

W.H. GRIFFITH THOMAS AND JAMES M. GRAY: TWO PROMINENT ANGLICAN EDUCATORS

Christopher Beckham

Fundamentalism is usually associated with obscurantism and anti-educational attitudes. This essay examines the lives and educational philosophies of two Anglican Educators who exerted significant influence on American fundamentalism in its formative years.

1. More Than One Kind of Christian Fundamentalist?

Some years ago, Professor Virginia L. Brereton wrote a significant study about the beginnings of American Bible institutes, schools, and colleges entitled *Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880–1940*. In her book, Professor Brereton explored the beginnings of institutions that she felt shaped the entire Christian fundamentalist movement. She argued that American Christian fundamentalism could not have developed into the significant force it has become without the rise of the Bible School and Bible Institute, and her argument continues to attract attention. Moreover, as she explored the institution, she highlighted the careers of several major clergymen/educators. As she did so, she pinpointed at least two 'types' of Christian fundamentalists, arguing that there were fundamentalists who had

...a great zeal for education and a strong concern for middle class virtues of respectability, punctuality, order, decorum, and rationality. [These fundamentalists] tended to be more doctrinally and theologically oriented. On the other side were those who described themselves as 'spirit-led'...more demonstrative, freer in displays of religious emotion, less impressed with middle class convention...They tended to emphasize experience over theology, and frequently harbored a distrust of schools, particularly higher education, as stultifying to the spirit and unnecessary to the achievement of evangelistic goals.¹

Among these 'fundamentalists' were some Anglicans who were also educators, and clearly had the 'great zeal for education' of which Professor Brereton wrote. These included W.H. Griffith Thomas and

¹ Virginia Lieson Brereton, *Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880–1940* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), p. 139.

James M. Gray. Did these two educator/ministers espouse any particular educational philosophies in their work?

2. The Lives of Thomas and Gray

This essay examines their careers.² W.H. Griffith Thomas, a presbyter of the Church of England, and James M. Gray, a minister of the Reformed Episcopal Church, are fascinating examples of early fundamentalists who were educational administrators, professors and ministers in a tradition that is especially noted for its ‘order and decorum’ as provided through the venerable Book of Common Prayer, and is perhaps not readily identified with Christian fundamentalism.

The Life of W.H. Griffith Thomas

W.H. Griffith Thomas was born in 1861 in Shropshire, England. Because of his personal circumstances, Thomas’ quest to gain an education and fulfil his desire to enter the ministry of the Church of England was a protracted process. Nevertheless, he was determined to overcome these odds.³ Through stringent personal discipline which meant studying after his work, late into the night, he began to meet the necessary qualifications for ordination.⁴ After this, he served in a series of parishes that provided him further opportunities to gain formal academic credentials.⁵ By the time Thomas finished his academic study, he had earned the Doctor of

² I realise that there is something problematic about calling both these men ‘Anglicans.’ Thomas was unquestionably an ‘Anglican’ as he was a priest in the Church of England, but Gray was a Reformed Episcopalian, and the use of the term ‘Anglican’ to describe that denomination in the nineteenth century might raise some eyebrows. However, using the term ‘Anglican’ as short-hand for two clergymen who were ordained in the episcopal tradition, who both used the Book of Common Prayer when they ministered in church settings, and who observed the sacramental life of the Anglican tradition, in general seemed the easiest nomenclature to use for this study.

³ See John D. Hannah, ‘The ‘Thomas’ in the W.H. Griffith Thomas Memorial Lectureship’ in *Biblioteca Sacra* 163 (January–March 2006): pp. 3–17.

⁴ There are few biographical resources that have been prepared on Thomas. Most of them appear in evangelical publications that are very sympathetic to Thomas and his religious views. The most detailed study of his life is M. Guthrie Clark’s *W.H. Griffith Thomas (1861–1924): Minister, Scholar, Teacher*. This short biography was one in a large series of biographies entitled *Great Churchmen*, and published by the Church Bookroom Press. Thomas’s life was no. 25 in that series.

