Canadian Universities and the Teaching of Religion

JOHN W. WEVERS

THE teachings of the Christian religion are omitted from the curriculum of the state-supported universities in all the provinces of Canada except Quebec. Courses in Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism are permitted and encouraged: but Christianity, the unloved mother of our Western culture, is moved into the attic rooms of Oriental Literature and Medieval Philosophy, or consigned to the lonely rest home of the theological college. She no longer occupies the queenly throne. The hands of history's clock have once more come round, so that Christianity, along with her Founder, is again relegated to a manger.

The "secular" university is an ill-begotten child, the product of an abortive age. This new age is founded on a new dichotomy. No longer is the world divided into the good and the bad. The dichotomy of the *civitas dei* and the *civitas terrena* is now outmoded. The modern fashion is to oppose the "secular" and "sacred" as somehow between them comprehending all knowledge.

I submit that this distinction is not only undesirable: it is a false one as well. The Biblical faith as rooted in the Hebraic thought-world did not recognize this dichotomy. Furthermore, the historical inception and conception of the university never envisaged any divorce between the secular and the sacred.

The thesis which this article is intended to develop has two parts. First of all, it analyses the Biblical faith, particularly as this is rooted in the Hebraic mind, to see whether there is any justification of the *purely* secular content of the curriculum of the state-supported university. To implement this investigation an analysis of the Hebraic concepts of "knowledge" and of "history" is undertaken. That the Hellenic sources of our culture might well lead to different conclusions is irrelevant to this study. All that is necessary is to demonstrate that the involvement of the religious in the so-called secular was a necessary presupposition of *one* of our cultural roots. Should this be the case, then it is clear that religious studies in the curriculum, for which provision is still being made in most Canadian Universities which are ecclesiastically supported, should be incorporated into the teaching programmes of our state-supported universities.

A second part of this paper is intended simply to support the conclusion of the first part. A brief survey of the origins of the university in medieval times soon convinces one that the divorce of the university from religion was not part of the original scheme of things at all. No modern university

would in any respect contemplate a return to the days of rigid authoritarianism; on the other hand, the question remains whether the baby has not been thrown out with the bath water in our emancipated curricula of today.

This is also substantiated by a brief survey of the ecclesiastical origins and affiliations of Canadian Universities. From this it appears that the state-supported university is in its present course turning its back on an important aspect of its task, an aspect which was seen much more clearly in the days when the Canadian universities were coming into being.

I

The Biblical notion of *knowledge* inevitably concerns the worlds of good and of evil. Knowledge (Heb. *da'at*) never concerns God's eternal being, but always centres on his demands.[1] Knowledge is not a possession; it is a practice; it is an "ought" which must be actualized. Thus the knowledge of God is the recognition of God's might, grace and will. Ignorance, on the other hand, involves guilt, non-recognition of God. As such it carries the germs of self-destruction within it (Hos. 6:4).

Even in its most avowedly secular form this ethical bent to both knowledge and wisdom is clear. The conception of wisdom and instruction[2] in Wisdom Literature is that of practical morality (cf. Prov. ch. 1). It is discipline and reproof of the learner which is taught (Prov. 5:12); prudence (*'ormā*) is defined as heeding the admonition of one's counsellors, whereas the fool, the antonym of the wise man, is the one who despises his father's instruction (*mūsār*; Prov. 12:1; 13:1; 15:5). Wisdom finds its antonym in "pride," "arrogance," or even "wickedness" (Prov. 8:7). Israel is called a foolish and ignorant people because they have dealt corruptly with God.[3]

Such practical wisdom is religiously oriented. If one is wise, one listens to the warning to serve YHWH reverently (Ps. 2:10). Wise people are the ones who know their God, and will therefore stand firm and take action against the godless Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. 11:32 f.).

The obvious corollary of knowledge thus defined is that it results in good conduct. Thus Jehoash did right in YHWH's sight because he had received priestly instruction (2 Kgs. 12:2). Training in youth will promote steadfast conduct in later life (Prov. 22:6). Heeding instruction serves other desirable ends as well, since one who does so assumes an honoured position in the community, whereas disregarding instruction leads to poverty and disgrace (Prov. 13:18).

Such knowledge has its source in God[4] who teaches men knowledge (Isa.

1. Cf. R. Bultmann, Art. "ginooskoo, ginoosis, epiginooskoo, epignoosis," *Theol. Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, Vol I (Stuttgart, 1933) 688–719.

