

CSCH Presidential Address 1999

**The Three-Headed Calf: Triple Vision and
the Canadian Society of Church History**

SANDRA BEARDSALL

I would like, at this, the fortieth annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Church History, to explore with you some aspects of the history of our Society. Because I am a student of the history of evangelical Christianity, I will begin with a personal testimony. And because I have been nurtured in the bosom of liberal theology, I would like to focus our thoughts around a story by the prairie author Sandra Birdsell, for whom I frequently have the honour of being mistaken.

First, then, the testimony. It happened in the cafeteria at the University of Ottawa a rather unlikely setting for anything momentous, but that is part of the genre, isn't it? The Canadian Society of Church History was on lunch break, and a large number of us had gathered around one long table to engage in a number of conversations. There we were, women and men, at different stages of life and scholarship, historians, religionists, and theologians, all sharing mediocre food and great insights, cross-pollinating our disciplines, and enjoying ourselves. It was for me one of those expansive, blissful moments, one in which I experienced what is best described by Marguerite Van Die, in her 1992 presidential address on nineteenth-century religious experience: I sensed "not only the bonds of a community set apart in sacred time and space . . . but also . . . the continuity of the faith and the generations."¹ I was filled with gratitude for

Historical Papers 1999: Canadian Society of Church History

those who had created and shaped this Society, this space for us both to “be” and to be challenged. As with many who find their hearts strangely warmed, I looked around at the alien souls eating by themselves, or in tiny groups, and was sad for them. I was sorry that *their* academic societies did not seem to foster the same wonderful combination of diversity and collegiality. At this cafeteria table I was dwelling in the inclusive world I had always hoped academia could be, and I yearned for all to share my joy.

But also like many converts, my initial elation was followed soon after by a hard test of my faith. It came at the next day’s business meeting of the Society. It wasn’t simply our lack of funds that brought me down; all the organizations of which I am part are similarly straitened. Rather, it was the hint of discontent in the air, frustrations with our CCSR membership, debates about dropping this connection or that, dissatisfaction with *Studies in Religion (SR)*, that made me realize that all was not quite so rosy in our little academic paradise.

I would learn that the struggle is not new. At a 1980 CSCH symposium entitled, “Church History of Canada: Where from Here?” Keith Clifford stated, “For some time now I think our CSCH has been suffering from an acute identity crisis . . . Are we historians first or religionists first?”²² Nineteen years later, the identity crisis is apparently no less acute, even if the patient often masks the symptoms well. As a newcomer to CSCH, and as a member of the executive, which is charged with co-ordinating efforts to help the Society to live and thrive, I realized that I needed to learn much more about who we are. As one who tells others that history is good for them, I decided that an exploration of CSCH history would be good for *me*. And while some of you will know this history far better than I, I believe a review can assist us as a Society, as we wrestle, once again, with questions of identity and direction.

As a way of framing the questions we bring to our history, I would like to draw upon Sandra Birdsell’s narrative, “The Two-Headed Calf,”²³ from her recent short story collection. It is a complex tale about a Manitoba woman seeking to understand the conflicting world-views she has inherited. Sylvia is the daughter of Betty, a rebellious German Mennonite teenager, who refuses to disclose to Sylvia the identity of her father, telling her only that “neither my parents nor his wanted us to marry.”²⁴ Sylvia is still a child when she comes to realize that her father is an Ojibwa/French Métis man, Arthur Champagne, “who had once tramped three miles on the Red River on one snowshoe to invite Betty to dinner.”²⁵ But she will spend

much of her adult life – and all of this short story – trying to find her way through the tensions and incompatibilities created by this liaison. “Just be you,” Sylvia’s Mennonite grandfather used to say to his young granddaughter. At which an adult Sylvia muses, “*Just be you* . . . But how was it possible not to be imprinted by other people’s histories, their secret fears and desires? . . . To just be would require a miracle.”⁶

The title of Sandra Birdsell’s story comes from an experience that Sylvia, again as a child, has at the local fair. Inside a dingy sideshow tent, Sylvia finds a glowing white cube which contains a stuffed Jersey calf, with two identical heads extending from a single neck. The calf entrances Sylvia:

The calf had two brains driving one body. It made her wince to imagine the heads straining on the single neck, the yanking and tugging against its own flesh and muscle. Or had it, she wondered, become an adroit acrobat, a contortionist, the heads working in tandem, anticipating each other’s impulses and desires before they were thought, or felt? The calf’s eyes looked to the left and, at the same time, to the right. Its heart would react according to what its eyes saw, the message the two brains sent to it: prepare to do two things at once, flee and stay. Sleep and eat. Laugh and cry.