⁵ See Clark, ‘Ordination’ at http://archive.churchsociety.org/issues_new/history/griffiththomas/iss_history_griffiththomas_Clark-Ordination.asp

Divinity degree from Oxford, based on dissertations he wrote about the Church of England's view on the Lord's Supper.⁶

In 1905, Thomas' career took a different turn, and he ended his work as a parish priest and entered full time work in higher education. He became the principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, a centre of evangelical ministerial training in the Oxford University context. Thomas remained there until 1910, when he left to teach at Wycliffe College, in Toronto, Canada. He remained there until 1919, when he and his family moved to Philadelphia, PA. From then until his death in 1924, Thomas regularly spoke in fundamentalistic Christian conventions and conferences, travelling far and wide. He spoke as a guest lecturer at Princeton Theological Seminary, and in numerous other American Bible colleges and schools.⁷ One of Thomas' most famous works was a 'manual for members of the Church of England' entitled *The Catholic Faith*. This book was the publication of his catechetical lectures, and this volume is a comprehensive study of how communicants in the Church of England could approach their life in accord within the Anglican tradition. In Thomas' lifetime, that book went through numerous editions, with over 20,000 copies printed. It was quite popular and inherently instructive in nature—overall, an excellent example of Evangelical Anglican catechesis.

Thomas had the unique mix of gifts that allowed him to be a popular author and a serious scholar. His devotional commentaries on various biblical books were widely read—and he covered an immense amount of ground with them. He wrote commentaries on each of the four Gospels, on many New Testament letters, as well as substantial volumes on Old Testament books. Many of his books run to several hundred pages. Moreover, as a lasting comment on their perceived usefulness, several of them remain in print, almost 100 years after his death.

His scholarly works were used in seminaries and theological colleges. One of his works, which is widely considered his magnum opus, *Principles of Theology: An Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles*, continues to be used as a seminary text in dogmatic theology. Nearly every one of Thomas' publications contains extensive bibliographies, containing wide references and enabling the reader to see something of the wide-ranging body of literature with which Thomas was conversant. If his bibliographies are

⁶ W.H. Griffith Thomas, *A Sacrament of Our Redemption: An Enquiry Into the Meaning of the Lord's Supper in The New Testament and the Church of England* (London: Bemrose & Sons, 1900).

⁷ See M. Guthrie Clark, *W.H. Griffith Thomas, Minister, Scholar, Teacher*, in the chapter 'Toronto.'

any indication, Thomas was extraordinarily well read, and ‘kept current in his field’ as every good academic must aspire to do. The depth and breadth of his work demonstrates how the early fundamentalist movement included many intellectuals. He was a consummate scholar/educator, who retained his conservative, semi-fundamentalist stance. However, as the eminent Anglican scholar of the twentieth century J.I. Packer has noted, Thomas utterly lacked the ‘obscurantist’ strain that seemed to mark fundamentalism as the movement matured.⁸ Thomas was noted for his ability to study topics systematically and for keeping abreast of wider trends. Moreover, Thomas was able to rise above a sectarian approach to his teaching. He could articulate his Anglicanism ably, but his conference and teaching ministry carried him places far and wide, and often in settings completely outside the realm of liturgical, sacramental worship.

One of the final acts of his career was his involvement in the formation of an evangelical seminary in Dallas, Texas, still in existence today.⁹ Thomas was to have been part of the first faculty and had corresponded and partnered extensively with the seminary’s founder, Lewis Sperry Chafer, in the details of organisation.

The Life of James M. Gray

James M. Gray was born in New York City in 1851. In his early adulthood, Gray decided to enter the Episcopal ministry and started his academic training.¹⁰ Not long after beginning his studies, Gray left the Protestant Episcopal Church, however, and entered the Reformed Episcopal Church in 1874. The Reformed Episcopal Church (REC) was a movement that separated out from the Protestant Episcopal Church over complex issues relating to doctrinal controversy and liturgical differences.¹¹

Upon his ordination as a presbyter in the REC church, Gray quickly distinguished himself as a capable minister. His reputation took him to Boston, where his superiors had explicit hopes that he could infuse life into the Reformed Episcopal work there.¹² The Boston move precipitated his launch into the realm of higher education, as Gray became involved

⁸ See J.I. Packer’s preface in Thomas’s *Principles of Theology* (Philadelphia: Theological Seminary of the Reformed Episcopal Church, 1996), np.

⁹ Hannah, ‘The ‘Thomas,’ p. 17.

¹⁰ John David Hannah, ‘James Martin Gray, 1851–1935: His Life and Work.’ ThD dissertation, May 1974, Dallas Theological Seminary, p. 68.

¹¹ The best history of this small, but quite interesting denomination is by Allen C. Guelzo, *For the Union of Evangelical Christendom: The Irony of the Reformed Episcopalians* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994).

