of God, the sacredness of creation, and the humanity and Christlikeness of God. In story form MacDonald communicated to thousands of readers in Britain and in North America what Scott had taught the relatively few. The establishment of a belief in the universal Fatherhood of God in late 19th-century Britain can be said to be as much due to George MacDonald as to any other single writer.[41]

During the final twenty years of Scott's life he increasingly gave himself to a socialising of the Christian conscience and to a working for the education of neglected segments of society, including women, the working classes, and religious dissenters. The Church's lack of social awareness he felt was largely responsible for the secularising of society. 'A theology that shut out human interests,' he said, 'has taught men a humanity that shuts out God and Christ.'[42] He followed with interest the political movements of the

working classes, notably Chartism and Socialism, and in response to the working class unrest of 1848 Scott and his friends, including Maurice and Charles Kingsley, founded what later became known as Christian Socialism, the first daring attempt in Britain to hold together the Christian faith with aspects of Socialism.[43] At a time when the word 'cooperation' carried dark and revolutionary connotations, Scott advocated the cooperative principle of Socialism while denying its secularist creed, and in so doing anticipated British Christianity's eventual acceptance of a form of socialism as compatible with the gospel. Scott criticised the wealthier classes for self-interestedly resisting all social change and blasted the Church for sanctioning the emphatic preservation of the distinction of ranks. Christianity, he said, ought to expand 'the man beyond the mere brute propensity to self-Conservation, by the force of love to man, grounded on a love unlimited, the love of God.'[44] The Christian Socialist hope, partly realised over the next twenty years through publications, cooperative associations for workers and working mens' colleges, was to involve the Christian Church in the elimination of social injustices in 19th-century Britain.[45]

Late in 1848, shortly after the birth of Christian Socialism, Scott was elected to the chair of English literature at University College, London, the only seat of higher education in Britain totally free from religious tests. And within the year, despite heavy criticism, especially from the Church of England, Scott, Erasmus Darwin and other friends, began what later became known as Bedford College, the first centre of higher education for women based upon the principles of religious freedom.[46]

In 1851 Scott became the first principal of Owens College, later the Victoria University of Manchester, also a centre of university education committed to religious liberty. Scott's

impact upon his largely Nonconformist students was immense,[47] not a few of whom later became prominent socio-political and theological reformers, and at least two of whom, D.W.Simon and J.A.Picton, were to effect major changes in 19th-century Nonconformist theology.[48] During Scott's latter years in Manchester he was frequently visited by many younger theologians from different parts of the country.[49] Two of these, both Nonconformist ministers, Henry Solly and James Baldwin Brown, clearly evidenced, in controversial books dedicated to Scott, his theology of God's universal Fatherhood.[50] Brown's election to the chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1878 indicated a growing acceptance within Nonconformity of Scott's theology. Other visitors to Scott in his latter years included three future Moderators of the Church of Scotland, and perhaps the three greatest 19th-century reforming leaders of the Kirk, Norman Macleod, Robert Herbert Story, and John Tulloch. Their contributions to the ecclesiastical and theological reformation of Scottish Christianity reflect many of Scott's emphases.

Although Scott had never been directly involved with any established ecclesiastical body after the time of his deposition in 1831, his contact with theologians from nearly every Protestant Church in England and Scotland offered him a continuing influence upon the reformation of 19th-century British theology. In 1864, however, Scott's health began to fail him, and his active contribution to the ongoing reform declined. On 12 January 1866, on the northern shore of Lake Geneva, Scott, at the age of sixty, died. With his death, and then much later with the death of his personal disciples, the memory of Scott faded, for his influence was almost entirely personal. As Baldwin Brown once said to Scott: 'You, more than most men living, have written your records not in books, but on the

fleshly tables of the hearts of your pupils and friends.'[51] Explicit reference to Scott may have ended with the death of his last disciple, but the succession of some of his deepest convictions continued until they found a permanent, and often central, place in the British Churches. As a seminal influence upon many theological reformers, and as a window into the lives of prominent Christian thinkers of his day, Scott deserves a place in the history of the Reformation of 19th-century Britain.

1 For a complete biographical study of A.J.Scott, see J.P.Newell's unpublished Ph.D. thesis, A.J.Scott and His Circle, Edinburgh University, 1981.

2 See T.Erskine, Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth of Revealed Religion (Edinburgh, 1820), and, The Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel (Edinburgh, 1828).

3 D.Campbell, Memorials of J.McLeod Campbell vol 2 (London, 1877), p125.

4 A.J.Scott, On the Divine Will (Greenock, 1830), p16.

5 A.J.Scott, 'Introductory Discourse on Revelation', Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans (London, 1838), p15.

6 A.J.Scott, Hints for Meditation on Acquaintance with God (Greenock, 1831), p10.

7 See J.McLeod Campbell, Reminiscences (London, 1873), pp24-7.

8 See R.H.Story, 'Edward Irving', Scottish Divines (Edinburgh, 1883), pp242-3.

9 Two of Scott's leading theological contemporaries, W.Cunningham and R.S.Candlish, took up an almost infallibilist position concerning the Westminster Confession of Faith. See R.Rainy, Life of William Cunningham (London, 1871), p503; and R.S.Candlish, The Fatherhood of God (Edinburgh, 1865), p289.

10 W.Hanna, Letters of Erskine vol 1 (Edinburgh, 1877), p149.

11 A.Thomson, The Doctrine of Universal Pardon Considered and Refuted (Edinburgh, 1830), p87.

12 'The Late Professor A.J.Scott', The Scotsman, 19 January 1866.

13
A.J.Scott, 'What was the Reformation?', The Morning Watch vol 1 (London, 1829), p635.

14
For a more detailed examination of these phenomena and Scott's role in their emergence see J.P.Newell, 'Scottish Intimations of Modern Pentecostalism', PNEUMA vol 4, number 2 (Oklahoma, 1982).

15
See, for instance, J.McLeod Campbell, A letter to T.Chalmers, 28 April 1830. University of Edinburgh New College MS CHA.4.134.21.

16
The Edinburgh Christian Instructor vol 29 (Edinburgh, 1830), pp502-4.

17
See, for instance, 'The Scots Presbytery, London', The Record, 29 April, 13 May 1830; The Times, 4, 8, 15 May 1830; The World, 26 April, 10, 17 May, 21 June, 19 July, 4, 18, 25 October 1830.

18
Scott, Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, pp76-7.

19
Ibid, p27.

20
A.J.Scott, Two Discourses (Cambridge, 1848), p33.

21
A.J.Scott, 'Social Systems of the Present Day', The Woolwich Gazette, 2 January 1841.

22
'The Scots Presbytery, London', The World, 18 October 1830.

23
'Case of Mr Scott - Heresy', Caledonian Mercury, 28 May 1831.

24
Ibid.

25
Ibid.

26 Records of the General Assembly 1828-31, Scottish Records Office, Edinburgh, CH1/1 81, pp527-8.

27 For a closer study of A.J.Scott's heresy trial of 1831 see a forthcoming article by J.P.Newell in The Scottish Church History Society Records (Edinburgh, 1983).

28 Scott, Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, p3.

29 A.J.Scott, 'Lectures on the Harmony of Natural and Revealed Truth', The Woolwich Gazette, 12 September 1840.

30 A.J.Scott, The Social Systems of the Present Day, Compared with Christianity (London, 1841), p376.

31 Scott, Two Discourses, p36.

32 Scott, The Social Systems of the Present Day, p336.

33 A.J.Scott, 'On Schism', The Pulpit vol 41 (London, 1842), p549.

34 Scott, The Social Systems of the Present Day, p375.

35 See J.Finlayson, 'Professor A.J.Scott', The Owens College Magazine vol 13, p107; and 'Owens College Evening Classes and F.D.Maurice', The Manchester Guardian. 10 June 1868.

36 Scott, 'On Schism', p510.

37 Ibid, p544.

38 Ibid, p552.

39
See W.B.Carpenter, Nature and Man (London, 1888), pp41-3; G.N.Ray, The Letters and Private Papers of W.M.Thackeray vol 2 (London, 1945-6), pp282-3; M.A.De Morgan, Threescore Years and Ten (London, 1895), pp227-8.

40
See, for instance, W.G.Horder, 'George MacDonald: A Nineteenth Century Seer', Review of Reviews, October 1905, vol 32 (London, 1905), pp358-9; Greville MacDonald, George MacDonald and His Wife (London, 1924), p192; and W.R.Nicoll, 'George MacDonald', The British Weekly, 21 September 1905, vol 38, p550.

41
See Horder, op.cit., p360.

42
Scott, Two Discourses, p46.

43
For accounts of the founding meetings of Christian Socialism, see Mrs C.Kingsley, Charles Kingsley: His Letters and Memories of his Life vol 1 (London, 1877), pp155-7; and F.Maurice, The Life of F.D.Maurice vol 1 (London, 1885), p460.

44
Scott, 'Social Systems of the Present Day', The Woolwich Gazette, 2 January 1841.

45
T.Christensen's, Origin and History of Christian Socialism (Aarhus, 1962), is the most accurate and extensive history of the movement, but does not adequately explore the central role played by Scott. See J.P.Newell, 'The Other Christian Socialist: A.J.Scott', The Hevthrop Journal vol 24 (London, 1983).

46
See M.J.Tuke, A History of Bedford College for Women (London, 1939).

47
See, for instance, the various personal tributes to Scott's influence in The Owens College Jubilee (Manchester, 1901)

48
See D.A.Johnson, 'The End of "Evidences": A Study in Nonconformist Theological Transition', The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society vol 2, number 3 (London, 1979), pp62-72.

49
See J.P.Newell, 'A Nestor of Nonconformist Heretics: A.J.Scott', The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society (London, May 1983).

50
See J.B.Brown, The Divine Life in Man (London, 1860); and H.Solly, The Doctrine of Atonement (London, 1861).

51
Testimonials to A.J.Scott (Edinburgh, 1856), p20.

JOHN MARK KING: CANADIAN THEOLOGIAN

by Gordon Harland

One hundred years ago this month the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church appointed John Mark King the first Principal of Manitoba College. He made a significant contribution to the Canadian religious scene as theologian, educator and churchman and he still has important things to say to us. He made a profound impression upon his contemporaries but although he is routinely mentioned in historical accounts of the church and education in Western Canada he is certainly not well known among us. With the recent discovery of a large number of letters, sermons and some lectures we are able to gain a much clearer picture of the man, his concerns and his thought. Today, I wish to focus on King as theologian, but first a few words about his life and work as Principal of Manitoba College.

King was born in the village of Yetholm on the Scottish borders in May, 1829. He received the M.A. degree from the University of Edinburgh, studied theology in the Divinity Hall of the United Presbyterian Church and also at the University of Halle in Germany where he came under the influence of such spiritually intense teachers as Tholuck and Julius Müller. The heritage of warm, evangelical piety combined with firmly structured theological thought which in Scotland reached back to the Erskine brothers and found its culminating expression in Thomas Chalmers, received another powerful and attractive articulation in Tholuck and Müller. It is this heritage which has its centre of gravity in the doctrines of sin, grace and regeneration that proved to be the burden of King's teaching, writing and preaching.

In 1856 he came to Canada as a missionary of the United Presbyterian Church and in 1863 he became the minister of Gould Street Church in Toronto which eventually became the well known St. James Square Presbyterian Church. For twenty years he exercised his ministry in this church in most fruitful and influential ministry. The place he came to occupy in the life of the Church and the wider community may be indicated by the fact that in 1882 Knox College selected him to be the first person upon whom it conferred the degree of Doctor of Divinity and in 1883 he was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

The General Assembly of 1883 received a memorial from the Presbytery of Manitoba seeking the appointment of a Principal and Professor of Theology for the new and struggling Manitoba College. The Assembly appointed King but this posed a real dilemma for him. He was not at all sure what he should do. His congregation and many others urged him to stay where his influence was already large and established. It was a difficult decision, but the needs of the College and especially the importance of laying a firm foundation for theological education in the promising new land of Western Canada were the sort of claims he could not turn aside.

King's impact upon the community was immediately felt and proved to be of enduring significance. Although Winnipeg was experiencing a severe financial depression following upon the speculative boom in real estate of 1881-82, King vigorously tackled the rather desperate financial situation of the College. He quickly won the confidence of everyone and especially the business community. Discussing his

abilities as a financial administrator, Colin Campbell wrote, "As a rule we do not look for skilled financiers in profound theologians and gifted preachers," but, he added, "Any country would have been honored to have him as finance minister, or any large financial institution as manager."[1] Certainly to appreciate the role King played, full attention would have to be paid to the way in which he raised money throughout Britain and Eastern Canada, the way he handled it, the extraordinary detailed supervision that he gave to everything from the purchase of coal and wood to student accounts. But not only did he get the College on a sound financial basis, he also set high academic standards, proved himself to be a superb teacher, and demonstrated that quality of leadership which called forth the best in faculty and students alike and led the college into what has been called her "golden period".

These were also years of deep personal sorrow. In 1886 Mrs. King died and a little more than a year later his nine year old son, John Ralph, suffered a fatal attack of scarlet fever while King was away on church business. He was profoundly shaken by these losses but in the words of his close friend and colleague Thomas Hart, "His discipline of sorrow seemed to give him a deeper insight into the meaning of life, and to clarify and quicken his views of man's need and God's remedy."[2]

Throughout the years until his death in March 1899, King carried a very heavy teaching load in both Arts and Theology, handled the affairs of the College down to the details, was active in the life of the community, preached widely and exercised leadership in the courts of

the Church. Responding to the needs of a frontier community in such a way, one would scarcely expect him to keep up with the theological developments of the day. But King did. Indeed the key to understanding him is to see how he engaged the intellectual issues of the day.

However, when we seek to delineate the content of King's theological thought, we are faced with the question of how best to get hold of it. On this subject there are no guides. Those few who have written sketches of his life have uniformly acclaimed him as a theologian whose thought is distinguished by its clarity and depth. But they leave us with adjectives of praise; there have been no attempts to set forth its character. We have two books from King: the lectures on Tennyson's In Memoriam and The Theology of Christ's Teaching, a set of class lectures published posthumously with an Introduction by the Scottish theologian James Orr. However, I think the best and quickest way to get into his thought is to consider some public lectures he gave at the opening of the summer sessions of the College during the nineties. In these lectures he addressed some of those issues which were central to the controversies of the age and to his own concerns. To these lectures, I now turn.

Theological Concerns as Exhibited in Public Lectures

In 1893, King opened the summer session with a lecture entitled "The Spirit in Which Theological Enquiry should be Prosecuted." Clearly the stress of the times has dictated his choice of subject.

Indeed right at that time, although King makes no reference to the fact, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. was meeting to hear and adjudicate the appeal in the case of Charles Briggs.

King's lecture reveals much about the man. He begins by stating that the aim of theological enquiry is "to learn what the actual nature of the revelation is" which is given in Scripture and thus "to ascertain and define religious truth". Since this is its aim, the first requirement "for its prosecution is love of truth." It is a distinction worth pausing over. It has been said of Frederick the Great that properly speaking he was not fond of music but of the flute, and not indeed fond of the the flute but of his flute. Now King's whole being was wrapped up in and committed to what he called the truth of the Christian faith. But here at the outset he is urging that there must be a creative tension between freedom and concern, between the open, critical mind and the committed self. This is a high and rare attainment but he impresses upon those students of theology that "it is a large and an essential element in the spirit which should animate you in the studies to be prosecuted in this place."

The second element in the spirit proper to theological enquiry is "a large degree of caution" in "arriving at and announcing conclusions". Christian theology, for King, is not a harmless subject, remote from the interests and the issues of daily life. Quite the contrary: its "questions touch human experience at the most vital points," and the

manner in which they are understood will have large consequence for the quality of the life, faith and hope of countless people. Moreover, what he calls "the eager, restless spirit of the age" evidenced in the vigorous pursuit of biblical criticism, and the disposition to obscure the church's great affirmation concerning God in Christ itself, carries the demand for an appropriate caution. That which King finds offensive is not so much new views as the presumptuous spirit in which radical new positions are announced with what he calls "an almost ostentatious defiance of the Church's feelings."