Perhaps, Sylvia thought . . . one message cancelled the other and the calf’s heart had stopped beating.⁷

The calf’s biological dilemma, Sylvia’s personal dilemma, reminds me of our academic dilemma. Can we imagine our Church History Society to be an entity with three heads, facing outward to history, religious studies, and theology? If so, how did we get this way? Are we an accident of nature and circumstance, or the result of some late 1950s experiment? What happens when we respond to stimuli from three worlds? Is it possible for us just “to be,” or will the mixed messages we receive about who we are do us in? And who wants a three-headed calf, anyway? Do we play any meaningful role in the Canadian academic barnyard, or are we really intended for a tattered tent in a tawdry sideshow – a slightly shocking lesson in the pitfalls of interdisciplinarity? These are the questions I would like to bring to a review of our history, which will have three parts: an overview of the Society’s life, a look at the shifts or changes we can detect, and a description of continuities I believe we can name.⁸ To undertake this

review, I have decided to do a study from within, to try to find out what we, in our meetings and papers, have told *one another* about who we are.

Historical Overview

The Society has presented its history to itself, in a formal way, only once before that I can discern: a “twenty year retrospect” delivered by John Moir in 1979.⁹ It was a detailed accounting of persons, places and anecdotes. While this memoir should be updated, my purpose in this section is simply to highlight the key events which, over the past four decades, have given the Society its present shape.

The initial impetus for the Society came in the late 1950s from Lorne Pierce, the editor-in-chief of Ryerson Press, who wanted to create, in John Grant’s words, “a reservoir of scholars and ideas that would make possible . . . a centennial [1967] three-volume history of the church in Canada.”¹⁰ Together with H.H. (Nick) Walsh, Pierce convened a meeting with church history professors from the “larger Protestant theological colleges”¹¹ to form an executive. Yet the purpose was to form a Society that lay “outside of any denominational context,”¹² and to that end, Abbé Maheux sent a letter of support. The executive created a purpose statement for the Society: “to promote and encourage research in Church History, with particular attention to Canadian Church History.”¹³

There were twenty-six attendees at the first meeting, held in Toronto. The new Society set an early precedent of stable membership fees: the 1960 rate of three dollars did not change for sixteen years.¹⁴ The 1961 meeting at McGill University saw CSCH meet jointly with CSBS and CTS to hear the presidential addresses. And so the Canadian Society of Church History settled early into its annual pattern of meeting, both alone and in joint sessions, hearing papers, eating together, and electing an executive. We have had thirty-six presidents, seven of whom have been women, and five of whom have been named “John.” 1967 saw the first presentation by a senior graduate student, much to the delight of the “academically established members,” who had already presented at least once, and as Moir puts it, “scarcely needed more public exposure.”¹⁵ The inclusion of graduate students thus became a point of pride for the Society. No doubt some of that “family feeling” I experience in the Society began as members encouraged junior scholars, while at the same time caring for its faithful seniors, such as an elderly Tom Boon, who, says John Grant,

added “a certain note of curiosity” by fainting during the meeting.¹⁶

The annual publication of the papers also began in 1967, for the convenience of members. Paul Laverdure indexed all the papers from 1960 to 1984, researching their publication history, and retrieving as many unpublished pre-1967 manuscripts as he could for the Victoria College Archives. This task included negotiating with a poor scholar then living in Spain, who would only give information for pay.¹⁷ The index is a resource which should also be updated – if only we could pay a poor scholar to do it!