¹² Hannah, ‘James Martin Gray,’ p. 81.

in the Boston Missionary Training School teaching classes on the ‘English Bible.’ The Boston Missionary Training School (which went on to become Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary) was largely the work of a prominent Boston Baptist A.J. Gordon.¹³ Gray remained a Reformed Episcopalian throughout his life, but his appeal was broad in that he was offered pastorates in several different denominations, and cooperated with ministers of varying denominations. He lectured widely on the topic of ‘Synthetic Bible Study,’ a teaching course which gave outlines of the contents of the Bible, but which also taught a methodology for ‘mastering’ the Bible. Correspondence courses developed from these lectures, and these courses were used in denominations as diverse as the Methodist Church and the Plymouth Brethren.¹⁴

Starting in 1892, he taught during the summer in Chicago at what was then the ‘Chicago Evangelistic Society,’ the forerunner of the Moody Bible Institute.¹⁵ By 1904, Gray was employed by the school full-time, and by 1907, was in charge. After he entered this role, an extended period of institutional advancement and expansion ensued. Gray was not as prolific an author as Thomas, but his *Synthetic Bible Studies* sold vigorously, and became Gray’s ‘signature’ work. According to one of his biographers, a paper titled *The Union Gospel News* which carried his ‘Synthetic Studies’ saw its circulation grow from 20,000 to 80,000, largely on the popularity of Gray’s columns.¹⁶ Gray led Moody Bible Institute for 30 years, retiring at age 86. During Gray’s era Moody Bible Institute prided itself as being the ‘self-styled West Point of Fundamentalism.’¹⁷

The careers of Thomas and Gray clearly illustrate that the term ‘fundamentalist educator’ is not an oxymoron, and there remain many avenues of study that are yet unexplored about these two men. While both W.H. Griffith Thomas and James M. Gray began their professional lives as active parish clergy, both of them made the jump to the classroom naturally and were successful in their endeavours in academia. Both Thomas and Gray were educators at heart. They stand as the kind of examples that merit consideration when evaluating the fundamentalist movement as a whole.

¹³ William Runyon, *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1935), p. 94.

¹⁴ Runyon, *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute*, p. 66.

¹⁵ Runyon, *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute*, p. 94.

¹⁶ Runyon, *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute*, p. 65.

¹⁷ Brereton, *Training God’s Army*, p. vii.

3. The Educational Philosophies of Thomas and Gray

If these two men adequately confirm Brereton's thesis that there were fundamentalists who were not anti-education and who favoured decorum and orderliness in life and worship, the next task can be taken up. What sort of educational philosophy did these men espouse?

The Educational Philosophy of W.H. Griffith Thomas

W.H. Griffith Thomas had quite a bit to say about the teaching and learning process. In his book *Methods of Bible Study*, Thomas remarked

Knowledge demands study—earnest, faithful, patient—constant study. The value of an adequate knowledge of the Bible is evident. There is intellectual profit in its information and instruction. There is moral profit in its guidance and warning. There is spiritual profit in its doctrinal and experimental truth.¹⁸

There are both ontological and epistemological components to this quotation. Knowledge exists, Thomas says, but it is not something that lies on the surface of the world, so to speak. It has to be mined out of the Bible, as it were, by serious application of one's mind. Once the proper application to know the material of the Bible is made, then various kinds of benefits accrue to the student. According to Thomas, he can become wiser by increasing his knowledge of Scripture. That in turn will improve him morally and his spiritual life will be deepened and broadened. As he wrote in *Grace and Power*, 'The Christian life starts with knowledge. 'If ye know these things.' (John 13:17). A knowledge of Christian truth is of paramount importance, of primary necessity. It does matter what we believe.'¹⁹ Thomas goes on to say

Knowledge, however, presupposes very much more than reading; it calls for study. And not study only, but a genuine application of mind, heart, and conscience...Bible study involves hard work because it demands thought.²⁰

¹⁸ W.H. Griffith Thomas, *Methods of Bible Study* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975 [originally published 1926]), p. 11.

¹⁹ W.H. Griffith Thomas, *Grace and Power* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), p. 129.

²⁰ Thomas, *Methods*, pp. 11–12.

Thomas clearly had sympathy with educational philosophies that stressed discipline and hard work on the student's part as being essential for the experience of gaining knowledge.

