INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

For the third successive year the Canadian Society of Church History is presenting in mimeographed form the papers delivered at its annual meeting. The papers printed here were originally read at the Society's meeting held in June, 1969, on the campus of York University, and are distributed in this format as a convenience to members of the Society, particularly for those members who were unable to attend that annual meeting. The reproduction of these papers in this relatively informal and inexpensive manner does not preclude their publication, elsewhere, and it is to be understood that copyright remains with the authors. Already two of the papers printed here have been published in substantially the same shape in academic journals - the presidential address of J.L.H. Henderson, "The Abominable Incubus," is to be found in Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society, Vol. XI, No. 3, September, 1969, and N.K. Clifford's paper, "Religion and the Development of Canadian Society: An Historiographical Analysis", appeared in Church History, Vol. 38, No. 4, December, 1969.

Additional copies of the Society's Papers 1969 and of the Papers for 1967 and 1968 may be purchased from the Society's Secretary, Professor J.P.B. Kenyon, Scarborough College, University of Toronto.

The Canadian Society of Church History welcomes inquiries and memberships from all persons interested in religious and ecclesiastical history. The annual meeting of the Society for 1970 will be held in conjunction with the Canadian Learned Societies at the University of Manitoba on June 6th and 7th in Winnipeg.

John S. Moir,
President.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE ABOMINABLE INCUBUS,
THE CHURCH AS BY LAW ESTABLISHED

by

J.L.H. Henderson
Huron College

The Whig theory of the nature of the British ecclesiastical establishments had been laid down in 1736 by an able controversialist, later bishop of Gloucester, William Warburton. The Alliance between Church and State, or the Necessity and Equity of an Established religion and a Test Law, (London, 1736) described the connection as "a compact between two sovereign powers each ordained for its own proper function"[1] each supporting the other. The church secured public endowment for its clergy. The church supported the institutions and the officers of the State. The State to its inherent civil authority could now claim the benefit of religious sanctions. The compact so defined was analagous to the contemporary doctrine of the social compact and indeed derived from it. Do you ask when the compact was made, where are the documents, who were the signers of such a charter? He answers "It may be found in the same archive where the famous original compact between magistrate and people, so much insisted on in vindication of the rights of mankind is reposited".[2]

The basis of the alliance rested solely upon its usefulness, not upon divine right or upon truth of the doctrines professed. "The true end for which religion is established," wrote Warburton, "is not to provide for the true faith, but for civil utility."[3]

There was therefore no anomaly in Britain's having two established churches, north and south, Presbyterian and Episcopal. The state allied itself to the church of the majority. Questions of forms of government were not the issue. It was in the interest of the Church establishment to retain its majority, and therefore to be as comprehensive as possible, for the existing compact was permanent, but not irrevocable.

Warburton's analysis exactly suited the Whig ruling class, but he was of too speculative a genius and too arrogant to be wholly acceptable to churchmen. It was left to a sober north country successor to write the text-book definitions. William Paley, 1745-1805, became and remained a best selling authority in theological studies. In his Moral and Political philosophy written in 1788, book 6, chapter nine "Of religious establishments and of toleration," begins "A religious establishment is no part of Christianity, it is only a means of inculcating it," and therefore "the authority of church establishment is founded in its utility."

Paley would reject the "arbitrary fiction" of a compact between state and people. It was enough for him that the establishment existed without clear paternity, and that it was useful. The clergy were freed from any dependence upon voluntarism. While all might not be scholars, they would at least be educated men, and enough scholars would arise. "We sow many seeds to raise one flower." Otherwise "preaching in time would become a mode of begging," and "A ministry so degraded would soon fall into the lowest hands." But for Paley three conditions must be fulfilled to retain the establishment in its most useful state. Confessions of faith and articles of subscription must be made as simple and easy as possible. Dissent must be fully tolerated provided that the dissenter was not exempted from church support. And the church established must remain the majority church of the nation. "If the dissenters from the establishment become a majority of the people, the establishment itself ought to be altered or qualified."

If Warburton and Paley showed a somewhat complacent England the providential utility of that best of all worlds, the French

Revolution woke the nation to the alternatives. The Terror and the war with France drove England into an urgent conservation, and the established church was seen to be not only rational and utilitarian, but in Edmund Burke's words "the first of our prejudices."[4]

The church "by law established" in England was seen to be a providential act. No man questioned by what law it had been established. The phrase had first been used in the Canons of 1603. The Scottish establishment indeed had been legally effected in its existing form in 1706. It was enough that the established Church of England had always been.[5]

In the colony of Upper Canada, product of these years, there was for many no difficulty about the establishment. Canada was the refuge of those who chose British institutions rather than remain in the lands of revolution. To the question then "when was the Church of England established in Upper Canada?" they could answer "and when was it not?" On their understanding, the national church needed no act of establishment in a colony. It did need, from parliament or from local legislature, endowments, regulation, "settlement," support. The establishment could be assumed. The details, the degree of public support, the legal matters, must be left to the generosity of crown and parliament, to the instructions to governors and to local action.[6]

Nova Scotia's first legislature did indeed pass "An Act for the establishment of religious public worship in this province and for suppression of popery." [Statute 32 George II, Chap. 5, N.S. 1758] "for the more effectual attainment of His Majesty's pious intentions... the liturgy of the Church established by the laws of England shall be deemed the fixed form of worship among us." Its true intent appears to have been to assure freedom of worship and exemption from church rates for all Protestant dissenters, and the summary banishment of all popish clergy. It bears the marks of its time, 1758 and the Anglo-French war.

New Brunswick's first legislature passed an Act for "preserving the Church of England as by law established in this province"

in 1786.

So the Canada Act of 1791 recited and reaffirmed the successive instructions to governors "for the encouragement of the Protestant religion" [31, Geo. III, c. 31, sec. 35], decreed a permanent appropriation of land, for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy [Sec. 36] and authorized the erection and endowment of parsonages or rectories, according to the establishment of the Church of England" [sec. 38] A further section [sec. 42] made it impossible for the local legislature to "vary or repeal" any of the ecclesiastical clauses without reference to both houses of parliament. And William Pitt, guiding the bill through the Commons, defended the whole as a measure to encourage the established Church.[7]

John Strachan was of course aware of the variation in the provinces. "By the Provincial law of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia this church is established."[8] In Upper Canada the establishment had no such benefit, nor any such liability, for what a provincial legislature may create, it may also destroy. But it remained the establishment, and by that term Strachan and others habitually referred to it. In the testimony of a hostile witness "for several years it was generally supposed that the Church of England was established by law in the Province."[9]

The question may well be asked whether the English establishment was useful or desirable in Upper Canada, given the changing religious opinions and the conditions of an American frontier. Few would recommend it by the mid-nineteenth century; presumably no one would do so now. But it is only right that it should be judged by the contemporary standard, utility.

A case could be made, and John Strachan and others made it, again and again. The new government needed support, needed the sanctions of religion, needed intelligent and persistent advocacy among the people, needed it desperately among the French and therefore worked through Roman Catholic bishops and clergy, needed it among the English speaking and was more or less prepared to pay the price. Grenville and Pitt saw it as the error of their predecessors that in the general policy of assimilating

the American colonies to the British constitution, the church had been neglected. The church also needed the support of government. How else could these raw settlements be given the sacraments and the solace of religion, let alone the buildings? If burgeoning London and Glasgow, Edinburgh and Manchester could legitimately receive churches and endowments in this period solely from state funds, could this dispersed frontier hope for them in any other way? Local pride in Kingston or Cornwall might be induced to begin construction. Government had to assist, and only government could supply salaries. Whatever the deficiencies of the Christian society by 1814, thirty years after the beginning of Upper Canada, and they were many by any standard, such religious ministrations as there were owed their support to government.

Strachan was, of course, an establishment man. His whole frame of reference assumed a close connection between, even an identification of, church and state. Had he remained at home he would have been a Moderatist in the Church of Scotland among the men who had briefly brought theological "tranquility" to Scotland. The establishment created in Upper Canada as in Britain the conditions under which progress would be made. And Strachan even as his friend Thomas Chalmers in Scotland was filled with useful plans that the establishment made practicable: schools, a university, educated and self-respecting colonials, churches, the parochial system, an informed respectable and industrious clergy, the services of religion available to the whole population. He would fight for it in the years to come as a principle worth preserving. But it is important to realize that he believed in 1815 in its utility. He was above all else a practical man rather than a theorist, and for him the establishment worked.

The years from 1815 to 1854 were to bring defeat to the whole concept of a church establishment in Upper Canada. The reasons are many but may be grouped into four: an initial internal difficulty in the assumptions of a colonial establishment, that is the existence of the Church of Scotland in Upper Canada, secondly, changes in church and state relationships in

England, thirdly, the American separation of church and state, and fourthly, the weakness of the "privileged" and "dominant" church in the colony.

Historically, the first assault upon the assumptions of the English establishment came from the Scotch.

The members of the Church of Scotland in the Canadas quite naturally believed themselves entitled to government assistance. The clause in the Canada Act about "a Protestant clergy", taken by itself, clearly could include Church of Scotland clergy. Aged politicians were later to recollect that in 1791 the inclusion of the Scotch church had been intended. Politicians know the value of ambiguity. In the Bathurst Papers[10] there is an interchange between Earl Bathurst, the Colonial Secretary, George Canning and others agreeing that they could not contemplate parallel establishments in any of the colonies beyond exceptional assistance in specific cases. Nor could Upper Canadians expect much support from the Church of Scotland. At the General Assembly of 1796, the Rev. George Hamilton of Gladsmuir, later Moderator, had effectively put down a movement to support Church of Scotland expansion overseas and official recognition of missionary societies in a speech which included the words, "Why should we scatter our forces and spend our strength in foreign service when our utmost vigilance, our unbroken strength is required at home? While there remains at home a single individual without the means of religious knowledge, to propagate it abroad would be improper and absurd."[11]

Hamilton had visited his brother Robert Hamilton, merchant of Kingston and Queenston, Upper Canada. You will observe that he was therefore connected with that pack of Upper Canadian Scots, the Dicksons, Clarks and Nicholls, that he was brother-in-law to Robert Gourlay, and had interviewed and hired John Strachan.

The Church of Scotland until the mid-twenties was of little help to Upper Canada. Secession clergy were more apt than theirs to emigrate. American Presbyterians presumably had no interest in government support. The initiative had to come

from Upper Canadians. Prompted by them, the Upper Canadian Assembly passed an address to the king in 1824 asserting "that the Churches of England and Scotland had...equal rights...and an equal claim to enjoy any advantages or support."[12] The position had already been conceded by Lord Bathurst. Clergy of the established Church of Scotland were Protestant clergy and entitled to support.[13] The Church of England, led by Bishop Jacob Mountain vigorously protested, and the long and public protest was the first engagement in the battles of the Clergy Reserves. The financial results for either of the established churches were negligible at the time, since the reserves were nonproductive. The legal aspects of the church's position had become a matter of public debate.[14] The assumptions of an establishment were raised, faced and put to dispute. By January of 1826 the Assembly of Upper Canada concluded that the Reserves were for all protestant groups, or could be applied to other purposes.