In 1969, CSCH met with the Learned Societies for the first time, and in 1970 federal funds provided our first travel grants. That same year, the Canada Council shifted its funding away from the *Canadian Journal of Theology* toward a new, more broadly-based journal, to be known as *Studies in Religion (SR)*. Meeting at the Learned, and the creation of the new Canadian Society for the Study of Religion (CSSR) forced the CSCH to choose between connecting with what Moir calls “old friends”¹⁸ at CTS and CSBS, who were meeting at the same time as CSSR, or with the Canadian Historical Association. Fears about the amenability of *SR* to historical research, and the new complexity of meeting at the Learned, gave our odd calf, as its second decade dawned, its first unambiguous experience of multiple and competing stimuli.

The struggle came to something of a head, if that metaphor is appropriate, in 1987 when the Society agreed to subscribe to *SR*, as a member of the CCSR (the Canadian Corporation for the Study of Religion).¹⁹ John Moir quit the CSCH in protest. And as if to underline the frustrations wrought by triple vision, this year Tom Faulkner, another long-term member, and ardent and articulate *supporter* of our involvement in CCSR, has decided to leave CSCH because of what he sees as our wavering commitment to *SR* and the Corporation.

Throughout these challenges, however, CSCH has continued to meet, to welcome new faces and invite fresh scholarship. As of this afternoon, members and guests have delivered 355 papers on hundreds of topics. Meanwhile, in the thirty-nine years since the inception of CSCH, God has died in the West, Modernism has become very ill, babies have boomed and turned fifty, the earth’s atmosphere has heated up by a half-degree, the academy has discovered that women and non-white persons can think, and the world has shuddered through a Cold War, innumerable hot ones, and the current chilly climate created by the global flight of

capital. Has all this activity – internal and external – affected the CSCH? Let us look now at some of the shifts and continuities.

Shifts

I see the shifts that have occurred in CSCH, apart from the structural ones noted above, to have happened in three interwoven areas: membership, paper topics, and approaches, and I will look briefly at each.

At a 1993 CSCH panel on “Teaching Canadian Religion,” John Webster Grant stated that the shift of focus of religious studies from the seminary to the secular university had been, for him, “relatively painless compared with the mental adjustments” required by the increased pluralism represented in the student body.²⁰ In the CSCH, the membership changes reflect both the shift of focus and some of the pluralism. In the first decade, there was a predominance of clergy and professors, some from history departments, most from theological schools.²¹ Not until 1970 did the Society have its first non-clergy president, and it took until 1975 to elect a second one.²² Now during the late 1990s, the presence of two clergy presidents in a row is an anomaly (Paul Friesen and I), and we see fewer and fewer clergy in attendance at meetings. While graduate students have been a welcome feature since the late 1960s, the past few years have seen a decline in the attendance of more established scholars. One problem to which I hope not to contribute is the “case of the disappearing past-presidents.” A trend of the 1990s has been the arrival of more participants from evangelical circles, a fact noted by Bob Burkinshaw in his 1995 presidential address, as he identifies CSCH as a welcoming forum for studies of evangelicalism.²³ Ethnically, we have remained more white and Northern European than the culture around us. And while we consider ourselves to be the “Société canadienne d’histoire de l’Église, and have conducted some business in two languages, we do not seem ever to have heard papers given in French.

And then there are the women. In 1961, the McGill Faculty of Theology offered free accommodation and meals to all CSCH participants, warning that “accommodation for ladies” was not available, so that those who brought wives would have to stay elsewhere.²⁴ Paul Laverdure recalls being at a CSCH banquet in the late 1970s where the only women present were those serving the food.²⁵ The first woman to present a paper was Janet Scarfe, in 1976, and the next was Elizabeth Muir, in 1984. The

numbers of female presenters increased to two and then three per year, until the 1990s, when women have represented between one-quarter and one-half of every programme. After electing Phyllis Airhart as president in 1985, the Society has gone on to choose six more women for that role. As John Grant sees it, women have naturally come to play their part as they have come into advanced academic study, and the Society seems to have accepted this shift without difficulty. One member tells me that her sense of being an outsider, when she arrived in the late 1980s, stemmed not from being a woman, but from being neither a paid academic nor a cleric.