He will not, however, offer any protection to the conservative who has closed his mind. The posture of defensiveness, King well knew, is productive of error in all areas of life, but especially in religion. Or as he puts it: "The unreasoning resistance to all change. . . is not one which can be commended. It is not courageous. It has at its root lack of confidence in truth... And it is not wise, any more than it is courageous." Nothing could be more calamitous for the Church King thought than to create a "divorce between itself and the intelligence of the age." Moreover, theological enquiry is not something to be tolerated as a necessary evil; it is to be encouraged. And it is to be encouraged not only in the interests of theological science but "in the interest of spiritual life, with which it might so often seem to be at war." He states this bluntly: "the maintenance of healthful religious life in a community for a lengthened period is incompatible with intellectual slumber." "The connection between

thought and life" between "the play of intelligence and that of moral feeling" he continues, is so close "that we cannot long have the latter without the former. The apologist or preacher who will bless the age must have a spirit at once "philosophic and devout" who has as his aim "seeing deeper into truth, rather than seeing more completely round it, setting it in its due relation to the permanent and universal needs of man ..." That phrase, truth in "relation to the permanent and universal needs of man" is central to King. It is a phrase, that recurs frequently, and is always carrying his most passionate concern. The deepest conviction he has, and the one which integrates his thought, is that it is precisely the great doctrines concerning man's sin, the incarnation, the atonement, and the work of the Holy Spirit which meet man's deep and universal need for meaning, forgiveness, and for vision. That is his central conviction. Because of this, scholars and preachers who impugn or ignore these central doctrines of Christian faith, instead of being up to date are actually ceasing to have a message relevant to man's greatest questions and needs. In this particular lecture, with the British Hegelian and Gifford lecturer, Edward Caird, in mind he asks "...what could a Christianity thus emasculated do for its recipient? How unequal it must prove to the demands of human need".[3]

The same concerns prompted him to choose the doctrine of The Atonement as his subject for the opening lecture in 1895. This central doctrine is of vast significance for the whole understanding of Christianity and, as he says, it is "as gracious as it is vast" and

it is being either badly misunderstood or "simply put to the side" and he is determined "to show where we stand in this Institution"[4] on the matter. To be sure, King acknowledges that there are numerous influences accounting for the shift in concern taking place. He points specifically to three: 1) A proper reaction "against a crude, coarse, almost a commercial view of the atonement"; 2) the widespread interest in the historical Christ with its predominantly ethical views of his life and person; and 3) the fact that many feel the lack of a clear connection between belief in the doctrine and the development of personal goodness that must be the living result of faith.[5] These protests represent a positive gain. Nevertheless, he stresses that an understanding of Christianity that does not have this doctrine at its centre goes against the "whole drift and tenor" of Scriptural teaching, fails "to supply any adequate reason for the Incarnation", and proceeds on "a radically defective view" of the human condition.[6] The ethical, humanitarian emphasis coming to the fore in theological circles possesses real strength, but it has a fatal weakness: it is, as he puts it, not "adequate to the full strain of human need".[7] This old doctrine of the atonement, of Christ's sacrificial and sin-bearing love is the truth that meets man's situation. "To preach", he says, "with this truth left out", in however cultured and gracious a style is—to use the apt illustration of Mr. Denney's fisherman—to fish with a hook without a barb. Men will take your bait: the age is in love with moralizing discourse; but you will not take the men."[8] It was an eloquent and strongly argued lecture and would appear to have received considerable attention. At least Mr. W.E. Dodge, a trustee of Union

Theological Seminary in New York, wrote him a letter and ordered a hundred copies to be distributed to the advanced students of that seminary.[9]

King returned to a similar issue in 1897 in a lecture entitled "The Purely Ethical Gospel Examined." It is, perhaps, the finest in this series of public lectures. Ethical concerns were, of course, central to King and he acknowledges that there have been positive gains made in recent years in gaining a fuller recognition for the ethical dimensions of the gospel than in former periods of the Church's history. Nevertheless, a purely ethical Christianity which seems to be gaining such popularity "is seriously and painfully defective, if it does not indeed change the centre altogether, and thus throw even the truths which it retains out of their proper relations."[10] Its deficiencies are closely interrelated, and they are visible in all crucial areas. Its view of man is sentimental, lacking in realism and "not set" as he puts it, "to the key-note supplied by the [Pauline] Epistles."[11] In the writings of St. Paul, "Sin is ...not a mere weakness, a simple defect" but an "enslaving power which has seated itself at the very centre of man's being..."[12] The moralism of this ethical approach is such that it fails to understand sin properly in relational terms with the result that what is lost to view, he says, is "the alienation <u>from</u> God which is at its heart..."[13] It is perhaps important to say that King, in stressing the reality and dynamics of sin, is not at all concerned to emphasize the littleness of man. Quite the contrary: he is urging his readers to see man in the full dimensions

of his being, in his capacity for both good and evil, what Pascal called the grandeur and the misery of man. It is in his relationship to God that we see the full measure of man's loss indicated by the word sin and also his true greatness pointed to in the word regeneration. The inevitable consequence of this misreading of the human condition is the obscuring of the necessity for, and greatness of, Christ's work in redemption and regeneration. And further, such a reduced Gospel cannot, he thinks, be expected to nurture a piety of great depth or earnestness. "Where it is in the ascendant, religious life will be apt to droop, or to degenerate into something little better than a moral cult."[14] Indeed, he goes on, "if I could believe that it was to become the prevailing type of teaching within the Churches (of the Reformation), I could anticipate nothing else than their signal and continuous decline."[15]

In these three lectures King addressed a few of the hotly debated issues of his day and in the process clearly revealed where he stood. He was conservative, he stood "in the old paths", but he was not narrow. He knew modern thought, he was open to its strengths, and he saw with exceptional clarity its weaknesses. There are no doubt many reasons why the Canadian churches did not suffer anything like the deep cleavage over the fundamentalist-modernist controversy that the American churches did, but surely one reason was the presence in our theological colleges of open-minded conservatives like John Mark King. Indeed, I have recently learned that this same evaluation of King was made by no less a figure than George Adam Smith. King had managed to secure Smith

to lecture at the Summer School in Manitoba College, and on the train on the morning that Smith left Winnipeg, he wrote a very moving letter to King. I quote but one short paragraph:

> "I thank you very affectionately for your generous trust of me and my efforts. I am fully aware that a great deal in the somewhat bungling attempts of us younger men to obtain fresh conceptions of God's truth must seem crude & raw to the larger experience of our elders. But if there is anything that will keep us sober & cautious it is the sympathy & confidence of older men like yourself, whose knowledge of God's word & experience of the religious life is so much deeper than our own can be."[16]

King regarded theology as a very practical as well as an intellectually demanding discipline. He often urged his students to preach the great doctrines, not, he always stressed, as pieces of an abstract system of thought, but in the most intimate relation to man's universal need for meaning, consolation and regeneration. Only the great doctrines were adequate "to the full strain of human need." King's own sermons are rich in theological content and indeed are an important resource for his own theological thought. Time does not permit our entering into this resource but I would draw your attention to a single passage from one of his sermons. It will remind us that long before there were thinkers like Anders Nygren to draw the distinction between Agape and Eros, King was making it with precision in a sermon to a frontier people. This is how he put it:

> "Our love needs to be stimulated by the presence of qualities in others, fitted to call it forth.
> Our compassion waits to be evoked by the sight of misery or destitution. It has its seat within us, indeed; but its moving cause without. It is not its own ground. We have not grasped that which is highest and most distinctive in

> the love of God, on the other hand, until we have apprehended the truth, that it has no motive external to Himself; that it has its ground in His own nature. It is not purchased for us by Christ, for Christ Himself is its expression. He is love's gift. It is still less procured by our goodness, our obedience... [or] our faith, for it is antecedent to all of these; their sole ground and cause where they exist; the sole hope of their origination, where they do not exist."[17]

After King's death in 1899, Father Drummond of St. Boniface College spoke of his association with King, the philosophical discussions they had had, and how he a Roman Catholic felt more at home with his thought than he did with that of most non-Catholic thinkers. He spoke also of King's intellectual power and his capacity to inspire a zeal in his students for philosophical study, and then he continued on to say that "the University has lost in Dr. King a representative of old world culture, whose opinions had great weight with the more thoughtful members of our body."[18] That points to something basic about Principal King. For King's genius was to hold together qualities which frequently get separated. He was "a representative of old-world culture" and that brought a richness to this new and bustling land. But he was no alien misfit: he embraced this new frontier, had a vision for it and gave himself unstintingly to its people. This quality of holding together what frequently gets separated marked the whole of his life. The union "of intellectual and moral excellence", the combination of "firm convictions with broad views and warm sympathies" that characterized those he most admired, he also embodied. He once told his students that the apologist or preacher who will

"bless the age" "must have a spirit at once philosophic and devout." This was his own achievement and through it he blessed both church and the wider community in those formative years.

NOTES

1. Colin H. Campbell, Q.C. in "In Memoriam: John Mark King", The Manitoba College Journal, Memorial Number, p. 161.

2. Rev. Professor Hart in ibid., p. 181.

3. This and the preceding quotations are from "The Spirit in Which Theological Enquiry Should be Prosecuted", The Manitoba College Journal, Vol. 8, no. 6, July, 1893.

4. The Rev. Principal King: The Atonement, The Stovel Co., Printers and Stationers, Winnipeg, 1895, p. 4, 5.

5. Ibid., p. 12ff.

6. Ibid., p. 16ff.

7. Ibid., p. 7.

8. Ibid., p. 38.

9. Letter from W.E. Dodge to King, dated August 4, 1895.

10. The Rev. Principal King, The Purely Ethical Gospel. The Stovel Co., Printers and Stationers, Winnipeg 1897, p. 14.

11. Ibid., p. 24.

12. Ibid., p. 23.

13. Ibid., p. 25.

14. Ibid., p. 34.

15. Ibid., p. 37.

16. Letter from George Adam Smith to John Mark King, dated "On the Train", June 29 [no year].

17. From a sermon on I John 4:16 "And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us."

"Walter Ellis: Mainline Conservative Protestant", Robert Burkinshaw

While British Columbia has a reputation as a highly secular province, it is also true that it contains a strong conservative Protestant, or evangelical, element. N. K. Clifford's suggestion that by the 1930's Western Canadian Protestantism had organized itself into a two-party system composed of liberals and conservatives certainly is credible in the case of British Columbia. (1) In fact, present evidence seems to suggest that B. C.'s conservative Protestant population has become proportionately larger since the 1930's than that of any other province in Canada, including Alberta, usually considered the country's "Bible belt". (2)

Examination of the evangelical population of the province quickly reveals incredible diversity within its ranks. Despite general agreement on doctrines such as the authority of the Bible and the nature of salvation, members can be categorized into a broad range of denominational groupings with variables such as ethnicity, socio-economic status, styles of worship and attitudes towards interdenominational cooperation, education and the wider society often playing key roles in their classification.

One important group of evangelicals in the province is composed of the theological conservatives who remained within the mainline Protestant denominations even though liberalism had reduced evangelicalism to a minority position in most of those denominations by the 1910's. These conservatives were generally of Anglo-Saxon decent, tended to be found in the Presbyterian, Baptist and Anglican denominations and were more concentrated in the Vancouver and Victoria

urban areas than were many other evangelical groups. Their numbers are difficult to determine but it is clear that they played a particularly key role from the 1910's through to the 1940's in founding interdenominational institutions which served the wider conservative Protestant community before the newer and smaller evangelical denominations were able to develop their own institutions.

For several decades Walter Ellis was probably the most influential figure in Vancouver's mainline evangelical community. He made his main contribution while serving in his dual capacity as principal of the Vancouver Bible School from its founding in 1918 until his death in 1944 and as minister of Fairview Presbyterian Church from 1926 until 1944. In addition, he lectured for five years before 1918 at Bishop Latimer Hall, the low-church Anglican theological college, and in 1917 became a prime mover behind the Vancouver Evangelistic Movement which spearheaded much strategic conservative Protestant activity in the city. Later, newer interdenominational evangelical organizations, such as the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, benefited from his support. It is intended, by means of a study of his career, that some light will be shed on Walter Ellis and also on several of those major institutions which gave strength to evangelicalism in Vancouver in the first half of this century.

Born in Derbyshire, England, Ellis came to Canada at the age of twenty in 1903 as assistant to the Anglican chaplain accompanying English settlers to the Barr Colony in Saskatchewan. The next nine years were spent studying in Toronto and by 1912 he had earned his B. A. (honours) and M. A. in Semitics from the University of Toronto and

the academic requirements for his B. D. from the evangelical Anglicans' Wycliffe College. He came to Vancouver to serve a one year locum at St. Mark's Church and in 1914 joined the faculty of Bishop Latimer Hall in 1914. Four years later he was married to Alice Mitton, also a fairly recent arrival from England. (3)

Latimer Hall had been founded on distinctly evangelical lines in Vancouver's West End on the model of Wycliffe College in 1910. Leading Vancouver citizens, including Charles H. Tupper, foremost among the city's elite, H. J. Cambie and the Rev. C. C. Owen of Christ Church, were active participants in its establishment. (4) Strong support was also received from the Colonial and Continental Missionary Society of London and W. H. Griffith Thomas, the renowned conservative theologian at Wycliffe College. (5) Ellis taught Church history at Latimer Hall and the Old Testament and Apologetics courses offered in common with St. Marks, the High Church college begun in 1912. (6)

In 1917 Ellis became active with the interdenominational Vancouver Evangelistic Movement (V. E. M.) in planning the French E. Oliver evangelistic campaign, the event which probably did the most to bring to public attention the widening division between liberal and conservative Protestantism. The V. E. M., a small group of businessmen, professionals and clergy, listed among its purposes the sponsorship of a mass-evangelism campaign, the establishment of a local Bible training school and the provision of a permanent base in the city for the China Inland Mission. Its members felt the public "preaching of the definite, positive and simple Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" of a large evangelistic campaign would be useful in countering the growing secularism of Vancouver and the spread of

liberal theology in the churches. (7) The services of Dr. French E. Oliver, an ordained Presbyterian minister from Los Angeles were secured and a temporary wooden tabernacle, capable of seating five thousand, was built on the old court house site on Hastings Street. (8)

Oliver's campaign was not supported by most of the city's clergy and he could not have endeared himself to all when he declared war on liberalism by announcing on May 20, 1917, the opening day of the eight-week campaign, that it was his intention "not to use a feather duster in defense of the faith and in criticism of higher criticism." (9) Nonetheless, the first six weeks of the campaign experienced no great public controversy as thousands crowded to hear the evangelist and nearly two thousand responded to his call for conversion. (10) During the last two weeks of his stay, however, the differences between Oliver and his V. E. M. supporters and members of the Vancouver Ministerial Association developed into a bitter controversy described by the media as "the biggest sensation of recent years in Vancouver religious circles." (11)

Dr. John McKay, principal of Westminster Hall, the Presbyterian college, publicly charged that Oliver was holding up "gross caricatures" of modern theology by associating the preaching of modern clergy with the "wild statements of irresponsible agnostics and rationalists." (12) The Rev. Ernest Thomas, minister of Wesley Methodist Church and strong exponent of the social gospel, was reported at length in the Province as preaching that the campaign was a conspiracy by the business community to suppress the Social Gospel movement. (13) He rejoiced that "the effort to dominate the pulpits of

Vancouver by browbeating and high finance has come to naught." Not only had the Vancouver Ministerial Association refused to officially endorse the campaign, he reported, but the Methodist Conference had condemned "any movement cloaked in the name of evangelism which was carried on in hostility to social reform, religious education and modern scholarship." He claimed that all the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers in the city upheld the Methodist stand as did "the younger, brainy Baptists." Thus, "Vancouver has chosen the path of advance and insists on the Christian pulpit being free to speak the great words of social justice and to recognize as revelations of God the discoveries of the scientist." (14)

Thomas was not far amiss in detecting a lack of fervor in the sponsoring committee for social reform as the primary commitment of the campaign was clearly for the salvation of individuals. However, it does not appear that the membership of the V. E. M. represented the business and financial elite of the city. In fact, of the nine identifiable men who served with Ellis on the central committee, only four were directly engaged in the business community and they do not seem to have reached the upper echelons - one was the accountant of a lumber firm, another was the manager of an insurance agency, the third was a salesman for a logging equipment firm and the fourth was the owner and operator of a box manufacturing plant. Two on the committee were in the medical profession and three were involved in religious institutions. (15)

The conservatives argued that the central issue in the controversy was one of the true Christian Gospel being defended against the attacks of unbelief. Oliver claimed it was time to

aggressively defend the truth against "the scholastic infidelity of 'modern intellectuality' which seeks to emasculate the gospel of Jesus." He pointed to the nearly two thousand converts gained in six weeks of preaching as proof that the traditional message was more relevant and effective to modern man than that preached by many city ministers. (16) The question was seen as one of religious authority. Oliver claimed he preached the same doctrine as the apostles and the Protestant reformers but charged that "direct efforts were being made to lead men and women away from the direct authority of the Bible." (17) The new theology lacked the ring of authority and Dr. J. L. Campbell, pastor of the city's largest Baptist church, First Baptist, told an applauding crowd at the tabernacle that "any theology that was not 1900 years old was no good." (18) At the close of the campaign, the membership of Broadway West Baptist Church published the concerns of many conservative protestants in a motion of support for Oliver. In it they expressed hope that he hold similar campaigns in other Canadian cities in order

> . . . to stem the tide of infidelity that under the guise of modern scholarship is undermining the faith of the people in the Divine inspiration and authority of the Blessed Bible, including its clear and definite teaching on the foundation truths of our eternal salvation. (19)

Ellis had been out of the city during the controversy surrounding the Oliver campaign and was distressed to learn of the vituperative nature of the debate and the role which Oliver and some members of the V. E. M. had played in it. He fully agreed that liberal theology was dangerous to the churches but his concern that a strong stand for conservative theology not be associated with strong invective marked

the beginning of a gradually growing rift between himself and the more militant conservatives, or fundamentalists, in the city. (21)

Ellis was also chagrined that both sides in the debate had seemed to pit scholarship against belief in traditional Christian doctrines in a way that implied the two were necessarily opposed to one another. He was a good scholar, having excelled in his graduate work in Semitics at the University of Toronto and had been invited by J. F. McCurdy to be his associate at the school of archaeology in Cairo. (22) As a young minister he had quickly acquired a reputation for preaching thoughtful, scholarly sermons and his love of books was such that his personal library at the time of his death contained between five and six thousand volumes. (23)

He was thus not at all opposed to higher academic study as were many evangelicals but he did criticize the methodology and assumptions of many modern scholars. He belonged to the Scottish Realist school of thought and firmly believed in Bacon's and Newton's scientific method of observing and classifying facts and thus rejected as speculation the newer modes of explanation which relied upon hypotheses inferred from the facts. He wrote for a popular audience,

> What of "Science"?
> many scientists are searching the
> creation of my God. His works as well
> as His Word will bear the closest
> investigation. I fear no
> contradictions. Sometimes in the enthrall-
> ment of their investigations scientists
> formulate hypotheses to explain or coordinate
> the facts they have discovered. Sometimes
> these hypotheses conflict with
> Scripture, but we must always
> distinguish between the Scientist's
> facts and his explanations. (24)

The major problem he found with the explanations of modern

scientists was that they took only natural causes into account. The implications of this approach were bad enough when confined to the scientific realm but they were devastating when it was consciously applied to biblical and theological studies.

The eight week Oliver campaign had given the V. E. M. sufficient momentum to continue as a permanent organization with headquarters at 121 W. Hastings Street. Operating for a number of years, it employed an evangelistic agent, held Bible study classes for new converts and operated a religious literature depot. (25) Of greater significance for the religious life of the city, however, were the two related institutions which emerged after the campaign - the Vancouver Bible Training School and the China Inland Mission home for personnel enroute to and from the Orient.