The changing relations between church and state in England and the changing theories generated must be condensed to a paragraph. The old simplicities of Warburton and Paley were gone, save perhaps a continuing concern for utility. The British legislation of 1828, 1829 and 1832, and the pressure for English disestablishment demanded new interpretations and such diverse persons as W.E. Gladstone and Sir Robert Peel, Bishops Philpotts and Lloyd, Keble and Pusey, Newman and Froude produced them. The old church was something of an anomaly in an increasingly pluralistic society and fortunately in the next decades it was to reform and transform itself. But among other changes it discovered what American and Scottish Episcopalians had long known, that the catholic and apostolic church was also a divine society independent of the state, that the distinctiveness of its ecclesiastical professions did not derive solely from the English crown. Churchmen in Upper Canada at least had alternative ground should the establishment go.

Even if the founding churches in Britain had not changed over the first half of the nineteenth century the American

environment would presumably have forced its own pattern upon Canadian church life. For the American doctrine of the separation of church and state was not simply a despairing solution to colonial religious diversities, far less the denial of religion by an infidel state as some Englishmen believed. It was also a reasoned response to new American attitudes, to concepts of democracy, egalitarianism and denominationalism. All churches were free before the law. None was privileged (save in those states where establishments still held) and by denominationalism, in theory at least, all churches were held to be equal parts of one great Christian society separated only in name but separated justly for conscience sake until religious separatism was held to be a good in itself. There was clearly no room for a national church, and very little room for that basic geographical unit of the usual establishment, the parochial system. Americans in 1810 worshipped in "gathered" congregations called apart from a largely unchurched world, rather than in parish churches.[15]

The tendency to fragmentation was strong. When a denomination arose able to work out an organization that would overcome such handicaps, the frontier was theirs. The Methodist Episcopal system of conferences, circuits and societies was an admirable institution for its purposes. Tightly organized under the dominating personality of Francis Asbury, it sent out itinerant preachers who collected congregations, recruited readers, class leaders and more itinerants who went on in ever expanding circles forever hiving off in more circuits, more congregations, forever riding west and north with the frontier. Inevitably they crossed into Upper Canada and found an instant response. The itinerants may have been often ignorant, American in all their assumptions, and soon gone, but they left classes and congregations behind them and they recruited bright young men who could preach the word of God to their neighbours, or ride off themselves to conference, ordination and circuits of their own. The Episcopals paid them the sincere compliment of imitating them, the American Episcopals with their

bishops of missionary districts, Charles James Stewart and John Strachan with travelling missionaries. Other sects were to follow the Methodists across the New York state border, but none so fully met the needs of Upper Canada. The result was disastrous to the idea of a national church. Canadians had heard the gospel and now preached it without help from any establishment. Their church was their own achievement, product of their own wills, and not the will of government. Thus was effected the real separation between church and state, not by the theory of American constitution-mongers, but by the practise of Upper Canadians.

The shrewd Samuel Wilberforce, bishop of Oxford, noted this aspect of voluntarism as characteristic even of American Episcopalians. "They belonged to (the church) because they chose to join her - because she was more reasonable or comely in their eyes than others - because they willed it; and to this action of their will, and that of others around them, it seemed as if she owed her being."[16]

The ultimate cause for the failure of the ideal of the English church establishment in Upper Canada was the weakness of the church itself. Its opponents thought of it as privileged and richly endowed. They suspected, with justice, that it wished to be dominant and province wide. They saw its leaders in positions of power, members of the Legislative Council and of the Executive, supported by government here and at home. Bishop Mountain was august and influential, though largely absent. The plain Charles James Stewart was firm in his convictions, active, and well-connected. And always there was John Strachan busily directing affairs at every level. Yet in fact the most strenuous efforts of even these men could not offset the essential weakness of the church.

So much of the English establishment depended upon the parochial system. In Wilberforce's phrase "It acquired all those associations and prescriptive rights whereby an hereditary church maintains her hold upon the love and reverence of men."[17] The parishes provided the sense of continuity, the feeling of permanence, the identification with the land. Its marks were

the familiar spire, the church bell, the accustomed clergyman hidden beneath his surplice and behind his prayer book, anonymous, undemanding, yet available, the liturgy unchanging and predictable, finding its echo in each man's memory. When the whole could be transplanted, the English emigrant found himself strangely at home, in touch with his God, if he was so minded, or at least aware of his inheritance. Alas, it did not readily bear transplanting. Time was too short. The environment was too dissimilar, the distances too vast, the settlements too dispersed. When by good fortune an English parish church appeared, men warmed to the achievement and diligently worked for more. Kingston under John Stuart had early shown that it was possible. John Strachan was not the least of its captives. Niagara, York, Etobicoke, Thornhill each in its time appeared to reproduce the English parish. But so few and scattered were they that men saw them as curiosities, not as the fabric of their own society as indeed they were not. A generation without memories of a national church, a generation or two of immigrants from the south, broke the continuity. The parochial system where it existed was an anomaly outside their experience, making no demands upon their allegiance.

And always there was the vast error of the Clergy Reserves.

John Strachan maintained that the reserves were the gift of a pious king exercising his just prerogative. In fact George III had seen the bill for half a day only in October 1789.[18] William Grenville added the clergy reserve article at the last moment apparently on his own initiative, as part of his attempt to reproduce the English social structure of squire and parson. The reserves were to be in the hands of government as a prospective endowment for the church. These or other lands would provide four parishes in every township. Patronage remained in the hand of the lieutenant governor. A magnificant gesture, the reserves could be worth nothing for years.

What can one say more about the clergy reserves? For Egerton Ryerson they were "the abominable incubus" par excellence.

Every little politician made them his whipping boy. Every land speculator and land company saw them as competition and sought to acquire some or all. Countless individuals squatted upon them, robbed them of their timber, abused their leases. On any dispersed frontier, vacant lands held for a rise in value, whether by the crown or by speculators, were a major social liability. Regrettably, in the early years little compensating revenue came in. They were a gift never fully given which the church could neither effectively use nor readily repudiate.[19]

In the end the ideal of the church establishment must come under the judgment of its own standards. Utility it may have possessed in limited measure in the first days of settlement, utility alike to the state and to the church. Its presumably overwhelming resources were not of the kind that would meet the needs of later stages of development. Of William Paley's three further qualifications what can be said? Ease of subscription was not for Canada to decide, although Mountain, Stewart and Strachan in their time were remarkably liberal in practise. Tolerance of dissent under the law was far in advance of English practise from the beginning. Though the Methodists had no authority to register marriages until 1830, not being settled clergy, dissenters were equal citizens, paid no church rates, enjoyed full liberty of worship.

Finally, affirmed Paley, the established church must remain the church of the majority. And here indeed the ideal collapsed entirely. Richard Cartwright had conselled in 1790 that only 5% of the population were churchmen, and that an established church was undesirable. Bishops might labour mightily, John Strachan might claim in print, and purport to demonstrate in Ecclesiastical charts, that most men were nominally Church of England or could become so given the opportunity. They failed, and did so at that point where a national church can least afford to fail in securing the consent of the people.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Sykes, Norman, Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century. Cambridge, University Press, 1934, p. 320.

[2] Warburton, Wm. Alliance between Church and State, London, 1736, pt. 2, sec. 3, p. 90-1.

[3] Alliance, pt. 2, sec. 5, p. 148-9.

[4] Burke, Reflections on the revolution in France, London, 1790, p. 147.

[5] Garbett, Cyril, Church and State in England. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1950, p. 30.

[6] cf. A.H. Young, "A Fallacy in Canadian history" in Canadian Historical review, Dec. 1934 "not endowments, property, support of the clergy, and a share in the government of a province or of its municipalities are the essential points in an establishment, after all, but rather beliefs, doctrine, discipline, forms of worship and of orders."

[7] cf. Harlow, Founding of the second British empire, 1763-1793, vol. 2, London, Longmans, 1964. p. 770.

[8] O.P.R.A., S.P., Strachan to Wilmot Horton, 25 May 1824.

[9] James Richardson in the Christian Guardian 31 July, 1833, quoted in J.J. Talman, "The position of the Church of England in Upper Canada, 1791-1840" Canadian Historical review, Dec. 1934.

[10] Historical Manuscripts commission. Report on the manuscripts of Earl Bathurst, London, H.M.S.O. 1923, pp. 564, 569, 570.

[11] John M'Donald, Civil Church establishment, Glasgow, Aird and Coghill, N.D., p. 218.

[12] O.A. 11th report, 1914, p. 607, Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada.

[13] P.A.C. series Q, vol. 159, pp. 428-9, Bathurst to Jacob Mountain, Aug. 1821.

14
The controversy is best summarized in Millman, T.R., Jacob Mountain, University of Toronto Press, 1947, pp. 158-168.

15
cf. Hudson, Winthrop S., American protestantism, cap. 1, sec. 3 "The concept of denominationalism", Chicago, University press, 1961.

16
Wilberforce, Samuel, A history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, 2nd ed., London, James Burns, 1846, p. 241.

17
Samuel Wilberforce, History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, London, James Burns, 1846, p. 241.

18
Harlow, V., Founding of the Second British Empire, vol. 2 London, Longmans, 1964, p. 765.

19
cf. Alan Wilson, The Clergy reserves, a Canadian mortmain, Toronto, University of Toronto press, 1968.

RELIGION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANADIAN SOCIETY: AN HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

by

N. K. Clifford
The Divinity School
University of Chicago

During the past forty years Canadian historians have viewed the relationship between religion and the development of Canadian society from three perspectives. None of these perspectives have risen out of the Canadian context; they have been imported and adapted with various degrees of success to the Canadian scene. The assistance they have given Canadian historians in perceiving and highlighting various aspects of the role of religion in our national life has been valuable. Like all perspectives, however, they have often concealed as much as they have revealed. Canadian church historians, of course, have been aware of the limitations which these perspectives have placed upon the story of the religious development of Canadian society. Their comments and criticisms, however, have never been systematically studied nor viewed in the wider context of the development of these perspectives elsewhere. This neglect needs to be remedied for such a study throws light not only on an aspect of the intellectual history of Canada but also on a number of points of emphasis in the use of these perspectives which appear to be distinctively Canadian. In what follows, therefore, an attempt has been made first of all to trace the development and continuing influence of these perspectives on the interpretation of religion in Canadian society. Secondly, to assess the adequacy and limitations of these perspectives as interpretive frameworks in the Canadian context. And finally to point out some of the factors in the present situation which need to be taken into consideration in the development of a new perspective.

