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# Pre-Reformation Reformers

## Introduction

1. **the difference *in nuce***
   1. Catholicism says, “the fullness of the apostolic tradition”; Protestantism says, “the purity of the apostolic age.” (Congar)
2. **reform movements**
   1. Every religion has reform movements that intend to return the religion to a pure state.
   2. Judaism had Karaism.
      1. c. 770: Karaism (from *qara*, “scripture”) arises. (Sigal 115)
      2. characteristics
         1. It rejected non-scriptural authority. Hence it rejected:
            1. the Talmud and the *geonim* (authorities after c. ad 200)
            2. laws about mixing meat and dairy
            3. tefillin, mezuzah, etc.
            4. *hanukkah* and *purim*
            5. mystical ideas and angelology/demonology (Sigal 116-117)
            6. messianic zeal (Sigal 116)
         2. It was more ascetic than rabbinism. (Sigal 116, 119)
         3. It instituted 10 as a prayer quorum. (Sigal 119)
      3. 1300s-1400s: Karaism is big in the Ottoman Empire. (Sigal 118)
      4. 1500s: Karaism declines. (Sigal 118)
   3. Islam had Khārijism.
      1. The Khārijites “spoke of the Islamic community as ‘the people of Paradise’ . . . to ensure that this community remained the people of Paradise, however, it was necessary . . . that those who broke the rules should be excluded from it. In this way there arose the distinctive Khārijite tenet that those who have committed a grave sin are thereby excluded from the community.” (Watt 4)
      2. “The members of the northern tribes had not been within the sphere of influence of the belief in divine kingship. . . . the normal practice in the desert tribes was for all the adult males to be regarded as in certain respects equal . . .” (Watt 6)
      3. “Each little band presumably re­garded itself as the core of the community of gen­uine Muslims, though not denying that there were genuine Muslims apart from the band. Most other men, however, were not genuine Muslims . . .” (Watt 5)

## Marcionism (144-c. 600)

1. **Marcion**
   1. Marcion, a wealthy shipowner in Sinope (province of Pontus in Asia Minor), had a reputation for asceticism but was involved in a scandal.
   2. He fled to Rome, where he donated 200,000 sesterces to the pope.
   3. He attended the lectures of the Gnostic, Cerdon.
   4. Unable to persuade Roman clerics to his beliefs, he left the Church in 144, and the pope returned his money and excommunicated him.
2. **teachings**
   1. Yahweh, god of the Old Testament, is not the same as Abba, God of the New Testament.
   2. Yahweh, as demiurge, created the universe; he ignorantly thought he was the supreme being. He mixed man’s spiritual soul with matter and refused knowledge of good and evil.
   3. Abba sent his son, distinct from him only in name, to appear at the synagogue in Capernaum. The son had no body and only appeared to die (a belief called docetism).
   4. Marcion’s Bible was: no Old Testament; ⅔ of Luke; 10 letters of Paul.
   5. after death
      1. Full Marcionites would be in the company of Abba.
      2. All others would be in Yahweh’s power when he destroys the universe with fire.
3. **morality**
   1. Marcionites avoided certain foods and were celibate.
   2. Marcionites were an elite. Marcion said, “Demiurge is with the crowd; the Lord is only with the chosen ones.” (Qtd. in Eberhardt)
   3. Marcionites were so austere that even Tertullian, an excessive rigorist, ridiculed them.
   4. To avoid severe asceticisms, most Marcionites stayed neophytes till near death.
4. **later history**
   1. “Apelles, Marcion’s disciple, reduced Marcion’s dualism to monism, and mitigated his asceticism.” (Eberhardt)
   2. “Syneros and Lucanus, other disciples, altered Marcion’s teaching by introducing an evil deity. Gradually the concept of Demiurge was lost sight of in favor of Manichae­an opposition between good and evil deities.” (Eberhardt)
   3. c. 150: Justin Martyr says Marcionism was already widespread.
   4. c. 400: Epiphanius (*Panarion* 42.1) says Marcionism is still important.
   5. after 600: Marcionism is not heard of again. Probably its members became Manichae­ans.

## Encratism (c. 170-300)

1. **introduction**
   1. Encratism was “less a sect than an attitude within the Church.” (Eberhardt)
   2. “Hermas, Tertullian, and St. Hippolytus all manifested certain Encratite tendencies in this broad sense of a mental attitude.” (Eberhardt)
2. **Tatian**
   1. “Tatian of Syria, a disciple of St. Justin, is associated with Encratism by St. Irenaeus [*Adversus Haereses* 1.28], but he does not say whether he founded the movement. Eusebius [*History* 4.28] does add this assertion.” (Eberhardt)
   2. Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 3.13) says “that Tatian condemned marriage and is believed to have mingled some Gnostic elements in his later teaching.” (Eberhardt)
3. **teachings**
   1. “Encratism” means “continence” (“abstention from sexual activity”):[[1]](#footnote-1) marriage is sinful.
      1. Perhaps Tatian taught that matter is evil.
      2. Or perhaps the Encratites misunderstood Paul in 1 Cor 7 on virginity.
   2. They taught that baptism includes a vow of chastity.
   3. Encratites said, “There is no resurrection but for such as preserve their virginity.”
   4. They were vegetarians.
   5. They forbid alcohol; some substituted water for wine at Mass.
   6. They “stressed good works over theological speculation.” (Eberhardt)
   7. They wrote apocryphal Acts of Paul, John, Peter, and Andrew.
4. **influence**
   1. “Encratite Puritanism constrained [others] to unwonted severity.” Though a small group, “their rigoristic attitude, like that of the Jansenists centuries later, unconsciously influenced the practice of many Catholics who repudiated their teachings.” (Eberhardt)
   2. Encratites prompted a general practice of less frequent confession.

## Montanism (172-c. 500)

1. **Montanus**
   1. Phrygia was the seat of Cybele (Great Mother) worship. “Pagan priests of Cybele reported her oracles in states of ecstasy or reverie.” Montanus “had perhaps been one of these pagan priests.” (Eberhardt)
   2. Montanus converts Christianity.
   3. 172 (so Eusebius; Epiphanius says 157): though still a catechumen, Montanus has moments of ecstasy in a Phrygian village and begins to prophesy.
2. **teachings**
   1. Montanus said he was “a prophet promised by Christ . . .” Later he said he was the Holy Spirit. (Eberhardt)
   2. early Montanism
      1. Early Montanism was similar to Protestantism. “Montanism . . . was at first merely a movement of religious enthusiasm within the Church: a sort of revival that professed to retain the entire Christian doctrine. Montanist votaries harked back to the charismata [special graces] of the apostolic age. Presently they became interested in an imminent parousia or second coming of Christ.” (Eberhardt)
   3. The second coming is imminent and will bring terrible punishments.
      1. “Millenarianism or Chiliasm . . . had prepared the way for Montanism by claiming that Christ’s second coming would bring about a thousand year reign of the just in an earthly Eden.[[2]](#footnote-2) This residue of exaggerated Jewish Messianism was sometimes given a spiritual meaning by certain fathers, such as Sts. Justin and Irenaeus . . .” (Eberhardt)
      2. Maximilla, who claimed: “After me the end will come,” died before 180.
   4. morality
      1. Parousia fever encouraged rigorism.
      2. “. . . marriage was discouraged, second marriages forbidden, all goods [were] held in common.” (Eberhardt)
      3. “Montanists should fast on bread, water, and dried meat.” (Eberhardt)
      4. “All study was to be forsaken . . .” (Eberhardt)
      5. A grievous sin after baptism is unpardonable. (See Heb 6:4, “it is impossible to restore again to repentance those who have once been enlightened . . . 6and then have fallen away, since on their own they are crucifying again the Son of God and are holding him up to contempt.”)
   5. later Montanism
      1. The Old Testament of the Father was replaced by the New Testament of the Son; the New Testament was now replaced by a Third Testament of the Holy Spirit.
      2. Montanists are “pneumatics” (from the Spirit); Catholics are merely “psychics.”
3. **history**
   1. Montanus toured Phrygia; the sect spread throughout Asia Minor; Thyatira became completely Montanist.
   2. Maximilla and Irisca, “two rich ladies who deserted their husbands to join,” start having ecstasies.
   3. Eastern bishops condemned Montanism but could not stop its spread. They warned the pope.
   4. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, prevented its spread in Gaul.
   5. “. . . when Montanist leaders appeared in Rome itself, Pope Zepherinus condemned the sect about 200.” (Eberhardt)
   6. Montanist schisms
      1. “. . . schism disrupted Montanist unity, for the trend to private inspiration became irresistible.” (Eberhardt)
      2. Tertullian led the Montanists of Carthage “from the parent body to become the Tertullianist sect. Surviving members of this group were reconciled by St. Augustine two centuries later.” (Eberhardt)
      3. “The Alogi denied the divinity of the Word . . .” (Eberhardt)
      4. “. . . the Artotritae insisted on cheese and bread as the eucharistic matter . . .”
      5. “. . . the Tascodrungitae called for attention at liturgical services by placing their forefinger to their nose.” (Eberhardt)
   7. Like the Marcionites, “many devotees were absorbed by Manichaeism during the third century.” (Eberhardt)
   8. Montanist sects had “played themselves out by the sixth century.” (Eberhardt)

## Novatianism (ad 251-c. 450)

1. Jan. 250-Mar. 251: Novatian administers the See of Rome from one pope’s martyrdom (Fabian, ad 240-50) to the next pope’s election (Cornelius, 251-53).
2. Novatian was a rigorist probably influenced by Encratism. He said that *lapsi* (apostates during Decius’ persecution, 249-51) were excluded “from any hope of reconciliation forever”; he denied absolution even to dying *lapsi*. (Eberhardt)
3. 251: Cornelius grants absolution to the *lapsi*. Novatian’s followers elect him anti-pope, and they break away from the Catholic Church. Many Montanists became Novatians.
4. 258: Novatian dies.
5. Novatian’s schism lasts for two centuries in the West; Pope Innocent I (402-17) mentions it.
6. Novatian churches exist in the East till the 600s.