Despite Ellis' unhappiness with certain aspects of the Oliver campaign, he agreed to become principal of the Vancouver Bible Training School (V. B. T. S.) (26) The post was to be part-time and he had no intention whatsoever of leaving the Anglican Church or his teaching position at Latimer Hall. Consequently, he was stunned upon returning from his honeymoon in the summer of 1918 to find himself replaced at Latimer Hall because of opposition to his taking responsibility for what was considered to be a rival institution. In addition, the most Rev. A. U. dePencier, the High Church Bishop of the diocease, repeatedly refused to renew his ministerial license because of his extensive involvement in an interdenominational institution. For the next seven years he and his new wife remained within the Anglican Church but he was limited to the role of a layman. During that time he worked full-time to develop the new Bible school. (27)

V. B. T. S. was the second Bible institute established in Canada and was closely patterned after the first, Toronto Bible College, which had been founded in 1894. (28) Ellis was a close friend of the long-term principal of the Toronto school, Dr. John McNicol, and was extended an invitation to join his faculty in 1923. (29) The V. B. T. S. curriculum and organizational structure closely followed the pattern set in Toronto and the council frequently looked to the example of the older, larger institution in its deliberations (30).

The dual purpose of V. B. T. S. was to provide biblical instruction for the many new converts from the recent evangelistic campaign and to train a supply of lay workers who could serve as Sunday School workers, pastor's assistants, and foreign, city and rural missionaries. Students could take either a full or part-time course of studies and great emphasis was given to evening courses. It was not originally intended that it would train clergymen and be a direct competitor of the theological seminaries. Its educational entrance requirements were more flexible than that of the seminaries, it granted a two, and then three, year diploma rather than a theological degree and it admitted women as well as men students. However, as theological liberalism became more entrenched in most mainline seminaries, some evangelicals chose it for all or part of their ministerial education. (31)

The school served, and was supported by, evangelicals from a broad cross section of mainline denominations. When classes opened in September of 1918, Dr. J. L. Campbell, pastor of First Baptist Church, and Rev. Charles Thompson, the Presbyterian director of the China Inland Mission's operations in Vancouver, worked with Ellis as

part-time instructors. Robert W. Sharpe, a prominent Baptist businessman, presided over a council composed of a number of Anglican, Baptist and Presbyterian laymen and ministers. (32) Of the total of eighteen part-time faculty who taught with Ellis between 1918 and 1944, seven were Presbyterians, three were mainline Baptists and one was an Anglican (Canon G. H. Wilson, one of the founders of Latimer Hall). The seven faculty not belonging to mainline denominations included four independent Baptists, one Free Methodist, one Plymouth Brethren, and one Regular Baptist. The student body came from a similar, though even broader, range of denominations but Baptists formed the largest group. (33)

This high degree of interdenominational mainline involvement helped to make V. B. T. S. quite different from many Bible schools on the continent which, though frequently interdenominational, directed their appeal to a relatively narrow spectrum of evangelical opinion. It adopted a stance similar to that of Toronto Bible College which, especially under the principalship of McNicol, had gained a reputation as an institution which was theologically conservative but which allowed for breadth on contentious eschatalogical and ecclesiastical questions. (34) The academic calendar of V. B. T. S. promised that "no sectarian nor merely denominational tenets will be taught in the classes." Breadth was particularly an issue with Ellis who decried the narrowness found in many Bible institutes.

> . . . the Bible Schools must enlist the sympathy of Christians on the widest lines consistent with truth. For us this means that we should make friends to ourselves of members of all the Churches who will sympathetically cooperate. So far as possible we should

> give them a voice in our affairs; at the same time we must zealously guard the matters of our faith which we hold as fundamental. (35)

Eschatology especially was an issue which threatened to divide evangelicalism. Most Bible institutes were strongly dispensationalist and at conferences of Bible Institute leaders attempts were made to adopt a common dispensationalist statement of faith. Ellis wrote in 1919 to Dr. A. Gray of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, strongly arguing against the adoption of a narrow statement, especially with regard to eschatology. (36) Later in the same year the V. B. T. S. council rejected a statement proposed by Gray on the grounds it was to exclusive. (37)

Such refusals to adopt a dispensationalist statement made the school suspect in the eyes of many. In 1930 the council was informed that the influential Prairie Bible Institute of Three Hills, Alberta, was spreading a rumour that V. B. T. S. held a postmillenial position - a view associated in the minds of many with liberalism. (38) Locally, dispensationalists were putting such pressure on the school to give up its broad eschatalogical stance that Ellis felt "caught between two fires", with liberalism on the left and dispensationalist fundamentalism on the right. (39) Ellis held the historicist premillenial view which, while not containing the optimistic view of history of postmillenialism was neither as pessimistic as dispensationalism. He stressed the figurative rather than the liberal interpretation of apocalyptical literature and found the dispensationalist approach made the Bible a "grotesque study book". (40) Of major concern to him, however, was that this not become a divisive issue and he was able to work closely and amicably over long

periods with some dispensationalists. (41)

Classes were held the first year in the facilities of the V. E. M. on Hastings Street but as numbers grew it moved to its own rented quarters on West Broadway, just east of Cambie Street. Four years later, a lot on the corner of West Tenth Avenue and Fir Street was purchased and a three story building was constructed and dedicated nearly debt-free in September, 1923. (42) The 1930's and 1940's saw the school reach its greatest size but a period of such sharp decline set in during the early 1950's that its operation as an interdenominational institution was forced to cease in 1956. Its assets were then turned over to a fairly recent arrival in the city, the Baptist General Conference, and it developed a new, more sectarian constituency. (43)

Compared with several Bible institutes in the Canadian Prairies, the Vancouver Bible School was never very large. Combined full and part-time enrollment exceeded one hundred only several times in the 1930's and 1940's. (44) The largest full-time enrollment of forty was reached just after World War II. (45) However, the school's significance appears to have been out of proportion to its size in at least two ways. A total of one hundred and fifty-four of its students between 1918 and 1953 entered some kind of Christian ministry in a full-time capacity, or married someone who did so. (46) Quite a large proportion of these went overseas as missionaries, particularly to China. Secondly, the impact of V. B. T. S. on the evangelical community of Vancouver was greatly enhanced by its regular Thursday evening lectures for local Sunday School teachers and leaders. Each Thursdays's lecture explicated the lesson provided for the week in the

International Uniform Lesson series. The series was an interdenominational curriculum published in the United States since the mid nineteenth century and was in widespread usage throughout the Protestant world until the 1950's. (47) Upwards of one hundred fifty Sunday School teachers and leaders from a broad cross-section of city churches regularily crowded into the V. B. T. S. auditorium for the popular lectures given by Ellis.

The influence of the school upon the Baptists of the province appears to have been particularly significant. The liberal-conservative issue was openly controversial in the denomination which split into two in 1927 as the thoroughly conservative Convention of Regular Baptist Churches separated from the more inclusive mainline B. C. Baptist Convention. (48) Although Ellis did not leave any opinions specifically on the schism in the Baptist ranks, he did make it plain in other contexts that he saw in the separatist tendency an unhealthy assertion of independence. (49) Consequently, it is difficult to argue that Ellis and V. B. T. S. played a direct role on the split. Yet, a number of Baptist laypeople and ministers had been confirmed in their conservative theology while studying under Ellis and some of these were part of the seceding group in 1927. (50)

It is more clear that V. B. T. S. played a significant role in keeping alive a conservative group within the mainline Baptist Convention. Over the twenty years following 1927 these conservatives made very extensive use of the school as they had no denominational school in Canada which they felt met their needs. The council recognized the importance of that constituency in appointing Rev. J.

E. Harris, a mainline Baptist minister, as principal following Ellis' death in 1944. Earlier that year, Harris had published an article in the denominational periodical in which he explored the causes of the Baptists' lack of vigour in Western Canada. He concluded that a loss of confidence in traditional beliefs was largely responsible. The copy of the article he kept in his personal papers bears the handwritten notation "a bit of my endeavour to 'strengthen the things that remain.'" (51) It appears he saw his new role at V. B. T. S. in the same light and worked continuously to build upon and extend the contacts Ellis had made with conservative mainline Baptist churches and individual members in the province. (52) The links between the school and these Baptists were such that the denomination's opening of its own lay training institute, the Baptist Leadership Training Institute, in Calgary in 1949 resulted in a sharp decline in V. B. T. S. enrollment as it became difficult to recruit students in what previously had been its most fertile field. (53)

The other major institutional outcome of the V. E. M. was the establishment of a home for the China Inland Mission (C. I. M.) in Vancouver. Founded by the Englishman, J. Hudson Taylor in 1865, the C. I. M. was one of the world's largest and most influential interdenominational mission societies. It was a forerunner of fervent overseas evangelism and of a very broadly based evangelical interdenominational cooperation in the effort. Yet, while allowing for the greatest breadth possible within the spectrum of evangelical Protestantism, its missionaries were among the first to detect and expose liberal theology among missionaries on the field. (54) By the early twentieth century the mission was maintaining approximately a

thousand missionaries in the interior of China. (55) Each year scores of missionaries from Great Britain, Europe, Eastern Canada and the United States passed through Vancouver, "the gateway to the Orient" in that age of ship travel. Around the time of the Oliver Campaign, members of the V. E. M. helped the mission acquire a large guest house to accomodate such personnel on West Eleventh Avenue, less than one block from the corner where V. B. T. S. would locate in 1923. (56) The home also gave the mission quarters for an orientation program for missionary recuits from the western part of the continent. More importantly, it made it possible for travelling missionaries to stay longer in Vancouver and, with their strong evangelical commitment and international perspective, to lend their support to evangelical concerns in the city. The home remained open for over thirty years but the Communist victory in China in 1949 disrupted the flow of missionaries and necessitated its closing. (57)

The C. I. M. and V. B. T. S. maintained a very close, mutually beneficial relationship for over three decades. Ellis had seriously considered overseas missionary work before deciding to emigrate to Canada and he maintained an interest in missions throughout his life. (58) He was strongly supportive of the C. I. M., encouraged his students to serve under it and sat on its Vancouver council for many years. The C. I. M. was also strongly supportive of V. B. T. S. Rev. Charles Thompson, its local representative, had been a member of V. E. M., served on the council of the new school and was one of its part-time lecturers. The close geographical proximity of the two institutions to each other after 1923, the steady stream of C. I. M. missionaries as guest lecturers at the school and the general close

cooperation contributed to a high level of interest among the students in China and a fairly large number of them went there as missionaries. (59)

The C. I. M. and V. B. T. S. were influential in promoting in the city a "Keswick-style" emphasis upon the inner spiritual life. Since the 1870's, annual conferences had met in Keswick, England, drawing thousands of evangelicals, mainly from Anglican and Reformed churches. "Practical holiness" was emphasized and promoted through intensive prayer and Bible study. (60) J. Hudson Taylor had been profoundly influenced by the conferences and thus the C. I. M. became very closely connected with Keswick. (61) The outlook of Ellis was also greatly shaped by Keswick teaching. Archdeacon Joynt, a Keswick speaker, was rector of the church he had attended for five years in London. (62) At Wycliffe College he was greatly influenced by W. H. Griffith Thomas, one of the foremost exponents of Keswick-style holiness teaching in North America. (63) It is thus not surprising that annual "Keswick weeks", designed to encourage deeper consecration on the the part of students and local church members, were jointly planned by V. B. T. S. and the local C. I. M. director at least until the 1930's.

Ellis was presented with a dilemma in 1926 in the form of an invitation from Fairview Presbyterian Church to become its minister. The congregation was largely from the former Chalmer's Presbyterian Church which had amalgamated with a Methodist congregation to form Chalmer's United Church. Like approximately one-third of the Presbyterians in Canada, the members did not concur with the 1925 creation of the United Church of Canada out of the Congregational,

Methodist and Presbyterian churches and sought to continue the Presbyterian Church in Canada. (64) In the case of the Fairview church, liberalism in the new United Church was a key factor for nonconcurrence. (65) Being familiar with Ellis' theology through the Thursday night public lectures at V. B. T. S., its members sought him as preacher. Ellis was very reluctant to leave the Anglican Church, even though confined to the role of a layman in it, but the continuing Presbyterian Church across the country was short of ministers and he was swayed by the need of the new congregation with which he was theologically compatible. In addition, he needed a larger income to support his family, which at that time included two boys, than V. B. T. S. could provide. The church's location at Fir Street and Eleventh Avenue, only one block from V. B. T. S., made it possible for him to continue his duties as principal at the school, which the church strongly supported. (66)

He was highly regarded by the congregation and respected for his warm, yet scholarly, preaching. He displayed considerable energy in carrying the combined load of academic and ministerial duties and saw the church develop into one of the more influential evangelical congregations in the city. It was never very large, growing from one hundred forty members in 1925 to two hundred and fifty in 1944, nor was it particularly wealthy. Its membership represented a broad cross section of occupations, but middle class managers, professionals and other white collar workers comprised nearly sixty percent of the total while approximately one-third were skilled and unskilled workers. (67) However, its influence has been far out of proportion to its size and

wealth. Since 1925 a total of thirty-one of its members have become full-time ministers and workers, twenty in the Presbyterian Church in Canada and eleven in other denominations and independent missions. Twenty of the total received all or part of their training under Ellis. (68) Not only did the congregation contribute to the Presbyterian mission fund at a higher rate per member than nearly all other Presbyterian churches in the city, it also supported interdenominational work heavily through a special missions budget. (69)

When Ellis died at the age of sixty-one in 1944, the type of conservative Protestantism he had struggled to preserve under pressure from both the left and the right continued in Vancouver's mainline denominations. (70) Fairview Presbyterian Church continued as a strong evangelical congregation but some of the other institutional expressions of mainline evangelicalism changed considerably. The decline of V. B. T. S. in the early 1950's was attributable to a number of factors, including the closing of the C. I. M. home and the opening of the Baptist Leadership Training School in 1949. By the 1950's, many who might have considered Bible school studies for missionary or even ministerial work in an earlier era were needing higher levels of education than V. B. T. S. was offering. Being in an urban environment, the school was affected far more by rising educational standards than were the Bible institutes in the Prairie provinces which generally drew from a more rural-based constituency. In addition, the much larger Bible institutes such as Prairie Bible Institute, had developed a widespread appeal and were drawing some rural students who previously may have considered V. B. T. S. (71)

In the same period that V. B. T. S. was in rapid decline, the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship at the University of B. C. was growing rapidly. The student group had been formed by Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian and Plymouth Brethren students in 1925 in response to the liberalism embraced by the Student Christian Movement (72) It was largely student initiated and led but was greatly influenced by the evangelical student movement in Britain with which it eventually affiliated. The presence of the C. I. M. in the city proved very helpful to the group by providing a steady stream of missionaries, many of whom were Oxford and Cambridge graduates, to address the students. During the 1930's the evangelical student groups at other Western Canadian Universities were in decline, but U. B. C.'s group, in large measure due to this strong international influence, was full of vitality. (75) Ellis had been strongly supportive of the I. V. C. F., and frequently opening his home near the campus to its gatherings. Both he, and later, Harris, often addressed the group and some of its members attended evening classes at V. B. T. S. (74)

In 1968, Regent College, which was enrolling two hundred full-time graduate students in Christian Studies by 1980, was established on the U. B. C. campus. Its founders were not from mainline denominations but were all members of Plymouth Brethren assemblies. However, through considerable previous involvement in interdenominational organizations, including V. B. T. S. and I. V. C. F., they had established considerable rapport with evangelicals in the major denominations. Marshall Sheppard, prime mover of the founding committee, had regularly attended evening lectures at V. B. T. S. in

the 1930's and 1940's and had been deeply influenced by Ellis' teaching. (75) With an inclusive evangelical statement of faith, the college almost immediately appealed to mainline conservatives and the denominational makeup of its faculty and student body was soon very similar to that which had existed at V. B. T. S. (76)

In mass-evangelism too, the influence of the institutions in which Ellis played such a crucial role continued long after his death. The 1965 Billy Graham - Leighton Ford Vancouver crusade which drew crowds of up to 30,000 was largely organized by men influenced by those institutions. Of the local campaign committee of six, two members had studied under Ellis at V. B. T. S. and another two were members of Fairview Presbyterian Church.(77)

It is not, of course, overly productive to speculate what institutional forms mainline evangelicalism might have taken in the city without Walter Ellis' influence. It is clear, however, that the fundamental role he played in developing evangelical institutions in Vancouver was crucial to the continuation and growth of a conservative Protestant element in the city which, while opposing the hegemonous liberal theology, was distinguishable from a fundamentalism which isolated itself in sectarian exclusion.

ENDNOTES

(1) N. K. Clifford, "Religion in the Thirties: Some Aspects of the Canadian Experience", The Dirty Thirties in Prairie Canada, R. D. Francis & H. Ganzevoort, eds., (Vancouver: Tantalus Research, 1980).

(2) Census figures and membership figures for a number of denominations seem to indicate this. I intend to pursue this further in later research.

(3) Interview with Mrs. A. E. Ellis, Vancouver, B. C., Jan. 11, 1982.

(4) Bishop Latimer College, Minutes of Council, May 26, 1909. For an evaluation of Tupper's status, see Robert A. McDonald, "Business Leaders in early Vancouver, 1886-1914", Ph. D. Thesis, U. B. C., 1977, pp. 240-242.

(5) Bishop Latimer College, Annual Report of Principal, Minutes of Trustees, May 16, 1912.

(6) Bishop Latimer College, Quarterly Report of Principal, Minutes of Council, Oct. 16, 1918.

(7) "A Statement of the Aims and Methods of the Vancouver Evangelistic Movement", (handbill, 1917, in Ellis papers.)

(8) The Vancouver Daily Province, May 21, 1917, p. 15.

(9) Ibid. (10) Ibid., July 7, 1917, p. 10.

(11) Ibid., July 7, 1917, p. 15 and July 10, 1917, p. 10.

(12) Ibid., July 17, 1917, p. 20.

(13) For Thomas' importance in social gospel circles, see Richard Allen, The Social Passion, Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1919-1928, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971).

(14) The Vancouver Daily Province, July 16, 1917, p. 19.

(15) Henderson's Vancouver City Directory, (Vancouver, 1917 & 1918).

(16) The Vancouver Daily Province, July 7, 1917, p. 10.