Our topics have reflected our shifting membership, and an increasing trend to Canadian subjects. Until the mid-1970s, with two early exceptions, Canadian topics never garnered more than half of a programme. By the 1980s Canadian subjects were clearly outstripping others, and in 1993, of seventeen papers, none were on non-Canadian topics. I have also tried to discern what proportion of each programme through the years might be seen to be of interest to each of our three constituencies: history, theology, and religious studies, with a fourth category for methodological issues. This task is of course difficult and arbitrary – even a beast with three heads moves them around a fair bit – although I did try to use the characteristics of each constituency as described by Tom McIntyre in a paper to the Society in 1985.²⁶ I determined that in almost every year, our presentations have been primarily historical, with theological subjects gradually decreasing, but not disappearing, and topics of a religious studies nature increasing since the 1980s, but rarely to more than 20% of any one programme. With our changing membership profile have come increasing numbers of papers about women and on evangelicalism. Methodological or historiographical presentations, the first of which occurred in 1967, have trickled in and out through the years; a recent trend is that of Society presidents choosing to give “historiographical” addresses.

Perhaps more telling in reviewing the shifts in our collective personality are the changing approaches described in those methodological papers. Before the first meeting in 1960, every founding member was sent a copy of a paper by Nick Walsh, in which he set what he saw as the task of the historian of the Canadian church.²⁷ Walsh’s proposed methodology was unabashedly theological, stating that “only he who is excited by his participation in the church is able to understand church history.”²⁸ While his language carries Protestant neo-orthodox assumptions, and a dread of

“sociologists,”²⁹ Walsh’s main concern was to free Canadian church historians both from Europeans’ preoccupation with their “national churches,” and from American denominationalism, to look to “the destiny which awaits the whole of the church Catholic.”³⁰ A decade later, a historiographical paper by Keith Clifford suggests, minus the theological underpinning, that historians are still seeking, with the aid of John Webster Grant, to free themselves from external, mostly American perspectives.

By 1980, the question of identity shifts from “Canadian” to “church.” In the “Where from Here?” panel John Grant suggests that church history is going to have to deal not simply with a “battery of institutions,” but with a more “diffuse and elusive entity” that is the church.³¹ That identity question broadens again in 1992. At a joint CSCH/CTS/CSSR panel on “doing church history” the question, “What constitutes a church?”³² is raised, but so is the identity of “history” itself, with language of deconstruction³³ and “re-membering.”³⁴

In 1994, Randi Warne picks up this identity question and addresses it to historians themselves, noting that personal academic identity is shaped in part by the hostile academic, social and economic climate within which church historians must work, one in which many who love and contribute generously to the study of church history will never find full employment.³⁵ Beth Profit, in 1996, also addresses the identity of the historian,³⁶ and Will Katerburg, in 1997, suggests that history is itself “identity,”³⁷ which creates both opportunity and limits for the historian.

And then, just to annoy those of us who reject the fatalistic notion that history is circular, in 1998 we find Paul Friesen raising, after a long absence, the question of the specific role and authority of the theologian in doing religious history.³⁸ This foray, however, is almost the mirror-image of that of Nick Walsh, four decades ago. Paul’s paper wades bravely into the murky waters of a current debate, so current that it continues in the latest issue of *SR*, about whether theology bears not only any similarity to, but shares any compatibility with, religious studies.³⁹ Theologians, it has been suggested, can serve only as “native informants” to religionists.⁴⁰ If Walsh in 1959 assumed, without looking into the tent, that the calf had only one, theological, head, Friesen, in 1998 needed to coax some religionists to come to the fair at all.

Another significant difference between Walsh’s and Friesen’s approaches are, of course, the absence of reference to a Canadian identity for church history scholarship. It disappeared, as we have seen, from

CSCH papers after 1980. At the same time, papers on Canadian topics now formed the majority of the annual programme. Have we stopped talking about Canadian identity, and begun to live it? Have we fulfilled the mandate set by the founders in 1960, to encourage the study “particularly of Canadian church history”? Perhaps the bigger challenge lies in the first two words of that mandate, “To promote”: the task of continuing to find others to join us in our endeavour.