## Manichaeism (c. 270-c. 600)

1. **introduction**
   1. Persia conquered the Parthian kingdom in 227. The Persians promoted Zoroastrianism.
   2. Mani (c. 215-c. 272/275) was Persian by birth. About 240, he preached in India. Later, he won favor at the Persian court, preaching a Zoroastrianism with Christian, Buddhist, Mithraist, and Gnostic elements. The magi denounced him, and the emperor, Bahram I, had him executed.
2. **teachings**
   1. The two supreme deities are Hridzai or Light, represented by the sun, and Archai or Darkness, author of matter. Hridzai formed Adam out of his own essence, but Archai infused evil elements into him. Archai sent Eve to evoke Adam’s evil elements.
   2. Mani called himself “apostle of Jesus Christ”; he claimed to have esoteric teachings from Jesus. Ultimately he identified himself as the Holy Spirit.
   3. Christ was son of Hridzai. He “took a merely apparent body to free the spiritual element in man from matter.” (Eberhardt)
   4. Manichees transmigrate “through bodies successively less material.” (Eberhardt)
   5. after death
      1. The elect go to paradise.
      2. Hearers undergo a series of purgations, then joined the elect.
      3. Sinful Manichaeans and unbelievers wander till the end of time, then go to hell.
      4. There is no salvation of the body.
3. **organization**
   1. The hierarchy was: twelve doctors, with one as leader; 72 “sons of knowledge” (administrators); elders (*presbyteroi*); deacons or missionaries.
   2. “Perfect ones” were Manichaean teachers and were apostles, bishops, priests, or deacons. They could not eat meat or slay animals (or plants with transmigrating souls); they could not drink wine; they were sexually inactive.
   3. “Hearers” could marry but could not have children. They obeyed Mani’s ten commandments: no idolatry, lying, greed, murder, adultery, theft, bad teachings, witchcraft, religious doubt, or laziness.
4. **worship** (Eberhardt)
   1. At first worship was internal: there were “no temples, altars, images, or sacrifices.”
   2. But later, external worship developed:
      1. first was “the feast of the *Bema* (chair) to commemorate Mani’s death . . .”
      2. Other “festivals were introduced or adapted from Christianity.”
      3. “A baptism with oil and a eucharist with water were developed.”
      4. “Prayers and readings from Mani’s letters in time formed a part of the liturgy.”
5. **spread**
   1. With Mani’s execution, Manichaeans fled Persia.
   2. “Some went to the Orient, to India, Armenia, Turkestan, and eventually as far as Tibet and China.” (Eberhardt)
   3. “They were readmitted to Persia after the Saracen conquest, and enjoyed toleration under the caliphate of Bagdad.” (Eberhardt)
   4. Manichees were in the Roman Empire by 280.
   5. In 296, Emperor Diocletian ordered the African pronconsul to prosecute them, not sparing the death penalty.” (Eberhardt)
   6. Emperor Julian (361-363) favored them.
   7. Later emperors renewed the edict of persecution: Valentinian I (372), Theodosius (381), Honorius (407), and Valentinian III (445). (Eberhardt)
   8. Around 400, Augustine’s Manichaean opponents, Faustus and Felix, circulated rather freely. (Eberhardt)

## Priscillianism (c. 370-600)

1. **introduction**
   1. Priscillianism is “an alleged Manichaean survival . . .” (Eberhardt)
2. **Priscillian**
   1. Priscillian was a very rich Spaniard.
   2. A friend, Helpidius, introduced Priscillian to Marcus, an Egyptian from Memphis who had moved to Spain to teach his Gnostic-Manichaean doctrines. Priscillian became an enthusiastic disciple; he studied Manichean and Gnostic literature, apocryphal writings, and astrology.
   3. “Through his oratorical gifts and reputation for extreme asceticism he attracted a large following. Among those drawn to him were two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus. The adherents of the new sect organized themselves into an oath-bound society . . .” (Healy)
   4. 380: a synod at Saragossa summons the Priscillianists; they refuse to appear; the synod excommunicates Priscillian, his friend Helpidius, and the two bishops.
   5. “. . . in defiance, Priscillian was ordained to the priesthood and appointed Bishop of Avila.” (Healy)
   6. “The Emperor Gratian issued a decree which not only deprived the Priscillianists of the churches into which they had intruded themselves but sentenced Priscillian and his followers to exile.” (Healy)
   7. 384: a synod in Bordeaux deposes Instantius.
   8. Priscillian appeals to the emperor (now Maximus). Martin of Tours obtains from the emperor a promise not to execute the Priscillianists.
   9. 385: a judge finds Priscillian guilty of magic, which is a civil crime. “. . . Maximus advertised his orthodoxy by torturing and executing Priscillian and several disciples . . .” (Eberhardt)
   10. The pope censures the emperor’s executions. (Healy)
   11. Ambrose and Martin of Tours criticize the Spanish hierarchy involved in prosecuting the Priscillianists to death. (Eberhardt)
3. **practices**
   1. “The foundation of the doctrines of the Priscillianists was Gnostic-Manichaean Dualism, a belief in the existence of two kingdoms, one of Light and one of Darkness. Angels and the souls of men were said to be severed from the substance of the Deity. Human souls were intended to conquer the Kingdom of Darkness, but fell and were imprisoned in material bodies. Thus both kingdoms were represented in man . . . The salvation of man consists in liberation from the domination of matter. . . . the Saviour came in a heavenly body which appeared to be like that of other men, and through His doctrine and His apparent death released the souls of the men from the influence of the material.” (Healy)
   2. They were vegetarian, sexually inactive, and (probably) fasted on Sundays. (Eberhardt)
   3. During Lent and the three weeks before Epiphany, they avoided public worship, shutting themselves up in mountain hermitages. (Eberhardt)
   4. They met in private homes at night to read apocryphal books. (Eberhardt)
   5. “They preserved a mysterious silence about their practises and doctrine . . .” (Eberhardt)
   6. “The ethical side of the Dualism of Priscillian with its low concept of nature gave rise to [a] system of asceticism . . .” (Healy)
   7. “. . . because it was believed that men in general could not understand the higher paths, the Priscillianists, or at least those of them who were enlightened, were permitted to tell lies for the sake of a holy end. It was because this doctrine was likely to be a scandal even to the faithful that Augustine wrote his famous work, *De mendacio*.” (Healy)
4. **history**
   1. The martyrdom of Priscillian and others resulted in a rapid spread of Priscillianism.
   2. 446-47: councils at Astorga, Toledo, and Galicia condemn Priscillianism.
   3. 500s: Priscillianism declines.
   4. 563: the Synod of Braga condemns it, and it soon dies out.

From Manichaeism to Catharism:

## Paulicianism and Bogomilism (c. 700-c. 1120)

1. **Paulicianism**
   1. “The origin of the name *Paulician* is obscure.” (Fortesque)
      1. Perhaps it is because, like Marcion, they devoted themselves especially to Paul.
      2. An Armenian Paul (†c. 715), who founded a congregation at Episparis in Armenia, is “thought by some to have given his name to the sect . . .” (Fortesque)
      3. 719: the name first occurs “in the Acts of the Armenian Synod of Duin . . .” (Fortes­que)
   2. founder
      1. 657: “Constantine of Mananalis, calling himself Silvanus, founded what appears to be the first Paulician community at Kibossa, near Colonia in Armenia.” (Fortesque)
      2. 657-684: Constantine spreads Paulicianism through Western Asia Minor. (Fortesque)
      3. 684: he is captured, tried for heresy, and stoned. (Fortesque)
   3. “They founded six congregations in Armenia and Pontus, to which they gave the names of Pauline Churches . . .” (Fortesque)
   4. beliefs and practices
      1. “It seems . . . obvious to count them as one of the many neo-Manichaean sects . . .” (Fortesque)
         1. There are two gods: the evil god “who made and governs the material world and the God of heaven who created souls . . .” (Fortesque)
         2. Matter is therefore evil.
      2. “But there is a strong Marcionite element too.” (Fortesque)
         1. “Their Bible was a fragmentary New Testament.” (Fortesque)
            1. “They rejected the Old Testament . . .” (Fortesque)
            2. “They referred always to the “Gospel and Apostle”, apparently only St Luke and St. Paul . . .” (Fortesque)

“They rejected St. Peter’s epistles because he had denied Christ.” (Fortesque)

* + - 1. “. . . there was no Incarnation, Christ was an angel sent into the world by God, his real mother was the heavenly Jerusalem.” (Fortesque)
      2. “They were Iconoclasts, rejecting all pictures.” (Fortesque)
      3. Christ’s “work consisted only in his teaching; to believe in him saves men from judgment.” (Fortesque)
      4. “The true baptism and Eucharist consist in hearing his word . . .” (Fortesque)
    1. Paulicians “refused to reverence the Cross because they regarded with horror all that it represented.” (Hughes)
    2. “The whole ecclesiastical hierarchy is bad . . .” (Fortesque)
    3. “. . . all Sacraments and ritual” are bad. (Fortesque)
    4. “They had a special aversion to monks.” (Fortesque)
    5. Paulician organization
       1. The founders were called “apostles” and “prophets.” “They took new names after people mentioned by St. Paul, thus Constantine called himself Silvanus; apparently they claimed to be these persons come to life again.” (Fortesque)
       2. “Under the apostles and prophets were “fellow-workers” (*synechdemoi*) who formed a council, and “notaries” (*notarioi*), who looked after the holy books and kept order at meetings.” (Fortesque)
       3. “Their conventicles were called, not churches, but “prayer-houses” (*proseuchai*).” (Fortesque)
    6. “They maintained that it was lawful to conceal or even deny their ideas for fear of persecution; many of them lived exteriorly as Catholics.” (Fortesque)
    7. “Their ideal was a purely spiritual communion of faithful that should obliterate all distinctions of race.” (Fortesque)
    8. “They would recognize no other name for themselves than “Christians”; the Catholics were “Romans” (*Romaioi*), that is, people who obey the Roman emperor . . .” (Fortesque)
    9. “Harnack sums them up as “dualistic Puritans and Individualists” and as “an anti-hierarchic Christianity built up on the Gospel, and Apostle, with emphatic rejection of Catholic Christianity” (*Dogmengeschichte*, II 528).” (Fortesque)
  1. subsequent history
     1. Constantine V (741-75) “transferred large numbers of them to Thrace . . .” (Fortesque)
     2. “Joseph (d. 775) founded communities all over Asia Minor.” (Fortesque)
     3. Under the next two leaders (Baanes † 801 and Sergius † 835) a schism occurred. “The Paulicians were now either Baanites (the old party), or Sergites (the reformed sect).” (Fortesque)
     4. “From the Imperial government the Paulicians met with alternate protection and persecution.” (Fortesque)
     5. c. 840s: “These Paulicians, now bitter enemies of the empire, were encouraged by the khalifa. They fortified a place called Tephrike and made it their headquarters. From Tephrike they made continual raids into the empire; so that from this time they form a political power . . .” (Fortesque)
     6. 871: Basil I destroys Tephrike. “This eliminated the sect as a military power. Meanwhile other Paulicians, heretics but not rebels, lived in groups throughout the empire.” (Fortesque)
     7. Emperor John I Tzimiskes (969-76) sends many to Thrace “to defend it against the Slavs. They founded a new centre at Philippopolis, from which they terrorized their neighbours.” (Fortesque)
     8. 800-1000: “During the ninth and tenth centuries these heretics in Armenia, Asia Minor, and Thrace constantly occupied the attention of the government and the Church.” (Fortesque)
     9. c. 866: “Photius wrote against them and boasts in his Encyclical (866) that he has converted a great number.” (Fortesque)
     10. 800s: *The Key of Truth* “accepts the Old Testament and the Sacraments of Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist. This work . . . represents a very late stage of their history, and it is disputed whether it is really Paulician at all.” (Fortesque)
     11. “Constantine IX [1042-55] persuaded or forced many thousands to renounce their errors.” (Fortesque)
     12. “The emperor Alexius Comnenus is credited with having put an end to the heresy. During a residence at Philippopolis, he argued with them and converted all, or nearly all, back to the Church (so his daughter: “Alexias”, XV, 9). From this time the Paulicians practically disappear from history. But they left traces of their heresy. In Bulgaria the Bogomile sect, which lasted through the Middle Ages and spread to the West in the form of Cathari, Albigenses, and other Manichaean heresies, is a continuation of Paulicianism. In Armenia, too, similar sects, derived from them, continue till our own time.” (Fortesque)
     13. 1820s: “There were Paulician communities in the part of Armenia occupied by Russia after the war of 1828-29.” (Fortesque)
     14. Manichaeism “reached the West through the eastern intermediaries of Paulicianism and Bogomilism . . .” (Eberhardt)
         1. 900s: “Many Paulicians had been massacred during the tenth century . . . Survivors fled to Italy and southern France . . .” (Eberhardt)
         2. “Manicheans, Paulicians, Bogomiles, Catharists and Albigenses, whatever be the truth that all are corporally related, these various sects were, at different times, all of them inspired by a common body of doctrine, and a similarity of moral practice.” (Hughes)
  2. Paulicianism and Protestantism
     1. “Since Gibbon [*Decline and Fall* 54] the Paulicians have often been described as a survival of early and pure Christianity, godly folk who clung to the Gospel, rejecting later superstitions . . .” (Fortesque)
     2. Dr. Adeney calls them “in many respects Protestants before Protestantism” [*The Greek and Eastern Churches* 219]. This idea accounts for the fact that the sect has met among modern writers with more interest and certainly more sympathy . . .” (Fortesque)