(17) Ibid., July 11, 1917, p. 22.

(18) Ibid., July 7, 1917, p. 16.

(19) Ibid., July 16, 1917, p. 20.

(21) Ellis interview, Jan. 12, 1982. Also, the Vancouver Bible Training School, Council Minutes, 1918 to 1925 allude to such a division.

(22) George M. Marsden, Fundamentalism and the Shaping of American Culture, (New York: University of Oxford Press, 1955.

(23) Unidentified newspaper clipping, 1913, in Ellis papers. Ellis interview, Jan. 28, 1983.

(24) Walter Ellis, "My Own Religion Today, (article intended for publication in Vancouver Sun, c. 1930) in Ellis papers.

(25) Vancouver Evangelistic Movement, Minutes, Aug. 7, 1917, in Ellis papers. As only a few fragments of the Vancouver Evangelistic Movement papers are extant, it has not been possible to ascertain when its activities ceased.

(26) In its 61 year history it was known as Vancouver Bible Training School, then Vancouver Bible School, then Vancouver Bible Institute and, finally, while under the auspices of the Baptist General Conference, Vancouver Bible College.

(27) Ellis interview, Jan. 11, 1982.

(28) Vancouver Bible Training School, Council Minutes, May 17, 1918.

(29) Ibid., May, 1923.

(30) Ibid., June 17, 1918, April 9, 1931 & January, 1945.

(31) Interview with Rev. Robert Birch, Burnaby, B. C., Feb. 4, 1982.

(32) V. B. T. S., Council Minutes, June 24, 1918.

(33) V. B. T. S., Annual photographs, 1918-1944, in Ellis papers. Interview with Miss Norma Cuthbertson, (Vancouver) Feb. 11, 1982 and Ellis interview, March 20, 1982.

(34) Warren Charelton, "Dr. John McNicol and Toronto Bible College", The Canadian Society of Presbyterian History, Papers, 1977, 38-57.

(35) V. B. T. S., Calendar, 1940, p. 7, in Ellis papers. V. B. T. S., Principal's Report, Council Minutes, March 8, 1919.

(36) V. B. T. S., Council Minutes, April 11, 1919.

(37) Ibid., Dec., 29, 1919.

(38) Ibid., May 2, 1930.

(39) Ellis interview, Jan 12, 1982.

(40) Ellis, sermon series, April and May, 1942, notes taken by Miss Norma Cuthbertson, in Cuthbertson papers.

(41) W. J. Scott, (North Vancouver) to W. Ellis, Dec. 27, 1933. In V. B. T. S., Council Minutes, Jan. 3, 1934.

(42) V. B. T. S., Council Minutes, Sept 11, 1923.

(43) Gordon Carlson, Seventy- five Years History of the Columbia Baptist Conference, (Seattle: Columbia Baptist Conference, 1964), p. 236-38.

(44) V. B. T. S., Principal's Reports, Council Minutes, 1918-1955.

(45) J. E. Harris, Diary, Sept. 30, 1947, in Harris papers.

(46) Mrs. A. E. Ellis to Mr. Carlson, Jan. 10, 1964, copy in Ellis papers.

(47) Gerald E. Knoff, The World Sunday School Movement, (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), pp. 2, 35, 41, 64-68, 103.

(48) For histories of the division, see Gordon h. Poussett, "The History of the Regular Baptists in B. C.", B. Div. Thesis, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, 1956 and John B. Richards, "Baptists in British Columbia - A Struggle to Maintain "Sectarianism"", M. A. Thesis, U. B. C., 1964.

(49) Ellis, Sermon, June 13, 1943, notes taken by N. Cuthbertson, in Cuthbertson papers.

(50) Interview with Mrs. Grace Robinson, (Maple Ridge, B. C.) Mar. 4, 1982. Ellis interview, Jan. 12, 1982 and Cuthbertson interview, Feb. 11, 1982.

(52) Harris diary, 1944-1948.

(53) J. E. Harris to E. I. McPhee, Oct. 4, 1953, in historical file, V. B. T. S.

(54) Marsden, Fundamentalism, p. 98.

(55) J. Hudson Taylor, A Retrospect, (Philadelphia: The China Inland Mission, c. 1910), inside cover.

(56) Ellis interview, Jan 12, 1982.

(57) Interview with Mr. L Street, Feb. 9, 1982.

(58) Frances, W. M., Rev Walter Ellis, M. A., B. D. A Memorial, A Tribute, 1925. In Ellis papers.

(59) Mrs. A. E. Ellis to Mr. Carlson, Jan. 10, 1964, copy in Ellis papers. Cuthbertson interview, Feb. 11, 1982.

(60) Ian Seller, "Keswick Conventions", New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, J. D. Douglas, ed., (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), p. 220.

(61) Marsden, Fundamentalism, p. 97.

(62) Francis, Rev. Walter Ellis, p. 4.

(63) Marsden, Fundamentalism, p. 99 & 246.

(64) See John S. Moir, Enduring Witness: A History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, (bryant Press, n.d.)

(65) Fairview Presbyterian Church, Minutes of Session and Minutes of Congregational Meetings, Nov., 1924.

(66) Ellis interview, Jan. 11, 1982.

(67) Compiled from Fairview Presbyterian Church, Membership Rolls, and The Wrigley - Henderson British Columbia Directory, 1924-1926, and The British Columbia and Yukon Directory, 1943 - 1945.

(68) From list compiled by Mrs. A. E. Ellis with assistance from members of Fairview Presbyterian Church.

(69) Statistical Reports, Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1926-1974.

(70) He died four days after a brain operation. He left a family of five boys, ranging in age from nine years to over twenty.

(71) See Donald Goertz, "The Development of a Bible Belt: The Socio-Religious Interaction in Alberta between 1925 and 1938", (M. C. S. Thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, 1980). J. E. Harris to E. I. McPhee, Oct. 4, 1953, letter in historical file, V. B. T. S.

(72) A detailed history is available in David Phillips, "The History of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship in Western Canada", M. C. S. Thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, 1976).

(73) Ibid., p. 110.

(74) Ibid., p. 56, Ellis interview, Jan. 12, 1982 and Harris Diary, Oct. 5, 1948.

(75) Ian S. Rennie (Toronto) to author, Feb. 10, 1982.

(76) Regent College, Registrar's Reports, 1971-72 to 1980-81).

(77) Ian S. Rennie (Toronto) to author, Feb. 10, 1982.

"To Bribe the Porters of Heaven": Poverty, Salvation and the Saint Vincent de Paul Society in Victorian Toronto, 1850-1890

by

Brian P. Clarke

The Saint Vincent de Paul Society is probably best known today for its store fronts, its "drop boxes" for cast-off clothes, and its wide distribution of free clothing and furniture. An exclusive emphasis upon the extent of the society's "outdoor relief," however, is misleading. Such an approach overlooks the religious impulse that motivated the members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society and the society's contribution to the formation of an Irish Catholic community in Victorian Toronto. Founded in Paris in 1833 by Frederic Ozanam for practicing Catholic men over the age of eighteen, the Saint Vincent de Paul Society was an integral part of the nineteenth century revival of French Catholicism. The "primary object" of the society was "the salvation of souls, and in particular the souls of the members themselves" through acts of charity.[1] However, true charity was inextricably linked with the sacramental life of the church. The Saint Vincent de Paul Society therefore promoted an Ultramontane form of Catholicism, a form of piety which centered upon the parish.[2] New Italian devotions, such as the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, as well as devotions to the Sacred Heart and Marian piety, were imported and popularized by the society.[3] In its emphasis upon the salvation of its members' souls and the sacramental life of the church, the Saint Vincent de Paul Society resembled a religious confraternity rather than a

conservative version of the Social Gospel. Still less did it have anything in common with social work.

The vertical structure of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society insured that the aims and method of the society would be transplanted with little or no modification. The activity of the society in Toronto was not an ad hoc response to local conditions, but rather conformed to the Ultramontane religious and social program set out in the Manual and monthly bulletin of the society. However, the particular contribution of the society to the development of Catholicism in Toronto depended very much upon local circumstances and upon developments in Ireland.

The failure of the Counter-Reformation to take root in Ireland and the general laxity of the clergy in the fulfillment of their duties in the eighteenth century resulted in the perpetuation of a popular religion which, though it included certain aspects of canonical Catholicism also existed along side of and exterior to the religious life of the church.[4] By 1830, however, the bishops of Ireland under the direction of Rome had inaugurated an internal and administrative reform of the church.[5] This reform by the bishops led to to the establishment of ecclesiastical discipline and the professionalization of the clergy.[6] A reformed church, having imposed new standards upon its clergy, could now initiate a concerted campaign to change the religious practices of the laity, and the revitalized hierarchy and clergy launched a "devotional revolution." The devotional revolution marked a dramatic change in popular religion: not only did attendance at mass increase,

but also the range of devotions within the church was vastly expanded. Beacause this devotional revolution was consolidated only in the generation following the famine of 1845, the massive influx of Irish Catholics in the 1840s presented the church in Toronto with the immense challenge of transforming nominal Irish Catholics into practicing ones.[7] With the arrival in 1850 of the French and Ultramontane ecclesiastic, Bishop Armand de Charbonnel, the Catholic church in Toronto necessarily embarked upon its own administrative reform and devotional revolution.[8] In the Saint Vincent de Paul Society, founded only a few months after his arrival, Bishop de Charbonnel saw a lay organization which through its close connection with the church was well suited to promote this devotional revolution.

The main object of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society was religious: to encourage its members in "the practice of religious life" and "to fortify the faith of the poor."[9] Having "the salvation of its members at heart," the society existed "to maintain its members, by mutual example, in the practice of a Christian life."[10] Charity was a means to an end, the means by which the members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society gained their salvation. Thus, the visiting of the poor was not primarily a philanthropic exercise; visiting the poor was the "special object" of the society because it was a form of active Christian virtue which required "but little time" and could be "easily practiced" by "men who live in the world."[11]

The clergy repeatedly stressed in their sermons for the

Saint Vincent de Paul Society that "without charity it was impossible to be saved."[12] Through good works the charitable could lay up in heaven a treasure of merit. "What was given to the poor was only lent to God," asserted Father McCann of Saint Paul's parish.[13] "When the soul is balancing between two eternities, happy or miserable," Archbishop Lynch explained, "he will repay principal and interest."[14] "In the blessings invoked upon our heads for services done," concurred James G. Moylan, editor of the Canadian Freeman and a member of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society, "we have strong protection in our hour of need." "And," he added, "how near that may be who can say?"[15]

"In the exercise of Charity which covereth a multitude of sins," asserted one member of the society, "we could make atonement for the irregularities of our past lives; and labouring for our sanctification ... we escaped the danger of future relapses."[16] However, "Christian works belong to God alone," and the sacraments, especially communion, were essential.[17] Without the aid of the sacraments "our charity would ... be but cold compassion-- a virtue completely human-- praiseworthy no doubt, but imperfect in the eyes of faith."[18]

Piety and charity therefore intermingled in the weekly conference meetings of the society. Meetings were opened with prayers by the conference president while the members kneeled.[19] After reciting the Ave Maria members would take turns in reading a selection from the Imitiation of Christ, The Bulletin of the Society of Saint Vincent of Paul, the Manual of the society, or the Gospels.[20] Before taking up the cases for relief, the members would consider the meditation of the week. These meditations,

taken individually or together, poignantly expressed the fundamental goal of the society. Members were urged to dwell upon "The small number of the Elect" and the "Certainty of Death." "The shortness of Life & the length of Eternity" only served to underscore the "Folly of Neglecting our Salvation" and being preoccupied by "the vanity of worldly things." Hence, the "Necessity of Charity" and "walking in the ways of God" to avoid the "danger of an unprovided death."

The sacraments of the church were essential, declared the president of the society, W. J. Macdonell, "to preserve the divine flame of charity among us."[21] Without the sacraments of the church, the work of the society would be mere philanthropy and without any religious significance. As a rule the members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society were expected to attend the quarterly, city-wide meetings and to receive communion.[22] In addition to the quarterly meetings, each parish conference held an annual retreat. At these retreats, besides attending morning mass, members would assist at the forty hours devotion and at the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.[23] The society also urged its members to say the rosary and impressed upon its members the "necessity" of frequent, that is, monthly communion.[24]

It is in the annual parish charity sermons and in the readings for the society's weekly meetings that the connection between Catholicism and charity, centering upon the concept of Holy Poverty, was most emphatically expressed.[25] The privations of the poor resembled those of Christ, declared Father Teefy of Saint Basil's parish, for Jesus Christ "though he was rich, yet for your souls He became poor."[26] Because the poor are the "representatives of Jesus Christ" it could be said that "they

are Himself."[27] The garret of the poor is "the tabernacle where Jesus Christ veils himself under the rags of misery, as on the altar he conceals himself beneath the Eucharistic species."[28] The poor were God's children. By resigning themselves to their condition they could, in effect, make a virtue of necessity; by accepting their lot they could gain sanctification.[29] Poverty instead of being an obstacle to salvation could become the means by which salvation could be gained.

As "our Divine Saviour," the members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society were assured, "wishes to be recognized under the features of the poor," they can be sure of "the efficacy of the prayers of him who is so near to God, and who is destined to come to your house."[30] The members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society in attending the needs of the poor gained the patronage of those who were near to God. "Let us," declared one member, "devote ourselves to the poor and so 'bribe these porters of heaven.'"[31] The poor, who were in their suffering so much like Christ, were the "porters of heaven" and their prayers could indeed open the gates to paradise.

Jesus Christ, Catholics were repeatedly reminded, pronounced "woe against the rich, saying it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle that for a rich man to enter heaven."[32] It was by being poor in spirit, by giving alms and in engaging in self-sacrifice that the rich could gain salvation. The members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society were urged to ask themselves how could "my caprice" be equal to the needs of the poor?

> ...should I dare treat Jesus Christ as I have hitherto treated the poor?... I have sometimes spent nights in worldly pleasure, how many have I spent at the bedside of the indigent sick?[33]

It was in the giving of alms that "the best antidote against those exagerations and those daily repetions of futile expenses" was to be found.[34] Thus, the "sight of so many privations is the best preservation against the abuses of riches."[35] The presence of poverty encouraged those who were better off to acts of self-denial, to gain the habit of a "simpler life" and thereby to devote their surplus to alms.

If the existence of poverty provided the individual wealthy Christian a singular opportunity to engage in charity, thereby providing for his own salvation, it can also be said that the poor redeemed society.[36] The order of society was of divine origin. Although poverty was a natural result of the Fall, "the day of man's first and most keenly felt poverty," property was of God.[37] The inequalities of society, stated Bishop O'Mahony, the auxiliary Bishop of Toronto, were "doubtless for the common good; without them society could not exist" because it is "necessary for men to occupy different stations in life." "If all were rich in society," he asked, " who would come down to fill the humble offices of the poor and render the duties that comprise all the workings of society?"[38] But if the hierarchical ordering of society is necessary for the "common good" of society it is still more ncessary for the realization of salvation.

God gave the rich, Father Teefy explained, "full right to what would not only support life, but would also sustain their rank in society." "Over and above that," he continued,"was superfluous wealth, of this superfluous wealth they were to give to the poor." The rich were stewards of their wealth, and they were "bound to act towards the poor as God acted towards them." By not making a proper use of their wealth, the affluent were warned, God would judge them guilty for their refusal to extend

"their hand to the poor just as the poor man" would be "guilty if he put his hand and took the goods of the rich man." As each rank in society had its duty, society offered an "economy of charity"; "the rich man gave material assistance and the poor man prayers and gratitude, his spiritual graces."[39] The order of society, by providing "the most magnificent field for the exercise of Christian virtue" was in effect a divine scheme for salvation.[40]

Conversely, social stability and harmony was guaranteed by religion, that is, by Catholicism. The failure of the wealthy to fulfill their obligations could only loosen the bonds of society. The aid of public relief, where the poor must "brave the fear of showing [themselves] importunate" could only result in "bitter bread."[41] Thus, the poor "instead of uniting their suffering with those of a Saviour God, instead of making them ... a cause and a source of merit, blaspheme Divine Providence ... and give themselves up to despair."[42] It is only with true Christain charity, asserted James Moylan, that "the yawning gulf is bridged over, and the Rich and the Poor are brought together is Christian sympathy." Without it, "the Tempter" will find "easy access" with the poor who see "happiness and splendor ... from the opposite shore." "Rancour and Envy and Hate" would be given free rein, and property, the "very foundation of civil order" would be threatened.[43] When the ties of charity were severed the poor turned away from God, from the church, "the despository and teacher of faith, sound doctrine and the guardian of morals."[44] From the rejection of divine authority it is but a short step to reject civil authority.[45]

It is this assumption that formed the basis of Catholic polemic against Protestantism. "What other result could we rationally expect from the operation of the Protestant principle

of private judgement " if it was applied to the ordering of society, asked Arcbishop Lynch. "If no authoritative tribunal existed for the interpretation of the laws of the country," he asserted, "nothing but anarchy and confusion would be the result."[46] The effects of the Reformation were unmistakable: "civil society has gone from bad to worse," Archbishop Lynch concluded."Men of huge capital" exploit their workers by refusing to pay a living wage. Avarice, "the drive to become rich too quickly even though the poor should unjustly suffer," had triumphed. The ties that bound rich and poor had been severed, and civil war could not be a "distant evil."[47]

The doctrine of Holy Poverty presupposed a hierarchical society, a society in which classes were bound by reciprocal duties and in which a premium was placed upon charity and resignation. Implicit in this ideal was a crtique of economic individualism and of laissez-faire capitalism. However, Catholic social thought was also marked by an idealization of rurual life. Cities were "haunts of vice" asserted Archbishop Lynch; in the country Irish Catholics "sheltered from the cold blast of a friendless world could gain an honest living" and their hearts could be "molded to every noble and religious principle."[48] This bucolic ideal, by appealing to the past, strengthened Catholic social conservatism. The social ideals of rural society were to be applied without modification in an urban and industrial context.