The educational philosophers known as educational essentialists have also made similar points. Essentialists champion rigorous education and teaching traditional subjects, often remarking that it is really through hard work and application that knowledge is gained. Historian and philosopher of education George F. Kneller, in his book *Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, wrote that essentialist educators 'insist on the importance of discipline...against the progressive emphasis on *personal interest*, [the essentialist] places the concept of *effort*.'²¹ This philosophical approach can readily be found in the works of the American educational philosopher William C. Bagley.²² Bagley was a Columbia University professor of education from 1917–1940, and was often credited as the chief spokesman of educational essentialism.

In Bagley's *Craftsmanship in Teaching*, for example, he explained that one of the teacher's main goals must be to inspire students about the value of 'patient and persistent effort.' Bagley writes of the value of 'struggle' and 'paying the price' often, and notes that it is this approach to education and all of life that pays rich dividends. As he put it

...among all the lessons...that we must teach him there is none so fundamental and important as the lesson of achievement itself,—the supreme lesson wrung from human experience...namely, that every advance that the world has made, every step that it has taken forward, every increment that has been added to the sum total of progress has been attained at the price of self-sacrifice and effort and struggle.²³

²¹ George F. Kneller, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964), p. 113.

²² See William C. Bagley, *Education and Emergent Man* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press), 1934, and Isaac Kandel, *William C. Bagley: Stalwart Educator* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961). For a brief biographical overview of Bagley, see J. Wesley Null, 'William C. Bagley and the Founding of Essentialism: An Untold Story in American Educational History,' *Teachers College Record*, v109 n4 (2007): pp. 1013–1055.

²³ William C. Bagley, *Craftsmanship in Teaching* (New York: MacMillan, 1911), p. 105.

Thomas echoed this sentiment when he wrote

we must search. God's thoughts are never revealed to listless readers, but only to eager searchers. The glories of the scriptures are not to be discovered without diligent search. The Bible is like a mine, and its jewels are not to be picked up on the roadside. It affords opportunity for thought, and requires its exercise.²⁴

However, Thomas fully accepted the divine/human character of the Scriptures, in the sense that they were the words of the Divine Being, mediated to human beings through a human writer inspired in some mysterious way. So, Thomas often stated that academic study of the Scriptures—the kind of hard mental work that accompanies scholarship—could only take person 'so far' and that divine assistance was necessary to grasp the full breadth and depth of the Bible's message. There was knowledge of the Bible that could be acquired through scholarly inquiry and study, but the deeper meaning—that which led to spiritual regeneration and spiritual vitality—required a sort of illumination through supernatural mediation. As he put it in *Grace and Power*, 'It cannot be too often emphasized that knowledge in the New Testament is not merely intellectual perception; it is spiritual experience.'²⁵

The primary way that Thomas believed this deeper kind of knowledge occurred was through what he called 'meditation.' He certainly was not thinking of an Eastern-styled approach where a transcendent state is sought. Rather, he defined meditation as 'reading with attention. More than this, it is reading with intention.'²⁶ He went on to explain 'Meditation must be real. The hour of meditation is not a time for dreams, vague imaginings, but for living, actual blessing, whether in the form of guidance, warning, comfort, or counsel.'²⁷

For Thomas, meditation meant 'careful reading of the...passage... thinking over its real and original meaning.' He said 'it is to be noted that the word 'meditate' in our English version, represents two Hebrew words—one meaning to 'muse' or 'think,' and the other implying 'speech,' or 'audible thinking.' These two elements should always be blended; thinking over the Word, its meaning, its application, its message, and then talking to God about it...' Even as he wrote about meditation,

²⁴ Thomas, *Methods of Bible Study*, p. 111.

²⁵ Thomas, *Grace and Power*, p. 131.

²⁶ Thomas, *Methods*, p. 111.

²⁷ Thomas, *Methods*, p. 113.

the ‘hard work’ approach of Thomas shines through evidently enough. He did not believe that a casual approach to Bible study was going to accomplish much.

Furthermore, if Thomas’s views of the student (at least the student of Scripture) matched well with educational essentialism, his views of the teacher were also congruent with it. Writing in *The Work of the Ministry*, Thomas said that he felt that teaching was above all a conservative enterprise, faithfully handing down tried and true maxims of a previous age, with an eye toward preservation of tradition.