1. **Bogomilism**
   1. 700s: “Colonies of Armenian Manichees were deported by the iconoclast emperors of the eighth century to the Balkans, where they re-emerged under the name of Bogomiles.” (Eberhardt)
   2. 900s-1000s: “Violent persecution during the tenth and eleventh centuries drove the latter into Lombardy and Languedoc. In the latter area they came to be known as Albigenses or Cathari . . .” (Eberhardt)
      1. Byzantine Emperor Alexius Comnenus (1081-1118) “vigorously persecuted the Bogomiles. Survivors fled to Italy and southern France . . .” (Eberhardt)

## Catharism (Albigensianism) (c. 1150-1250)

1. **beginnings**
   1. “. . . there are possible indications of this menacing Neo-Manichaeism as early as 1022 . . .” (Eberhardt)
   2. 1119: Pope Calixtus II “excommunicated the Cathari at the Council of Toulouse . . .” (Eberhardt)
   3. 1139: “Pope Innocent II repeated this censure . . . at the Second Lateran Council, and recommended prosecution by the secular authorities.” (Eberhardt)
   4. “The pope sought to convert them through St. Bernard of Clairvaux, but the latter’s preaching tour in Languedoc had but limited success.” (Eberhardt)
   5. In southern France “the town of Albi became a headquarters and gave them the name of Albigenses.” (Eberhardt)
2. **beliefs**
   1. classes
      1. the perfect
         1. The “perfect” “did not defer the *consolamentum* [“the Catharan sacrament”] until their deathbed” but engaged in asceticisms.
         2. “At their probation they promised: “I promise to devote my life to God and the Gospel, never to lie or swear, never to touch a woman, never to kill an animal, not to eat milk, meat, or eggs; ever to partake of fish and vegetables; never to eat, travel, or spend the night without a companion.”” (Eberhardt)
         3. The perfect “recited the Lord’s Prayer daily, and only they of the Cathari had the right to do so.” (Eberhardt)
         4. “They conducted the ceremony of “breaking of bread,” and presided over the *apparellamentum*, a monthly meeting of the Cathari at which all faults were confessed in generic fashion.” (Eberhardt)
      2. the believers
         1. The “believers” “were initiated into Catharism by means of the *convenza*, which included a formal and explicit renunciation of the Catholic Faith, and a pledge to receive the Catharan sacrament, the *consolamentum*, at least at the hour of death. . . . the convenza most explicitly required the neophyte to renounce “all the doctrines of the Church of Rome” . . .” (Eberhardt)
         2. “Besides this, the “Believers” had few positive duties, for they were not bound by the Manichaean asceticism of the “Perfected.” They were obliged, however, to venerate the “Perfected” whenever they met them . . .” (Eberhardt)
   2. “The Catholic Church was identified by the Cathari with Satan; they argued that the popes and the Roman curia were the successors of Constantine rather than of Peter, in virtue of the “Donation of Constantine.”” (Eberhardt)
   3. “. . . the cross, images, and statues were nothing but idols.” (Eberhardt)
   4. “The Catholic sacraments were also rejected.” (Eberhardt)
      1. “Baptism was deemed an idle rite.” (Eberhardt)
      2. “The words of consecration in the Eucharist, “This is My Body,” they said, meant merely, “This represents my body.”” (Eberhardt)
      3. “Christian marriage they utterly rejected for they condemned marital relations as the original sin of Adam and Eve, and as tending to multiply matter, which they held to be evil. Indeed, they considered illicit sexual relations preferable to matrimony, since concubinage was temporary and secret, whereas marriage was permanent and publicly sanctioned, thereby constituting a scandal.” (Eberhardt)
      4. The Cathari recommended suicide (called the *endura*) to sick believers or those in danger of succumbing to temptations. Sometimes suicide was imposed on the sick: “Visited by the “Perfected,” they were asked whether they preferred to be a martyr or a confessor: to die by suffocation or by starvation. Worst of all, children were kidnapped or even “consoled” in this fashion by the Perfected.” (Eberhardt)
3. **subsequent history**
   1. 1167: “They professed to have “popes” or “bishops” and in 1167 held a council of such leaders from Lombardy and Provence near Toulouse. . . . at least in southern France [they marked] out dioceses . . .” (Eberhardt)
   2. 1184: “at the Diet of Verona (1184) Lucius III and Frederick I directed that unrepentant heretics be handed over to the civil powers.” (Eberhardt)
   3. “Weakness of Catholicity in Provence reached its height during the reign of Raymond VI of Provence (1194-1222) . . .” (Eberhardt)
      1. Some of the Catholic bishops “compromised with the Cathari in order to obtain mere toleration of their continued residence.” (Eberhardt)
      2. “Archbishop Berengar of Narbonne (1191-1212) was so lax toward these heretics that he was subsequently deposed by Innocent III.” (Eberhardt)
      3. “The masses were abandoning the Catholic churches, neglecting the sacraments, and accepting the Catharist domination passively. If Languedoc was to be saved, it would have to be from without.” (Eberhardt)
   4. “From 1206 forward St. Dominic and his early companions began to preach and debate in the Albigensian area, and to reclaim fallen Catholics.” (Eberhardt)
   5. by 1200: “. . . Catholic services were almost deserted and . . . both town and countryside were dominated by the Cathari.” (Eberhardt)
   6. The Cathari appealed to the peasantry by their austerities. Also, of them were doctors.
   7. “In Languedoc, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, the two terms, ‘weavers’ and ‘Cathari,’ were synonymous . . .” (Eberhardt)
   8. organization: the Cathari were “a federation of churches, each presided over by a “bishop” . . . He was assisted by two vicars, the Filius Major and the Filius Minor, and by the deacons, who were the chief itinerant proselytizers.” (Eberhardt)
   9. liturgy: the bishop “had charge of the ceremonies of the imposition of hands for initiation, of the breaking of bread which replaced the Holy Eucharist, and of the recitation of liturgical prayers.” (Eberhardt)