Continuities

If an elucidation of the shifts in the Society over the years seems selective and subjective, my sense of the “continuities” is even more speculative. There are some obvious recurring themes: financial woes, and declining attendance, both of which were first raised as early as 1961, the latter of which John Moir calls “a hardy perennial for discussion.”⁴¹ But the deeper continuities present themselves, it seems to me, as paradoxes, as probably befits a multi-headed calf. I would name three. One is the paradox of our simultaneous openness and wariness, another is what I would call our “passive advocacy,” and the third is our “cautious confidence.”

It seems we knew early on that our calf would have to look in several directions. From the 1960s, historiographical papers remind us that the discipline cannot be narrowed, either in scope or in methodological tools.⁴² We have urged ourselves to look more deeply within religious traditions to piety and practice, and more broadly without to comparative studies.⁴³ We have recognized the challenge of serving three constituencies, but we have encouraged one another not to abandon the methods of any; rather, to “respect the elements of correlation,”⁴⁴ “to have more canons, not fewer.”⁴⁵ In his 1997 address, Will Katerburg asks “what relationship should be fostered” among the many communities with a stake in the writing of religious history. He concludes that “separation may contain divisiveness and bad manners; it may also inhibit creative scholarship.”⁴⁶ When we hear ourselves speak like this, when we see how readily and respectfully we have embraced newcomers and their research interests, we seem like the most expansive crowd in the cafeteria.

And yet, by maintaining relationships in several directions, we tend to remain wary of all of them. We express mistrust of *SR*, in part because it takes the canon right out of our fort altogether, but more because its

length restrictions limit the number of historical papers it can include. We do not spend much energy in support of the CCSR. We have not met jointly with CTS and/or CSSR since 1992, and we seem somewhat insignificant to the sprawling CHA. Perhaps the Canadian Catholic History Association (CCHA) is the most kindred to our spirits, but they do not push our boundaries in quite the way our other associates do. And so we find our Society to be rather isolated, even as we name ourselves and our methods as broad and inclusive.

The second paradox may be related, the one I call “passive advocacy.” By this phrase I mean that we rarely, as a Society, seem to take a stand, or set out on a mission, and yet we often work on important, controversial issues. I think of CSCH as “passive” in the sense that it did not go out to recruit feminists, evangelicals, or radicals, that it avoids making political statements, and doesn’t even particularly enjoy the machinations of the academic bureaucracy. Our passivity can cause us pain; it can make us appear disengaged or irrelevant. And yet, despite our apoliticism, we *are* nibbling at the edges of oppression. Back in 1968, John Webster Grant’s paper, “The Reaction of WASP Churches to Migration in the Laurier Era” was too hot to find a publisher.⁴⁷ Last year the papers of the CSCH quietly raised issues of gender, race, class, first nations, and age. They did so not by making grand claims on those topics, but simply by bringing the names of the marginalized to light, allowing their dismissed or forgotten voices to echo in the halls of academe.

The final paradox is again related: our “cautious confidence.” As early as 1980, our own members predicted that church history was “destined soon to vanish.”⁴⁸ Trying to belong in three constituencies, we are not completely at home in any.⁴⁹ And yet, throughout the years, there also rings a note of certainty that in our research and writing we are doing something meet and right, that we know our task and our boundaries. I think of panel responses by Brian Clarke and others to Ramsay Cook’s *The Regenerators*, in 1986, and to David Marshall’s *Secularizing the Faith*, in 1994. In both panels, the respondents articulate a depth of understanding of the church’s history that could only come from entering a dialogue among history, faith, and the tools of social analysis.⁵⁰ Beth Profit says our work makes us better at examining “our own presuppositions and values.”⁵¹ Martin Rumscheidt argues that as a church historian, “I do not merely describe, but I also confront: I recreate. In re-creation, I am aware of being involved.”⁵² Somehow, the tricky task of interpreting signals from

several directions seems to make church historians not only cautious, but also confident, willing not only to report, but also to remake and to be remade. And this confidence continues, despite the obstacles the years have thrown its way.