It is his work [the minister as religious teacher] to pass on ‘the deposit (I Timothy 1:14)’ and the need of competent teachers is constant and great. Teaching is far too rare a characteristic in ministry; men can talk, or preach or exhort, or appeal; but none of these must be confused with teaching. Teaching is causing another to learn, and nothing short of this will suffice. We must not only endeavor to cultivate the teaching gift ourselves, but we must also ever be on the lookout for such to train them. The deepest, strongest and most lasting results in the ministry accrue to those who can teach.²⁸

This again comports with educational essentialism. While Bagley was in no way speaking of religious matters, he said to a graduating class of a teacher’s college that he hoped they would take a “vow of idealism,—the pledge of fidelity and devotion to...fundamental principles of life which it is the business of education carefully to cherish...and transmit untarnished to each succeeding generation.”²⁹

In his book *Introduction to Teaching*, Bagley said that teaching is more a matter of stimulating learners to learn, rather than ‘causing’ as Thomas put it, but their understanding of the process is remarkably alike. As Bagley wrote, ‘to stimulate, encourage, and direct learning is the goal and substance of the art of teaching.’³⁰

Bagley and other essentialists would agree that there are certain ‘fundamental principles’ that must be passed down from generation to generation—and that the work of the teacher is to see to it that students learn these ‘fundamental principles.’ It is beyond the scope of this paper to define those ‘fundamental principles,’ but the parallels between what

²⁸ W.H. Griffith Thomas, *The Work of the Ministry* (New York: Doran, 1910), p. 78.

²⁹ Bagley, *Craftsmanship in Teaching*.

³⁰ William Bagley and John A. Keith, *An Introduction to Teaching* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), p. 27.

Bagley saw the task of teaching to be and what Thomas saw the task of teaching to be should be clear enough.

The Educational Philosophy of James M. Gray

Whereas Thomas was an Oxford-trained scholar, who could produce both scholarly volumes and less technical books that appealed to popular audiences, almost all of James M. Gray's work was for the non-specialist. The appeal of his writings, especially for his writings about Bible interpretation, was large. His most famous books were *How to Master the English Bible* and *Synthetic Bible Studies*.

In his book *How to Master the English Bible*, Gray proposed to give people a method not merely of studying the Bible, but of mastering it. His method was not difficult—it mostly consisted of advocating that persons who wished to master the Bible simply read it—over and over and over again—not cover to cover, but one book at a time, looking for the central message of each biblical book. The sense of Gray's approach was that before one could really study the Bible, one had to know its broad outlines in such a way as to master the overall 'whole.' As he put it, a student of the Bible needed to 'use the telescope first and the microscope afterwards.'³¹ He wrote

How to master the English Bible! High-sounding title that, but does it mean what it says? It is not how to study it, but how to master it; for there is a sense in which the Bible must be mastered before it can be studied, and it is the failure to see this which accounts for other failures on the part of many earnest would-be Bible students. I suppose it is something like a farm; for although never a farmer myself, I have always imagined a farmer should know his farm before he attempted to work it. How much upland and how much lowland? How much wood and how much pasture? Where should the orchard be laid out? Where plant my corn, oats, and potatoes? What plot is to be seeded down to grass? When he has mastered his farm he begins to get ready for results from it.³²

The epistemological issue for Gray is one of saturation of the mind with Bible content. His approach is thematic and sweeping. He is seeking for his students what he might have termed 'big picture' knowledge.

³¹ James M. Gray, *Synthetic Bible Studies* (New York: Revell, 1906), p. 7.

³² Gray, *Synthetic Bible Studies*, p. 7.

Now there are many ways of studying the Bible, any one of which may be good enough in itself, but there is only one way to master it...And it is the Bible itself we are to master, not books about the Bible, nor yet 'charts.' I once listened to an earnest and cultivated young man delivering a lecture on Bible study, illustrated by a chart so long that when he unrolled and held one end of it above his head, as high as his arms could reach, the other curled up on the floor below the platform. As the auditor gazed upon its labyrinthian lines, circles, crosses and other things intended to illuminate it, and 'gathered up the loins of his mind' to listen to the explanation following, it was with an inward sigh of gratitude that God had never put such a yoke upon us, 'which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear.'³³

Gray's approach to 'big picture' learning of the Christian Scriptures remained popular for a long time—well throughout his lifetime, and his book *How to Master the English Bible* remains in print. If it is true that Thomas can be classified as being an educational essentialist, with his emphasis on rigour and discipline, Gray belongs in a different category. Gray approached religious education in a much more 'populist' way. Gray revelled in the fact that there was nothing complicated in what he wrote. Gray commented that people who followed his method having 'scarcely more than a common school education' could indeed 'master' the English Bible. His 'synthetic method' brought to Bible readers a way to 'master' the contents of the Bible without any special academic preparation in theology. If a person could read, he or she could carry out his method. Special knowledge of biblical Greek and Hebrew were not necessary. Gray emphasised the importance of 'time spent' but equally stressed that memorisation was not the aim. Gray's work underscores the 'populist' and 'progressive' impulses of the early Christian fundamentalist movement, which Virginia Brereton noted. She felt there were similarities between the way the Bible Schools and Institutes and the Progressive educators approached schooling in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.³⁴ During Gray's administration at Moody, Brereton noted that courses centred on 'how' religious work was to be done, rather than 'why' it was to be done, multiplied.