## Waldensianism (c. 1160-present)

1. **anticlericalism**
   1. “The common denominator of most of the movements now to be surveyed seems to have been a popular resentment against the wicked lives of the clergy of the Dark Ages, or dissatisfaction with the wealth and power of the victorious clerical theocracy. In this way they resemble a similar resentment toward the worldliness of the Renaissance theocracy which produced the Protestant revolt.” (Eberhardt)
   2. “. . . wherever it is most flourishing and most menacing to the unity of the Church, it [anticlericalism] is closely associated with some popular national cause. . . . The strength of the Albigensian heresy of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries must have owed something to its patronage by the Count of Toulouse [Raymond VI] and to its acceptance by a large fraction of the Provençal nationality . . .” (Eberhardt)
2. **Pierre de Bruis** (c. 1125)
   1. “Pierre de Bruis was a deposed priest of southern France who inveighed against the Church in Provence and Laguedoc about the same time [as the Cathari]. He rejected a visible Church, the Mass and the real presence, infant baptism, churches, the cross, prayers for the dead, and ecclesiastical music. Fasting and clerical celibacy were abhorrent to him.” (Eberhardt)
   2. “His followers engaged in iconoclasm but while De Bruis was burning images near St. Gilles in 1125, some of the “Church Militant” threw him in also.” (Eberhardt)
3. **Waldensianism** (c. 1160)
   1. Peter Waldo
      1. “Peter Waldes or Waldo, a wealthy merchant of Lyons, was reputedly shocked into a change of life by the sudden death of one of his friends. . . . he made over his property to his wife, and apparently without her consent, placed their two daughters in a convent.” (Eberhardt)
      2. c. 1160-1170: he communicated “his views on evangelical poverty to others, and became the leader of a group of lay associates who practiced voluntary poverty.” They were known as the “Poor Men of Lyons.” (Eberhardt)
      3. “One annalist speaks as if he were dead by 1200; others imply that he lived until 1217.” (Eberhardt)
   2. teachings and practices
      1. “At first the Waldenses seemed to be merely single-minded enthusiasts for an apostolic mode of life; though they rebuked unworthy clerics, they did not propound any heresy.” (Eberhardt)
         1. The Waldensians, though laymen, announced from the pulpit their interpretation of texts from the Bible and the Fathers inculcating poverty and work. (Eberhardt)
         2. “Rainier Saccbo, an ex-Waldensian who became later a Dominican friar, described them as follows: “They present an appearance of piety, for they lead good lives before men, believe rightly about God, and hold all the articles of the Creed. . . . They are composed and modest, with no vanity of dress, for they use no precious clothes nor very abject materials. For fear of a falsehood, they refuse to trade; shunning oaths and fraud, they live by manual labor. Their teachers ply the weaver’s trade. They remain content with bare essentials, opposing the amassing of wealth. Chaste and moderate in eating and drinking, they do not attend taverns, dances.” . . . Here would seem to be many traits of the early Puritans and Quakers.” (Eberhardt)
      2. “Anticlerical elements, however, soon appeared and the sect became progressively more radical, influenced in part by the contemporary Cathari or Albigenses. At this stage criticism of the clergy had proceeded to attacks on the Roman Church, which received a ready audience.” (Eberhardt)
         1. The Waldenses said that “the Roman Church was no longer the Church of Christ, but rather a “church of the malignant” introduced [when the pope] accepted temporal goods from Constantine the Great.” (Eberhardt)
         2. Only the Waldenses “represented the true children of Christ; as for the clergy, the pope was the head and font of all error, the bishops were like the Scribes, and the monks were true descendants of the Pharisees. (Eberhardt)
         3. “Tithes ought not to be paid, for the primitive Church had exacted none. Do we not read in Deuteronomy: “The priests shall have no part or inheritance with the rest of Israel?” Hence the Waldenses deemed it sinful to endow a church or abbey; let the clergy work with their hands like other people. Indeed, does not Matthew say: “All of you are brethren”?” (Eberhardt)
         4. “Eventually the Waldenses also rejected the sacrament of holy orders, and contended that any good layman, even a good woman, might be Christ’s minister.” (Eberhardt)
         5. “Some of the Waldenses ended up by denying all the sacraments except baptism and communion—like the Lutherans later, they rejected any real presence save at communion.” (Eberhardt)
         6. “They admitted no venial sins and rejected purgatory.” (Eberhardt)
   3. development
      1. c. 1177: Archbishop John [of Lyons] prohibited the Waldensians’ preaching in his area (Dauphiné, Provence, and Languedoc).” (Eberhardt)
      2. “To defend themselves against the bishops, the Waldenses appealed to Pope Alexander III and the Third Lateran Council (1179) for authorization for their translations from the Bible and permission to teach.” (Eberhardt)
      3. “The pope, we are told, embraced Peter Waldes, moderated his penchant for poverty, and yet directed him not to preach without episcopal authorization.” (Eberhardt)
      4. “The Waldenses obeyed the papal commands but a short time, for at the Synod-Diet of Verona in 1184 Pope Lucius III excommunicated them and Emperor Frederick I placed them under the ban. . . . [There were also] edicts of Otto IV and of Alfonso II of Aragon . . .” (Eberhardt)
      5. But “the Waldenses continued to spread from France into Germany, Italy, and Spain.” (Eberhardt)
      6. “They persisted in regarding themselves as Catholics, for they deemed excommunication null when pronounced on persons doing good works.” (Eberhardt)
      7. “Innocent III tried to salvage some of the Waldenses by organizing them into a religious order, but they consistently refused to obtain ecclesiastical approbation for their teaching. This forced the same pope who had sanctioned the Franciscans to give a final refusal to the Waldenses in 1212.” (Eberhardt)
      8. c. 1212: Waldo dies. “. . . the Waldenses began to split up into factions which went under such names as Humiliati, Leonists, or Insabatati . . .” (Eberhardt)
      9. “They appeared as far north as the Baltic Sea, but their chief strongholds lay in the Alpine valleys of Dauphiné and Piedmont.” (Eberhardt)
      10. “They borrowed some sort of organization from the Albigenses, and also came to have a hierarchy of the “perfect.” In the case of the Waldenses, their leaders, the “Bearded,” supposedly led a more austere life than the other members of the sect.” (Eberhardt)
      11. “During the second half of the thirteenth century the inquisition began to prosecute the Waldenses and continued an active campaign until 1393 when the papal tribunal was paralyzed by the Great Western Schism.” (Eberhardt)
      12. “. . . the Waldenses remained powerful in certain regions and in Piedmont publicly held meetings or congresses of more than 500 persons. They so defied the inquisitors that some feared to prosecute them.” (Eberhardt)
      13. “Waldensian strength declined during the fifteenth century, but a group known as the Vaudais survived in Savoy until they merged with Protestantism in the sixteenth century—some 3,000 of these were massacred by King Francis I of France in 1544. : (Eberhardt)
      14. “Groups of Waldenses, their doctrines infiltrated with Protestant tenets, have survived to the present, claiming to be the oldest sect in the Latin West with a continuous existence in dissent. In Rome they have a church bearing the inscription *lux in tenebris* . . .” (Eberhardt)

## Spiritual Franciscans (c. 1220s-1450)

1. **beginnings**
   1. 1209: Innocent III approves the Franciscans as a religious order.
   2. 1220s: even before Francis’s death in 1226, his followers split into two groups.
      1. The *Relaxati* (later called “Conventual Franciscans”) say Francis’ rule, which enjoins strict poverty, is an ideal.
      2. The *Zelanti* (or Spiritual Franciscans or *Fraticelli* [Little Brothers]) say the rule must be followed precisely.
2. **beliefs generally held by the Spiritual Franciscans**
   1. John XXII, by abrogating in 1323 the strict Rule of St Francis (which is the pure gospel), has committed heresy; he and his successors are no longer popes
   2. all other religious and clergy are damned
   3. mortal sin deprives clergy of the powers of holy orders
3. **later history**
   1. 1245: Innocent IV (1243-54) transfers Franciscan lands and houses to the Roman Church, since the Franciscans practice complete poverty.
   2. 1256: Alexander IV (1254-61) condemns the Joachists (or Joachimists), Spiritual Franciscans who adopted Joachim of Fiore’s division of history into three ages.
      1. c. 1150: the Cistercian Joachim of Fiore (c. 1132-1202) divides his­tory into three ages: the age of the Father (Old Testament times), the age of the Son (dominated by the Church), and the age of the Holy Spirit, which ­­a new religious order will in­au­gurate c. 1260.
      2. The Joachists say that c. 1200 Joachim of Fiore’s writings replaced the Bible.
      3. They say the *Fraticelli* are the new religious order that will inaugurate the age of Spirit.
      4. They say that c. 1260 the Catholic priesthood will become void.
   3. 1279: Nicholas III (1277-80), in a bull generally favoring the *Relaxati*, defines the Franciscans’ poverty as equivalent to the apostles’; he also takes Franciscan lands and houses; and he forbids further discussion of poverty
   4. 1312: Clement V (1305-14) in a constitution attempts a compromise; having lost ground, the *Relaxati* oppress the *Zelanti*
   5. the North-Italian *Fraticelli*
      1. 1317: John XXII (1316-34) excommunicates a group of *Zelanti* led by Angelo da Clareno († 1337)
      2. 1318: Angelo defiantly organizes his group into a parallel Franciscan order, calling them the *Fraticelli*
      3. 1389: a leader at Florence (Michele Berti) is burned at the stake
   6. the Sicilian *Fraticelli*
      1. 1312: the *Zelanti* take two monasteries in Italy, forcing the *Relaxati* there to flee
      2. 1314: Clement V excommunicates them, and they flee to Sicily
      3. 1317: banished from Sicily, they move to Naples
      4. c. 1331: they merge with the Michaelites
   7. the Michaelites (from their leader, Michael of Cesena)
      1. 1321-28: the “theoretical controversy” over poverty
         1. 1321: the Dominican inquisitor at Norbonne (John of Belna) declared heretical the teaching that Christ and the apostles owned nothing
         2. the Franciscans (both *Relaxati* and *Zelanti*) oppose the Dominicans
         3. 1322: a general chapter of the order under Michael of Cesena, general of the Franciscans, solemnly declares that Christ practiced absolute poverty
         4. 1322: John XXII returns the Franciscans’ lands and houses, thereby forcing them to own property
         5. 1323: John XXII declares heretical the assertion that Christ and the apostles possessed no property, either individually or collectively
         6. 1324: Louis IV the Bavarian, King of Germany (1314-47), calls the pope a heretic for doing away with Christ’s poverty; the pope excommunicates him
         7. 1324: *Defensor pacis* (*Defender of Peace*, by Ubertino of Casale, John of Jandum, and Marsilius of Padua) says that the emperor and the Church at large are above the pope
         8. 1328: Louis IV and the German army, accompanied by the authors of *Defensor pacis*, take Rome; Louis IV is crowned Emperor of Rome, and he appoints a Franciscan as antipope, Nicholas V
         9. 1328: John XXII deposes Michael as general and appoints a Conventual, who induces the majority of the order to repudiate the Michaelites
         10. 1320s-1330s: Michaelites are known to exist in Germany, England, Carcassone (France), Spain, Portugal, Sicily, Lombardy, Sardinia, and Armenia
   8. 1426: the pope appoints the Conventuals John of Capistrano and James of the March as inquisitors; a number of Spiritual Franciscans are burned at the stake (at Fabriano, in the presence of the pope); the Spirituals thereafter decline
4. **Franciscans orders today**
   1. Order of Friars Minor
      1. The largest order; commonly called simply the “Franciscans.”
      2. c. 16,000 members; c. 1,500 houses; c. 100 provinces
      3. 1897: Leo XIII combines Observants, Discalced, Recollects, and Riformati under general constitutions; they are thereafter simply “the Order of Friars Minor.”
      4. 1960s: c. 26,000 members
      5. 1970s: decline
   2. Order of Friars Minor Capuchin
      1. c. 11,000 brothers; 1800 communities (fraternities, friaries); 99 countries
      2. 1525: “some Friars Minor in the Marches want . . . to live a stricter life of prayer and poverty . . .” The pope quickly recognizes them. The Capuchins are the most recent branch of the Franciscans.
      3. They grow quickly, first in Italy, then (from 1574 on) throughout Europe.
      4. “The name Capuchins refers to the peculiar shape of the long hood; originally a popular nickname, it has become a part of the official name of the Order . . .” (“Franciscan Order”)
   3. Order of Friars Minor Conventual
      1. c. 5,000 friars; 290 houses
      2. “They are located in Italy, the United States, Canada, Australia, and throughout South/Central America, and Africa.” (“Franciscan Order”)
      3. “They are the largest of number in Poland because of the work and inspiration of St. Maximilian Kolbe.” (“Franciscan Order”)
   4. Secular Franciscan Order
      1. 17,000 in the US; also found elsewhere
      2. 1212: Francis founds an order “for brothers and sisters who do not live in a religious community.” (“Franciscan Orders”)
      3. pre-1978: known as the Third Order Secular of St. Francis
      4. “Members of the order continue to live secular lives [but] gather regularly for fraternal activities.” (“Franciscan Orders”)
   5. Third Order Franciscans (tertiaries)
      1. “Tertiaries (Latin *tertiarii*, from *tertius*, third), are associations of lay folk connected with the Mendicant Orders.” (“Tertiaries”)
      2. c. 1221: Francis writes an order for married persons involved in the Franciscan movement
      3. later name: “later on, when the Friars were called the “First Order” and the nuns the “Second Order,” the Order of Penance became the “Third Order” . . . This threefold division already existed among the Humiliati.” (“Tertiaries”)
      4. Third Orders Secular vs. Third Orders Regular
         1. “In time a tendency set in for members of the Third Order to live together in community, and in this way congregations were formed who took the usual religious vows and lived a fully organized religious life based on the Rule of the Third Order with supplementary regulations. These congregations are the Regular Tertiaries as distinguished from the Secular Tertiaries, who lived in the world, according to the original idea. The Regular Tertiaries are in the full technical sense religious, and there have been, and are, many congregations of them, both of men and of women.” (“Tertiaries”)
         2. Secular Franciscan Order
            1. 17,000 in the US
            2. pre-1978: called “Third Order Secular of St. Francis”
         3. Third Order Regular of the Brothers of the Poor of St. Francis of Assissi, CFP (“Franciscan Orders”)
            1. They are based in the United States but also have houses in Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, and Brazil.
            2. They “serve the poor, neglected and disadvantaged youth, the powerless, people in need, and the elderly.” (“Franciscan Orders”)
         4. Third Order Regular of St. Francis of Penance (“Tertiaries”)
            1. The order has both Observantist and non-Observantist sections.
            2. 1513-21: Leo X (1513-21) approves their rule.
            3. c. 1500: 8,000 houses; the “1,300 Observantist communities alone numbered 30,000 members . . .” (“Franciscan Orders”)
            4. c. 1650: c. 70,000 members, 150 provinces
            5. today: 16 houses (2 in Rome, 5 in Sicily, 7 in Austria, 2 in the US)
         5. Brothers of the Poor
            1. The Brothers of the Poor “are teachers, childcare workers, social workers, counselors, pastoral ministers, retreat ministers, religious educators, school administrators, and much more.” They “serve persons with AIDS . . .” (“Franciscan Orders”)