2. The most recent study of *mūsār* as "discipline" and "instruction" is that of J. A. Sanders, *Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism* (*Colgate Rochester Divinity School Bulletin* XXVIII) 1955. For his discussion of the concept of instruction in the Book of Proverbs, *vide* pp. 32–45.

3. Deut. 32:6.

4. Cf. Joh. Fichtner, *Beih. z. ZATW* 63, pp. 177ff.

40:14; Ps. 32:8; 94:10; Prov. 2:6–7). Only if instruction comes from him is man rightly taught (Isa. 28:26; 48:17; cf. Ps. 25:9); instruction is actually defined as that which YHWH persistently teaches (Jer. 32:33). If men are thus instructed their prosperity will be great indeed (Isa. 54:13). Naturally what YHWH teaches are his statutes and ordinances, that is to say, his demands upon men (Ps. 119 *passim*; 132:12). YHWH's guidance is, however, not limited to this. The raw recruits of Israel's armies will be taught the art of warfare by YHWH himself (Jdg. 3:2); such military instruction even becomes the theme for psalmodic praise. (Ps. 18:34; 2 Sam. 22:35; Ps. 144:1).

Wisdom and learning may be variously mediated but in the last analysis they come by God's good spirit (Neh. 9:20). Skill in metal, stone, and wood crafts was given to Bezaleel and his able associates through a plentitude of the spirit of God (Ex. 31:1 ff.—P Code). Instruction may come in the sanctuary through an incubation rite,[5] that is, by a direct communication from God in a dream or visionary experience. Instruction may come through hearing God's words read (Deut. 4:36), or through careful observation of history (Deut. 11:2 ff.)—that is, through noting God's redemptive acts in Israel's history. Instruction may also be given by parents (Prov. 1:8; 4:1). In the Deuteronomic conception it was specifically Moses who in prophetic fashion taught Israel YHWH's statutes and ordinances.[6]

Wisdom, regardless of its dress, always involves "the fear of YHWH" (cf. Prov. 8:13). This is its basis in Wisdom Literature (Prov. 1:7). It is not always clear, however, what this term conveyed. It is in point of fact simply a technical term for the life lived in accordance with YHWH's demands. This is apparent from an examination of Psalm 34:11–14. The passage is in typical Wisdom literary form. The speaker addresses his audience as "sons," and promises to teach them "the fear of YHWH." Immediately he proceeds to define this by a summary of the Wisdom ideal:

> Guard your tongue from uttering evil,
> Even your lips from speaking deceit.
> Turn away from evil and do the good;
> Search out peace and pursue it.

It is by now clear that *da'at* is religiously oriented. In fact, only seldom is reference made to instruction in anything specifically non-religious. Training in war or in song does occur, but war was a religious duty and training in song is predicated only of the temple singers. Nebuchadrezzar wants Hebrew youths trained in the letters and language of the Chaldeans (Dan. 1:4), but this three year education programme was in a pagan court. So

5. Ps. 16:7. *Vide* J. W. Wevers, "A Study in the Form Criticism of Individual Complaint Psalms, *Vetus Testamentum* VI (1956), 95f. for an interpretation of this verse.

6. Deut. 4:1, 5; 6:1; cf. also 4:14 and 5:28. The prophet in a sense can be understood as such a mediator of divine knowledge according to the Priestly writer's definition of prophet in Ex. 7:1f., just as the wise man imparts his proverbs, Prov. 2:1; 3:1; 4:20 *et passim*. On the other hand, Qoheleth tried to attain wisdom by applying his mind to it, Eccl. 1:13, 17, though he does conclude that such study is much weariness to the flesh, 12:12.

too Moses was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts 7:22), but this also is not germane to our inquiry. When Jeremiah tells the women of Jerusalem to teach their daughters a lament (Jer. 9:20), it is a religious exercise, just as Moses' teaching to Israel the "Song of Moses" (Deut. 31:19, 22).