Conclusion

And so, here we are: thirty-nine years old, open yet wary, passive yet advocating, cautious yet confident. This is our story, or my reconstruction of it. Does it help us with our questions about ourselves as a Society? Can the calf keep looking three ways? Do we have a place in the menagerie?

Back in Sandra Birdsell's story, we learn that Sylvia's mother Betty, the rebellious Mennonite, does not go into the tent to see the two-headed calf. "I am not remotely interested in freaky things,"⁵³ she says. Betty is, however, able to solve *her* identity problems in mid-life. "The woman who once wanted fire," says Sylvia, "settled for being the wife of an Anglican minister, wearing socks with her Birkenstocks, a dirndl skirt, and a long T-shirt to accommodate a rather comfortable girth," speaking "platitudes, homilies that substitute for caring now that her life seems predictable and safe."⁵⁴

One option, then, is for the CSCH to find itself the academic-society equivalent of an Anglican minister, a "safe" place to continue its life. But for Sylvia, the narrator, this solution doesn't satisfy. The story, however, offers us another way to examine ourselves, strange beast that we are. Sylvia is preoccupied with the calf's heads, and the effect of their competing messages on the young animal's heart. What would happen if we looked, not to our competing constituencies first, but to our own heart? What if we asked, "Do we have the heart for this task?"

That question is ultimately not mine, but ours, to answer. It seems to me, though, as I have immersed myself in the thoughts and words of the members of this Society, that we do indeed have a sturdy heart, one that can perhaps withstand even the frightening task of being a multi-disciplinary creature. Will Katerburg, reading Nietzsche, calls history writing "a mystical, even religious endeavour."⁵⁵ Marguerite Van Die, in concluding her address, speaks of "that transcendent dimension with which imaginatively we continue to grapple – even as it, by its nature, continues to elude us."⁵⁶ "The amazing thing," John Webster Grant told me recently, "is that we are still here." But we are – a bit tattered, a bit conflicted, but *here*.

Like every good convert, I have come through my post conversion valley to a new peak, a second naivete, where once again I can give thanks for those who shaped this Society, this space for us both to “be” and to be challenged. And once again, I do hope that others can share my joy.

Endnotes

1. Marguerite Van Die, “Recovering Religious Experience: Some Reflections on Methodology,” *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History Papers* (hereafter *CSCH Papers*) (1992): 160.
2. N.K. Clifford, “Church History of Canada: Where from Here?” *CSCH Papers* (1980): 8.
3. Sandra Birdsell, “The Two-Headed Calf,” in *The Two-Headed Calf* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart), 141-189.
4. Birdsell, “Calf,” 179.
5. Birdsell, “Calf,” 150.
6. Birdsell, “Calf,” 188.
7. Birdsell, “Calf,” 177-178.
8. In presenting this research I am most indebted to a bevy of highly-qualified, unpaid “research assistants”: members of this Society who provided data, reflection, and suggestions for this paper.
9. John Moir, “The Canadian Society of Church History – a twenty-year retrospect,” *CSCH Papers* (1979): 76-97.
10. John Webster Grant, “Church History of Canada: Where from Here?” *CSCH Papers* (1980): 21.
11. Moir, “Retrospect,” 77
12. Moir, “Retrospect,” 76.
13. Moir, “Retrospect,” 97.
14. Moir, “Retrospect,” 79.
15. Moir, “Retrospect,” 87.
16. Grant, telephone conversation with author, May 1999. See also, Moir, “Retrospect,” 87.