## Mystical Orders: Beguines, Beguards, and Free Spirits (1200s-1300s)

1. **Beguines** (pious lay associations of women)
   1. The Beguines were “a pious association of women who lived without vows … [for] prayer, manual labor, the care of the sick, preparation of the dead for burial, and the instruction of young girls . . .” (Bihlmeyer)
   2. “. . . without taking formal vows, [they] devoted themselves to prayer and social welfare.” (Eberhardt)
   3. “Beguine”
      1. the name may come from “Albigensians” (Al-*bigen*-sians)
      2. the name may come from a woman’s gown of undyed wool (*bège*, biege)
      3. or “Lambert Le Begue, a charitable priest of Liège (d. 1180) in Belgium, may have given his name to lay communities of Beghardi (male) and Beguini (female) . . .” (Eberhardt)
   4. c. 1185: groups first appear in Liège.
   5. c. 1200: pious women assemble in Nivelles around the mystic, Marie of Oignies († 1231).
   6. 1233: Gregory IX places the Beguines under papal protection.
   7. Devout women denied admission to the Cistercians or Premonstratensians flock to the Beguines; they live in *Beguinages* (hermitages, assemblies) under a “Grand Mistress.”
   8. They have no rule, but they take a vow of chastity and lead a common life in convents. “Their lives were taken up by devotion to God, in search of ecstatic and visionary experiences . . .” (Burman 103)
   9. “. . . this new form of life spread, in spite of much hostility even on the part of the clergy, to other cities of Belgium, Holland, France and Germany . . .” (Bihlmeyer)
   10. c. 1300: they reach their maximum.
   11. downfall
       1. “Subsequently, however, their unregulated piety degenerated into Quietism and anticlericalism during the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries . . .” (Eberhardt)
       2. Some Beguines seem to have adopted the pantheistic and quietistic ideas of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, causing even orthodox Beguines to fall into disrepute.
       3. Others have real or imagined associations with the *fraticelli* in southern France.
       4. 1311: the Council of Vienne (the 15th ecumenical council) suppresses the Beguines; many groups become Franciscans or third-order Dominicans.
       5. 1319-1322: many in France are burned at the stake.
   12. c. 1320s: John XXII (1316-34) permits orthodox Beguines to continue.
   13. Today, a dozen or so *Beguinages* still exist in Belgium and Holland.
2. **Beghards** (pious lay associations of men)
   1. 1220: the Beghards, male counterparts of the Beguines, appear in Belgium and Holland
   2. they care for the sick and bury the dead
   3. they are not as numerous as the Beguines but establish themselves in almost as many places
   4. they are suspected of heresy and cease to exist by 1500
3. **Free Spirits**
   1. the Free Spirits were probably not a sect but individuals who prac­ticed mysticism.
   2. 1311: the Council of Vienne proclaims the existence of a sect of Free Spirits and claims they are living among the Beguines and Beg­hards.
4. **subsequent condemnation**
   1. 1364: Urban V divides Germany into four provinces to root out the Beguines, Beghards, and Free Spirits.
   2. Lambert (*Medi­eval Heresy* 181) concludes that radical mysticism did go “at least to the limits of orthodoxy in its views of the possibility of union with God in this life, and was indifferent, if not hostile to the sacraments and to the mediating role of the Church.” (qtd. in Burman 105)

## Brethren of the Common Life (1381-c. 1800)

(*Fratres vitae communis*, *Fratres devoti*)

1. **Geert** (**Gerard**) **Groote** (**1340-84**)
   1. 1374: Groote, a lawyer, reads Ruysbroeck and other mystical writers; he renounces his benefices and lives in solitude (1374-81)
   2. 1381: he is ordained deacon in Utrecht and preaches penance to clergy and people
      1. opposed by clerics whose lives he had denounced, he retires to Deventer, where he and a group of friends and disciples devote themselves to prayer, study, and teaching
      2. the Brethren are not a formal order: they are “associations of laity and non-monastic priests . . . called to practice a disciplined life within their existing callings” (“Devotio Moderna”)
   3. the Sisters of the Common Life (similar to the Beguines) come into existence during Groote’s lifetime
2. ***devotio moderna***
   1. Groote, influenced by Meister Eckhart and his intimate friend Ruysbroeck, developed a new form of piety that stressed
      1. the imitation of Christ
      2. a valuing of the interior life
      3. a devaluing of the Church’s institutionalized aids to salvation
      4. criticism of formal acts of piety
      5. criticism of naive reliance on the external aspects of religion
      6. insistence that illiterate peasants can know God as easily as scholars
      7. urgency in the face of sinfulness and death
      8. regular and methodical meditation
      9. “intense and emotional meditation on the suffering of Christ” (“Devotio Moderna”)
3. **development of the religious order**
   1. 1384: after Groote dies, his favorite disciple Florence Radewijn (1350-1400) organizes the group
   2. soon other communities imitate the Brethren in the Netherlands and northwestern Germany; eventually the houses unite as a congregation
   3. 1386: Radewijn founds the monastery of Windesheim near Zwolle
   4. 1387: because mendicants looked down on the Brethren for living in com­munity without vows, Windesheim adopts the Augustinian rule, and other houses follow suit
   5. the most famous monastery is on Mount St. Agnes near Zwolle, where Thomas à Kempis lives and works
      1. 1399: Thomas à Kempis joins the Augustinian canons
      2. c. 1427: he writes the *Imitation of Christ*
   6. the Brethren support themselves by copying and teaching
   7. priests in the community conduct missions, write edifying works, and cultivate a form of humanism
   8. schools of the order influence northern Europe for almost 200 years
      1. 1430: the order has 37 monasteries
      2. c. 1500: the order has 84 monasteries and 13 convents
      3. through Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa (a pupil at Deventer), the Brethren influence Erasmus and other Humanists
4. **reforms initiated by the order**
   1. John Busch, a canon of Windesheim († c. 1450), introduces the reform of the Brethren into many Augustinian orders in Saxony and Thuringia
   2. 1477: Count Eberhard († 1496) invites the Brethren into Württemberg and, with Gabriel Biel (c. 1425-95), establishes several houses and the University of Tübingen
5. **demise**
   1. 1516: Leo X (1513-21) suppresses the Württemberg house
   2. 1500s: most of the other foundations disappear during the Reformation
   3. 1600s: new universities, seminaries, and teaching orders are competition
   4. 1700s: the few houses still remaining disappear in French Revolution