Educational progressives such as John Dewey stressed the need for the unity of education with actual activities that people performed.³⁵

³³ James M. Gray, *How to Master The English Bible* (Chicago: Winona, 1904), p. 13.

³⁴ Brereton, *Training God's Army*, pp. 108ff.

³⁵ See Kneller, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, pp. 96–102.

Dewey criticised educational ideals that saw the school as a place to merely learn lessons that bore little resemblance to the actual activities of real life. Dewey called for making the school into an actual place of real community life in his famous book *School and Society*. In this book, Dewey argued that lessons should not be disconnected from actual living. Dewey believed it was a misapplication of the educative process to teach a student how to do wood work as though that was just another subject to be learned, with no connection to real life. Dewey wanted educators to see things differently.

If we were to conceive our educational aim in a less exclusive way, if we were to introduce into our educational processes the activities which appeal to those whose dominant interests are to do and to make, we should find the hold of the school on its members to be more vital, more prolonged, containing more of culture.³⁶

Gray was miles apart from John Dewey in terms religious beliefs, but he appears to have agreed with some of Dewey's educational philosophy. While Gray was president at Moody Bible School, for instance, courses that centred on 'field work' increased, and the actual 'doing' of evangelistic work by students was a highly valued aspect of the academic enterprise. Students were to distribute tracts, preach in a variety of settings, and engage in all sorts of 'outreach' activities.³⁷ Professor Brereton noted that in the early days of the Bible schools, they saw their success primarily in measuring the amount of 'field work' done by their students rather than by the number of degrees or diplomas conferred.³⁸

Conclusion

The aim of this article is to demonstrate that Professor Brereton was right to detect the existence of a type of fundamentalist who favoured education. W.H. Griffith Thomas and James M. Gray are good examples of this 'type.' Their careers will hopefully open many vistas for further inquiry, especially regarding connections between their administrative work, theological agreement and divergence, their educational philosophy, and their instructional methodology.

³⁶ John Dewey, *School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900), p. 45.

³⁷ Brereton, *Training God's Army*, p. 107.

³⁸ Brereton, *Training God's Army*, p. 80.

While their educational philosophies may have diverged, the two men shared many similarities besides the facts of their similar ecclesiastical background. Thomas and Gray alike engaged in pan-Protestant activities—they wore their denominational identities in such a way that they wished to be known as evangelicals first, and members of the episcopal tradition secondly. As Professor Brereton observed, those early fundamentalists who were most closely involved in the Bible School and Bible Institute work mitigated the rougher edges of the movement precisely through their ability to work in a variety of denominational settings. Men like Thomas and Gray were able to cooperate and stand as men who could speak ‘inter-denominationally.’ The conferences and Bible Schools where they taught and served exerted a ‘check on the [fundamentalist] movement’s powerful centrifugal forces.’³⁹

Early fundamentalism appears to have benefited from leadership by men like Thomas and Gray, who could make their appeal from the broader centre of the Christian tradition and speak to a wide audience. Agreement on every point of doctrine was not necessary, so long as certain cardinal doctrines such as those identified in the widely known, mass distributed volume known as *The Fundamentals* were affirmed.⁴⁰ More work on these Anglican educators, and the lasting influence of their writings, remains to be done.

CHRISTOPHER BECKHAM is an Assistant Professor in the history and philosophy of education at the Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky, and is a presbyter of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Diocese of the Central States.

³⁹ Brereton, *Training God’s Army*, 139.

⁴⁰ *The Fundamentals* were a two-volume set of essays edited by A.C. Dixon and R.A. Torrey, and published by the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. Some prominent Evangelical Anglicans (including W.H. Griffith Thomas) had articles in these volumes. James M. Gray was also a contributor. Other Anglicans who contributed included Canon Dyson Hague of Canada, and a posthumous inclusion of an essay by Bishop J.C. Ryle. See George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 118–119.