I

During the first three decades of the 20th century Canadian historians were preoccupied with the evolution of Canadian nationhood.

The themes which claimed their attention were the winning of national status, the achievement of responsible government, and confederation. Their focus was on political and constitutional matters, consequently "they did not effectively analyze the social, economic and intellectual forces within North America which were creating a Canadian community increasingly conscious that it was far from being an overseas projection of Britain." (1) In the 1920's several Canadian historians began to turn their attention to these problems.

At roughly the same time the need to record the religious history of Canada as one sustained movement in the life of the nation also became apparent. The basic problem was to discover a single principle which would give unity to the whole. Edmund H. Oliver in his book The Winning of the Frontier (2) was the first to tackle this problem by using the frontier thesis as the framework for his narrative.

The importance of the frontier for American development had been the subject of serious study and debate by American historians ever since 1893, when Frederick Jackson Turner gave his famous paper on "The Significance of the Frontier" before the meetings of the American Historical Association in Chicago. By 1930, the Turner - Anti-Turner debate was widespread amongst American historians (3) and both the significance and limitations of the theory for the interpretation of Canadian history had been argued before the Canadian Historical Association. In 1928, Walter N. Sage of the University of British Columbia, argued for the validity of the frontier thesis as applied to Canadian history. (4) The following year, however, John L. McDougall launched an attack on it. "Whatever justification there may be for Professor Turner's thesis as an explanation of American history," he concluded, "it could be little short of a calamity if Canadian historians were to attempt to deform the story of our own development to fit the Procrustes bed of the frontier theory." (5) It was into a context of debate, therefore, that Oliver's The Winning of the Frontier came when it was published in 1930.

The Winning of the Frontier was reviewed for the Canadian Historical Review by John T. McNeil. "There is more Canadian church history," wrote McNeil, "in this volume of 271 pages than has ever before been placed between two covers." (6) McNeil, however, was well aware of the criticism being directed at the frontier thesis and therefore he added:

> "Some readers, familiar with the 'frontier' theory of the history of the United States, may be prepared to find that the thesis is overworked. The present reviewer can only state his accord with the author's main position. The Canadian churches cannot in the least degree be understood as mere projections of the communions of the old world from which they sprang. Their course has been mainly shaped by a frontier environment." (7)

Yet while Oliver uses the frontier thesis, at no point does he give any clues to the literary heritage of his book. (8) Neither Turner nor any of the American church historians who utilized the frontier thesis, such as Peter Mode and W. W. Sweet, are mentioned. (9) When one examines Oliver's use of the term "frontier," however, it becomes clear that he was not reduplicating Turner's categories nor those of Turner's disciples. The frontier, for Oliver, was not the cradle of Canadian democracy, it was not the focal point of Canadianization nor a safety valve to drain off the explosive tensions of an Eastern labor force. Rather it was the place where the institutions of civilization tamed and domesticated the unruly forces of the wilderness. The frontier was that line along which "the outriders of civilization do battle -- with the primitive and elemental." (10)

For Oliver the frontier signified "need and opportunity." The need was twofold. First of all, there was the need of the church to be involved in mission. "It is the law of Christ's Kingdom," Oliver argues, "that the church that neglects the uttermost part of the earth, whether in its own land or across the sea does so at grave peril to its spiritual life." (11) Secondly, there was the need of new solutions to new problems which arise in a new environment. "The Councils of the Church," he points out, "may be held and decisions registered at great centres, as in Jerusalem, but the most vital problems ever arise in, and the solutions must always be found for, Joppa and Caesarea, Antioch and Galatia, -- among, and for the Gentiles and on the growing frontier." (12) The missionary dimension of Oliver's thought deeply influenced his conception not only of the need but also the opportunity of the frontier. This opportunity lay in the fact that it yielded "new fields for mission activity." "In Canada," continues Oliver, "just because of the primitive conditions and pioneer settlements characteristic of a young and growing country, it has been the expanding geographical frontier that has afforded the most striking challenge to the Church." (13) It is the

cont'd.

attempt of the churches to meet the challenge of the frontier which for Oliver is "the controlling feature of religious policy and the constant motive of church enterprise in Canadian life." (14)

After a brief period at McMaster University, following doctoral studies at Columbia, Oliver came out to the west as an educational pioneer and missionary. Not long after his arrival at the University of Saskatchewan as a professor of history he became involved in the establishment of the Presbyterian Theological College on the campus of the University of Saskatchewan and became its first principal. In the negotiations leading to the formation of the United Church in 1925, Oliver became a spokesman of the Union Churches in the west which had been formed prior to 1925 in the expectation that the union of the churches in Canada would be immediately forthcoming. Oliver's election as the fourth moderator of the United Church of Canada was, at least in part, a recognition of his role as spokesman for these union churches and his two year term from 1930-1932 was marked by his unflagging efforts to organize relief for those who were being wiped out by the crop failures and dust bowl conditions which characterized Saskatchewan during the Depression years. Consequently it is not surprising that his conception of the frontier was deeply influenced by his missionary concerns for Western Canada and its people which he knew so well and with whom he had so deeply identified himself.

There was a conflict of interest in Oliver's mind, however, as he used the frontier theory. The real value of this theory, as Turner developed it, was to explain and emphasize the newness and uniqueness of North American ideas and institutions. In the process of adapting to a new environment on the frontier there was a continual beginning again in which new problems and new ways of doing things transformed old social patterns, techniques and ideas. From an analysis of these frontier dynamics, Turner argued, it was possible to explain the newness and uniqueness of American social development.

Oliver grasped the significance of this theory but he was torn between emphasizing elements of continuity and analyzing those aspects of the new environment which produced discontinuity with the past. By defining the frontier as the battle-line between the forces of civilization and the wilderness, he indicates his interest in the elements of continuity with the past. Indeed it was only after he had

emphasized the factor of continuity that he was prepared to talk about how the frontier altered the decisions made in the large metropolitan centers of civilization.

He pointed out that the advance of the frontier decreased dependence on Europe and led to the formation of national churches responsible for their own support and destiny. He also emphasized that the issues which arose on the frontier altered British colonial policy with regard to religion, national policy and questions such as education and the separation of church and state, however the uniqueness of these events were not the main focus of his study and they were never allowed to alter substantially his emphasis on the continuous forward march of civilization.

In the early part of the twentieth century, the Canadian West was a symbol of opportunity. During the thirties, however, it turned into a nightmare. Under Harold A. Innis' direction, therefore, Canadian historians began to direct their attention to the influence of the great metropolitan centers of the East on the development of Canada. Consequently, even amongst church historians Oliver's The Winning of the Frontier faded into obscurity and neglect.

While Oliver's work has generally been ignored by professional church historians in Canada, it has not, however, been without its continuing influence. Claris Edwin Silcox in his study of the union of the churches in Canada stressed the importance of the union churches in the West and the pressure of home mission work on the Western frontier as a major factor in the formation of the United Church of Canada in 1925. (15) Dr. George Dorey, a colleague of Oliver's in Saskatchewan, also reflects the impact of the "geographical determinism" of the frontier thesis in his Robertson Lectures for 1952-53. (16) By far the most intriguing recent use of the frontier thesis, however, has been the attempt of Gerald R. Cragg to explain the lack of an indigenous Canadian theology in terms of it. He writes:

> "In a pioneering community there are few encouragements to academic speculation. 'Winning the frontier' has been the major responsibility of all the churches, and other matters have been remorselessly thrust aside. --- Lack of adequate resources, combined with the pragmatic approach natural in churches that were fighting to win the frontier regions has kept all our colleges small and most of them weak.--- There has been little 'learned leisure,' and under such conditions an indigenous theology does not readily develop." (17)

When the roll of distinguished Canadian theologians who have spent all or significant portions of their careers in the United States is called (18), one wonders whether the frontier thesis is an adequate explanation for the lack of an indigenous Canadian theology. Perhaps the attraction of the great metropolitan centers of learning in North America would provide a more adequate explanation of this phenomenon. Nevertheless, Cragg's observations provide an interesting example of the continuing influence of the frontier thesis in the interpretation of the Canadian experience.

II

In 1929, the year before Oliver's book appeared, Richard Niebuhr published The Social Sources of Denominationalism (19), a book which was to have a formative effect on the interpretation of religion both in Canada and the United States. Niebuhr adapted the church-sect typology developed by Max Weber and elaborated by his colleague Ernst Troeltsch, to the interpretation of American Protestantism. Perceiving the static character of this typology, Niebuhr reformulated it by spelling out the attitudes of the two types towards secular culture and then transformed it into a dynamic concept by proposing that the typology be used to study the processes by which sects become reconciled to the world. The result of this reformulation was "the well-known hypothesis that sects develop ultimately into churches - that is, that their attitude toward secular culture in time undergoes a change from harsh rejection to a degree of toleration or even acceptance." (20)

In Canada, this typology was picked up by Samuel Delbert Clark and used as a basis for his study of church and sect in Canada. (21) In an earlier work on The Social Development of Canada (22), Clark had shown himself to be an exponent of the "frontier hypothesis." When he adopted the church-sect typology in 1948 to explicate "the sociological significance of certain general movements of religion in Canadian social development," (23) he did not abandon his earlier commitment to the frontier theory but combined the insights of the earlier orientation with those of the church-sect typology. The result was a first-class study of Canadian religious development which J. B. Brebner hailed as

"a pioneering work of great importance, a monumental mile-stone in Canadian historical writing beyond which particularist studies will seem inexcusable except insofar as they fill gaps in our knowledge and are adequately related to the edifices which Mr. Clark has erected..." (24)

Out of Clark's earlier study (25) it became clear that the social development of Canada had been characterized by a succession of frontier religious movements. These movements continually challenged and threatened the efforts of the major denominations to secure undisputed control over the ministrations of religious services. The conflict between established religious authority and those who refused to recognize such authority was identified by Clark as the conflict between church and sect. Clark related this conflict to the frontier thesis by noting that the sect has been a product of frontier conditions of social life and the church is the product of a mature society.

The combination of the church-sect typology with the frontier thesis was Clark's contribution to the development of this theory. The main significance of this theoretical advance was that unlike Oliver, Clark was not left stranded with his center of focus riveted on the frontier. The fact that the church was characteristic of the urban situation meant he was able to make an easy transition back to the analysis of urban religious phenomenon. Moreover, because religious phenomenon amongst economically marginal groups in the urban context tended to take a sectarian form he was able within the framework of this typology to make a major contribution to the analysis of the religious dynamics of Canadian urban society in the 19th century.