What is learned normally involves either the world of good or of evil. Men are warned against learning the abominable practices of the Canaanites (Deut. 18:9), or the idolatrous practices taught by foreign tribes (Deut. 20:18), or the "way" of the nations (Jer. 10:2ff). The Judaeans in Jeremiah's time had learned the evil Canaanite ways from their fathers (Jer. 9:14), and were now teaching others these wicked ways (Jer. 2:33). On the other hand, the Psalmist vows to teach transgressors God's ways (Ps. 51:13); similarly Qoheleth taught people proverbs, that is, the good life of the Yahwist (Eccl. 12:9). It is God's demands upon men which need to be learned (Ps. 143:10), which demands are incorporated in his righteous ordinances, statutes and commandments (Ps. 119:7, 71, 73). People are to teach their children God's words which in turn promote the fear of YHWH (Deut. 4:10; cf. 14:23). This learning process is to be both auditory and visual and is to go on constantly (Deut. 6:6–8; 11:9). In the eschatological age knowledge will be ideally complete for all men will then know YHWH (Jer. 31:34). It is by no means accidental that Ezra became the scribal ideal, since it is said of him that he had set his heart on studying the *tōrā* of YHWH, to perform it, and to teach his statutes and ordinances in Israel (Ezr. 7:10).

The thesis that it is not a secular/sacred dichotomy that occupied the Hebrew mind but rather the antithesis of a good *versus* a bad world has by now been amply documented from the Hebrew conception of knowledge.[7] It might, however, be suggested that this is what one might expect from a religious text such as the Bible. After all, this is precisely from the "sacred" realm, and it might plausibly be argued that its evidence is as such irrelevant. Two points ought to be borne in mind in this regard. First of all, the Hebrew conception in which the secular and the sacred are not distinct realms is not unique to the Hebrews; it was the view of reality commonly held throughout the ancient Near East. It would be surprising indeed to find among the ancient Hebrews such a modern distinction. In the second place, it should be kept in mind that it is precisely and only these Scriptures which constitute the Hebraic roots of our Western culture. Even if the Hebrews had compartments of life untouched by the sacred, they would be irrelevant.

II

As a matter of fact the Old Testament as well as the New does, I believe, show clearly that such areas did not exist for its writers. This is clear even

7. It would merely be wearisome to analyse the New Testament concept of knowledge as well. It is based on, and is essentially the same as, that of the Old Testament. The interested student is referred for further study to the article by Bultmann listed in note 1 above.

from a superficial analysis of its conception of history. It matters little whether YHWH was originally a weather god at Sinai or not, or what the original significance of his name may have been;[8] it is clear that the Hebrews always thought of God as an active personality, inevitably involved in the course of Israel's history. Even the earliest Hebrew historian, the author of the "J" Code of the middle of the tenth century B.C.(?), conceived of history as "the act of God."[9] For this "father of history" YHWH may act in extraordinary and arbitrary fashion, but to his will one must bow.[10] Even in YHWH's earliest form, in his appearance to Moses before he had become covenantally allied to Israel as its God, he was greater than other local gods. His power was to be demonstrated in Egypt, certainly outside of home territory. YHWH's domain was never conceived by the J historian as limited to Canaan. In the tower of Babel story (Gen. 11:1–9) YHWH directs the course of mankind's history in the plain of Shinar; similarly he was active at Haran, giving travelling orders to Abram (Gen. 12:1, 24:7).

Furthermore YHWH is also in control over nature. He rained destruction over the Cities of the Plain (Gen. 19:24); he afflicted the waters of the Nile with disease so that the fish were destroyed; he brought on the plague of gnats, had control over the weather in Egypt, and directed the course of locusts there (Ex. cc. 7–10). It was YHWH who divided the waters of the Red Sea and at the right moment brought them together again (Ex. 14:21, 27). It was not Baal but YHWH who granted fertility to the patriarchal wives (Gen. 21:1 *et al.*).

But for J as well as for later writers YHWH is essentially the God of Israel. For this reason he blessed their patriarchal ancestors. He freed his people from the house of servitude; he led them victoriously into Canaan. The doings of YHWH find their actual purpose and expression in Israel's history. For J, history constitutes YHWH's redemption of his promise to Israel in spite of all kinds of hindrances which seem to bar the way.

The literary prophets too believed that YHWH was Israel's God, but drew new conclusions from it. Because of this favoured position Israel will be held doubly responsible for its sins (Amos 3:2). God will execute doom on his chosen ones at the hands of the heathen. In fact, YHWH's ethical concern extends beyonds the borders of Canaan. He will send fire on the fortresses of Damascus, the Philistine cities, Tyre, the Ammonites and Moab because they have violated the ordinary laws of humanity (Amos 1:3–2:3). In other words, YHWH's control over the destinies of men is not limited to Israel. Prior to Amos, YHWH's interference in other peoples' affairs somehow involved Israel: his real concern had been the fortunes of his own

8. For a recent summary and discussion of these problems cf. T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (2nd ed., 1950), pp. 82 ff.