## John Wyclif and Lollardism (1366-1400s)

1. **John Wyclif** (1324-85)
   1. “John Wycliffe (1324-84) [was an] English priest and Oxford professor . . .” (Eberhardt)
   2. “In England, . . . Wycliffe evidently revealed the influence of the Spirituals in his first appearances in history.” (Eberhardt)
      1. Wycliffe “was a partisan of royal absolutism, holding that all ecclesiastical goods were subject to confiscation by the king.” (Eberhardt)
      2. 1366: Wycliffe and other Oxford theologians were summoned “for consultation on the question of payment of tribute to the Holy See. Wycliffe’s opinion was that King John’s pledge had been null by divine law since Christ’s mode of life condemned any clerical possession of temporal goods.” (Eberhardt)
      3. 1374: “through the patronage of Duke John of Gaunt, the king’s son, Wycliffe was named member of a royal commission to negotiate the Concordat of Bruges with the Holy See, and there proposed to disendow the Church in England. Though his views did not prevail in the delegation,
   3. “Presently he carried these ideas further.” (Eberhardt)
      1. “Possessors of church property, he held, were in a state of sin, and so long as they remained therein they were deprived of their legitimate jurisdiction. Eventually he concluded that any superior in the state of sin ipso facto lost his authority over his subjects. Since a superior’s state of conscience is essentially invisible, Wycliffe had practically proclaimed the ecclesiastical hierarchy and its authority indistinguishable and denied the visibility of the Church.” (Eberhardt)
      2. “After denying as well the divine institution of the papacy and the episcopacy, Wycliffe found it simple to conclude that the judgment of the Church was not necessary in matters of faith, so that individual conviction of faith and private interpretation of Scripture constituted adequate theological criteria.” (Eberhardt)
      3. “Wycliffism, in brief, proclaimed an invisible Church in which the hierarchy, if theoretically admitted, could exercise little authority by reason of the inability of determining the state of a prelate’s conscience, on which depended in Wycliffe’s view the validity of his jurisdiction.” (Eberhardt)
      4. “Finally the English innovator virtually denied transubstantiation.” (Eberhardt)
   4. 1418: the Council of Constance and by Pope Martin V condemn 45 of Wycliffe’s errors. (Eberhardt)
      1. “When Hussitism was censured at Constance, Wycliffe’s errors were also reviewed and repudiated.” (Eberhardt)
      2. “(1) The material substance of bread and the material substance of wine remain in the sacrament of the altar.”
      3. “(3) Christ is not in the same sacrament identically and really in His proper corporeal presence.”
      4. “(4) If a bishop or priest be in mortal sin, he does not ordain, consecrate, confect, baptize.”
      5. “(5) That Christ established the Mass is not based on the Gospel.”
      6. “(7) If a man is properly contrite, all external confession is superfluous and useless.”
      7. “(10) it is contrary to Holy Scripture for ecclesiastics to have possessions.”
      8. “(11) No prelate may excommunicate anyone unless he first knows him to be excommunicated by God.”
      9. “(14) A deacon or priest may preach the word of God without authorization from the Apostolic See or a Catholic bishop.”
      10. “(15) No one is civil lord, prelate, or bishop while in mortal sin.”
      11. “(16) Civil lords can appropriate the temporalities of the Church at will.”
      12. “(17) Citizens can correct sinful lords at will.”
      13. “(30) Papal or prelatial excommunication is not to be feared, as it is the censure of Antichrist.”
      14. “(37) The Roman Church is the synagogue of Satan and the pope is not the proximate and immediate vicar of Christ and the apostles.”
      15. “(41) It is not necessary for salvation to believe that the Roman Church is supreme among the other churches. . . .”
2. **Lollardism**
   1. Wycliffe “communicated his message to itinerant preachers, the “poor priests,” later branded as lollards, possibly from a Dutch term for heretic. Wycliffe’s errors were also propagated through garbled versions of the Scriptures in the vernacular—though Orthodox versions were already extant.” (Eberhardt)
   2. “For a time Lollardism enjoyed a certain immunity through the protection extended to Wycliffe by John of Gaunt and the negligence of Archbishop Sudbury of Canterbury.” (Eberhardt)
   3. 1382: “the next archbishop, William Courtenay (1381-96), secured a condemnation of twenty-four of Wycliffe’s propositions by a London council . . . John of Gaunt had possibly prevented the archbishop from prosecuting Wycliffe himself . . .” (Eberhardt)
   4. “Deprived of his professorship at Oxford, Wycliffe retired to his parish at Lutterworth and died shortly afterwards. His *Trialogus* had bitterly attacked the Church, and there is no evidence of his recantation.” (Eberhardt)
   5. 1401: “Lollardy became such a menace that in 1401 the statute *De Haeretico Comburendo* was enacted against them.” (Eberhardt)
      1. “. . . after the execution in 1417 of John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, the Lollard leader, the sect seems to have languished, “conquered but not extinguished” . . .” (Eberhardt)
      2. The statute “claimed eleven known victims before 1485 . . .” (Eberhardt)
   6. influence
      1. “The influence of Lollardism upon Bohemian Hussitism will be noted subsequently.” (Eberhardt)
      2. 1500s into the sixteenth century when it merged with Protestantism.” (Eberhardt)

## Hussitism (c. 1400-present)

1. **introduction**
   1. “By occasion of the marriage (1382) of Princess Anne, sister of Wenceslas of Germany and Bohemia, to King Richard II of England, an interchange of scholars and envoys had begun between the Universities of Prague and Oxford. Wycliffe’s ideas were introduced into Bohemia and adopted by John Hus.” (Eberhardt)
   2. “The Hussite heresy of the early fifteenth century was . . . obviously associated with nascent Czech nationalism and with armed conflict between Czechs and Germans.” (Eberhardt)
2. **John Hus** (1369-1415)
   1. 1369: Hus is born “in the village of Hussinecz, Bohemia . . .” (Eberhardt)
   2. 1393-96: he earned bachelor’s and master’s degrees at the University of Prague (recently founded in 1347). (Eberhardt)
   3. 1398: instructor in philosophy
   4. 1400: ordination to the priesthood
   5. 1402: rector of the university
   6. Hus was “an austere preacher. Court favor long ensured him immunity. Wenceslas the Drunkard was long indifferent to heretical currents, while Hus was the favorite preacher and confessor of Empress Sophia.” (Eberhardt)
   7. “Archbishop Sbinko of Prague (1403-11) was disposed to be lenient toward the royal darling, especially since Wenceslas had repudiated the Roman obedience which the archbishop professed. Prompted by Rome, however, the archbishop indeed prosecuted Wycliffism, but accepted readily Hus’s assurances that be did not share Wycliffe’s errors. Yet at this time books of Wycliffe with approving annotations were in Hus’s possession.” (Eberhardt)
   8. Hus also “counted on latent Czech nationalism which resented the German domination. He preached often in the native language and attracted the support of many of the Czech nobles, headed by Jerome of Prague, when he flayed the vices of the clergy.” (Eberhardt)
   9. 1409: Hus persuaded “Emperor Wenceslas, who like his father favored his Bohemian more than his German subjects, to grant the Czech students at Prague University an arbitrary majority. The Germans and Poles then left in anger.” (Eberhardt)
   10. 1414: Council of Constance (1414-18)
       1. The Council of Constance ended the Western Schism (3 popes). It was convoked by the Antipope John XXIII but confirmed by Pope Gregory XII. (“Council of Constance”)
       2. “En route to Constance, Hus continued his preaching, leaving theological disputes and riots in his wake.” (Eberhardt)
       3. “He came to Constance on November 3, 1414. Pending the opening of his examination, “John XXIII” released him from excommunication and allowed him the liberty of the city, on condition that he refrain from celebrating Mass and preaching. When Hus disobeyed these injunctions, he was placed in mild confinement. Sigismund repeatedly warned him that his safe-conduct would not protect him in case of condemnation, but Hus rejected such an outcome of the inquest as unthinkable. During the next six months inquiries were made into Hus’s teachings, but his formal trial was delayed by the flight and deposition of “John XXIII.”” (Eberhardt)
   11. 1415: trial
       1. June 6-8: Hus is on trial before the Council. (Eberhardt)
       2. He denied many of his alleged writings and refused to recant anything against which a scriptural text could not be adduced. But he defended Wycliffism which had already been censured by the council on May 4.” (Eberhardt)
       3. “The council was prone to be lenient and proposed a general recantation whereby Hus might merely affirm that he abjured all of his errors. This admission he refused to make on the ground that he had taught no errors and that none had been proved against him.” (Eberhardt)
       4. July 6: the Council condemns 30 of Hus’s propositions. (Eberhardt)
       5. 1415 May 4: the Council declares Wyclif a heretic. (“Council of Constance”)
       6. 1418 Feb. 22: Pope Martin V censures both 45 propositions of Wyclif and 30 propositions of Hus. Among them: (Eberhardt)
          1. “(1) There is but one holy, universal Church, which is the society of the predestined . . .”
          2. “(7) Peter is not and was not the head of the holy Catholic Church . . .”
          3. “(12) No one is the vicar of Christ or of Peter unless he follow him in morals.”
          4. “(15) Ecclesiastical obedience is an obedience invented by the priests of the Church beyond the express authority of Scripture.”
          5. “(17) Christ’s priests living according to His law and having the knowledge of Scripture and the desire to edify ought to preach despite pretended excommunication.”
          6. “(25) The condemnation of the 45 articles of John Wycliffe made by the doctors is irrational, unjust, and badly done.”
          7. “(30) He is no civil lord, prelate, or bishop while he is in mortal sin.” (Eberhardt)
       7. 1415 July 6: the Council passes sentence on Hus. “His resolute defiance was patent and he was handed over to the secular arm as an obstinate heretic. The municipal authorities . . . burned him at the stake that very day. Hus’s courageous obstinacy at death raised his reputation among his disciples, who henceforth regarded him as a martyr.” (Eberhardt)
       8. 1416: the Council tries and condemns Jerome of Prague. He is executed on May 30.
       9. “But it was ominous that 450 of the Bohemian nobles had signed a protest against the punishment of one of their number; Hussitism was about to become a militant force.” (Eberhardt)
3. **the Hussite wars**
   1. Utraquism
      1. “. . . the rallying point of the Hussite wars was a doctrine which Hus himself had not stressed.” (Eberhardt)
      2. Prague professor Jacob of Mies “maintained that both priests and laity ought to receive the Eucharist under both species.” (Eberhardt)
      3. 1415 June 15: in response, the Council of Constance “declared that Communion under both species was unnecessary for the laity since Christ was present whole and entire under each species, and that the custom of lay reception of the chalice had been discontinued for adequate practical reasons. Yet the notion of receiving Communion *sub utraque specie* captivated many Bohemians who did not otherwise subscribe to Hussitism: these “Utraquists” became militant ritualists.” (Eberhardt)
   2. Defenestration of Prague
      1. Emperor Wenceslas allowed the Utraquists “to put their rite into operation . . .” (Eberhardt)
      2. 1419: “Catholics resisted and on July 30, 1419, rioting developed into civil war.” (Eberhardt)
         1. “While the excanon, Johann of Selau, was carrying the chalice in an Utraquist procession in Prague, it was rumored that a stone had been thrown at him.” (Eberhardt)
         2. “In retaliation some of the Hussites invaded the senate and hurled seven of its members out of the window on to the spears of the mob.” (Eberhardt)
         3. 1419 August 16: Emperor Wenceslas “vowed vengeance” but died on August 16.
         4. “This left the Bohemian throne to his brother Sigismund. Since the latter was known to be an uncompromising advocate of Catholic and German supremacy, Hussite nationalists fled from Prague. Under John Ziska, alleged instigator of the “Defenestration,” the radicals fortified a mountain fifty miles from Prague which they named Tabor. Ziska organized an effective army . . .” (Eberhardt)
         5. 1420: Ziska “was master of Bohemia,” including Prague. (Eberhardt)
   3. anti-Hussite crusades
      1. “Martin V and the Council of Constance . . . named Sigismund executor of the sentence against the Hussites.” (Eberhardt)
      2. Sigismund used German troops, “which confirmed the nationalist rebels in their resistance.” (Eberhardt)
      3. “The Czechs had two able generals, Ziska (d. 1424), and Prokop (d. 1434). Ziska developed primitive artillery and tanks, and devised a defense of his convoys by baggage wagons, similar to that of American pioneers against Indians on the plains. Sigismund was brave, but an old-fashioned knight . . . he led feudal chivalry against yeomen and peasants armed with new weapons. . . . Sigismund was forced out of his kingdom and placed his chief hopes on negotiations with the new Council of Basle.” (Eberhardt)
      4. “The Hussites began to invade neighboring states so that public prayers were ordered in German dioceses at the sound of the bell, from which practice the Angelus evolved.” (Eberhardt)
4. **Hussite survival** (1431-1519)
   1. Compact of Prague
      1. 1431-1449: Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence
      2. 1431-1434: the Council of Basel negotiates with the Hussites. (Eberhardt)
      3. The Hussites were divided. (Eberhardt)
         1. Taborite extremists refused to negotiate.
         2. Calixtines (moderates) “were willing to be reconciled if their fixation about Communion under both species received some recognition.” (Eberhardt)
      4. 1433 November 30: “the Compact of Prague with the Council of Basle conceded to the Calixtines the use of the chalice on condition of their professing belief in the real presence under both species.” (Eberhardt)
   2. Taborite rout
      1. “. . . the Germans invaded anew to deal with the reduced forces of the Taborites. At long last the Germans had learned from their foes. Pretending to flee, they enticed the now over-confident Taborites from their circular fortress. Then at the proper moment, the German knights wheeled and cut down the Taborites before they could regain their defenses.” (Eberhardt)
      2. Renewed negotiations patched up a peace . . . Sigismund was at last recognized as the king of Bohemia.” (Eberhardt)
   3. “Germs of Lutheranism” (Eberhardt)
      1. 1437: Sigismund dies.
      2. During the minority of King Ladislas, a German Habsburg, the native Bohemian, George Podiegrad, came to the fore, first as regent, and later as king. His concessions to the native Hussites undid the work of reconciliation at Prague.” (Eberhardt)
      3. 1471: the successor, “Ladislas of Poland (1471-1516), was a staunch Catholic . . .” (Eberhardt)
      4. But “the irreconcilable Hussites, now called Bohemian Brethren, were too strong to be suppressed.” (Eberhardt)
      5. 1519: at Leipzig, “the Catholic champion, Johann Eck, forced Luther to admit that he had studied and approved teachings of John Hus. For the first time the [Church was] unable to extinguish . . . the fire of heresy.” (Eberhardt)