So impressive was Clark's study that for some time it appeared as if it would be the last word on the subject of Canadian religious development. Yet it was not long before both sociologists and church historians began to raise questions about the adequacy of the church-sect typology as a description of religious phenomenon in North America. By the 1950's sociologists were becoming aware that much of the material they were investigating did not fit the simple polarities of the church-sect typology. Scholars such as Milton Yinger (26) and Peter Berger (27), therefore began to refine the church-sect typology by adding other categories such as cult and denomination in order to describe more effectively the religious phenomenon which their research had revealed. W. E. Mann's study entitled Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta (28) was a

reflection of this broadening of the church-sect typology to include other types of religious phenomenon such as the cult. Indeed, by the 1960's the church-sect typology had completely disintegrated as the sociologists introduced a six-fold list of categories rather than the original two. In the new list, the cult, the sect, the established or institutionalized sect, the denomination, the church and the ecclesia were all set forth as containing different shades of meaning.

While the sociologists attempted to refine the church-sect typology for their own purposes, church historians such as Sidney Mead and Franklin H. Littell criticized this typology from their own perspective and settled on the single term "denomination" as the one which best described the church in North America. Littell summed up his criticism of the Troeltschian typology as follows:

> "As suggestive as this typology is sociologically, theologically it is pernicious. Any definition of the 'church' which makes the church before Constantine a 'sect' and relegates most of the modern missionary movement and the churches outside European 'Christendom' to the status of 'sects' obviously leaves much to be desired." (29)

Consequently under the combined attacks of both the sociologists and the church historians, the church-sect typology has generally fallen into disuse and few, if any, are concerned with it as a currently viable interpretive framework,for the study of religion in the United States.(30)

In Canada, however, the situation has been different. H. H. Walsh, in criticizing Clark, pointed out that "his tendency to judge revivalism from a purely sociological point of view misses much of the true significance of religious 'enthusiasm'." (31) This was an important point and had Canadian church historians picked it up, it might have led them beyond the confines of the church-sect typology. In the United States, revivalism has been dealt with in historical and theological terms by a variety of scholars from W. W. Sweet to W. McLaughlin. In 1948, the same year as Clark's work appeared, Maurice A. Armstrong published The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809. (32) This work, which was done in consultation with W. W. Sweet, however, did not set the pattern. Indeed, Walsh himself, when his book The Christian Church in Canada (33) was published in 1956, continued to speak of the sects and sectarianism. Even as late as 1963, John Moir was writing on "The Sectarian Tradition in Canada." (34) This has meant that the interpretation of this area of religious experience has remained within the

context of the church-sect categories. The question is why? What has prevented Canadian scholars from going beyond the church-sect typology?

John Moir has suggested an answer in his paraphrase of S. D. Clark. He says, "Canada has preserved Churchism to preserve itself. Whenever military, economic, political or cultural absorption by the United States threatened, as in 1776, 1812, 1837, 1911 or even 1957, Canada has turned to its counter-revolutionary tradition for inspiration. And ecclesiasticism is a traditional part of that tradition." (35) A further reason is that Canadian church historians have refused to use the category of "denomination." This has meant that they have not been able to follow Mead's direction in going beyond the church-sect typology. "In this respect," says H. H. Walsh, "Canadian Christianity stands in sharp contrast to American Christianity, which takes denominationalism as normal.... The long series of church unions that are so prominent in Canadian church history, culminating in the formation of the United Church of Canada in 1925, is the historical expression of an ideal that looks beyond denominationalism as the final destiny of the church in Canada." (36)

In Britain, Bryan R. Wilson, who holds the senior appointment in sociology at Oxford, has revitalized the study of sectarianism over the past few years in a series of sociological studies. (37) After subjecting both Troeltsch and Niebuhr to serious and sustained criticism, Wilson moves beyond the church-sect typology. Insofar as he has continued to focus on sectarianism, however, it might appear at first glance that Canadian scholars, in this regard, have remained closer to the British rather than the American tradition. Wilson's views on ecumenicalism, however, are unlikely to appeal to Canadian church historians, and to date there is little evidence that they are prepared to move with him beyond Troeltsch and Niebuhr in the study of sectarianism. Therefore, in spite of the initial illumination which this perspective helped to throw upon the religious dynamics of Canadian society, it appears at present to be creating more problems than it has been able to solve.

III

In an article entitled "Two Ways of Life: The Primary Antithesis of Canadian History" (38) published in 1943, Arthur R. M. Lower developed

another distinctive perspective on the interpretation of the role of religion in Canadian society. Starting with Weber's and Tawney's observations concerning Protestantism's affinity with capitalism and Catholicism's resistance to the capitalistic spirit, Lower set out to examine "the juxtaposition of two civilizations, two philosophies, two contradictory views of the fundamental nature of man" which have characterized the "primary antithesis of Canadian history."

In 1938, Lower had touched on this theme in a review of D. G. Creighton's The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence, 1760-1850. (39) The theme of this book, as Lower pointed out "arises out of the sharp antithesis between the two societies of the region of the St. Lawrence and the lakes: the exploitive commercial Protestant society of Montreal and the other towns, and the more or less static rural society of the Catholic habitants and Upper Canadian pioneers. With the general nature of Creighton's thesis, Lower believed there could be little disagreement. However, he felt Creighton had over-weighted the struggle between commerce and agriculture and under-weighted the factor which Durham had described as "two nations warring in the bosom of a single state." According to Lower, Creighton had not emphasized those philosophies which lie behind the concept of race, and had failed to highlight the unending battle over what Andre Siegfried called "the fundamental nature of man."

The weaknesses which Lower discovered in Creighton's book indicate the themes he was to develop in his essay had been on his mind for some time. His reference to Andre Siegfried's book The Race Question in Canada indicates another source for Lower's perspective besides the Weber-Tawney thesis. Siegfried's work was one of the first to dwell on the "bitter warfare" between the two races in Canada and to emphasize "how religious questions are at the root of all Canadian differences and divisions." (40)

After briefly describing the nature and development of French Canadian society, Lower asks the question which fascinated Weber: why are there no business men in this society? "The explanation," he claims, "is simple." French Canadian society is founded on a philosophy which gives a subordinate place to the man of business and his pursuits. It would therefore be naive to expect any development of native capitalism -- except the special form of capitalism represented by ecclesiastical corporative organization.

To find the business man in Canadian history, argues Lower, we must turn to the other way of life in Canadian society, that of the English Protestant. "No other group has so systematically set up acquisition as an object in itself and made it the centre of a cult as have the men of business of the English speaking world." (41) Like Weber and Tawney, Lower finds the key to this phenomenon in Calvinism. "Wherever Calvinism has prevailed," he argues, "societies committed to the acquisitive way of life have arisen. This coincidence seems logical, for while the spirit of acquisition is as old as man, Calvinism subtly reinforces it." (42) It accentuated the motives of accomplishment and success as signs of election.

Lower, however, realized there were other aspects to the English Protestant tradition in Canada. Methodism with its social gospel tradition was a "counterweight to acquisition." This tradition split Methodism, causing many of its members to move into the acquisitive camp, while the social gospelers provided much of the drive behind Canadian socialism. These, according to Lower, are the "two most significant traditions at work in our English speaking community today: they represent the sharpest antitheses and the future will witness a battle over which shall organize it." (43) Therefore, Lower concludes, our two Canadian ways of life exemplify an antithesis between a natural, primitive, rural, Catholic outlook on life and an acqusitive, materialist, commercial, urban outlook which is shaped by Calvinistic individualism.

Seven years later in 1950, Lower contributed a chapter on "Religion and Religious Institutions" to a volume of essays on Canada (44) edited by George W. Brown. In this chapter, Lower introduced a variety of new material on religion in Canada. He acknowledged for example, that "other characteristics of Protestantism derive from the North American frontier experience rather than from the Reformation." (45) He also pointed out that "Protestant denominations in Canada which have their parent churches abroad have come to differ appreciably from them." (46) While acknowledging the impact of the frontier environment, however, he was careful to point out "this does not mean that Canadian churches are mere extensions of American churches." (47)

Lower also took note of Protestant sectarianism and indicated he was well aware of the church-sect typology as elaborated by Richard Niebuhr and S. D. Clark. He makes it clear, however, why sectarianism

is not his central concern.

> "The Dominion Census of 1941 lists some seventeen different and recognized denominations, then lumps together dozens more under the heading 'other.' Most of those listed are small, however, and the dispersion of Protestantism is not really so great as the innumerable conventicles of its minor sects would indicate. Thus, in 1941, of the 55.20 per cent of the Canadian population which was Protestant, 90.34 per cent was comprised within five denominations: Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, and the United Church of Canada. The two largest Protestant churches - the Anglican and the United - together accounted for 63 per cent of the Protestant total. The innumerable minor sects made up, all told, only 9.6 per cent of the Protestant population." (48)

Thus while Lower takes into consideration the frontier thesis and the church-sect theory, it is nevertheless apparent he is still working within the basic interpretive framework which he had elaborated in his essay of 1943.

The only further refinement Lower introduced into his analysis of the role of religion in Canadian society, appeared four years later in his monograph entitled This Most Famous Stream. (49) Here he made a basic distinction between the Protestantism of modern times and that of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In his earlier article, Lower had mentioned this other side of Protestantism, but his major focus had been upon the commercial and materialist spirit fostered by Calvinism. By 1954, he was prepared to say, "No other historical phenomenon was to influence so profoundly the world in which we live as this new Protestantism, hardly even the Industrial Revolution itself." (50)

This distinction between the old and new Protestantism represented a shift of emphasis in his assessment of the impact of Protestantism on the English speaking world. "The major concern of the new Protestantism," he continued, "was not so much with the salvation of the individual soul as with the society in which the individual lived." (51) Lower saw the source of this new Protestantism in John Wesley. From Wesley's evangelistic revival of Protestantism, Lower argues, flow the great liberating movements for prison reform, the abolition of slavery, popular education, hospitals and improvement of public health. When the original genius of Methodism was transferred to the secular sphere about the period of the first world war, Methodists in Canada found it natural to enter politics and to become active in the left wing political movements. (52)

Lower painted his colorful pictures of Canada and Canadian religion with a broad brush. There are consequently many details with which one would like to quarrel. No one can deny, however, that he contributed a vivid and colourful perspective which has had more influence upon the interpretation of religion in Canada than any other single perspective.