9. John MacMurray, *The Clue to History* (London, 1938), p. 38.

10. For a thorough survey of the J writer's point of view cf. the late Gustav Hölscher's *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel: Untersuchungen zum Jahvisten und Elohisten* (*Skrifter utg. av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund*, 50), Lund, 1952. He speaks of the "Zug des Unheimlichen u. Unberechenbaren (dass) Jahve auch noch bei J behält" (p. 117).

people. Now YHWH's work has wider relevancy. In fact, it had been YHWH who was responsible for the course of non-Yahwist tribal migrations in former days such as those of the Ethiopians, the Philistines and the Syrians (Amos 9:8).

Not only does YHWH direct the course of all human history for the prophets, but he is also the lord of nature. It is YHWH not Baal who gives agricultural produce (Hos. 2:8ff.) or withholds it. In fact, the course of natural events is directed to an ethical end if Israel will but see it as such (Amos 4:6–12). Calamities such as famine, drought, crop diseases, pestilence, or earthquakes are used by YHWH as warnings of a coming judgment. YHWH concerns himself about every relationship in life whether it be to the natural realm, to one's fellow man or to God.

For the prophetic writers, YHWH's concern for the world is a necessary corollary to the fact that he is the Creator.[11] This is already apparent in the eighth Century. It is often suggested by interpreters of Amos that the so-called doxologies (4:13, 5:8f., 9:5f.) are later additions, intrusions in his thought. Such a judgment fails to take into account the necessary place of the creation motif. YHWH can make his demands upon Israel precisely because it is he who "forms the mountains, creates the wind, and declares to man his thought." Only the Creator "who made the Pleiades and Orion, who turns deep darkness into morning and darkens day into night, who calls for the waters of the sea to pour them out upon the earth, who builds his roof chambers in the heavens and who founds his vaults on the earth," only he can demand a strict account of men's actions.

Since YHWH is the Creator God his dominion extends throughout the world, and pagan men and nations will involuntarily submit to his direction. Assyria is the instrument in YHWH's hands for chastising Israel (Isa. 10:5–11). Jeremiah repeatedly refers to Nebuchadrezzar as the servant of YHWH to whom Judah and neighbouring lands will be given (Jer. 25:9, 27:6, 43:10). A half-century later the unnamed prophet of the Exile cites Cyrus of Persia not only as YHWH's shepherd (Isa. 44:28), but as his Messiah, his anointed "whose right hand I have grasped." (Isa. 45:1). Even God's saving power is not limited to Israel (Isa. 45:22f.); in fact, the Suffering Servant is to serve as "a light to the nations, that my salvation may extend to the ends of the earth." (Isa. 49:6).

This universal dominion of Israel's God is also evident from the prophetic notion of the "day of YHWH." Popularly this was thought to be a day of triumph for Israel but Amos opposes this widely held notion by his famous "Woe to you who desire the day of YHWH!" It is to be a day of darkness rather than of light, of terror rather than of triumph (Amos 5:18–20). This judgment is assumed to be world-wide in Isaiah, directed not only against Judah, but also against "the cedars of Lebanon, the oaks of Bashan, and the ships of Tarshish" (Isa. 2:12–22). The *Dies Irae* of Zephaniah

11. This particularly comes to expression in Deutero-Isaiah; cf. 40:12–15; 26, 28 e.g.

may begin in Judah and Jerusalem but will certainly spread to Philistia, Egypt and Ethiopia, as well as against Assyria. Gradually, however, prophetic thought changes, so that in Deutero-Isaiah YHWH's day is a day of triumph heralded by the return of the exiles to Jerusalem and climaxed by the universal conversion of the nations and their rulers to Yahwism (cf. Isa. 45:14 ff.; 49:7, 12).