# The Reformation

## Why the Reformation Happened

Many footnotes have their numbers custom-set.

No files in the grace subdirectories contain notes from Moeller pp. 42-ff. (but notes for 42-44 will be added to “indwelling”) except this file, and notes in this file are selective.

1. **initial comments**
   1. “. . . today the differences between major Protestant denominations are far less clear-cut than at the time of their appearance . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 2)
   2. “In Protestantism we are involved not so much with a Church as with a movement made up of churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 2)
2. **factors that decreased the Catholic Church’s influence on minds and hearts**
   1. *mysticism*
      1. Mysticism is “the conviction that God could be directly experienced . . . Tauler’s sermons describe God’s direct presence almost without reference to the mediation of Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 4)
      2. “Eckhart and Tauler in Strasbourg, Ruysbroek and à Kempis in the Netherlands, and Rolle and Julian of Norwich in En­gland [were too few to be] a major pro­blem.” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
      3. “Of a mystical bent but uninterested in the subtleties of theology were various associations of lay individuals, devoted to revitalizing the spiritual life of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
         1. the Friends of God (Rhine Valley)
         2. the Brethren of the Common Life (Holland)
         3. the Sisters of the Common Life (Holland)
         4. The chief works were
            1. Thomas à Kem­pis, the *Imitation of Christ*, and
            2. the anonymous *Theologia Germanica*, “which Luther initially praised.” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
      4. These groups “which stressed the direct experience of God found them­selves in a state of tension with the notion that God was known and mediated primarily through the church as a sacramental agent. . . . many recruits to Protestantism did come from [mystical] people . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 5)
   2. *nominalism*: see the separate handout on “Nominalism.”
   3. *the renaissance* (“particularly in its humanistic form”)
      1. The Renaissance (“rebirth”) began “in the fifteenth century in the city-states of Italy.” Classical learning had been preserved “in mon­as­teries and in the rising universities,” but the Renaissance had a new concern, “the outlook upon life expressed in Greek and Roman” works. (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
      2. “The interest in classical learning demanded new and accurate texts,” and soon critical acumen was turned toward “writings which affected the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
         1. In the “Donation of Con­stantine,” “Emperor Con­stan­tine bequeathed his earthly power to the papacy.” But Lorenz Valla proved that “papal claims to temporal or political authority could not rest upon it . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
         2. Valla questioned “the accuracy of the Vulgate as a translation,” and Eras­mus point­ed out “differences a more accurate text made in religious belief.” (Dillenberger and Welch 7)
      3. Renaissance humanism was “favorable to the concerns of this life . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      4. Humanists stressed the nobility of humanity. (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      5. They “proposed that classical learning be substituted for scholastic theology . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
   4. *economic and nationalist changes*
      1. The Church had “acquired half of the land in France and Ger­many and organized it [according to] feudalism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      2. But “the rise of a middle class preoccu­pied with trade and commerce created a new segment of society inde­pendent of direct influence by the church. [The Cru­sades] facilitated the new interest in trade and commerce.” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      3. Merchants “usually felt themselves . . . free from the church in matters which pertained to their vocational interests.” (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      4. “The new middle class . . . supported ethnic groups. It was in part responsible for the waves of national feelings . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      5. The discontent of victims of the new commerce “finally broke forth in Luther’s own day in the Peasants’ Revolt.” (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
   5. *Augustinianism*: In the later middle ages, there was “a new interest in the thought of Augustine . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      1. “Gregory of Ri­mini, Gabriel Biel, and at the time of the Re­formation, Stau­pitz, were Augustinians who influenced Luther . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
      2. “Augustine became of special importance to the major reformers.” (Dillenberger and Welch 8)
         1. Luther joined the Observant Augustinians in September 1505. The Augustinians were founded in 1256. (Lapple 51) The Augustinians came together every three years. “One of their common features was a public disputation in which a speaker was selected to defend the theology of Augustine, whom most believed was their founder. [On April 25, 1518,] year Luther was the disputant.” (Kittelson 110)
      3. “The presupposition for the [Protestant] doctrine of justification was a vigorous reassertion of Augustini­an anthropology. Joining himself to the criticism leveled by late medieval Augustinianism against “the new Pelagians,” Luther identified Pelagianism as the one perennial heresy of Christian history, [which,] under the patronage of the church of Rome, had now become dominant.” (Pelikan 4.139)
      4. Through Augustine “the Reformers remained in contact not only with a large part of Christian Platonism, but also with the Bible itself. But at the same time, the Reformers, receiving their Platonism through the medium of certain theories peculiar to Augustine (on concupiscence, the concept of original sin, and anti-pela­gianism), took it over in a reduced form, without its ‘realistic’ develop­ments, and only saw the Bible in the light of certain somewhat constricting preconceptions.” (Moeller and Philips 51)
   6. *other factors*
      1. 1447: Gutenberg invents the printing press. (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      2. 1492: Columbus discovers the New World. (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
      3. 1543: Copernicus, in Luther’s lifetime, suggests geocentrism. (Dillenberger and Welch 9)
3. **the situation in the Church**
   1. *conciliarism*
      1. After the Council of Pisa, there were three claimants to the papacy, at Avig­non, Rome, and Pisa. “. . . those who believed in the right of councils . . . suddenly seemed the only hope . . . Pressured by the emperor Sigismund, the Pisan pope called the Council of Con­stance in 1414, where cardinals and theologians elect­ed a new pope in place of the three, but also burned the reformer, John Hus . . . the Council was more interested in defining authority than in reform . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
      2. positions
         1. Some “conciliarists believed in shared authority . . . with the papacy preeminent . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
         2. Others “believed in shared authority [with] the council dominant [but] with con­siderable authority given to the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
         3. Others believed “a council was supreme, with the papacy acting in an exec­u­tive capacity . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
         4. The popes believed councils were extensions of their power. (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
      3. During the Refor­mation, “new appeals were made to the reforming role of councils . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 10)
   2. *a secularized Church*
      1. “Since the state served only one’s earthly pilgrimage and the church directed one . . . to another life, the church naturally felt [more important and] res­pon­sible for forming and directing the social life of society.” [10] By the early 1200s, “Innocent III was more powerful than any monarch.” (Dillenberger and Welch 10-11)
      2. “The church’s claim to control every aspect of life . . . made it almost inevitable that the church would . . . become secularized . . . This, coupled with the picture of rival claimants to the papacy at the end of the Avignon period, had the general effect of undermining the religious, though not the temporal, au­thor­ity of the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
      3. New techniques “came into prominence to meet the [Church’s] financial needs.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         1. “For example, a newly appointed bishop’s first year’s income went to the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         2. “To increase the income, [sometimes bishop] vacancies were not immedi­ately filled so that the papacy could claim the funds in the meantime.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         3. Bishops held dioceses “they seldom visited, but from which they collected revenue.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
         4. “A prince was sometimes [an] absentee bishop. He collected funds from his bishopric and not infrequently shared them with the papacy in payment for the assignment of the bishopric to him.” (Dillenberger and Welch 11)
   3. *indulgences*
      1. the penitential system
         1. sacrament of confession: “upon the confession of sins, the priest, if he considered the penitent worthy, would declare absolution of sins in the name of the triune God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
            1. Forgiveness restored one’s relationship with God and saved from eternal punishment. (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
         2. penances
            1. But justice demanded that one still make amends: “punishment for sin [was] completed in purgatory . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
            2. But “God had en­trusted the work of redemption to the church [and] what was “bound” or “loosed” on earth would be bound or loosed after one’s death.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
            3. “By making temporal satisfaction, one could already now begin to mit­i­gate and decrease subsequent punishment. . . . Such temporal satisfaction took the form of specific acts (frequently prayers) assigned by the priest to the penitent . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)

“The performance of assigned acts of penance indicated that one was indeed contrite.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)

“But more important, [penances] would *now* begin to pay the penalty of sin . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 12, emphasis added)