In 1956, H. H. Walsh published a volume entitled The Christian Church in Canada (53). He adopted Lower's thesis as his main theme. He did not think too much of the frontier thesis or the environmentalists' interpretation of Canadian history. "Far more important than environment and strong personalities," he argued, "is the existence of two major cultural groups within one national framework. The clash of cultures is the great Canadian theme, for it brought about confederation and was a great determining factor in shaping our fundamental instrument of government, the British North America Act of 1867." (54)

Walsh, however, was not completely content with this one theme as a center around which to organize his treatment of The Christian Church in Canada. Besides the clash of cultures he wished to include the clash of church and sect and the related clash of established church versus voluntary church conceptions. The dynamics of the latter church struggle, however, were largely within the Protestant church, whereas the clash of cultures involved the relationship between Roman Catholic church and the Protestant church. These problems were never clarified. Consequently Walsh's book suffers from a lack of methodological clarity and as a result he did not achieve an integrated picture of the role of religion in the development of Canadian society. Lower, in his review of The Christian Church in Canada, saw it as little more than "a convenient though not authoritative sketch for persons who should know something of the subject (such as students of theology) but have not much time to devote to it." The only positive thing Lower could say of the work was that it was "possibly an indication of the interest slowly being awakened in an important field of Canadian scholarship - religion in history." (55)

In The Vertical Mosaic, (56) John Porter makes no reference to Lower's views on religion in Canadian society, but goes back to Max Weber and Andre Siegfried (which were Lower's sources of inspiration) and develops a view of the significance of religion in Canadian social development which is very similar, if not identical with Lower's. As the

subtitle of Porter's book suggests, his main concern is with an analysis of social class and the structure of power in Canadian society. Closely related to this main theme is "the influence of ethnic affiliation and religion on class structure."

Using the variables of ethnicity and religion, Porter found Catholics and particularly French Roman Catholics lower in the class structure in proportion to their numbers than Protestants and particularly Anglo-Saxon Protestants. And because social structure is directly related to the structure of power in any society, he found many more Anglo-Saxon Protestants in the upper reaches of the institutions of power such as the economic elite, the labor elite, the political elite and the federal bureaucracy of Canadian society. It is easy to conclude on the basis of the Weber-Tawney thesis therefore, that Catholicism and the values which it represents in education and elsewhere in society are incompatible with a fully developed industrial order. It is strange, however, that a book published in 1965 makes no mention of the massive critical literature which has developed around the Weber-Tawney thesis. (57) In fact, the whole thesis is now so open to question one would have thought it would be necessary to defend the use of it. Porter, however, makes no effort to defend it.

Consequently, it is not surprising to discover William F. Ryan challenging Porter's thesis that "Quebec's Catholic hierarchy assumed a reactionary attitude to the industrialization of the province." In a book entitled The Clergy and Economic Growth in Quebec, 1896 - 1914 (58), Ryan sets out to challenge not only Porter but also the commonplace idea of Canadian historiography that "Catholicism has impeded economic development in the French-Canadian province of Quebec," which has been perpetuated by Lower, S. D. Clark and Conrad Langlois, to name only a few.

Ryan's book focuses on "the influence exercised by the Catholic Church on the economic spurt that took place in the province of Quebec in the period 1896-1914." His conclusions are that "the Catholic Church in Quebec, which has commonly been portrayed in Anglo-Saxon circles as being perhaps the major negative force impeding economic development in that province, has in reality been more concerned about and more deeply involved in the promotion of such development than most churches in Anglo-Saxon countries. Clearly the major levers of rapid economic

development and especially of rapid industrialization are not to be sought in the attitudes and initiatives of the Catholic Church, however great her influence, but rather in more prosaic economic factors such as entrepreneurship, abundant capital and technical know-how." (59)

As Cameron Nish has suggested, (60) much more research is required before it will be possible to completely demolish such a deeply rooted canon of interpretation in Canadian Anglo-Saxon historiography. Yet Ryan's work is sufficiently substantial to constitute a very serious dint in this interpretation of the role of religion in the development of Canadian society. Perhaps it will take some time for it to wither and die but in the meantime it appears clear that some new perspective is required from which to view this problem.

IV

In an essay entitled "Asking Questions of the Canadian Past," published in 1955 (61) John Grant noted "the subtle temptation to write into Canadian church history assumptions derived from the study of other countries." The danger in this approach, he suggested, lies in the fact "we may easily be led to overlook differences that are as striking as the similarities and sometimes even more significant." As he points out, "the analogy of the American frontier has been particularly misleading." Moreover, "S. D. Clark's excellent work, Church and Sect in Canada, is deprived of some of its value by the author's apparent determination to read out of Canadian evidence conclusions suggested by studies elsewhere." And "even Dr. Lower, who usually succeeds in writing the Canadian story from within, has succumbed at times to the tempting American analogy." (62)

To avoid the temptation of using suggestive analogies from other countries and to assist Canadian church historians in asking questions "of magnitude, relevance, and relation" to "our sense of identity as Canadians," Grant suggested four problems whose solution would provide worthy themes for an analysis of the uniqueness of Canadian ecclesiastical experience: "the influence of religious issues on the whole Canadian political tradition;" "the problem of church and state in Canada;" "the development of a Canadian attitude to denominations;" and finally,

"distinctive Canadian features in church life."

This essay has proven in retrospect to mark the beginning of a new era in the study of religion in its Canadian context. Beginning with the publication in 1959 of John S. Moir's Church and State in Canada West (63), almost every year a major work related to the four problems suggested by Grant in this essay has been published. (64) Each in its own way has attempted to analyze the uniqueness of religion in Canadian society. No new overall perspective on relations of religion and Canadian society has arisen out of this research and publication to offer an alternative to the three perspectives discussed earlier. This work, however, has revealed that Grant's call for a church history which would be relevant to the Canadian sense of identity did strike a responsive chord in a large number of individuals who were interested in these problems.

Since the mid-fifties Canadians have been involved in a search for a national identity. Having recently emerged from colonial status, Canadians became increasingly aware of the extent to which their economy was intertwined with that of the United States and with the advent of television in the mid-fifties Canadians were also becoming increasingly aware of the acute dangers of cultural domination by the United States. As a result of this awareness church historians sensed the need to do their part in the search for the uniqueness of the Canadian experience.

The search for identity, however, was not only a search for a Canadian identity. It was also a search for the identity of the Canadian church historian. For behind Grant's rejection of the "suggestive American analogies" other factors can be discerned. The sociologists and secular historians had proven their dominance in the field at a time when Canadian church historians were just beginning to become self-consciously aware of themselves as a group. Five years after Grant's paper appeared the Canadian Society of Church History in 1960 as a parallel to the American Society of Church History which was formed in 1888. It was natural therefore that a young discipline in the process of defining its identity would begin by defining its boundaries and by guarding its frontiers.

The threat to its identity came not simply from "suggestive American analogies" but also from sociology. While Grant was concerned with the former, it was H. H. Walsh who was concerned with the latter.

He was convinced that Canadian church historians ought to look to theology (particularly in its neo-orthodox form) rather than sociology for its inspiration.

There was, of course, a danger here of reactivating what Northrup Fry (65) has called the "garrison mentality", which sees the standards and values of a particular isolated community as a fortress to be defended against alien influences. To reject the conceptual framework which had been used in the interpretation of the relation between religion and the development of Canadian society was to reject a tradition of historical synthesis which was in fact an integral part of the Canadian identity - namely an identity which has been created by living in dynamic tension between British and American cultures and which has felt free, as Kaspar Naegele has pointed out, to accept and reject various aspects of the English and American models of culture and society. (66)

As the historian's context changes it is inevitable that his perspective will change, both with regard to the facts which he considers important and to the limitations which he perceives in the tradition of historical synthesis preceding him. It ought not to surprise anyone therefore, that as one reviews the tradition of historical synthesis from the perspective of 1969, it looks quite different than it did in 1955.

As it appears today the basic problem lies not so much in the importing of foreign perspectives or sociological insights, but rather in the narrowness of the conception of religion and religious phenomenon which is implied in all of these perspectives. In almost all cases religion is defined in institutional terms (i.e., in terms of churches or groups which are in the process of becoming churches). By placing the focus here the tendency is to concentrate on the articulate leadership of these institutions and the official publications which these institutions have sponsored. While no one can reasonably doubt the importance of such documents, there is no guarantee that they provide an accurate reflection of the real religious life of the nation. To get at this level of material it is necessary to broaden our definition of religion to include not simply Judeo-Christian institutions but a wide variety of non-institutional and para-religious phenomenon. Those who have accepted the conclusions of recent comparative studies that

Canadian religion has been more institutionally oriented than American religion may feel that the study of Canadian religion ought to continue to be focused on its major institutional expressions. There are, however, a number of areas in the study of Canadian religion which might benefit by being viewed through a broader definition of religion (one which is free from the negative implications which Barth gave to this word), a new methodology which readily uses the insights of sociology, comparative studies and the history of religions, and a new perspective from which to view the function of religion in Canadian society.

In part, the basis for such a new perspective has been provided by John Porter (67), not in his treatment of religion in terms of the Weber-Tawney thesis, but rather in his classification of the mass media, the universities and the churches under the general category of the "Ideological System." Following Karl Mannheim and other advocates of the sociology of knowledge, Porter sees the ideological function of society as that of maintaining the value system which gives cohesion and unity and also a sense of legitimacy to the social order and particularly practices and usages within a given society. To maintain the value system, to ensure its transmission to newcomers and succeeding generations, society relies upon certain institutions such as schools, churches and the mass media to carry out these functions. Although Porter notes "how important religion has been in the structure of social ideology and in legitimating of power structures" in Canadian society he does not give a detailed analysis of how it has functioned. Part of his problem was that there are few historical studies available which would have assisted him in the elaboration of such a theme. Yet surely there is a perspective here which would throw much light on the relationship between religion and Canadian society.

There has obviously been conflict between religious groups in Canada, but there has also been a large measure of consensus. Otherwise the ideological system and its value structure would have collapsed. Beyond the pluralism of competing religious institutions therefore, what have been the deep and abiding symbols of unity to which all Canadians have given assent? In what ways has religion contributed to the development and communication of these symbols? In periods of rapid social change and national crisis which precipitate symbol transformation,

how has religion responded in bridging the gaps between the old and new situations? These are the type of questions which this perspective raised and the answers to these would contribute greatly to our understanding of the function of religion in Canadian society.

Rather than narrowing the focus of Canadian church history and limiting its conceptual tools, therefore, it seems clear at this point that the discipline ought to be opened up. For this is the only way in which to overcome the limitations of the historical study of religion in the Canadian context and to bring it into dialogue with those disciplines which are currently deepening our understanding of the meaning and function of religion in the world today.

FOOTNOTES

1. J.M.S. Careless, "Frontierism, Metropolitanism and Canadian History," Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XXXV (1954).

2. E.H. Oliver, The Winning of the Frontier, (Toronto, Ryerson Press, 1930). Biographical materials are available in Clarence MacKinnon's A Life of Principal Oliver (Toronto, Ryerson Press, 1936), and the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Ord. series, Vol. XXX (1936) Proceedings, p. XV-XVIII.

3. cf. Gene M. Gressley, "The Turner Thesis: A Problem in Historiography," Agricultural History, XXXII (1958) p. 227-249. The two most recent studies of the Turner - Anti-Turner debate are Richard Hofstadter, The Progressive Historians (New York, Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1968). The latter work contains an excellent bibliographical essay on all aspects of the controversy.

4. Walter N. Sage, "Some Aspects of the Frontier in Canadian History," Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association (1928) (Ottawa, Department of Public Archives, 1929) p. 62-72.