It is by now fully evident that for the prophets YHWH is the Guide and Determiner of all history. Little need be said of the Deuteronomic historians of the seventh and sixth centuries, since they wrote under the impetus of the eighth and seventh century prophets. In a sense the apex of a theology of history was reached by Deutero-Isaiah in the sixth century, and later writers became more artificial in their presentation. This becomes particularly apparent in the Priestly writers whose schematic reconstruction of history is midrashic rather than historical.[12] History is an explanation of the origin of institutions by divine command. Gradually God's vision is delimited from Creation, to the family of Noah, to Abraham, to Moses and the Israelites. From then on God's interest is centered almost exclusively on Israel, and later on Judah and the Davidic dynasty. For P, God created the heavens and the earth in the beginning but the universe soon lost its appeal for YHWH in favour of his "peculiar people." History centered in the Levitical laws. History prior to their delivery in the desert was merely a preparation for them. All subsequent history was judged by subscription and allegiance to them.

The last Old Testament attempt at an understanding of history is apocalyptic, a form of writing which was to be become popular in later times, but is directly represented in Scripture only by the book of Daniel in the Old Testament, and the Apocalypse of St. John in the New.[13] To the writer of Daniel, God is of course supreme over history. Those who ravage the people of the saints of the Most High are only allowed to continue for a time. Everything in history is predetermined by the will of God, who rules the kingdom of men and sets over it whom he wills.[14] In the main, world empires tend to deteriorate. That of Babylon was symbolized by gold; the succeeding ones, by silver, by brass and by iron and clay respectively.[15] In spite of the pessimism with respect to past and present history, apocalyptic writing inevitably sets its hopes on a favourable outcome. The "contemptible person" will eventually fall (cf. Dan. 11:45). History is the ranging of the evil powers over against the good extending even to events in heaven (Rev. 12:7 ff.), but eventually "those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the firmament" (Dan. 12:2).

12. C. R. North, *The Old Testament Interpretation of History* (London, 1946) 107 ff.

13. An excellent handling of this type of literature may be found in H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (London and Redhill, 1944).

14. Dan. 4:17 *et al.*; cf. especially 11:36.

15. Ch. 2; cf. North, *op. cit.*, pp. 133 ff.

In the New Testament the day of the Lord is at hand (Matt. 3:2). In a sense it is a realized eschatology. The times were full (Gal. 4:4) and the Word became flesh (John 1:14). History has reached its climax in Christ, the divine Saviour and Lord of men. But history has taken on a new *telos*; the world is speeding to a consummation wherein Christ is to judge the living and the dead when he will reappear (2 Tim. 4:1 *et al.*). Citizens in the kingdom of Christ always stand under the judgment of grace. The New Testament pictures the *Anni Domini* as history's realization of this kingdom until Christ shall render it complete into the hands of the Father.

This is the faith which constitutes one of the two main roots of our modern culture, and because it is such it has been necessary to examine this at some length. I would submit therefore that the relegation of religion to the church, its exclusion from the University curriculum, is an unscientific procedure. The University exists to examine its culture and creatively to mediate it to tomorrow's citizens. The refusal to examine the roots of one's culture in the past is fatal to a university if it wishes to remain humanistic.

III

Nor is the modern university justified historically in persisting in its so-called secular course. A course of study not dominated by ecclesiastical thinking would have been unthinkable in the Middle Ages. A "secular" university simply did not exist nor could it have done so. A brief review of the origins of the university easily substantiates this.[16]

The word "universitas" originally referred to a guild, either of masters as at Paris, or of students as at Bologna. It was a sort of confraternity or trade union, to which members belonged for mutual help and comfort. Such "universitates" ensured decent burial for their members in a hostile and foreign environment. Their formation seems originally to have been demanded by the hostility of the communities and the rapacity of landlords. The "universitas" constituted a tremendous weapon. In contrast to the modern university it had no buildings and existed wherever a group of scholars happened to be. Accordingly it could and often did "secede" from a given locale whenever its rights and privileges were infringed upon. This weapon of "secession" was as potent as a papal excommunication. Its invocation often brought emperors and popes to their knees and won extraordinary privileges for the members of the "universitas."