Far from promoting social change, viewing society from the perspective of Holy Poverty resulted in an emphasis upon charity as a religious responsibility.The socially disruptive consequences of a growing urban and industrial society were a direct result of individualism: the rich forgot their duty of charity and the poor were discontented with their lot. Only Catholicism with

its sacramental aids and inducements could restore the proper relations and harmony of society. The Protestant, declared James Moylan, is charitiable "naturally, with as much earnestness and strength as any other man." But his religion "by denying the religious value of works of charity, has taken from him the strongest inducement to struggle on patiently in the work of providing for [the] aged or infirm."[49] All reform, therefore, began with a return to church. Individual spiritual reform, properly understood, was the key and only legitimate basis for all social reform. Charity, which had as its aim the salvation of souls, reinforced the hierarchical order of society, and by engaging in charity, the rich could ensure that society fulfilled its true purpose as an arena for the salvation of souls.

"Essentially Catholic," declared the Manual of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul, "our society should always maintain as a singular honor, a close connection with the Parochial clergy and Bishops of the Diocese."[50] "Its intimate union with the Church," the Manual continued, "is for the Society of Saint Vincent of Paul as for all Catholic works, an indispensible condition of stability, and the most necessary of all duties." "We should always remember that we are only laics" and should therefore "observe and follow with an absolute docility the directions which our ecclesiastical superiors may think to give us."[51] "It is the office of our pastor to expose our duties to us," the Manual concluded, "it is ours to discharge them."[52]

The members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society were to the "servants" of the church, the "auxiliaries" of the clergy, and it was with this expectation that Bishop de Charbonnel founded the society in Toronto.[53] As the Saint Vincent de

Paul Society was established upon a parochial basis, it was in the parishes that the society's activities were centered and the initiative of its members most apparent.

With parish trustees playing little or no role, the parish priests enjoyed a monopoly in the management of parochial property.[54] The laity, usually members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society, were appointed to serve, at the parish priest's pleasure, on ad hoc committees established by the clergy to deal with limited and specific parochial issues.[55] Members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society often acted as ushers in the parish churches and frequently aided the women's sodalities to put on bazaars, picnics, and garden parties to aid the parish building fund or to liquidate the parish debt.[56] Because of these contributions, so essential to the operation of any parish, the Saint Vincent de Paul Society was, as Father Laurent of Saint Patrick's parish put it, the "right hand" of the clergy.[57] But the members of the society could easily view themselves as the representatives of the parish. It came quite naturally to them to take the initiative and present addresses and petitions on behalf of the parish.[58] Though the parish priest would usually select lay delegates and representatives from the Saint Vincent de Paul Society, the parish priest would remind the members that the initiative belonged to the clergy, and that independent action on the part of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society was zealous but not prudent-- and on at least one occasion their zeal did lead to a confrontation with the Archbishop.[59]

Though at times the actions of the members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society met with the disapproval of the clergy,

the church was able to galvanize an Ultramontane laity by allowing free scope for the organizational talents of Irish Catholics. It comes as no surprise that the society took pride in exhibiting "to our Protestant neighbors a beautiful example of Catholic charity."[60] So close was their identification with the church that the members of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society saw in their practice of charity the very symbol of Catholicism. The society through its connection with the clergy not only became a center for the dissemination of Ultramontane ideals and the new Italian devotions, but was also a vehicle for creating a cohesive lay minority who were self-consciously Catholic and were militant defenders of the church. Indeed, it was this new piety which, on the one hand, helped to popularize Ultramontane ideals and, on the other, served to cement the members' loyalty to the church. Through the Saint Vincent de Paul Society, Catholicism in Toronto created a militant minority-- a lay army of the church.

The role of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society in the formation of an Irish Catholic community was not limited to creating a militant and, for the most part, middle-class minority. With public charities under the management and direction of Protestants, Catholic fears of "leakage" were easily aroused. Catholic denunciations of "souperism" and of Protestant "proselytising mills" were common throughout the nineteenth century.[61] "It is high time to protest against the outrageous and indefensible conduct of these would be philanthropists" in their "despicable trade of souperism," thundered the Canadian Freeman. By "taking advantage of the adverse circumstances" of the Irish Catholic poor, these charities were, the Freeman insisted, a "snare" to entrap and convert Catholics.[62] The out-

door relief of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society to the poorest section of the Irish Catholic community-- widows, women whose husbands had gone elsewhere in search of work or had simply abandoned them, and their children-- was part of the Catholic church's attempt to develop a network of charitable institutions parallel to the public and Protestant dominated charitable voluntary associations.

"Leakage," however, was only one problem confronted by the church. After visiting a mission just outside Toronto in 1852, Bishop de Charbonnel wrote to Cardinal Fransoni, Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda Fide, that he had "never found so much ignorance and rarely as much corruption."Many," he continued, "never go to confession ... and communion, and if not positively Protestants, are so in practice on account of their cold indifference ... and their spirit of independence."[63] The religion of the Irish Catholic immigrant with its casual attitude to canonically enjoined observances, which Bishop de Charbonnel found so incomprehensible and horrifying that he could only see the corrupting influences of Protestantism, was a peasant religion, an eclectic mixture of Christian and pre-Christian beliefs.[64] The task of the church was not simply to "prevent defections from the faith" but to transform the nature of this peasant religion.

"There is almost no catechism in the diocese," complained Bishop de Charbonnel.[65] The lack of religious education clearly worried the clergy for, as Father Laurent put it, "on the Catholic youth of to-day will mainly depend the progress of the Catholic church of the future."[66] The Saint Vincent de Paul Society, therefore, took charge of the supervision that should belong to the parents, but "which through carelessness or want of time, they sometimes acquit themselves badly," in order to ensure that

Catholic children attended the Separate Schools.[67] As for the weekly catechism, the members not only assembled the children on Sunday afternoons, but also assisted the clergy in conducting the classes.[68] The society's visitors also made sure that children were confirmed and made their first communion-- the initiations into the full sacramental life of the church-- as well as ensuring that they regularly attended Sunday Mass: all of these religious duties which the pre-Famine generation ignored.[69] Adults too were encouraged to attend church regularly and to fulfill their Easter duties.[70] Rosaries, crucifixes, prayer books, and religious literature were distributed by the society.[71] These devotional aids were a means of popularizing new forms of piety: the cult of the Virgin Mary, the devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Holy Family.[72] Much of the literature of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society also served to guide visitors in questioning the poor so that they could determine the effect of their efforts in the reform of religious observances.[73] Perhaps the most visible effort of the society to influence the ways of the Irish Catholic poor was in its attempt to curtail wakes. The society not only paid for the funerals of the poor, but the members also "prayed in the Houses by the corpses" and attended the funerals to prevent traditional wake games and amusements.[74]

However, it would be misleading to assume that the devotional revolution among the Irish was solely imposed by either the church or a lay elite. Emigrating from a country that itself was experiencing dramatic social change, Irish immigrants had to adjust to an urban and industrial environment. Without skills, with hopes but without the means of attaining them, the

Catholicism of the devotional revolution gave Irish Catholics an identity that could meet their needs in an urban milieu. One of the aims of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society visitors was to "encourage economy and forethought amongst the poor."[75] True, Holy Poverty placed limits upon the possibilities of self-help. However, many Irish Catholic workers sought the modest goals of self-reliance and independence, some of which ran counter to the ideals of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society, but which may not have been foreign to the recent Irish immigrant: independence, passivity, deference and rebellion existed uneasily within the peasant of pre-Famine Ireland. The church, then, offered Irish Catholic immigrants a possible form of cultural adaptation. The identity of the devotional revolution was not simply imposed from above. The Saint Vincent de Paul Society along with many other Catholic voluntary associations, the parish confraternities, temperance societies, and Irish nationalist societies, was part of a concerted effort by both clergy and laity to create a religious subculture. Voluntary associations like the Saint Vincent de Paul Society not only created a militantly Ultramontane lay minority, but also made possible broad support for the church within the Irish Catholic community. Neither the institutional consolidation of the Catholic church nor the work of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society would have been possible without the support and the contributions, however small, of the laity. If the Catholic church offered Irish Catholics an identity suitable to an urban and industrial setting, it can also be said that the Irish Catholics created a religious subculture and an ethnic community, and in so doing,made themselves.

NOTES

[1] Manual of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul (London, 1867), p. 30.

[2] "Visitors Report" in Joseph J. Murphy, "Scrapbook of newspapers clippings about and memorabilia of the Saint Vincent de Paul Soc.-- Toronto," p. 4; Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, Les Débuts du Catholicisme Sociale en France (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France,,1951), pp. 175 and 186-187.

[3] Roger Aubert, Le Pontificat de Pie IX (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1963), pp. 463-68; Bulletin of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, September 1872 pp. 295-99, May 1873 p. 152, June 1875 pp. 161-63, February 1889 p. 45, September 1889 p. 257, May 1890 p. 143. Copies of the Bulletin now in the Archives of the Archdiocese of Toronto (A.A.T.) were originally in the libraries of the Saint Patrick's and Saint Basil's conferences.

[4] David W. Miller, "Irish Catholicism and the Great Famine," Journal of Social History 9 (1975): 89-91.

[5] Emmet Larkin, "The Devotional Revolution in Ireland," American Historical Review 77 (1972): 630 and S. J. Connolly, Priests and People in Pre-Famine Ireland (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982), pp. 69 ff.

[6] Emmet Larkin, The Making of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, 1850-1860 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), pp. 488-490.

[7] Emmet Larkin, "The Devotional Revolution in Ireland," p. 648.

[8] See M. W. Nicolson, "Ecclesiastical Metropolitanism and the Evolution of the Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto," Histoire sociale/ Social History 15 (1982): 129-156.

[9] Canadian Freeman, 8 May 1862 and "Toronto Particular Council Report," Bulletin, March 1882, p. 92.

[10] Manual, p. 20.

[11] Manual, pp. 30-33.

[12] See,for example,Irish Canadian, 19 February 1868.

[13] Irish Canadian, 7 December 1872.

[14] Irish Canadian, 1 November 1882. See also Irish Canadian, 20 October 1875.

[15] Canadian Freeman, 22 December 1870.

[16] "Twenty-Fifth General Meeting Held in St. Paul's Church Sunday the 10th of September, 1865," in J. S. McGivern, ed., A Documentary Contribution to the History of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society in Toronto (Toronto, 1975), p. 57.

[17] Manual, p. 20 and Conference of Our Lady, Minute Book, 18 June 1854 (hereafter cited as O.L.).

[18] Manual, p. 422.

[19] Manual, pp. 49 ff.

[20] See, for example, O.L., 8 February, 18 June, and 8 October 1854.

[21] O.L., 18 June 1854.

[22] The meetings were held on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, the First Sunday of Lent, Second Sunday after Easter, and July 19, the feast day of Saint Vincent de Paul.

[23] O.L., 18 September and 4 December 1853 and 16 November 1865.

[24] See, for example, O.L., 8 February, 18 June, 8 October 1854, and 8 February 1857.

[25] I have borrowed the term from Sheridan Gilley, "Heretic London, Holy Poverty, and the Irish Poor, 1830-1870," Downside Review 89 (1971): 64-89. Gilley's brilliant exposition of the nature of Catholic charity in Victorian London is an essential contribution to the understanding of nineteenth century Catholic social theory and social action.

[26] Irish Canadian, 9 February 1879.

[27] Manual, pp. 225 and 234-35. See also W. J. Macdonell's comments in Canadian Freeman, 21 September 1871.

[28] Bulletin, May 1877, p. 165.

[29] Bulletin, June 1879, p. 173.

[30] Bulletin, June 1887, p. 163.

[31] "Twenty-Fifth General Meeting ... 1865," in McGivern, ed., A Documentary Contribution, p. 57.

[32] See, for example, Canadian Freeman, 26 January 1871.

[33] Manual, pp. 309-310.

[34] Bulletin, September 1875, p. 260.

[35] Rules of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul (Toronto, 1861), p. 30.

[36] Gilley, "Heretic London, Holy Poverty, and the Irish Poor," p. 66.

[37] Irish Canadian, 5 February 1879.

38 Irish Canadian, 15 December 1880.

39 Irish Canadian, 21 November 1889.

40 Irish Canadian, 15 December 1880.

41 Bulletin, June 1877, p. 169.

42 Manual, p. 10.

43 Canadian Freeman, 20 December 1872.

44 Canadian Freeman, 6 February 1868.

45 Canadian Freeman, 6 February 1862.

46 Canadian Freeman, 1 July 1869.

47 Irish Canadian, 28 January 1886.

48 "The Evils of Wholesale and Improvident Emigration from Ireland," 1864, Lynch Papers, A.A.T.

49 Canadian Freeman, 8 June 1871.

50 Rules, p. 10.

51 Rules, p. 26.

52 Manual, p. 233.

53 Manual, pp. 6 and 26.

54 See "An Act to Incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishops of Toronto and Kingston in Canada, in each Diocese," LXXXII, 29 March 1845, Power Administration I, A.A.T.

55 See, for example, "Committee on Ways and Means, Report 1876"; Charles Robertson to Archbishop Lynch, 12 July 1861; Eugene O'Keefe to Archbishop Lynch, 20 October 1877; D. A. O'Sullivan to Archbishop Lynch, 22 July 1884, Lynch Papers, A.A.T.

56 "Book of Announcements," Saint Michael's Cathedral, 5 February, 23 July, 21 August 1882 and "Book of Announcements," Saint Paul's Parish, 23 July 1871; O.L., 25 November 1855, 13 April 1856, 17 August 1877, 4 September 1887.

57 Irish Canadian, 29 April 1886.

58 O.L., 6 February, St. Patrick's Conference, Minute Book, 19 August 1877 and 25 May 1890 (hereafter cited as St. P.).

59 See the Globe, 5, 7, 8, and 10 January 1881.

60 "Toronto Particular Council Report, 1887-1888," Bulletin, October 1888, p. 349

[61] See, for example, J.J. Murphy, "Scrapbook of newspaper clippings," pp. 38-39; Canadian Freeman, 26 June, 6 and 13 November 1862, 23 March 1871, 28 March 1872; St. P., 25 November 1877 and 10 March 1878.

[62] Canadian Freeman, 10 June 1969.

[63] Bishop de Charbonnel to Cardinal Fransoni, 30 May 1852, de Charbonnel Papers, A.A.T.

[64] David W. Miller, "Irish Catholicism and the Great Famine," pp. 89-91 and S. J. Connolly, Priests and People, pp. 100-120.

[65] "Explication de la supplique du 2d Concile de Québec," 22 October 1855, de Charbonnel Papers, A.A.T.

[66] Irish Canadian, 16 November 1870.

[67] Manual, p. 477; O.L., 3 and 27 November 1853, 19 March 1854, 2 September 1855, 13 April 1879, 4 May 1879, 27 April 1880, 8 September 1880 and St.P., 23 December 1877, 10 November 1878 and 2 March 1879.

[68] O.L., 9 October 1853, 22 December 1855, and 27 January 1856.

[69] "Summary Statement From 10 November '50 to 1 May 1851," in J. S. McGivern, ed., A Documentary Contribution, p. 37 and Presidential Address-- St. Vincent de Paul Society, Toronto," Bulletin, February 1879, p. 61.

[70] "Vistors Report," J.J. Murphy, "Scrapbook of newspaper clippings," pp. 4 and 5.

[71] See Hospital Board, Minutes; "Toronto Particular Council Report," Bulletin, March 1882, p. 92; Superior Council Report for the Year (Quebec, 1883), p. 20.

[72] Bulletin, April 1872, pp. 125-126, September 1872, pp. 298-300, May 1873 , p. 152, June 1875, pp. 161-163, June 1879, pp. 172-181, April 1882, p. 100, and March 1883, p. 70.

[73] "Toronto Particular Council Report," Bulletin, March 1882, pp. 92-93.

[74] "Summary Statement From 10 November '50 to 1 May 1851," in J.S. McGivern, ed., A Documentary Contribution, p. 37; O.L., 30 October 1853, 4 May 1856, 22 September 1867, 15 December 1872, 24 December 1876, 14 January 1877, 29 August 1880; St. P., 14 February 1875 and 28 March 1886.

[75] Bulletin, November 1878, p. 320.

EARLY CRITICS OF MARTIN LUTHER: THE CASE OF CASPAR VON SCHWENCKFELD

A paper presented by E.J. Furcha, Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Church History (CSCH), Vancouver, B.C. June 1983.

Note: The following paper is an attempt to single out contemporaries of Martin Luther who critiqued some or all of his several theological and reformatory positions. It looks at the individual writers without prejudice and outside the often rather negative attitude toward them that was adopted by earlier histories, thus failing to do justice to their own respective positions.

To survey the current flood of Luther publications--particularly in Germany--is to reach the conclusion that the great Reformer of the sixteenth century is above criticism and reproach. Volume after volume explores for public or scholarly consumption Luther's influence then and now and his many-faceted contributions to literature, the German language, politics, music, theology, etc. Invariably the verdict is positive.

In view of such extensive affirmation of a person who undoubtedly towered above his age and has cast his shadow well into our own time, one might be permitted to review some criticism of Luther and his work on the sidelines of events, as it were, roughly between 1523 - 1561. The critic under review

is Caspar von Schwenckfeld, 1489-1561, Silesian nobleman and lay theologian.

It almost goes without saying, of course, that Schwenckfeld acknowledged the debt he owed Luther (CS lV, 822ff--a statement from about 1533). He never forgot Luther's great achievement in breaking down walls and introducing a reformed understanding of the Christian faith. In at least one instance, he was prepared to state agreement with Luther on twenty points (CS Xlll,234f, dated 1553).[1] Nonetheless, from the vantage point of his own view on the nature of the church, the power of the internal word of God and the need to find the fruits of the spirit in the lives of the followers of Christ, he felt compelled to challenge Luther and some of his exponents. Instead of change and renewal their efforts seemed to him to lead once again to the tyranny of a dead faith (Cf Letter to Friedrich II, Count of Liegnitz, Oct. 1528--CS lll, 103ff; and CS V, 822.11-16 and many other passages).