5. John L. McDougall, "The Frontier School and Canadian History," Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association (1929) p. 125. cf. Morris Zaslow, "The Frontier Hypothesis in Recent Historiography," Canadian Historical Review Vol. XXIX (1948) p. 153 ff.

6. John T. McNeil, review of The Winning of the Frontier, (Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XII, 1930), p. 81.

7. ibid., p. 81.

8. One of the few clues to any direct connection between Oliver and the Turner thesis is through Edwin R.A. Seligman, one of his Ph.D. thesis advisors at Columbia. Lee Benson has pointed out in Turner and Beard: American Historical Writing Reconsidered, (Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1960), that Seligman was the man probably most responsible for bringing Achille Loria to the attention of American scholars and as Benson shows Loria's economic thought had a major impact upon Turner's "frontier thesis." (Benson, ibid., p. 21-34). Oliver's colleague at the University of Saskatchewan, A.S. Morton, was also a proponent of the frontier thesis.

9. cf. Sidney Mead, "Prof. Sweet's Religion and Culture in America: A Review Article," Church History, Vol. 22 (1953), p. 35 ff.

10. E.H. Oliver, The Winning of the Frontier, (Toronto, Ryerson Press, 1930), p. 1.

11. The Winning of the Frontier, p. 1.

12. ibid., p. 1.

13. ibid., p. 2.

Footnotes -cont-

14. ibid., p. 3.

15. Claris Edwin Silcox, Church Union in Canada: Its Causes and Consequences, (New York, Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1933). cf. Seymour Martin Lipset, Agrarian Socialism (U. of California Press, 1950: reissued by Doubleday Anchor Books, 1968). Lipset also argues that church union in Canada "was largely a movement of the Canadian West." p. 41ff.

16. G. Dorey, "Factors which have affected the Development of our Church: Topography, Climate and Rainfall and the Determining Facts of History," Robertson Lectures 1952-53 (United Church Archives).

17. Gerald R. Cragg, "The Present Position and Future Prospects of Canadian Theology," Canadian Journal of Theology, Vol. 1, 1955, p. 6.

18. e.g. Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Shirley Jackson Case, W. C. Graham, Peter G. Mode, John T. McNeil, William Hordern, Gordon Harland, Larry Tombs, MacLean Gilmour, James Smart and recently Gerald R. Cragg himself, to mention only a few.

19. H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism, (Henry Holt and Co., 1929) reprinted by Meridian Books, 1957.

20. Benton Johnson, "A Critical Appraisal of the Church-Sect Typology," American Sociological Review, vol. 22, (1957) p. 89.

21. S.D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto, U. of Toronto Press, 1948).

22. S. D. Clark, The Social Development of Canada, (Toronto, U. of Toronto Press, 1942).

23. S.D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada, op. cit., p. vii.

24. J. B. Brebner, review of S.D. Clark's Church and Sect in Canada, Canadian Historical Review, Vol. 30, p. 76.

25. S.D. Clark, The Social Development of Canada, op.cit., p. 1, fn. 1.

26. Milton Yinger, Religion, Society and the Individual (New York: Macmillan Co., 1951), p. 148-155.

27. Peter L. Berger, "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," Social Research, Vol. 21 (Winter, 1954), p. 474ff.

28. W.E. Mann, Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta, (Toronto, U. of Toronto Press, 1955).

29. Franklin H. Littell, From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History, (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., 1962), p. XIX. cf. Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963), p. 104.

Footnotes -cont-

30. cf. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. VI, nos. 1 & 2, (1967) for a recent reappraisal of the church-sect typology by Paul Gustafson, Erich Goode, N.J. Demarath and A.W. Eister.

31. H.H. Walsh, "Canada and the Church: A Job for the Historians," Queens Quarterly, 1954, 61:78.

32. M.W. Armstrong, The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809, (Hartford, Conn: The American Society of Church History, 1948).

33. H.H. Walsh, The Christian Church in Canada (Toronto, Ryerson Press, 1956).

34. John Moir, "The Sectarian Tradition in Canada," The Churches and the Canadian Experience, ed. by John W. Grant, (Toronto, Ryerson Press, 1963).

35. J. Moir, ibid., p. 132.

36. H.H. Walsh, "A Canadian Christian Tradition," The Churches and the Canadian Experience, ibid., p. 158. cf. John W. Grant, "Asking Questions of the Canadian Past," Canadian Journal of Theology, Vol. 1 (1955), p. 103 for a similar point of view.

37. cf. Bryan R. Wilson, Sects and Society (London: Heinemann, 1961); Religion in Secular Society (London: Penguin Books, 1968); Patterns of Sectarianism, ed. by B.R. Wilson (London, Heinemann, 1967).

38. This article has been recently reprinted in Approaches to Canadian History, ed. by Carl Berger (Toronto, U. of Toronto Press, 1967) pp. 15-28. Page references will be to this edition. For a brief comment on the circumstances surrounding the writing and presentation of this paper cf. Lower's autobiography My First Seventy-Five Years (Toronto, Macmillan of Canada, 1967), p. 272 ff.

39. A.R.M. Lower - review of The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence, 1760-1850, by D.G. Creighton, Canadian Historical Review, Vol. 19, (1938), p. 207-210.

40. Andre Siegfried, The Race Question in Canada, (English trans. London, 1907 - reissued, McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, 1966), p. 15.

41. A.R.M. Lower, "Two Ways of Life: The Primary Antithesis of Canadian History," op. cit., p. 22.

42. ibid., p. 22.

43. ibid., p. 24.

44. G.W. Brown, (ed.), Canada (Berkeley & Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1950).

45. ibid., p. 463.

46. ibid., p. 463.

Footnotes -cont-

47. ibid., p. 465. cf. A.R.M. Lower, My First Seventy-Five Years op.cit., Lower says that Turner's essay is "the most formative piece of writing in modern history." "While many a man," he continues, "has studied the relation of man to his environment,... no one else prior to Turner hit the target so neatly in the bull's eye. Turner is open to the serious limitation that his view of the frontier, that is, of the moving edge of civilization into the wilderness, is purely American and hence rather parochial, but it is still the case that his conception has awakened response from every historian worth his salt and has been applied negatively and positively but always with illuminating effect to a thousand situations." p. 152.

48. ibid., p. 464.

49. A.R.M. Lower, This Most Famous Stream, (Toronto, Ryerson Press, 1954)

50. ibid., p. 126.

51. ibid., p. 126.

52. S.M. Sipset in his Agrarian Socialism (op.cit.) also emphasizes this point. After noting that the Methodists are the largest group in the United Church of Canada (p. 218) he states: "The United Church of Canada is comparable to the non-conformist workingmen's churches of Great Britain. It has stressed the social gospel aspect of Christianity. Many of its leaders have been active in secular reform activities... Since it has the least fundamentalist and conservative creed, the United Church tends to attract and influence those who believe in a liberal Christianity that is concerned with establishing 'the good life' on earth." (p. 211-212). Recently Lipset has emphasized the Clark-Underhill thesis concerning Canada's counter-revolutionary tradition and has claimed that "religious organization in Canada, emphasizing elitism and particularism, acted as a counter-force inhibiting excessive individualism (self-orientation) and egalitarianism." cf. "Revolution and Counter-Revolution - The United States and Canada, "The Revolutionary Theme in Contemporary America, ed. Thomas R. Ford, (Lexington, Ky., University of Kentucky Press, 1967), p. 45. The first elaboration of the significance of Canada's counter-revolutionary tradition for the church which I have been able to discover, is in an address by Harold A. Innis on "The Church in Canada" given to the United Church's Board of Evangelism and Social Service on March 18, 1947. cf. The Annual Report (1947), p. 47 ff.

53. H.H. Walsh, op. cit.

54. "The Canadian Heritage in Canada," op. cit., p. 272.

55. A.R.M. Lower, review of "The Christian Church in Canada," by H.H. Walsh, Canadian Historical Review, Vol. 39 (1958), p. 251-252.

56. John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto, U. of Toronto Press, 1965).

Footnotes -cont-

57. cf. S.N. Eisenstadt (ed.), The Protestant Ethic and Modernization: A Comparative View (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), for the best modern discussion of this debate. The extensive bibliographies contained in this work point to the massive literature which was available on this subject prior to 1965 when Porter's work was published.

58. William F. Ryan, S.M., The Clergy and Economic Growth in Quebec, 1896-1914, (Quebec, Les Presses De L'Universite Laval, 1966).

59. ibid., p. 300.

60. Cameron Nish, review of The Clergy and Economic Growth in Quebec, 1896-1914, by William F. Ryan, American Historical Review, Vol. 72, July, 1967, p. 1521.

61. John W. Grant, "Asking Questions of the Canadian Past," Canadian Journal of Theology, Vol. 1, No. 2 (July, 1955), p. 98 ff.

62. ibid., p. 101.

63. John S. Moir, Church and State in Canada West (Toronto, U. of Toronto Press, 1959).

64. cf. S. Crysdale, The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1961); G.S. French, Parsons and Politics: The Role of the Wesleyan Methodists in Upper Canada and the Maritimes from 1780-1855, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962); J.W. Grant (ed.) The Churches and the Canadian Experience (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1963); W.H. Elgee, The Social Teachings of the Canadian Churches, Protestant, The Early Period, before 1850, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1964); D.C. Masters, Protestant Church Colleges in Canada, (Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1966); J.W. Grant, The Canadian Experience of Church Union, (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1967).

65. C.F. Klinck, et al., eds., Literary History of Canada (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1965, revised ed. 1967), p. 830 ff.

66. K. Naegele, "Canadian Society: Some Reflections," in Bernard Blishen et al., ed., Canadian Society (New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., first ed., 1961), p. 27 ff. It should be noted that much of this material has been cut out of the third edition published by Macmillan of Canada, 1968.

67. John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic, op. cit.

CATHOLIC MODERATES AND THE RELIGION OF COMPROMISE IN LATE SIXTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE

by
E. M. Beame
McMaster University

Despite accumulating evidence and our increasing sophistication in treating historical problems, stereotypes die hard. We continue to cling to outmoded and often inaccurate concepts for the sake of convenience or because they aptly express our own prejudices towards the past. So it is with our conception of the politiques of the French Wars of Religion. Not only have we been unhistorical in persisting to regard the politiques as a cohesive party of moderates juxtaposed between warring factions of Catholics and Huguenots; but we have also been indiscriminate in accepting the harsh and biased characterizations of the group by their more fanatical contemporaries.