The actual institution or locale of such a university was the Studium. To have its licenses recognized, however, it had to be a Studium Generale, which meant the combination of at least one of the higher faculties along with the basic Arts Faculty. Whether the so-called "first" university, that

16. For the most complete account of these origins in English cf. Hastings Rashdall, *Rise of the Universities*, 2 vols. in 3, rev. ed. 1936, originally published under the title *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1895). For a general bibliography on the medieval universities, both original and secondary sources, see L. J. Paetow, *Guide to the Study of Medieval History*, rev. ed., 1931. For a fascinating account of the rise and fortunes of these universities based largely on Rashdall's work see N. Schachner, *The Medieval Universities* (London, 1938).

at Salerno, was such a Studium Generale, is not certain. Already in the tenth century it was famous as a medical centre, though it reached its height in the next two centuries. It was well-situated on the southwestern coast of Italy, at the crossroads of Latin, Greek, Arab and Jewish cultures. Galen and Hippocrates were studied in Latin translations, but later when the more esoteric and occult forms of Oriental medical practices became popular, Salerno gradually receded into oblivion.

In general, it may be said that Paris and Bologna were the two greatest centres of learning as early as the end of the eleventh century, each representing a different type. In the North—Northern France, Germany, England, etc.—the theological faculty predominated. Paris was the outgrowth mainly of the Cathedral School of Notre Dame, and was under the direct control of its chancellor. Here the "universitas" was a guild of masters whose license to teach, the *jus ubique docendi*, was controlled by the chancellor. By the end of the eleventh century students began to flock to Paris owing largely to the popularity of Abelard. Paris had all but one of the four higher faculties of Theology, Civil Law, Canon Law and Medicine, the exception being Civil Law. Supreme, however, was the Faculty of Theology. Of course, it had the basic Arts Faculty as well, which was the actual "universitas" as far as regulating the affairs of the university was concerned. Due to a threatened "secession" in 1200 of the university from the city, a charter was granted to it by Philip Augustus in which extraordinary privileges were granted to its members.

This was not the first charter granted to a university. In 1158 Frederick Barbarossa as king of Sicily and Naples had granted a general charter of privileges for students in Italy in his famous *Habita*. Practically speaking this meant Bologna, a completely different type of university from that of Paris. Besides the usual Arts Faculty, it had the two legal faculties, for which studies it was the European centre. But the "universitas" was one of students, not of masters. Since the masters were not foreign scholars as at Paris but local citizens, it was not they but the students who flocked to Bologna, banded together, and "ran" the university, dictating fees, lecture hours, local privileges, and so forth. Bologna became the Southern University type where Law and Medicine, not Theology, were the higher faculties. This became the pattern for later medieval universities throughout Italy, Spain and Southern France.

Mention has been made of Arts as the basic faculty. Arts comprised the seven liberal arts of the trivium and the quadrivium, i.e., grammar, rhetoric and logic on the one hand, and arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music on the other. Grammar was taught as a system of rules for Latin grammar, based on Donatus's textbook for beginners, and Priscianus for advanced students. Rhetoric was not a study of style, but pure pedantry, the treatises of Cicero and the elements of Roman Law being analyzed in strictly mechanical and unintelligent terms. The real centre of the trivium was logic where the logical works of Aristotle, the Latinized version of Por-

phyry's Introduction and the several commentaries of Boethius were assiduously studied. The Quadrivium by modern standards was almost meaningless. Arithmetic and astronomy were merely intended as means to calculate the date of Easter. Geometry was the presentation of a few of Euclid's propositions out of context, and of course without proof. Music was an unintelligible "jargon of pseudo-Pythagorean numbers and Psalter and Church music." The Course, though considered fundamental to the higher faculties suffered from the dominant hand of logic. The Classics were scorned since they could not be subject to syllogistic method. Furthermore they were pagan and impractical.

It was this impulse to subject everything to syllogistic method that caused the Medical faculties to languish in the Middle Ages, and Civil and Canon Law to flourish. Theology was the *regina scientiarum*, but by no means the most popular faculty except at Paris and to a lesser degree at Oxford. But the omnipresent power of ecclesiastical thinking moulded university instruction and learning. The principal of authority was a fetish. Aristotle and the Bible were sacrosanct as well as the Church Fathers. Only to a lesser extent were the works of Peter Lombard, Gratian and Averhoes in this same category. Knowledge was fixed and eternal, and the role of the university was simply to pass it on. Certainly the "secular" university had not yet been born.