Schwenckfeld may not have been the first follower of Luther, turned critic, but he is certainly among the most persistent. He chides the Reformer for not being radical enough in his efforts to reform the church,[2] for rejecting the papacy, while accepting some of its teaching,[3] for vascillating on points of teaching[4], and last, but not least, for

Luther's failure to recall that God can make wise men of fools--"as a doctor ought to know" (CS IX,54.27ff).

There were those, of course, who earlier had charged Luther of heresy and blamed him for leaving the true teaching of the church. From among his own ranks, Carlstadt, Spalatin, Agricola and Thomas Muentzer--to name but a few--expressed objections and/or criticism.[5] They shall not concern us here. There is plenty of material in Schwenckfeld's own work referring to Luther and things Lutheran to hold our attention for the remainder of this paper.[6]

Perhaps more than any other contemporary theologian, Luther fascinated the Silesian nobleman. Even when he disagreed with the Wittenberg reformer he often insisted on the bond of friendship between them and acknowledged the lasting influence Luther had exerted upon him. Unfortunately, the feeling was not always mutual. Luther's attitutde toward Schwenckfeld, especially in later years, was either one of indifference or anger. He obviously did not take him seriously as a theologian and simply lumped him with other enthusiasts. In fact, he may frequently not even have read what Schwenckfeld had to say.

As we noted elsewhere, three phases in Schwenckfeld's critique of Luther and Lutheran teachings may be

distinguished.[7] During the first, which ended about 1529--the year of the Marburg Colloquy--the two men are in agreement. While not all of Luther's tenets are accepted by Schwenckfeld, he is relatively gentle in his criticism and seeks to affirm similarities rather than stress differences.

With Schwenckfeld's opposition to union negotiations at any price, the second phase is generally delineated. Several major writings of this period contain heated exchanges in which Schwenckfeld ascribes flaws in Luther's thought to a faulty Christology. More likely than not, though, they may be rooted in Luther's anthropology in which the enslaved will plays such a prominent role. As we shall see later, the nobleman seems to side with Erasmus, though he shifts the emphasis by relating free will to the regenerate person.

Additional pressure to sharpen his criticism and clarify his position comes from a rather stinging attack on Schwenckfeld's views by a group of theologians and pastors meeting at Schmalcalden during February/ March 1540. The attack is directed against both Franck and Schwenckfeld. The former is charged with errors regarding the doctrine of the church. Some of his paradoxes are singled out for censure.

Schwenckfeld's offence is said to be a faulty Christology in that he allegedly denies the humanity of Christ (C.R. 111.983-986). The nobleman replies in 1541 in the Confession und Erklerung vom Erkandtnus Christi....to which he appended a detailed response to each of the clauses in the Schmalcalden Articles that referred to his teaching (CS V11, Doc. 354, especially pp 500-509; the booklet, incidentally, is one of Schwenckfeld's major writings). A bitter taste lingered for a long time. As late as 1553 in A Letter to Sybilla Eisler he refers to this "ganging up" on him by Melanchthon, Bucer, Bugenhagen and others (CS X111,253ff).

In the third phase, Schwenckfeld emerges as one who speaks for the "true" Luther over against distortions in other Luther exponents. This phase begins in the late forties and probably reaches its peak in the mid-fifties with a rather drawn-out exchange of pamphlets between the Silesian and Flacius Illyricus, 1520-1575.[8]

When we undertake to review Schwenckfeld's critique, we are not seeking to undermine Luther's prestige. Nothing would prove to be more futile than such a venture. However, the criticisms of Luther by his contemporaries are worth hearing, especially when they come from within the camp, as it

were, and are aimed not so much at bringing Luther back to his former ways, as they are to advance his cause and to assure a sound Biblical foundation to his evangelical stance. We shall follow Schwenckfeld's critique in roughly chronological sequence.

Ere we do so, a brief word on Schwenckfeld himself may be in order. The Silesian has definitely been on the sidelines of Reformation history. Until recently most historians dismissed him--along with Carlstadt, Denck and Franck, et. al.--as an enthusiast or radical Spiritualist. Largely through the dedicated work of the Schwenckfelders of America who searched out extant works and commissioned the nineteen volume Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum his literary output is now available. Scholars like Karl Ecke, E. Ellwein, Julius Endriss and more recently Joachim Schoeps and the late Reinhold Pietz, have gradually rehabilitated Schwenckfeld. The biography by Selina G. Schultz, recently re-issued, is still the best account of his remarkable life.

The nobleman was what Europeans call a dilletant. He loved theological pursuits and obviously enjoyed discursive treatments of key tenets in letters and pamphlets. Though in his early years he had been in the employ of a Silesian Duke, he later seemed to

propagate Pacifist notions. His spiritualist understanding led him to a form of universalism similar to that of Denck and Franck.

As far as we know, Schwenckfeld never married. For the greater part of his mature years, from about 1529 to his death in 1561, he moved about the countryside, visiting with benevolent ladies of means, enjoying the hospitality of broadminded abbots, and possibly reaping the benefits of his extensive publications.[9]

The Silesian nobleman is to be numbered among the so-called twice born. He had a religious experience which he fondly referred to as a "gnaedige Heimsuchung".[1] Whether this gracious visitation gave the impetus to Schwenckfeld's increased internalizing of the Christ event or whether it was preoccupation with some of the Medieval mystics, there is a definite thrust in his writings toward separating spirit and matter in the life of faith and in any attempts to speak theologically.

The temptation is great to read into Schwenckfeld's position a kind of universalism that would undermine the significance of the atonement. However, he is quite explicit that only the elect receive the divine seed. Only when the eternal word, Jesus Christ, is conceived internally--without the aid of any externals--can a new birth, the second birth, come about in the

receptive heart of a believer (CS 111,832; V,410,501f). Individuals who are thus renewed from within will then become instruments of the renewal of the church. Any other kind of reform of the church appears to him to be inadequate and affected by human measures. This would merely lead to a new dogmatism.

One of the difficulties that presents itself in reading Schwenckfeld is the discursive nature of his tracts and letters. In addition, he often attacks Luther's followers, alleging that they held a position like that of their master. It is often next to impossible therefore, to single out what is intended to be criticism of Luther's own position and what is aimed at a system, roughly identifiable as "Lutheran".

As Schwenckfeld matures in his own theological understanding and approximates his theology to that of the Medieval mystics and to those exponents of Scripture and early Christian traditions who stress the spiritual nature of God's dealings with his creatures, the gap between him and Luther widens. On the nobleman's part, criticism of Luther gets to be more clearly focussed on specific theological tenets and on the way of reform which allegedly is stuck in externals. On Luther's part, one notes an ever growing animosity because of the stubbornness

and audacity with which this relatively uneducated gadfly of theological notions interferes with the orderly progression of Luther's significant work.[11] With this brief sketch of Schwenckfeld's life and work, we may now venture into specific criticisms he makes of Luther.

Perhaps one of the first criticism of Luther comes from the year 1525. It is recorded in a rather rambling letter to a relative, dated May 8, 1540. The letter is preserved in a printed Epistolar of 1570. Allegedly the information it contains is drawn from diary entries, made in 1525 but no longer extant. This weakens the reliability of the document. A recollection--though based on accurate information--is coloured by the intervening years and the different perspective of a person in his fifties.

One remarkable feature of the account, however, is its irenic tone and the relative equanimity with which the author reflects on his first enquiry of the scholar Luther and the pastor Bugenhagen (Pomeranus). Schwenckfeld represents himself as a humble learner whose scholarly qualifications do not allow him to be too decisive on any point. Nonetheless, he ventures to query and even contradict both Luther and Bugenhagen on the meaning of the relevant words in the Eucharist

when translated into German. The influence of Zwingli's "spiritual" reading of Luke 22.19 is apparent and acknowledged,

> Meum corpus, quod pro vobis datur, est hoc scilicet quod panis fractus, comestus, etc.

One dimension of the ever-growing discrepancy between a reformed understanding of the text and its Medieval interpretation shines through the dialogue, especially when the Silesian is moved to exclaim, "es ist unmoeglich das des Bapstes Reich soll undergehen weil dieser Artickel des Fleisches und Bluts im Sacrament des Brots und Weins stehet." (11,247, 9-11).

In subsequent years Schwenckfeld critiques the Lutheran eucharistic teaching regularly and with poignancy. One of the chief sources he draws on is John 6. For the right understanding of the words of institution this text is crucial. It figures prominently in the writings of Valentine Crautwald, a professor of theology at the University of Liegnitz, as it does in the Epistola Christiana of the Dutch lawyer Cornelius H. Hoen (died before April 1524).[12] As the nobleman gains confidence in his own theological understanding, he assails Luther's attempt to reconcile Medieval teaching with newly won Biblical insights. On occasion, he points to Luther's own arguments in support of an understanding of the eucharist which

takes seriously the spiritual nature of the living Christ who communicates in/through the believing heart.

Another important document in the eucharistic debate is Schwenckfeld's 1527 edition of Crautwald's De Caena Dominica (CS 11,422ff). Equally significant is Schwenckfeld's Anweisung (CS 11,440ff). It contains arguments against the four dominant views held at the time, namely the Anabaptist, Curialist, Lutheran and Zwinglian positions. Again, the document is not published until 1570, though it seems to have been circulated in manuscript form since approximately February of 1527.

The nobleman continues his campaign for spiritual reform. By 1528 he adds to his critique of Luther's eucharistic position, concern over easy compromises in so-called union discussions. He seems to think that the Marburg Colloquy (1529) is a sell-out of what he believes to be the genuine evangelical teaching.

He objects further to Luther's teaching on free will, preferring a middle position between the two initial antagonists, Erasmus and Luther, "per judicium Spirituale", as he puts it in an undated letter, probably addressed to John Rurer, a Liegnitz professor (CS 111, Doc. 57, p. 24ff and Doc. 59, p. 37ff, probably from the same year).

Though, as we noted above, Schwenckfeld had distanced himself from Luther by 1533 to the extent that he did not even like to be classed among Luther disciples, the final break did not come--it would appear--until the Tuebingen Colloquy in May 1535. This particular meeting involved him with Blaurer of Constance, Bucer and Frecht of Ulm on issues which range from right preaching to union negotiations which compromised evangelical liberty as the nobleman perceived it. Other issues dealt with were the concept of the church, infant baptism, the nature of Christ, the eucharist, etc. Several extant letters, pamphlets and reports of occasional meetings suggest that the road to this particular encounter with leading Lutherans had been arduous. While I have glanced at the documentation on Schwenckfeld's side (largely contained in CS V, especially documents 170, 186-194), I am not prepared at this point to pursue the matter further. Suffice it to say that Schwenckfeld gradually shifts his attacks away from Luther to one of his exponents and to a challenge of the practice of Lutheran preachers.

Not infrequently, he takes up the defence of his position indirectly by counselling enquirers or adherents on how Luther ought to be understood or how his "erroneous ways" might be corrected once again.

In 1527/28 Schwenckfeld takes issue with Luther's theory of ubiquity (CS III,250ff)[13] and considers him in error when ascribing divine qualities to bread and wine (CS III,633). In a 1530 publication, Schwenckfeld alleges that Luther misunderstood the mystery of the incarnation (Vom wahren und falschen Verstand und glauben, CS III, Doc. 97).

Again and again he returns to the charge that Luther is concerned with external things and that he allows too great a freedom to the unregenerate to be involved in the eucharist though they are unworthy and lack discernment of the body of Christ.

Another topic on which the nobleman publicly differs from Luther is the manner in which he understan the believer to be nurtured and affirmed in the faith. With reference to Galatians 3.2 Schwenckfeld reads "by the hearing of God's word". The difference seems to be significant enough to allow Schwenckfeld to build on it the separation of externals from internals in matters of faith (CS I,148--in a letter, probably as early as 1523, to the sisters in the Cloister of Naumburg). He seems to agree with Franck when he argues that the spirit must be present to illumine the word, while for Luther the spirit is given in the reading and hearing of the word.

To Schwenckfeld the internal nature of the word of God and its freedom from any externals is a significant tenet above all others, it would seem. Since the gospel is not a law but the teaching of God in the heart, it cannot be received through the external hearing--a teaching Luther is alleged to have maintained.

Related to this argument is Schwenckfeld's criticism of Luther's view of the church. Here the nobleman is concerned with the notion that only the truly regenerate persons are "brothers in Christ" (CS 1V,818).

Naturally, he affirms a holy, universal church. He objects, however, to defining this church in terms of a local community (CS V,336-337).

> Das Volck im Newen Testament wird je ein geistlich Volck genennt...
> Denn die im fleisch noch kinder sein nur zeitlich guter nemen ein (CS X111,61ff).

Though he distinguishes himself in his ecclesiology both from Luther and the mainline reformers and from the Anabaptists, he does not fall into the trap of conventicalism altogether. There is, however, the tendency in his position toward disembodiment that borders dangerously close in docetism in his christology and insists on an elusiveness from the world that makes the church he espouses virtually invisible (cf. E.J.

Furcha, Schwenckfeld's Concept of the New Man, p. 114ff and 180f).

Schwenckfeld's poetic attempts to exalt the glorified state of the Son of God and with him to elevate the bride of Christ to a realm considered to be beyond reach led to the suspicion by many of his contemporaries that he was actually denying the fulness of Christ affirmed by Chalcedon. Schwenckfeld resented this charge. To allow us to see for ourselves and to draw our own conclusions, I shall juxtapose a few statements by the nobleman and by Luther.

In his Abelainung und Verantwurtung (1544), he makes the following claims. These are compared to excerpts from Luther's writings of the years 1525-30[14]

A. Luther	B. Schwenckfeld
1. Physical and spiritual eating of the Lord's Supper is distinguished. God's presence would be of no avail to man, unless there is a visible sign of his presence (WA 23.182). Indeed, even if the flesh of Christ were beef, as long as God's word bids us eat it, it would be of avail for the sake of the word (WA 23.257/258).	1. Schwenckfeld objects to the obvious separation of the teaching of Jn. 6 from what is given to the disciples in the Eucharist (IX, 39:23ff). Such outward eating cannot be confirmed by Scripture (IX, 38:12ff).
2. Christ has won forgiveness on the Cross; it is available only in the Eucharist. To find forgiveness, one has to go to the Sacrament (WA 18.203).	2. To place the power of Christ's suffering in the visible sacrament is to introduce a new kind of indulgence (IX, 40:16ff).

3. They all have eaten of the same spiritual food (1 Cor. 10:3). Therefore everyone who eats the Sacrament, partakes of Christ's body (WA 28.288).	3. Schwenckfeld is opposed to such a view. He finds it to be the result of mingling the body of Christ and the material objects, given as a memorial (IX,39:12ff).
4. The right hand of God is everywhere, yet at the same time nowhere. Christ's body is in heaven and among men. He binds himself to the sacrament that men need not go ahunting everywhere (WA 23.150-152).	4. Schwenckfeld objects to such physical limitation as unscriptural and dangerous (Christ himself has warned against such localization, Mt. 24:23) (IX, 41:29-42:6).
5. On the basis of Ps. 42:4 (!), Luther urges his adherents to be the throng and to receive the Sacraments as a sign of thanksgiving in time of spiritual barrenness. For to spurn God by not participating in the Sacraments is to run the risk of being spurned by God (WA 30.II. 605-618).	5. Such insistence is to make an idol of the Sacraments. It is to tie salvation to works and to place confidence in the sign and equate it to Jesus Christ, the sole giver of all grace and salvation (IX,41:12ff).

The trend of Schwenckfeld's thought is clear. The more he observes a hardening of Luther's views, the more he reminds his readers of the Reformer's earlier leaning toward spiritual renewal. In the Kirchenpostille of 1522 (WA X.I.1,186), Schwenckfeld reads of Luther's affirmation of the power of God's word as transmitter of the divine nature. At that time Luther stressed its difference from perishable human words. In the publications under discussion, however, Schwenckfeld discovers a tendency to mingle external and internal word. He concludes therefrom that Luther's reform attempts have obviously not

gone beyond the Sacramentarianism which Schwenckfeld had feared since 1525 (CS II, 247.5--248.5).

	gospel		the letter
	spirit		reason
	faith		a phantom (ein wahn)
Luther's	sacrament	is	creature
	people		carnal
	godliness		false and imaginary (CS IV, 52.3-9)

Luther must not be surprised if he finds many people objecting to his teaching on the Lord's Supper (CS V, Doc. 184). What had begun as a worthy enterprize in correcting the errors of the papacy, threatens to turn into a new tyranny (CS III, 103.26ff). Schwenckfeld's verdict is that Luther's evangelical reforms do not rise above carnal liberty: they rely on an invented faith and the dead letter.

He is concerned with maintaining internal discipline within the church. He makes that a prerequisite for rightful participation in the sacrament.

Why does he object to Luther's position as he understands it? A clue may be found in a fragment conjecturally dated 1535, though it may be earlier (CS V. Doc. 184, pp 273/74). Here the Silesian advances seven arguments for not wishing to accept Luther's teaching on the matter. Foremost is the observation that Luther's eucharist involves both a spiritual and a physical manducation. Schwenckfeld by now is definitely advocating a Stillstand, i.e. abstention from participation in the eucharist, until the issues

are clarified and a conclusive theological position has emerged. Though he rejects being labeled non sacramental, he comes rather close to a denial of any visible manifestation of Christian unity and communion.

Schwenckfeld further objects to Luther's lifting of the bread during the eucharistic celebration--a gesture which he interprets as a remnant of the Medieval practice of veneration of the body (the practice according to Baum, Capito and Bucer, p. 513 was continued in Wittenberg until at least June 1536).

Thirdly, in Luther's eucharist both the worthy and the unworthy are given the bread. In his own leaning toward a Donatist view of the church, Schwenckfeld finds such a practice unacceptable.

One more of the seven points deserves mention here. It is the suspicion on the part of the Silesian that Luther's words of institution function as a bringing of the body of Christ from heaven into the bread. Does he allude here to what is widely known as Luther's consubstantiation (the "in-with-and-under-the-bread" presence of Christ)? (Cf WA 26.287.288 for Luther's position).