The term politique was used in the vaguest way by publicists and pamphleteers of the sixteenth century. In the early part of the century the word had, at the worst, an innocuous connotation and, at the best, a meaning signifying statesmanship; in the heat of the Religious Wars it was transformed into a general term of opprobrium.[1] Zealous Catholics used it to denote what they considered the lack of religious concern of moderates who sought a modus vivendi with the Protestants; and so the politiques were described as "those who prefer the peacefulness of the kingdom or their own repose, to the salvation of their souls."[2] As the wars progressed, the diatribes against the politiques became more frequent and more acerbic. Nowhere, however, is a meaningful definition or identification given; instead, politiques are referred to in general terms of disdain, such as "supporters of heretics", "atheists" or "Machiavellians."[3]

These epithets, of course, are not very informative and they reveal more about the attitude of the author than about the subject; yet they all point to a common accusation--that the politiques were non-religious, at least not orthodox Catholics, and that they subordinated religious considerations to political ones. One of the more subdued of the anti-politique tracts, bearing the title La Foy et Religion des Politiques de

ce temps,[4] asserted that the politiques

> are not quite manifest Huguenots, nor true and zealous Catholics, but are a mixed goods, a shop full of so many kinds of drugs so confusedly mixed together that it is very difficult and dangerous to set down a perfect definition of them.

Of one thing, though, the author is certain, that whenever one hears the cry of "the State, the State, Government, Government, without concern in the first place for religion," there is a politique.[5]

These accusations undoubtedly contain some element of truth, especially the charges of excess statism. Most of the Catholic moderates who spoke out for toleration or some form of accommodation with the Huguenots argued from the standpoint of expediency and the necessity of the survival of the state: To attempt to extirpate heresy by force, they claimed, would only bring on civil war and civic ruin. Whether or not the politiques, in so reasoning, developed the principle of raison d'etat, as some claim,[6] is not of especial concern here; suffice to say that their opponents who argued that to permit the exercise of two religions would bring on the collapse of the French monarchy, are open to the same charge. More serious are the accusations which call into question the Catholic orthodoxy and even the Christian belief of these moderates.

The very approach of the moderates to the problems arising from the Reformation made them suspect of heretical leanings. They agreed with many Protestant claims concerning abuses in the Catholic Church; they emphasized the essential similarity of both religions; and they were willing to concede some form of religious toleration. If their friendships with influential Huguenots were not sufficient to taint their Catholic orthodoxy, then their occasional sympathies with Protestant ideas did. Charles de Marillac, Archbishop of Vienna, was accused of favoring Lutheran doctrines in the 1530's; the Gallican theorist, Pierre Pithou, was a convert from Calvinism; and Jean Bodin has been charged, though erroneously,[7] with adhering to the new religion. The moderate Bishop of Valence, Jean de Monluc, of whom even Théodore de Bèze remarked that he "made a sort of mixture of both doctrines" (faisoit comme un

melange des deux doctrines), was tried at Rome for heresy and only avoided deposition through royal pressure.[8] Chancellor Michel de L'Hôpital, by virtue of the fact that almost his entire family, including his wife, openly espoused the Calvinist creed and that he himself held some questionable opinions, was regarded by his detractors as leaning towards Protestantism. Even Montaigne, whose adherence to Catholicism was not really questioned in his own day, was criticized at Rome for quoting the poetry of Bezè and Buchanan.[9]

This list of examples can be extended considerably, and understandably so, for Calvinism pervaded the upper levels of French society and was especially marked among clerics and intellectuals. The temptation to flirt with Protestant ideas was undoubtedly very strong among sensitive Catholics concerned with the reform of ecclesiastical abuses, and these Catholics were always attentive to the charges of corruption made by the Reformers. In their readiness to listen, however, did they, as some of their contemporaries alleged, expose themselves to seduction by Protestant doctrines? This may have been so in some instances. Monluc, for example, in his desire to conciliate the Huguenots, was ready to introduce major doctrinal modifications. In a series of sermons and instructions published between 1557 and 1561 he not only attacked the cult of images and the invocation of the saints, but he also questioned the Catholic position on the Eucharist, purgatory, free will, and the efficacy of works;[10] during the Colloquy of Poissy Monluc refused to receive communion from the Cardinal of Armagnac, preferring to take it in both kinds in the Genevan fashion.[11]

It must be noted, though, that Monluc's deviations from orthodoxy occurred while the results of the Council of Trent were still in doubt. After 1564 he ceased his doctrinal pronouncements and he died a good Catholic. In the case of Marillac, whatever inclinations he had towards the new doctrines appeared in the 1530's when Protestantism was first beginning to gain converts and when the policy of Francis I towards heresy was anything but consistent. His biographer claims that during the remainder of his life Marillac demonstrated no attachment to, nor any particular sympathy for, the Reformation.[12]

As for Chancellor L'Hôpital, the accusations of heretical tendencies were not without circumstantial evidence. Apart from his belief in toleration and the defections within his own family, L'Hôpital's Christianity is largely evangelic and scriptural and in his writings there is no affirmation of specific Catholic dogmas and traditions. At the Colloquy of Poissy the Chancellor refused to consider the Calvinists as heretics, for, he argued, "they believe in God, the Trinity, acknowledge Holy Scripture and seek no salvation other than in the Lord Jesus Christ."[13]

With one exception, L'Hôpital reveals nothing more of his doctrinal attachments, and that exception is an assertion of predestination, savouring of Calvinism, that is found in a letter to Margaret of Savoy (1572-73): "Nobody", he wrote,

> reaches heaven by his own virtue, in spite of his piety and his innocence; no one can be his own guide. It is the grace of God that summons us and directs us. All that we receive is from Him who chose at the beginning of the world the elect whom He would associate with His Empire.[14]

Is this statement, appearing late in his life, final proof of the former Chancellor's Protestantism? Actually, as an affirmation of Calvinistic predestination, it is incomplete. God is described as the initial cause and His grace a sine qua non of man's salvation; but nowhere is God described as the sole active means and man the passive recipient of salvation, as with Calvin.[15] Moreover, in another letter of the same period L'Hôpital asserts that everyone is "punished or rewarded according to his works."[16] What emerges then is a fairly orthodox Catholic view of predestination, not unlike that described by Loyola in Rules 14 and 15 For Thinking With the Church,[17] in which predestination does not rule out free will and human merit. Thus, in the absence of more concrete evidence to the contrary, one must accept the fact of the Chancellor's Catholic orthodoxy.[18]

What contemporaries mistook for Calvinistic sympathies was nothing more than L'Hôpital's humanistic conception of Christianity which favoured simplicity over formalism, morality over theology, and Holy Scripture over philosophy-- a conception which might aptly be termed Erasmian. L'Hôpital,

moreover, was not alone among the French moderates of this period to partake of the Erasmian tradition; in one way or another the great majority of those labelled politiques were spiritually indebted to this Christian humanist. Perhaps, though, a note of caution should be inserted at this point concerning the use of the adjective "Erasmian." Ever since the publication of the pioneering works of Renaudet, Bataillon and Phillips,[19] there has been a tendency to consider Erasmus as a ubiquitous spirit influencing religious moderates everywhere in Europe. Unfortunately, the nature of a spirit is such that it is not readily discernible; and too often similarity of ideas is mistaken for influence. By the onset of the Wars of Religion only a few of the older French humanists could have had personal contact with Erasmus or with his contemporaries; hence the possibility of direct influence was remote. What joins the politiques to Erasmus is a continuing stream of French Christian-humanistic thought which nurtured their ideas--ideas that may be termed Erasmian only because Erasmus represented their apotheosis.

In the case of L'Hôpital the ties with Erasmus were more direct, for the two humanists enjoyed a number of common friendships and associations.[20] No other French moderate of this period endorsed the religious sentiments of Erasmus so strongly; L'Hôpital, like Erasmus, conceived of Christianity as essentially moral and pious living modelled upon the Scriptures and the life of Christ. Religion had to be spontaneous, sincere, simple and devoid of ostentation. "We must not adore the unique Eternal God," he wrote to Claude d'Espence

> ...by the varied concert of our songs, by harmonious poems praised by the masses...Our style must be simple, without preparation, without refinement, without ornament, but filled with a serious dignity. It is enough to express the sentiments innate in our hearts under the inspiration of a natural sincerity....

Questions of dogma, scholastic arguments, and inquiries into the finer points of Christian doctrine had no real place in L'Hôpital's religious system; in words that could easily have come from the pen of Erasmus, he lamented the preoccupation of theologians with such matters:

> Here it is nearly six hundred years that Aristotle reigns in the temple of Christ and that Saint Paul was chased from it. Apes of all sects walked in strange garb and supplied us with Greek philosophy and not the religion of Jesus. 22

As a Christian humanist L'Hôpital saw no contradiction between Christianity and the classics, but he was hardly as reverent of Cicero and the pagan classics as was Erasmus; nor did he display the same optimism about human achievements and free will.

Perhaps L'Hôpital most clearly resembles the great humanist in his attitude towards the Reformation. He refused to admit that the religious split was irrevocable or that the gulf which separated Catholics and Protestants was especially wide. Before the Estates-General at Orleans he pleaded: "Let us get rid of these diabolical words, names of parts, factions and seditions, Lutherans, Huguenots, Papists: Let us not change the name of Christians."[24] As an Erasmian, L'Hôpital was unwilling to concede the idea of a dismembered Church; but he ruled out force as a means of restoring religious unity and he was far from optimistic about the ability of colloquies and doctrinal debates to heal the schism: "You say that your religion is better, I defend mine: What is more reasonable, that I follow your opinion, or you mine?"[25]

The root cause of heresy, as L'Hôpital saw it, was moral degeneration within the Church--the preoccupation of the clergy with luxury, worldliness, and power. Only through internal church reform, through moral purification, could the underlying reasons for religious dissidence be removed. Then reconciliation would follow as a matter of course and other differences could be worked out later. This is the program that the Chancellor had in mind when he wrote to the Cardinal of Lorraine at Trent:

> Let morals be reformed first, beliefs reformed later on. There is the best means to prepare and assuage minds. You sow good grain in vain if the earth is not ready to receive it; you will reap only tares and bad herbs. 26

Was this not also the program of Erasmus?