17. Paul Laverdure, telephone conversation with author, May 1999.
18. Moir, "Retrospect," 91.
19. Laverdure, telephone conversation.
20. John Webster Grant, "Teaching Canadian Religion: Some Questions of Approach," *CSCH Papers* (1993): 273-77.
21. Grant, telephone conversation.
22. Moir, "Retrospect," 90, 96.
23. Robert K. Burkinshaw, "Aspects of Canadian Evangelical Historiography," *CSCH Papers* (1995): 184.
24. Burkinshaw, 80.
25. Laverdure, telephone conversation.
26. Tom McIntyre describes "historians" as being interested in topics like politics, social class, and religion; "religionists" see history as one means of illuminating religious issues; and "theologians" understand the study of history as a contribution to education for ministry ("Teaching Religious History in Three Different Settings: Complexes of Correlations," *CSCH Papers* [1985]: 81).
27. H.H. Walsh, "The Challenge of Canadian Church History to its Historians," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 5 (1959): 162-169.
28. Walsh, "Challenge," 163.
29. See Clifford, "Where from Here?" 1.
30. Walsh, "Challenge," 167.
31. Grant, "Where from Here?" 24, 25.
32. Tom Sinclair-Faulkner, "What do Church Historians Study?" *CSCH Papers*, (1992): 139.
33. Walter Principe, "How Do Historians Determine What is Authentic Christianity?" *CSCH Papers* (1992): 147. Principe here argues the *limits* of deconstruction.
34. Martin Rumscheidt, "How Ought Church Historians to do Church History?" *CSCH Papers* (1992): 151.
35. Randi R. Warne, "A Paeon to the Faithful," *CSCH Papers* (1993): 279-285.

36. Beth Profit, "Texts and Contexts: Meaning and Methodology in Church History," *CSCH Papers* (1996): 217, 222.
37. William Katerburg, "History as Identity: Subjectivity, Religion, and the Historical Profession," *CSCH Papers* (1997): 134.
38. Paul Friesen, "Give me that old-time Religion: The Postmodernist Plot of the Theologians," *CSCH Papers* (1998): 129-40.
39. See Kenneth Gordon MacKendrick, "The Aporetics of a Tennis-playing Brontosaurus, or a Critical Theory of Religion: A Rejoinder to Russell T. McCutcheon and William E. Arnal," *Studies in Religion* 28 (1999): 77-83.
40. Report of a panel held at the American Academy of Religion in 1996. G.R. Evans, "The Compatibility of theological and religious studies?" *Bulletin of the Council of the Societies for the Study of Religion* 26 (1997): 50-68.
41. Moir, "Retrospect," 85.
42. Clifford, "Religion," 522-23.
43. Paul Dekar, "Church History of Canada: Where from Here?" *CSCH Papers* (1980): 13.
44. McIntyre, "Teaching," 83, 86.
45. Tom Sinclair-Faulkner, "The Canon of the Classroom: A Case Study in the Teaching of Religion in Canada," *CSCH Papers* (1993): 263.
46. Katerburg, "History as Identity," 148.
47. Moir, "Retrospect," 89.
48. Grant, "Where from Here?" 24.
49. "So, History truncated religion, Religious Studies had reservations about Christianity, and theologians and other religious practitioners wanted to focus on what was happening NOW. Where did that leave Church History?" (Warne, "Paeon," 282).
50. On *The Regenerators*, Brian Clarke is concerned with Cook's "static, dualistic interpretation of orthodoxy" ("Modernism, Tradition, and Orthodoxy: A Comment on *The Regenerators*," *CSCH Papers* [1986]: 149), while Randi Warne challenges the "narrowness" of Cook's definition of religion ("*Post hoc ergo propter hoc*: History, Theology and *The Regenerators*," *CSCH Papers* [1986]: 155). On *Secularizing the Faith*, John Stackhouse, Jr. challenges David Marshall's right to "pronounce upon" the authenticity of

faith of a theological development (“Who is to Say?: Defining and Discerning Secularization in Canadian Christianity,” *CSCH Papers* [1994]: 199). Brian Clarke asks, “On what grounds does one decide that one particular form of historic Christianity has normative purchase, particularly now that Liberal Protestantism – which also made claims of its own to orthodoxy – is part of the Protestant heritage?” (“*Secularizing the Faith: A Comment*,” *CSCH Papers* [1994]: 204).

51. Profit, “Texts,” 222.
52. Rumscheidt, “How Ought?” 152.
53. Birdsell, “Calf,” 180.
54. Birdsell, “Calf,” 184.
55. Katerburg, “History,” 149.
56. Van Die, “Recovering,” 165.