IV

The Canadian university scene was originally dominated by the ecclesiastically-supported college as well.[17] Only four universities in Canada, three of which were founded after 1900, do not admit of an original ecclesiastical connection, Saskatchewan in 1907, Alberta in 1908 and British Columbia in 1915. Unique in Canada is McGill, founded through the generous private endowment of James McGill. It had received its charter in 1821, and opened its doors to medical students in 1829. Manitoba was established in 1877, but it actually grew out of an affiliation of three denominational colleges: St. John's, St. Boniface, and Manitoba Colleges (Church of England, Roman Catholic and Presbyterian respectively). Since 1877 five other colleges have affiliated with it. It ought furthermore to be said that of the four universities mentioned above every one has one or more theological colleges affiliated with it.

The French-Canadians founded the first schools in Canada. Already in 1663 Laval was founded as the Grand Séminaire de Québec. It achieved university standing in 1852 when it received its charter. The Université de Montréal was originally a Montreal branch of Laval, but later achieved independent standing. Other Roman Catholic universities are St. Francis Xavier in Nova Scotia (1855), Université d'Ottawa (1866), St. Mary's College in Halifax (1860), and Assumption in Windsor (university status

17. A brief survey of the Canadian scene is given in R. C. Wallace, "The Universities in Canada," *The University Outside Europe*, ed. by Edward Bradby (Oxford, 1939) pp. 115 ff.

in 1953). Mention should also be made of St. Joseph's College in New Brunswick, Regiopolis in Kingston (1866) and St. Michael's College, federated as an arts college with the University of Toronto in 1910.

The Church of England has been responsible in Canada's history for the establishment of a number of schools. The earliest was King's College in Nova Scotia which achieved university status in 1802, and is now associated with Dalhousie University. The University of New Brunswick was also originally a King's College (1828), as was the University of Toronto. King's College, York (later, Toronto) was reorganized as a university without sectarian privileges in 1849, whereupon Bishop Strachan founded a new university under the name of Trinity College. In 1903 Trinity federated with the University of Toronto. Bishop's College was founded at Lennoxville in 1843, and Huron College, mother of the University of Western Ontario, was opened in 1863.

Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists also founded colleges. Dalhousie University, originally endowed in 1818, made a permanent beginning under Presbyterian auspices in 1863. Queen's University, Kingston, a Presbyterian foundation, received its charter in 1841. The Methodists have been responsible for three colleges: Mt. Allison at Sackville, N.B., which became a university in 1858: Victoria, established at Cobourg in 1841, but removed to Toronto and federated with the University there in 1884: and Albert College in Belleville (1866). The Baptists founded Acadia University in Wolfville, N.S., in 1838, and they created McMaster University in Toronto in 1887 by joining two small colleges. In 1930 McMaster moved from Toronto to Hamilton.

It is apparent from the above catalogue of university beginnings that the Canadian University has in the main not been secular in origin. And yet in many of our universities no course in the teachings of the Christian religion is to be found in the curriculum. The invidious misinterpretation of the original intent of a policy of separation of church and state has promoted an unwarranted secularization whereby religion has become the naughty word of our Senior Common Rooms.

Such a course of action is the result of the intrusion of a false dichotomy in our thinking. That a university serving and subsidized by a Canadian citizenry should be non-sectarian is a principle with which no one can quarrel. That courses in Pauline thought, the history of the Christian church, and in Christian doctrine should be banned from university curricula is a disavowal of our cultural heritage and is historically unjustified. The Judaeo-Christian inheritance is a basic element in our cultural origins, perhaps the most important of all. Aside from the tragedy of ignorance on the part of many students with respect to their own religious heritage which this failure to teach religion on a "course" basis promotes, it also constitutes a distortion of this Judaeo-Christian heritage of ours, and a denial of the original intent of the university.

The process of secularization in the educational system has proceeded

much faster and farther in the United States than it has in Canada. A number of United States Universities are, however, aroused to the moral and cultural vacuum that is being created and have tried to meet this by the establishment of undergraduate departments of religion. Princeton, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Stamford, and many more have created such departments—with unexpected results. Courses in religion have been among the most popular on the campus. It is a dereliction of duty to leave this field in the hands of SCM, VCF and denominational groups. The fact that their excellent work is so successful shows that the university is failing in its primary function, namely, to aid the student in thinking out for himself a satisfying view of thought and action. A Department of Religion is not a luxury; it is an imperative.[18]

18. That the University's responsibility towards its religious heritage is being recognized by Canadian educators was convincingly demonstrated in University of Toronto President S. A. Smith's *President's Report for the Year ended June 1953*, pp. 1–4.