Few of the moderates present so complete a picture of their religious feelings, but the glimpses that they reveal indicate a striking

similarity of views. There were different embellishments and shifting emphases, as might be expected, but these were largely variations on the same theme. A distinctive pattern, though, emerges: The church is considered a spiritual institution, whose rites and ceremonial are of a secondary religious significance: "The essence of religion," wrote Pierre Gravelle, "does not lie in external things, but in the observance of the positive and certain commandments of God."[27] Theology is more or less ignored, while the essential feature of Christianity becomes the exemplary moral life, lived in imitation of Christ: "Let us learn to love God and to love our neighbor as ourselves," urges one politique, "and let us learn charity which is the whole substance of religion;"28 and another asserts "that the greatest and principal commandment is charity....which we must acquire during this life, as it is the perfection of the Christian man."[29]

The restoration of church unity, whether for political, social or religious reasons, was a matter of prime concern to the moderates; their formulas for achieving it, though, varied widely. None would accept the use of force, and some form of limited toleration seemed a necessity; but what sort of sacrifices had to be made? Did unity have to be at the expense of Roman Catholic doctrine? Of course, the answer depends upon one's definition of Catholic doctrine, and these Erasmian moderates tended to construe doctrine loosely. Still, a considerable number of them would permit no meddling with Catholic beliefs. L'Hôpital, for example, was hostile to dogmatic modifications mainly because he was afraid that theological discussions would lead to a disregard for religious essentials.[30] To Étienne Pasquier, who fervently desired Christian reunion, any attempt at doctrinal compromise would only upset the Church. In an apologia written to Nicholas Brûlart, he disparaged past efforts of Church Councils to establish articles of faith, and added:

> Our faith was...established by Holy Scripture, the authority of the Holy Fathers, as well as by the traditions of the Church. If there are some abuses they should be removed without uprooting that which we held to for so long. If you open the door to disputes there is not an article of faith that ill-bred and vicious persons cannot call in question. 31

Even Montaigne, whose religious zeal has been laid open to doubt, criticized the willingness of more conciliatory Catholics to compromise on dogma:

> They fancy they are behaving like moderate and prudent men when they concede to their opponents some of the articles in dispute... We should either wholly submit to the authority of our ecclesiastical government or altogether dispense with it. It is not for us to determine what degree of obedience we owe it. 32

Underlying this refusal to seek a doctrinal rapprochement with the Protestants was the belief that their defection could be attributed entirely to ecclesiastical abuses. Despite the wide diffusion of Calvin's Institutes, despite the redaction of Reformed Confessions of Faith, and despite the anathemas of Trent, politiques continued to maintain throughout the Religious Wars that institutional reform of the Catholic Church would remove the major obstacle to religious reunion. L'Hôpital, Pasquier, François de Montholon and Pierre du Belloy, as well as many other anonymous politique pamphleteers, all expressed this conviction, while Etienne La Boétie went so far as to make it the basis of his solution to the problem of religious disunity.

As La Boétie saw it, doctrine had played a negligible role in producing the schism, for those who left the Catholic Church, if they considered its doctrines at all, had mistaken the lax morality of the priests for false belief. "They separated not because they thought that we hold a false opinion," La Boétie claimed, "for they understand neither ours nor theirs; often, hearing them speak of it, they speak as much against their doctrine as against ours."[33] The vast majority of those who had joined the Reformed churches did so because of dissatisfaction with aspects of Catholic ceremony and observances; and these matters could easily be compromised without sacrificing Catholic doctrine. Thus, as a means of bringing back the dissidents, he would, among other things, reform the lives of the clergy, redefine iconographic policies, and alter the method of administering the sacraments.[34]

Although La Boétie displays considerable insight into the causes of the French Reformation, the solution that he offers for the problem of religious division was too simplistic for the majority of Catholic moderates. To them the question of doctrine could not be brushed aside

so easily; reform of abuses would be ineffective unless accompanied by some measure of doctrinal concord. They were willing, therefore, to enter into theological discussions with the Protestants, and they applauded Catherine de'Medici when she called leading Catholics and Calvinists together at Poissy in 1561 to find a doctrinal basis for uniting the French churches. Unfortunately, the Cardinal of Lorraine, who led the Catholic prelates, insisted that agreement be reached first on the thorny question of the Real Presence in the Eucharist; hence the Colloquy was doomed to failure from the start.

Another approach to doctrinal compromise was presented to the delegates at Poissy in the form of a pamphlet by the Belgian irenicist, Georg Cassander. This was the De officio pii ac publicae tranquilitatis vere amantis viri in hoc religionis dissidio (1561) which had been written as a solution to the problem of German religious division. Cassander was unquestionably an Erasmian: He apparently had read the major works of Erasmus and was much impressed with the Enchiridion; his basic Christian impulse was ethical; and he valued morality far above dogma. But Cassander realized the futility of attempting a religious rapprochement without some concession to Protestant liturgical practices, and, more important, without an agreement on a fundamental theological creed.

Thus, he proposes that both sides agree to a brief statement of the essential doctrines of true Christianity, which would reflect a belief in the life, death and resurrection of Christ.[35] When this is accomplished the door to unity would be open, for "those who are bound together by a correct feeling about Christ...even though they disagree over certain opinions and rites," must not be considered heretics or schismatics.[36] And Cassander goes on to state that

> every church which rests on the foundation of the true and apostolic doctrine contained in the brief symbol of the faith, and which is not separated by an impious schism from the communion of other churches, ..I regard... as a member of the true church and the catholic church of Christ. 37

Actually, Cassander is attempting to circumvent the theological impasse to religious unity by defining as essential Christian beliefs

only those doctrines that the churches already held in common. The finer theological tenets, those dogmas which had been the subject of heated Reformation debates, he considers more or less adiaphora, and he classifies them as rites and ceremonies rather than as doctrines. Yet he was orthodox to the degree that he would not reject any doctrine or observance of the Catholic Church. These he accepts because they are based on tradition; and, unlike Erasmus, he would not abolish such abused practices as the veneration of saints, the cult of relics and indulgences. His only concern was that those who object to them not be considered heretics.

The Cassandrian prescription for reaching Christian concord by agreement on a minimum of essential dogmas became a favorite recipe of the French-Catholic moderates in their search for a cure for religious disunity.[38] His formula of reductio ad brevissimum ac simplicissimum could have been expected to pose some difficulty for French Catholics after the Council of Trent completed its work in 1564; however, the publication of the Tridentine Decrees in France was delayed until 1615, making it possible for moderates to ignore the pronouncements of the Council and to proclaim that Catholics and Huguenots were sufficiently in agreement on doctrinal matters to effect a national religious unity. Despite all the rancour produced by thirty years of acrimony and strife, a Catholic, writing as late as 1591, was able to argue that both religions confess to the same foundations of faith, and they only diverge "on certain differences, and not in contrarieties;"[39] while another, in a tract published just a few years earlier, optimistically elaborated the positive reasons for union:

> We are all Christians, we have the same symbol in the articles of catholic faith, we use the same prayer that Christ taught us, we have the same law and Decalogue, we recognize the same Bible and a single Scripture, we hope for the same salvation through the death and passion of our Savior, and await a same Paradise: the summation of both our Religions is the same, that is, to love God with all one's heart and one's neighbour as oneself.[40]

This line of reasoning, naturally, was appreciated by moderate Huguenots, who used it in their appeal for a policy of religious toleration; and it is not surprising to find almost the identical phraseology in the Anti-

the Averroism that was carried north from Padua before the middle of the sixteenth century. Paduan skepticism or Pyrrhonism was the rage among French humanists in the latter part of the century, and it undoubtedly influenced some Catholic moderates.[42] Guillaume Postel, who went through numerous religious phases, was always seeking to evolve a rationally constructed religion. It was rational skepticism that led the moderate Pierre Charron to question the immortality of the soul [43] and that steered Montaigne in the direction of religious relativism. Montaigne remained a Christian by virtue of his fideism and a deep-seated social conservatism.[44] Jean Bodin, on the other hand, did not. In his unpublished dialogue, the Heptaplomeres, Bodin demonstrated that Christianity could not stand up to rational scrutiny; and, as he was too much a rationalist to substitute faith for reason in his own religious thought, he ended up espousing the cause of natural religion.[45]

Bodin, however, was hardly typical of the vast majority of politiques, whose religious inspiration was Erasmian and not Paduan. Their Christianity was based neither upon scholastic reason nor upon religious or spiritual insight. Their aversion to theology was particularly strong; and even those who insisted that Catholic dogma remain intact throughout the efforts at religious reunification probably did so more out of fear of innovation than out of dogmatic conviction. It is no surprise that there is rarely a reference in their writings to the more contentious theological questions of the Reformation--those involving faith and works, the sacraments and Eucharistic doctrine, and the authority of Scripture; but this does not justify their opponents' claims that they were without religion, lacking piety, or even bad Catholics. One does not have to be a theologian or take part in theological debates in order to develop a set of religious doctrines; the fact that the French moderates did not always elaborate fully what they meant by "the articles that are necessary to our salvation" is no proof that they lacked an orthodox creed. Most of the evidence points to the contrary. Erasmus,[46] after all, who tried to avoid

doctrinal formulation, professed a reasonably orthodox interpretation of the Apostle's Creed and, when pressed, was ready to accept the Church's view on other points of doctrine; it is not assuming too much to say that the politiques on the whole held to at least as much.

Footnotes

1. The more traditional meaning of the word politique approximated that of a person well versed in the art of governing. The extent to which the meaning degenerated during the Religious Wars is indicated by the following verses written by the arch-enemy of the politiques, Louis d'Orleans:

"Ce nom de Politique estoit vn nom d'honneur,
C'estoit le iuste nom d'vn juste Gouuerneur,
D'vn prudent magistrat, qui par raison civile
Scauoit bien policer les membres d'vn ville,
Et qui sage, & accord par accordants discords
De citoyens diuers tiroit de bons accords....
Auiourd'huy ce beau nom fouillé de mille vices
N'est plus qu'en nom d'horreur qui destruit les Polices,
Vn nom plein de vergongne, & qu'on a mesprisé
Par le crime de ceux qui en ont abusé."

Le banqvet et aprés disnee dv Conte d'Arete, ov il se traicte de la dissimvlation du Roi de Nauarre & des moeurs de ses partisans (Arras, Iean Bourgeois, 1594), pp. 21-22.

2. Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes, Mémoires de Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes, in Petitot, Collection complete des memoires relatifs a l'histoire de France, depuis le regne de Philippe-Auguste, jusqu'au commencement du dix-septieme siecle (1822), XXIV, p. 322.

3. A typical anti-politique writer points to the "atheist Machiavelli" as the "Evangelist of the politiques." La contrepoison contre les Artifices et Inventions des politiques & autres ennemis de la religion Catholique....(Paris, Anthoine le Riche, 1589), p.13.

4. Paris, Guillaume Bichon, 1588. The author was a Benedictine monk. See also Le Karesme et meovrs dv politiqve, où il est amplement discouru de sa maniere de viure, de son Estat & Religion. (Paris, Pierre Mercier, 1589); Le Martel en teste des Catholiqves françois. Où est amplement discouru de la cause des miseres de ce pauure Royaume, & le vray moyen d'y donner remede (Paris, Rolin Thierry, 1590); and Memoires semez par qvelqves Politics avx Estats, qui se tiennent, en la ville de Bloys, avec la response Catholique a iceux (Paris, 1588).

5. La Foy et Religion des Politiques de ce temps, Aii v° and p, 6.

6. See Friedrich Meinecke, Die Idee der Staatsrason in der neueren Geschichte (Munchen und Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, 1924), pp. 24, 71, 190-91 and John Neville Figgis, Studies of Political Thought From Gerson to Grotius, 1414-1625 (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 28, 96. and 103.