Schwenckfeld seems to find some agreement with his views in Bucer. In methodology, at least, Bucer

seems to have borrowed the Silesian's approach when he juxtaposes the early and the later Luther aruging that the latter is a regrettable departure from the former. (He speaks in defence of Schwenckfeld in section 20 of the Vergleichung. Cf Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften, 11, p. 363f).[15]

After Marburg, Schwenckfeld's agreement with Bucer and others of the Strasbourg circle seems less evident. The relationship between them is certainly less cordial. Bucer circulated allegations to the effect that the Silesian was dangerous to the Protestant cause because of his heretical views. Schwenckfeld, in turn, set out to defend himself. Two such writings are the Schutzschrift (CS 1V, Doc. 142) and Protestation, (CS 1V, Doc. 138) both of 1533. Taken together the two pamphlets reflect succinctly Schwenckfeld's position at the time (see also, Krebs/Rott, Elsass 11, p. 75ff).

The change in leadership within the Lutheran camp after Luther's death, shifts the thrust of Schwenckfeld's criticism to the positions of some of the advocates of Lutheran teaching whom he suspects of infidelity to the cause. Interestingly enough, most of his attention is directed to Flacius whom we mentioned earlier.[16] The arguments are contained

in at least five pamphlets written by the nobleman or someone close to him between 1553-1555.[17] A sketch of the most pertinent points must suffice here. I have limited myself to delineating the position of Flacius as found in a copy of his Von der heiligen Schrifft...wider Caspar Schwenckfeld (1553).[18] Several other counter arguments by Schwenckfeld are preserved in volumes XIII and XIV of the Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum.[19]

Illyricus	Schwenckfeld
1. Schwenckfeld misreads Rom. 10.15 when he considers that faith comes from the inward hearing (XIII, 379;12ff; 380-381).	1. No one comes to the Father unless he is drawn (Jn. 6:44, 45) (XIII, 515:31). Illyricus does not know how God speaks in the heart (XIII, 526:12).[20]
2. Schwenckfeld denies that Scripture is the word of God (XIII,380:26;432).	2. Illyricus introduces new idol worship, when he substitutes anything else for the one Word by which all things are made, viz. Jesus Christ (XIII,514: 20ff).[21]
3. To posit the inward communication of God in a believer's heart is heretical (XIII,381,382).	3. All men are taught by God (Jn. 6:45). To ground faith in the preached or written word is an error (XIII, 516: 19ff).[22]
4. Christ and 'word of God' cannot be equated (XIII,387ff).	4. Illyricus is a literalist, like the Jews. He does not know that Christ is the Word (XIII,518:23ff).[23]
5. To say that God does not use media in the conversion of the sinner is false (XIII, 403,413,427).	5. Illyricus errs with Sophists and Thomists when he states that God works our salvation through media (XIII,515:20ff).[24]

6. Sacraments and the ministry of apostles and preachers now are valid (XIII,435).	6. Illyricus errs in acribing the same power to the preaching of the Apostles and to that of humble preachers (XIII, 516:34ff).[25]
7. Conversion is not justification (XIII,443).	7. Illyricus does not know what it means to be convered (XIII,517:20ff).[26]
8. Faith is not God dwelling in a believer's heart (XIII, 443/ 444).	8. God works the conversion of the sinner inwardly through himself (XIII,536:4ff).[27]
9. Even Christians cannot keep the Law of God perfectly (XIII, 446).	9. Christ liberates (Jn. 8:32) and brings to life what was dead (XIII,568:35).[28]

We could multiply charge and counter charge at will. However, the above examples are sufficient evidence of the fierce struggle that raged at this time among Lutheran theologians. Their concern was with the right interpretation of Luther's stance. Were we to include Maior's[29] arguments and consider the controversy between Illyricus and Osiander, we would have sufficient material for a rather extensive analysis. We are perhaps on track in suspecting that Illyricus fights what he hears Schwenckfeld is saying rather than what Schwenckfeld actually says. The nobleman, too, seems to be attacking a caricature of the preachers rather than Illyricus, himself. However, he is accurate enough in summarizing his opponent's argument to deserve credit for having read his books.

Three points of difference are of particular interest in this context. The first is a tendency

on the part of Illyricus to make the inward renewal dependent upon an exact course of outwardly observable factors. He hopes thereby to safeguard the smooth progress of the Evangelical church against the onslaught of Sectarian deviations. From the same motive of keeping pure what had begun in the Spirit of God, Schwenckfeld (and the Maiorists for that matter), claims priority for the inward operation of God's Spirit.

Somewhat related to this problem is Illyricus' insistence on the differentiation of conversion (renewal) and justification. For Illyricus--as Haikola points out--renewal follows immediately after justification. Both are to be rigidly separated from obedience (which is not God's work but ours).[30] That Illyricus had to consider Schwenckfeld's position a form of synergism is apparent. When one overlooks that the nobleman treats renovatio, regeneratio and vivificatio as synonymous expressions for the divine act of reclaiming fallen humanity by coming to dwell in a person's inward being, one might mistake his theology of regeneration for synergism. With Osiander (against whom Illyricus polemized in his De Justificatione),[31] Schwenckfeld shares an understanding of rebirth which includes the forensic and empirical aspects of justification. He agrees with Illyricus that God

demands perfect righteousness--a demand which cannot be met by sinful people. However, he is convinced from his reading of Scripture and the testimony of the early church that renewal and rebirth are essential prerequisites of justification. Illyricus has misinterpreted Schwenckfeld's intention when he accuses him of having made some mediating qualifications the condition of justification. Nowhere in his theological 'system' does he in fact come closer to arguing for the immediacy of the God-human relationship than in his doctrine of rebirth. God works thoughout, to effect and accomplish his own purposes. Schwenckfeld clearly defines justification. "Justificatio (i.e. justifying and making just) is God's gracious dealing with us in order to accomplish his salvation....In (this act) a sinner is converted, born anew, made godly, righteous and holy" (XIII,867: 4ff).

On the basis of Rom. 3:28-30; Gal. 2:16; 3:24 and 5:14, the nobleman defines 'justificare' to mean 'aus einem gotlosen ungerechten Sunder einen gotseligen, frommen, gerechten menschen machen' (XIV, 791:3ff). "By justification, a sinner is made God's beloved servant--a dear child who is regenerate" (XIII,672:10ff).

Illyricus vehemently defends evangelical imputation to guard himself against the accusation of positing an arbitrary God in the act of declaring a sinner

righteous. With similar force, Schwenckfeld, on the other hand, declares that any 'imputativa justitia extra nos' is unscriptural and a miserable deception through false teaching (XVI,17).

The third difference, if not as vehemently defended on either side as the second, is of importance, nonetheless. It is the question of a valid definition of 'word of God'. In 1551, Schwenckfeld had written an extensive treatise in which he differentiates between external and internal word.[32] On the Lutheran side, he found strong claims made for the 'verbum vocale' of the preachers that seemed to equate the living word of God with human words. The difference between him and the Lutherans is one of degrees. Schwenckfeld refuses to bind the living creative and recreative word of God to externals. Scripture and the preached word are authoritative only insofar as they are authenticated by the witness of the Holy Spirit.

The Lutherans of his day, on the other hand, accepted Scripture and the preached word as the norm by which to 'test the spirits'. In their understanding, the Spirit of God was seen to be operative in the very act of reading Scripture; the written word of God was regarded as an aid in the process of renewal. For Schwenckfeld, on the other hand, the Bible

remained a book of seven seals to the unregenerate person. "Without Christ and his Spirit, Holy Scripture cannot be understood, as Paul testifies to the Corinthians" (2 Cor. 3:14-17) (XII, 427:30ff). "Believers, however, ought to use it for instruction, reproof, correction and punishment" (XII,433:15ff). Even then, one must remember that these 'tools' are helpful to the external being only (XII, 434:23ff), and that Christ alone is the sole foundation of the new life (XII,436:1ff). "Wherever the Lord is present, there is his word, even though there were no Scripture" (XII,453,margin).

The misunderstanding between Schwenckfeld and Illyricus was not resolved during their life time. In fact, the same problem of interpretation became apparent in the work of all Reformers who had attempted to define rebirth and renewal in terms of God's breaking into human existence to reclaim it from its fallen state, and had then proceeded to confine the redemptive power within institutional boundaries. They invariably found that the reality of the institutional church--even though it had been purged from numerous blemishes--was far from the ideal body of Christ. Yet this body alone had been ordained to be the 'divine' agent of God's recreative work. To

To accept the truth of the continuation of Christ's atoning work and to lay claim to his power in renewing human life, was to take seriously the question to what extent this new birth became effective here and now.

Schwenckfeld chose the one alternative. He removed the 'boundaries' of the new life beyond the confines of human institutions. He risked misunderstanding. The magisterial Reformers took the other extreme. They defined the 'new life' within the categories of reason and the visible boundaries of the institutional church. Perfection and fulfilment were placed beyond the experiential level of the here and now. Despite apparent coherence, they risked fragmentation of the body of Christ. Both paths are still live options.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Among the agreements listed are, Faith justifies and not works; By nature we do not have a free will to do the good; God's grace alone brings about what is good in us; God's grace is the beginning of our salvation; Christ is sole mediator and our only saviour.

[2]This charge appears among other allegations in V.Doc. 184, likely from the year 1535.

[3]In a circular of 1531 Schwenckfeld notes the contradiction in Luther's position when he rejects the papacy, yet praises some of the teaching promulgated by it. (Cf. C.S. lV, 197).

[4]Cf. volumes XVll, p. 488 where Luther is accused of being more changeable than a cameleon and XVlll, 227-235 where contradictory statements on the matter of the sacrament are pointed out by Schwenckfeld. Both writings come from a time between 1542 and 1559.

[5]The Carlstadt-Luther debate at Jena in 1524 is perhaps one of the early indications of internal tensions; cf. Sider, Karlstadt's Battle with Luther, pp. 38-48. See also G. Rupp, Patterns of Reformation. Tension with Agricola are reflected in WA 39/1 pp. 334ff; this dates to the period from between 1537-40. According to S. Ozment, Mysticism and Dissent, p. 66 Muentzer may be the first to charge Luther's concept of grace with being "cheap grace". G. Spalatin, 1484-1545 argued that Luther's emphasis on justification by grace alone would lead to neglect of good works; Cf WA 6.196 and WA 40 11.60.

[6]Of the twelve hundred and fifty two items in the Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum, though not all from the pen of the nobleman, many take issue with one or more of Luther's concepts.

[7]Cf E.J. Furcha, Schwenckfeld's Concept of the New Man, p. 129ff.

[8]See p. 20f below.

[9] I am not aware of any account he kept of income from his literary output, but judging from the popularity of his writings well into the 17th and 18th centuries his popularized theology sold well and financial benefits must have been good.

[10]S.G. Schultz, Op. Cit., p. 6ff, puts the date as early as 1518. I am inclined to place the experience sometime between 1525-29. Cf Furcha, Op. Cit. p. 13.

[11]S. quotes a statement by Luther from around 1543/44 in his own Von de Creatur beim Erkanstmus

[12]Von der Creatur beim Erkanntnus Christi und Luthers Malediction, C.S. IX, 33. "Über das feret er zu mit

seyner Eutycherej und Creaturlichait macht die Kyrchen irre. So ihm doch Gott nichts bevolhen noch gesanndt. Und der unsynnige Narr vom Teufell besessen versteet nichts, waiss nicht was er lallet. Will er aber nicht aufhören, so lass er mich mit seinen Biechlein die der Teufel aus ihm scheisset und speyet ungehewet.

[12]O. Clemens has argued that Luther rejected Hoen's view as early as 1521 when the Epistola Christiana was brought to him by Hinne Rode. The editors of Z 1V, however, question the traditionally held chronology of events. When Zwingli published the document with his own comments in 1525 (Z 1V.505ff) he may have meant to address Erasmus rather than Luther. It is possible even that Hoen never intended his own publication for Luther at all.

[13]Cf 11, Doc 40 and L11,240ff Luther is said to judge carnally in the matter of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament.

[14]The four treatises are: Wider die himmlischen Propheten ... (1525) (WA XV111), Dass diese Worte 'Das ist mein leib' noch feststahn (1527) (WA XX11), Vom Abendmahl Christi, Bekenntnis (1528) (WA XXV1), and Vermahnung zum Sacrament des Leibes und Blutes Christi (1530) (WA XXX).

[15]The work he defends is Ein anwysunge das die opinion der leyplichen gegenwertgheyt unsers Herrens Jesu Christi jm Brote oder under der gestalt dess Brots gericht ist. CS111.1f. The same pamphlet was published by Zwingli in August of the same year with a short preface by the editor.

[16]For a recent study of the theological position of Illyricus, cf. Lauri Haikola; Gesetz und Evangelium, Lund: 1952. Unfortunately, Haikola disregards almost completely the feud between Illyricus and Schwenckfeld, although it extended over a period of years and touched on some of the problems which were central in the thought of Illyricus, viz. faith and justificatiоn, the degree of sin in a new man, and the relation of Law and Gospel.

[17]The five treatises are: a. Juditium eines predigers in der Schlesien (1553). This is likely not by Schwenckfeld (X111,545). b. Vom Worte Gottes (1554);

c. Vom Unterschayde des worts Gottes und der hayligen Schrifft (1554); d. Confutatio und Ablainung (1554). All four documents are in Volume XIII. The fifth treatise appeared in 1555, after Illyricus had produced yet another book against Schwenckfeld. Schwenckfeld's reply is the Beschluss und Valete (XIV,514ff).

[18]The text is from a reproduction of a copy which had been used by Schwenckfeld in his refutation (XIII, 361ff).

[19]I have not listed all the documents here. They are easily accessible in volumes XIII and XIV of the Corpus.

[20]See also XIII,533:20ff; 535:25ff. and frequently elsewhere.

[21]See also XIII,516:29ff.

[22]Cf also VI,296; XIII,527:34ff.

[23]Cf also XIII,515:39ff; 519:8; 538:1ff.

[24]Cf also XIII,515:5ff; 516:15ff.

[25]Further reference: XIII,564:29ff.

[26]Cf also XIII,533:5ff.

[27]Similar remarks in: XIII,519:36ff; 531:18ff; 535:25ff.

[28]Similar remarks: IV,719:28; V,815:9; XIII,557:25; 566ff.

[29]Maior (1502-1574) was a Lutheran theologian who stood opposed to Illyricus in his insistence on the reality of justification and the beginning of the new life here on earth. One might say that he defends the early Luther (of the Kirchenpostille and the Psalmenvorlesung), whereas Illyricus builds his system on the theology of the later Luther.

[30]Haikola; Op. Cit. chapter Vlll.

[31]Haikola; Op. Cit. pp. 315ff.

[32]Von der Hailigen Schrift was likely begun earlier but appears in circulation only during the early part of 1551. Xll, 417ff. See pp. 28, 43ff. and 184ff. Schwenckfeld contends that Scripture becomes illuminating by the agency of the Spirit only. Apart from the revelatory activity of the Spirit, Scripture remains a "dead letter". To the believer it is of four-fold use, namely to edify, to admonish, to improve and to punish. In this context it is essential to recall the distinction between Holy Scripture and the Word of God. In other words, the nobleman subscribes to a modified "Biblicist" position whereby Scripture is the norm to a believer who is guided by the Spirit of God in his understanding of what Scripture contains for him.

Jewish Apocalypticism and Protestant Fundamentalism

By

M. James Penton

Although apocalypticism has been a rather constant theme of Christian history from the first through the twentieth centuries, in the period since the French Revolution it has developed wide-spread importance throughout the English-speaking world. During the early nineteenth century it became a major factor in both Great Britain and North America. In the 1830s and 1840s, literally hundreds of thousands of Americans and some Canadians were swept up in the Millerite movement. Christ was coming in 1843 or, when that date failed, in 1844 or on a half dozen or more later dates. About the same period Joseph Smith and his Latter-day Saints were expecting the Lord to come to a new Zion somewhere in America. Later in the same century, various Adventists, Bible Students (Jehovah's Witnesses) and a great number of main-line Evangelical clergymen proclaimed that Christ would soon come for his saints and, shortly thereafter, would smash the nations with a rod of iron.

In the twentieth century - in spite of the rise of theological liberalism, neo-orthodoxy and other movements which have often de-emphasized Christian apocalypticism - apocalypticism has continued to increase. Today millions upon millions of sectarians such as the Seventh-Day Adventists, Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, Pentecostals and numerous offshoot groups from those movements

throughout Europe and the Third World proclaim the imminent return of Christ and the destruction of the world as we know it. Significantly, too, many Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Anglicans and United Churchmen seem to be touched by the same ideas, just as were many of their grandparents a century ago.

In many ways this is not surprising. Since Christ's day Christians have placed great importance on his second coming or advent - his parousia. Furthermore, the Olivet Sermon or Little Apocalypse, especially as discussed at Matthew 24 and at Luke 17 and 21, describes the end of this world as coming cataclysmically. The Apostle Paul also stresses the same thought (2 Thess. 1:5-10) as does 2 Peter 3 and most importantly, the Revelation is in large measure a continuing description of the terrible events that must precede the end of this age of sin, suffering and death.

What is rather surprising, however, is how Jewish in outlook Anglo-American, Protestant nineteenth- and twentieth-century apocalypticism is in comparison with most traditional apocalypticism. And it should be noted, too, how stridently pro-Zionist or Israeli it frequently is. For example, on 18 June 1982 at the very moment that Israeli military forces were "blasting their way into Lebanon," Prime Minister Menachem Begin was hosted in the United States as guest of honor by an Evangelical organization known as the "Lover of Israel." According to the popular press, evangelist Mike Evans told Begin that he was on a "divine mission." The "Lovers of Israel" assured the Israeli prime minister of their "prayerful support."

Significantly, although perhaps more stridently pro-Israeli than

many Evangelical, fundamentalist and sectarian Protestants in the United States, Canada and other parts of the world, the "Lovers of Israel" were and are in many ways typical of them, as anyone can easily see by visiting a few Evangelical bookstores. Protestant dispensationalists, in particular, emphasize over and over again that "natural" Israel is still playing a major role in salvation history and that in these "last days" the God of Heaven will protect his chosen people against the hordes of Islam and the machinations of modern atheistic Communism. In The Final Countdown, Charles Ryrie presents prophetic accounts of what is soon to take place. According to him and other Christian dispensational apocalyptics such as Christian and Missionary Alliance Church "Pastor Bill" R. Goetz of Abbotsford, British Columbia, the Jews are being regathered to Palestine or Israel as part of God's design. Furthermore, they are aligned with the ten nation confederacy which grows out of the Roman Empire (supposedly the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image described at Daniel 2 and by apocalyptic interpretation the countries of the Common Market) and soon they, the Israelis, will be attacked by the forces of Godless Communism which will come down as the "king of the North" from Russian itself. Necessarily this will lead to the rise of the Antichrist, the rapture of the saints, seven years of tribulation on the earth, the conversion of Israel to Christ and, finally, Christ's return to earth with his saints to establish his millennial kingdom and rule over the earth from the city of Jerusalem itself.[1]

Just how far some of this apocalyptic can go is demonstrated by a small leaflet entitled "Why All the Vultures" by Joel Darby.

published by Evangelical Tract Distributors P.O. Box 146 Edmonton, Alberta, it reads in part:

> "THE VULTURES are circling in the valley of Armageddon. God is preparing a feast of seven months for these vultures to feed upon. And a new breed of vultures has appeared in Israel, a breed never seen before. These vultures are multiplying at three times the normal rate in Israel. This is a sign of the end times," writes former Rabbi Michael Esses in his new book, "Next Visitor To Planet Earth" (Logos, Plainfield, N.J. 07060).
>
> I checked carefully to authenticate this thrilling development before passing on this information. I phoned Pastor Archie MacKinney, leader for many years of the world-wide ministry to the Jews, American Messianic Fellowship. Archie was one of the five of us who founded BOOK FELLOWSHIP 30 years ago. For a number of years he has been conducting tours of Israel, and knows the situation over there very well. YES, he assured me, it IS true, very true indeed. They call them buzzards over there and my old friend tells me that whereas the buzzard normally lays one egg at a time, they are now laying FOUR, and swarms of them are surprising the people in northern Israel. WHY, they wonder, are there such increasing hordes of these winged scavengers?
>
> Well, according to the Bible, they have a huge feast coming and at the rate God has arranged for them to multiply, it must be SOON. Nothing catches our Lord by surprise. His prophecies always come true, right on time and no needed preparation is omitted. There will be plenty of buzzards to take care of the vast army of slain men and horses, an army which will soon set out from the North to conquer Israel and to capture its vast resources and strategic military location. There is more than a trillion dollars worth of chemicals in the Dead Sea alone, and many other natural resources besides the ideal location for a nuclear power to use in the capture of the vast oil deposits in nearby Arab lands. God knew that this wealth was there long before man discovered it. He knew very well the nature of man, and the greedy grab that the godless forces of the Kremlin and her satellites were going to make for it some day.

Darby then goes on to tell how God is going to slay 5/6 of the Soviet Army with hailstones in spite of Soviet attempts to outwit the Israelis. Because the Israelis have modern radar and could detect an attack by Soviet planes, tanks or other war machines made

of metal, the Communist legions of the "King of the North" are going to advance on Palestine across Asia Minor and Syria on horseback carrying weapons made of "lingostone," a "stronger-than-steel wood product made in Holland." As Darby proclaims: "According to Reuters News Agency, Russia has bought large quantities of powerful archery equipment from the British, also draught horses from all over the world. We reported to you the story of the amazing lingostone many months ago. Pastor MacKinney has some of it. Scraps of it burn like coal in a fireplace, and Ezekiel said the Israelites would be burning the abandoned weapons in place of other fuel for seven years!"

In a more (or less) sober vein, even popular gospel singers take up this theme or are, at the very least, influenced by it. In her recent popular hit "Song of Praise," evangelical songstress Amy Grant intones the Hebrew words "El Shaddai, El Shaddai El-Elyon na Adonai; El Shaddai, El Shaddai Erkamka na Adonai" to hundreds of thousands of Christian youth throughout North America in adulation of the God of Israel.

Christian fundamentalists argue, of course, that this is all as it should be and quote their favorite proof texts to support their particular interpretation of Heilsgeschichte. Sectarians do, quite understandably, vary the basic interpretation given by "main line" dispensationalists such as Ryrie, Goetz and the best known of them all - Hal Lindsey. Nevertheless, the teachings of Adventists, Christadelphians, the Church of God (Faith of Abraham), the World-Wide Church of God, Jehovah's Witnesses and a dozen other such sects are little more than variations on a common theme; and this

should therefore indicate to the historian that all are born from the same womb - whether "legitimately" or "illegitimately."

What distinguishes this particular brand of Christian apocalypticism from other types thereof? And why is the Jewish aspect thereof so pronounced? The answers to these questions are complex but emerge rather quickly when one does a little historical research to discover the sources of what for simplicity's sake may be dubbed "dispenational apocalyptic." But before discussing those sources at length, a few points should be made.

First, the idea that "natural" or "fleshly" Israel continued to have a specific role to play in the unfolding of salvation history after the first years of the development of the Christian church is a rather new and somewhat novel one. While Hal Lindsey makes a good deal of the idea that the return of the Jews to Palestine is one of the signs which "proves" that we are living in the "last days" or "end times," there is certainly nothing to show that the writers of the New Testament had any such idea. As Stephen Travis says: "To begin with, there is not a whisper about this in the New Testament. Chapters 9-11 of Paul's Letter to the Romans speaks at length about the destiny of Israel, but Paul's great hope there is for a spiritual return of the Jewish people to Christ. Paul says nothing about Jews returning from all over the world to the land of Palestine."[2] Furthermore, Paul and the early Church as a whole stressed the idea that the Church itself was the Israel of God. The Jerusalem Council mentioned at Acts 15 applied the words of Amos the prophet to the Church - not fleshly Israel - to support Paul's idea: "After this I will return, and will rebuild the tabernacle of David

which has fallen down. I will rebuild its ruins, and I will set it up, so the rest of mankind may seek the Lord, even all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called, says the Lord who does all these things. Known to God are all His works from the beginning of the world." (Acts 15:16-18 NKJV). And if this were not enough, the Apostle Paul himself stated: "And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Galatians 3:29 NKJV)

Secondly, the Church has seldom attempted to give a literal interpretation of Revelation chapters 7 and 14 where the 144,000 members of the twelve tribes of Israel (minus the tribe of Dan) are described as standing on Mount Zion with the Lamb of God. Expositors have generally been wise enough to realize that these passages are clearly symbolic, for if the 144,000 are literal Israelites, they are also all male virgins who have "not defiled themselves with women." Yet there are literalists who, through strange systems of "logic," manage to ignore this fact.

Thirdly, from the time of St. Augustine until the nineteenth century, most Christians - Protestants as well as Catholics - tended to be post-millennialists rather than pre-millennialists.[3] As a consequence, the idea that the Church was the "Israel of God" was strengthened significantly. For this particular eschatological schema left no place for the fulfillment of bilbical prophecy on fleshly Israel.

It must be asked again, then, how the present, largely philo-Jewish, pre-millennialist, dispensational Evangelical and sectarian Protestantism came into being? And why, too, have

English-speaking lands been free, at least to a somewhat greater degree, of the most serious types of anti-semitism that have affected many Catholic and some other Protestant lands?

In the first place, it must be recognized that pre-millennialist ideas were common in the early Church, and with them a general belief that Old Testament prophecies with respect to Israel would be fulfilled literally here on earth. Justin Martyr is quite specific on this point in his exegesis of Revelation 20. He ties that text in with a prophecy of Isaiah and indicates that many - although not all - good Christians believed in a future earthly millennial kingdom with Christ ruling from Jerusalem.[4] On top of this, the Old Testament cannon had not as yet been clearly defined, at least in so far as Christians were concerned. Thus apocalyptic concepts could be and were borrowed from the apocrapha and the pseudepigrapha. Consequently apocalyptic estimates as to the time of Christ's second advent are found in the early Church in such works as the Epistle of Barnabas. And, curiously, some of these have been picked up by modern, English-speaking Protestants.

For example, many early Christians evidently accepted the idea, taken from the slavonic Enoch and Barnabas, that the thousand-year reign of Christ would follow 6,000 years of human history from the time of the creation of mankind in Eden. Interestingly, that idea was common among British and American apocalypticists from the seventeenth century on to the present, and is still found in the thinking of various Adventist sects. Jehovah's Witnesses, in fact, selected 1975 for the beginning of the Great Tribulation precisely because they believed that that year marked the end of 6,000 years

of human history.[5]

Important, too, is the fact that many ideas common to much of modern Anglo-American apocalypticism came from post-biblical Judaism, through medieval Catholicism, the Reformers, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Protestantism (in virtually all its forms) and into the nineteenth century. Take for example the so-called year-day principle.

Although the basis for the year-day principle - in which prophetic days in Daniel and Revelation are interpreted as years - is found at Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6, the idea was not applied to any other prophecies within the Old Testament until the time of Rabbi Akibah ben Joseph (A.D. 50-132). Then it was to the "seventy weeks" of Daniel 9:24-27. Only during the ninth and tenth centuries was it used as a general rule to exegete "day prophecies" within Daniel. That, too, was done by various Jewish rabbis.[6]

Eventually, however, the year-day concept was introduced to Christendom by that most facinating medieval apocalyptic, Joachim of Floris, and through his followers - many of whom were mendicants - to the Wycliffites and the Reformers. Consequently, in the nineteenth century, as in previous centuries, this so-called principle was taken up by many Protestant divines and became a standard exegetical tool to determine the timing of the Second Coming. Basing his work on the long tradition of apocalyptic studies carried out by such men as Joseph Mede, John Napier, Sir Isaac Newton and even King James I of Great Britain, the Reverend E.B. Elliot produced his important and influential Horae Apocalypticae, which advocated the year-day principle. So a concept

still followed by many sectarian Protestants came from medieval Jewery, through apocalyptic Catholicism into Protestantism and to modern Anglo-American dispensationalism and sectarian Protestantism.[7]

But why have these and other ideas with a Jewish origin blossomed with such vigor in the world of Evangelical and sectarian Anglo-American Protestantism? The answer in part seems to be: (1) the "flat plain" concept of the nature of the Holy Scriptures as developed in Calvinism and disseminated throughout Britain by Calvinists within the Presbyterian, Anglican and separatist traditions; (2) the insistance upon a historicist interpretation of the book of Revelation as a continuation of Daniel's prophecy in order, largely, to picture the Church of Rome as the Harlot of Babylon; and (3) the peculiar speculations of a number of early nineteenth-century British Evangelicals, most of whom were members of the Church of England.

Once the "flat plain" concept of the nature of the Scriptures became general currency in the English-speaking world, much attention began to be given to Old Testament prophecy. Since, however, many Old Testament prophecies had not been fulfilled literally on Israel, Protestants began to try to determine how they would be fulfilled on the Church. Then, too, with a historicist interpretation of Revelation, they often began to explain the New Testament in terms of the Old in a literal fashion rather than in a spiritual one as had been done more commonly by Christians in past centuries. To many such Protestants a wooden bibliolatry replaced the Christ event (that occurence through which the Word became flesh

and dwelt among us) as the centre of Christian hermeneutics; and the Good News of Christ's birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension with the sealing of the Church for salvation began to be replaced with another "good news" - the good news of a future, far more literally "Jewish" messianic kingdom, often seen as occurring here on earth.

Eventually this outlook, coupled with the events of the French Revolution, caused a number of British Evangelicals to come together to establish what has amounted to the basic eschatology for the type of philo-Judaic, pre-millennialist eschatology which in its many forms dominates so much of fundamentalist and sectarian Anglo-American Protestantism and which is coming to influence many others as well. These men gathered together in what were known as the Albury Park Prophetic Conferences, held just outside London, and later in the Powerscourt Conferences in Ireland.[8]

Among those who attended the Albury Park Conference were a number of men of first rate importance for the later history of Evangelical Protestantism. These were, specifically, Lewis Way, Henry Drummond, Edward Irving and John Nelson Darby.

It was Way (1772-1840), a wealthy barrister, who took over the leadership of the Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews and published its journal, The Jewish Expositor. As Carl Olof Jonsson says: "Under the pen-name Basilicus, from 1820 to 1822 Way published a series of articles in that journal on Christ's second coming, expounding his premillennial views. These articles, as well as his earlier Letters on the same subject (published in 1816), strongly influenced many students of the prophecies, among them

Henry Drummond."[9] Thus Way did much to promote the idea that the Jews still had a major role to play in salvation history; and it was he who first suggested the Albury Park Conference, largely as a Christian antidote to current liberal ideas.[10]

But the roles of many of the other figures who attended the Albury Park Conferences are generally better known. John Nelson Darby, a major figure at those Conferences and later, at the Powerscourt Conferences as well, became a major figure in the spread of many of the ideas generated at Albury Park as has been discussed in detail by Ernest Sandeen.[11] Darby and the Plymouth Brethren, of whom he became ~~a major~~ an organizer and spokesman, became the "little bump that fermented a great loaf" or - in some persons' views - a whole series of loaves of rather half-baked bread. For it was Darby and the Brethren who spread the idea of a pre-tribulation rapture of the saints and the "two stage coming" of Jesus Christ at the beginning of the millennium - ideas still expounded by persons such as Ryrie, Goetz, Lindsey and others. Futhermore, it was these concepts as plagiarized and expounded by great numbers of orthodox Protestant clergy that have come to influence the Dallas School of Theology, Jehovah's Witnesses and the World-Wide Church of God, to name but a few.

But where did these strange and rather novel ideas originate? In The Incredible Cover Up, Dave MacPherson claims that the "secret rapture" or "two-stage coming idea" originated in the ecstatic utterances of a Miss Margaret Macdonald of Glasgow, Scotland who was early associated with Edward Irving of the Catholic Apostolic Church and Darby himself.[12] But in a recent article in The Bible Examiner,

Carl Olof Jonsson demonstrates clearly that it was Henry Drummond who was responsible for them.[13]

Influenced by Irving's translation from the Spanish of The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty by Juan Josafat, a pseudonym for the Jesuit Manuel de Lucunza, Drummond produced what Jonsson calls "the embryo of the secret pre-tribulation rapture theory or the 'two stage coming' idea."[14]

But what does this peculiar concept have to do with the Jewish nature of modern pre-millennial, Anglo-American fundamentalist and sectarian apocalypticism? Evidently a great deal. For it was Drummond himself who made the idea of the restoration of fleshly Israelites to Palestine and their ultimate conversion to Christ part and parcel of what is now the dispensational system of apocalyptic. Writing in the tract "The Lord is at Hand," published in 1828, Drummond wrote:

> "The day of the Lord" consists of many parts, like every other day, and different acts are to be performed in different parts of it. The morning is that which is fixed for the resurrection, as Bishop Horsley has well shown on Psal. XXX.3,5. The restoration of the Jews from all lands, and establishment in their own, is not an act that can take place in the twinkling of an eye, but must be gradual and progressive; the resurrection of the dead saints, and the changing of the living, is not a gradual and progressive, but a sudden and instantaneous act; consequently the latter must take place at some moment of the progress of the former. . . .
>
> During the war, then, which succeeds the changing of the elect, the only witnesses for Jehovah which will be left on the earth, will be the Jews, and a promise is still to them that they shall be brought out of all trouble, and re-establish in their own land; and that at the very moment of their greatest strait, the Lord shall manifest himself on their behalf. Thus the appearance of the Lord to raise his saints, and his manifestation again, in order to save his national Israel, seem to be distant from each other by all that period occupied by the war of Armageddon, during which time the Lord may be, though on earth, yet invisible to all but his risen saints.[15]

This all shows very clearly that the full-blown tradition of modern philo-Judaism within Evangelical Protestantism goes back at least to 1828. Fortunately, it has been responsible for a sympathy towards the Jews among English-speaking Christian conservatives which, in all probability, has helped greatly to blunt the extreme anti-semitism which has affected other parts of Christendom so seriously in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Yet it has had its negative side, too. Often it has led to the unwarranted speculation of apocalyptic date-setting as with the Millerites, Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses. Sometimes it has brought about a quietist retreat from social issues or, more recently, to involvement in right-wing politics in the style of the Moral Majority, a Rios Mont in Guatemala or a Ronald Reagan in the White House. And curiously, it has led to a really strange perversion of the Jewish and Christian traditions in the attitude of former American secretary of the Interior James Watt: "If Jesus is coming to take us home soon, there is no particularly good reason to preserve the environment." Furthermore, Christ can restore it anyway. But even more seriously, it has frequently given to Anglo-Saxon Protestant Christianity a strangely legalistic, Jewish cast out of harmony with the spirit of primitive Christianity itself. And finally, all too often as with the "Lovers of Israel," it has caused Christian dispensationalists to take a political position towards the modern state of Israel which is altogether too lacking in moral discrimination. Their motto frequently seems to be "Israel, right or wrong. But still God's people."

[1] Charles C. Ryrie, The Final Countdown (Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1972. William R. Goetz, Apocalypse Next Beaverlodge, Alta.: Horizon House Publishers, 1980).

[2] Stephen Travis, The Jesus Hope (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1974), p. 81.

[3] For a general overview of the various concepts relating to the millennium, see Loraine Boettner, The Millennium (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1974).

[4] "Dialogue with Trypho," Chap. lxxxi as published in Vol. I of The Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Erdmans, 1973), p. 240.

[5] The Watchtower, 15 August 1968, pp. 494-501.

[6] LeRoy Edwin Froom, The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1948), Vol. II, pp. 124, 195-6.

[7] A detailed account of the year-day concept may be found in Froom's four-volume set, The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers.

[8] Ernest R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1970), pp. 18-20, 34-8, 61-2.

[9] Carl Olof Jonsson, "The True Originator of the Two-Stage Coming Idea" in The Bible Examiner, November-December 1982, p. 13.

[10] Ibid., p. 14.

[11] Sandeen, pp. 62-80.

[12] David MacPherson, The Incredible Cover-up (Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1975), pp. 36, 54, 62 (ftn. 21) and the Appendix on pp. 151-7.

[13] Jonsson, pp. 12-19.

[14] Ibid., p. 17.

[15] Pp. 14-16.