* + 1. treasury of merit
       1. “. . . Christ and the saints had done such good works that they accumulated merit far beyond their own needs. . . . the church could draw [on these] to meet the needs of the ordinary person [12] . . . completing the assigned penance.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12-13)
       2. Since “the church was the body of Christ,” and since “the average per­son died before completing the necessary pen­ance,” the treasury of merit could be applied to those in purgatory. “. . . both the extent of their suffering and the length of their sojourn might be reduced.” (Dillenberger and Welch 13)
    2. the indulgences controversy
       1. “Initially, “indulgence” was merely a term for the cancellation under appropriate conditions of a part of [a] penance [because] assigned acts were a distinct hardship [or because a] service to the church, such as a gift of land or money, merited special consideration.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
       2. “The first extensive use of an indulgence for special meritorious service was Pope Urban II’s promise of complete indul­gence to all who joined the first Crusade.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
       3. “An indulgence, therefore, was usually the substitution of one kind of act or deed for another. It did not alter the fundamental con­ception that satisfaction must be made or that justice must run its course.” (Dillenberger and Welch 12)
    3. the controversy
       1. “The controversy over “indulgences” affected those in the parish more immediately and directly than any of the [11] intellectual or social currents . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 11-12)
       2. “The visible side of an indulgence was a slip of paper upon which was noted its spiritual worth. These could therefore be sold like an article of trade. It was not unusual for the papacy to farm out the sale of indulgences to princes who aspired to ecclesiastical importance. They in turn would send an agreed-upon share of the proceeds to Rome.” (Dillenberger and Welch 13)
       3. “Hence, the need for revenue on the part of the papacy became a temptation to issue one indulgence after another.” (Dillenberger and Welch 13)
       4. Tetzel, a Dominican, preached an indulgence in German lands, “the proceeds of which were to go to Rome for the comple­tion of the new St. Peter’s Church.” Here is an excerpt from one of his sermons:

Listen to the voices of your dear dead relatives . . . “We bore you, nourished you, brought you up, left you our fortunes, and you are so cruel and hard that now you are not willing for so little to set us free.” [13] . . . [Remember,] As soon as the coin in the coffer rings, The soul from purgatory springs.” (Qtd. in Bainton, Roland H. *Here I Stand*. Nashville: 1950. 78.) (Dillenberger and Welch 13-14)

* + - 1. “Increasingly the careful distinction [between] forgiveness and tem­poral sat­is­faction was obscured. . . . officially indulgences had always been confined only to the remission of penal­ties, whether here or in purgatory. [But] In the confessional the average person, just as Luther, was told that the purchase of indulgences was effective also for salvation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 14)
    1. “Large sections of Christendom held fast to distorted marginal truths of the faith: venera­tion of saints and relics, accumulation of indulgences, going on pilgrimages. Many Chris­tians were driven (and tormented) by . . . a highly quantified ethic of earning merit. Thus in the Castle Church of Wittenberg around [1517] it was possible for a believer, by reciting prayers and de­voutly contemplating the elector’s relic collection, to accumulate 1,900,000 years worth of in­dul­gences.” There was also “Belief in the devil and witches [and] anxiety over judgment [and] hell . . .” (Lapple 54)
  1. 1512-1517: Lateran Council V fails to reform the Church. (Lapple 65)

## Purgatory

1. **existence of purgatory**
   1. dogma
      1. “The souls of the just which, in the moment of death, are burdened with venial sins or temporal punishment due to sins, enter Purgatory.” (*de fide*) (Ott 483)
      2. “The cleansing fire (purgatorium) is a place and state of temporal penal purification.” (Ott 482)
   2. heresies
      1. Purgatory was denied by the Cathars and Waldensians. (Ott 482)
      2. It was denied by “some of the schismatic Greeks. [482] . . . [The Greeks’] objection was chiefly directed against a special place of purification . . .” (Ott 482)
         1. See Petrus Mogilas, *Confessio Orthodoxa* part I q. 64-66 (revised by Meletios Syrigos). (Ott 482)
         2. See Dositheos, *Confessio*, decr. 18. (Ott 482)
      3. Purgatory was denied by “the Reformers . . .” (Ott 482)
         1. Luther, *Schmalcald Articles* pars. 2 art. 2 secs. 12-15. (Ott 482)
         2. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* 3.5.6-10. (Ott 483)
   3. scripture
      1. “Holy Writ teaches the existence of the cleansing fire indirectly . . .” (Ott 483)
      2. 2 Macc 12:39-45, “Judas and his men went to take up the bodies of the fallen . . . 40 under the tunic of each one of the dead they found sacred tokens of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbids the Jews to wear. . . . 42 they turned to supplication, praying that the sin that had been committed might be wholly blotted out. . . . 43 [Judas Maccabeus sent] two thousand drachmas of silver . . . to Jerusalem to provide for a sin offering. . . . 44 to pray for the dead. . . . 45 looking to the splendid reward that is laid up for those who fall asleep in godliness, it was a holy and pious thought. Therefore he made atonement for the dead, so that they might be delivered from their sin.”
      3. Matt 5:25-26, “Come to terms quickly with your accuser while you are on the way to court with him, or your accuser may hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you will be thrown into prison. 26 Truly I tell you, you will never get out [of prison] until you have paid the last penny.”
         1. In itself the parable threatens “the person who does not fulfil the commandment of Christian brotherly love, with just punishment by the Divine Judge.” (Ott 484)
         2. “Through further interpretation of the Parable, a time-limited condition of punishment in the other world began to be seen expressed in the time-limited punishment of the prison.” (Ott 484)
         3. “Tertullian [*De anima* 58] understands by the prison the underworld, and by “the last farthing” the petty transgressions which must be expiated there by the postponement of the resurrection (to the millennial kingdom).” (Ott 484)
      4. Matt 12:32, “Whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come.”
         1. This “leaves open the possibility that [other] sins are forgiven . . . in the world to come.” (Ott 483)
         2. Gregory the Great (*Dial*. 4.39): “In this sentence it is given to understand that many sins can be remitted in this world, but also many in the world to come.” (Ott 483)
      5. 1 Cor 3:12-15, “if anyone builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw—13 the work of each builder will become visible, for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each has done. 14 If what has been built on the foundation survives, the builder will receive a reward. 15 If the work is burned up, the builder will suffer loss; the builder will be saved, but only as through fire.”
         1. “only as through fire”: “that is, in the manner of a man who, in the catastrophe of a conflagration, loses everything and barely saves his life.” (Ott 483)
         2. “The Apostle is speaking of a transient punishment of the Day of the General Judgment, probably consisting of severe tribulations after which the final salvation will take place.” (Ott 483)
         3. “The Latin Fathers take the passage to mean a transient purification punishment in the other world. They interpret the words “as by fire” all too literally in the sense of a physical fire.” (Ott 483)
            1. Augustine, *Enarr*., in Ps. 37:3
            2. Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 179
   4. tradition
      1. Church Fathers
         1. “Ancient Christian grave inscriptions beseech peace and quickening for the dead.” (Ott 484)
         2. “The Latin Fathers especially employ the scriptural passages” cited above. (Ott 484)
         3. Cyprian (Ep. 55.20) “teaches that penitents who die before the reception of the reconciliation must perform the remainder of any atonement demanded in the other world, while martyrdom counts as full atonement: “To be tormented in long pains and to be cleansed and purified from one’s sins by continuous fire, is a different thing from expiating one’s sins all at once by the suffering (of martyrdom).”” (Ott 484)
         4. Augustine
            1. Augustine (*De civ. Dei* 21.13) “distinguishes between temporal punishments which must be expiated in this life, and those which must be expiated after death: “Some suffer temporal punishments only in this life, others only after death, still others both in life and after death, but always before this most strict and most final court.”” (Ott 484)
            2. “He frequently refers to an improving and cleansing fire” (*ignis emendatorius*, *ignis purgatorius*). (E.g, *Enarr*. Ps 37:3.) (Ott 484)
            3. “According to his teaching [*De civ. Dei* 21.24.2], suffrages benefit those who are born again in Christ, and have not lived such good lives that they can dispense with such help after death, but not such bad lives that such help is no longer of any avail to them, that is to say, to an intermediate group between the blessed and the damned.” (Ott 484)
      2. doctrinal declarations
         1. “Against the schismatic Greeks whose objection was chiefly directed against a special place of purification, the Union Councils of Lyons and of Florence uphold the purifying fire and the expiatory character of the penal sufferings . . .” (Ott 483)
            1. Innocent IV 1243-1254 (letter *Sub Catholicae*, ad 1254, in the wake of the 13th ecumenical Council of Lyons I): “Finally, since Truth in the Gospel asserts that “if anyone shall utter blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, neither in this life nor in the future will it be forgiven him” [cf. Matt. 12:32], by this it is granted that certain sins of the present be understood which, however, are forgiven in the future life, and since the Apostle says that “fire will test the work of each one, of what kind it is,” and “ if any man’s work burn, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire” [1 Cor 3:13,15], and since these same Greeks truly and undoubtedly are said to believe and to affirm that the souls of those who after a penance has been received yet not performed, or who, without mortal sin yet die with venial and slight sin, can be cleansed after death and can be helped by the suffrages of the Church, we, since they say a place of purgation of this kind has not been indicated to them with a certain and proper name by their teachers, we indeed, calling it purgatory according to the traditions and authority of the Holy Fathers, wish that in the future it be called by that name in their area. For in that transitory fire certainly sins, though not criminal or capital, which before have not been remitted through penance but were small and minor sins, are cleansed, and these weigh heavily even after death, if they have been forgiven in this life.” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 456; from *Welcome*)
            2. (14th ecumenical) Council of Lyons II (*Profession of Faith of Michael Pal­ae­ol­o­gus*, ad 1274): “those who after baptism slip into sin must . . . by true penance attain forgiveness of their sins. Because if they die truly repentant in charity before they have made satisfaction by worthy fruits of penance for (sins) committed and omitted, their souls are cleansed after death by purgatorical or purifying punishments . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 464; from *Welcome*)
            3. Clement VI (letter *Super quibusdam* to the Consolator, the Catholicon of the Armenians, 1351): “there is a purgatory to which de­part the souls of those dying in grace who have not yet made complete satisfaction for their sins. . . . they will be tortured by fire for a time . . . as soon as they are cleansed, even before the day of judgment, they may come to the true and eternal beatitude which consists in the vision of God face to face and in love.” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 570s; from *Welcome*)
            4. (17th ecumenical) Council of Florence (“Decree for the Greeks,” from the bull *Laetentur coeli*, 1439): “if those truly penitent have departed in the love of God, before they have made satisfaction by the worthy fruits of penance for sins of commission and omission, the souls of these are cleansed after death by purgatorial punishments . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 693; from *Welcome*)
         2. The Reformers said purgatory was “contrary to Holy Writ . . . and also rejected it from the standpoint of their doctrine of justification . . .” (Ott 483)
            1. Leo X (bull *Exsurge Domine*, ad 1520): it is false that “Purgatory cannot be proved from Sacred Scripture, which is in the canon.” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 777; from *Welcome*)
            2. (19th ecumenical) Council of Trent (*Canons on Justification*, ad 1547): “the repentance of a Christian after his fall [includes] satisfaction by fasting, almsgiving, prayers, and other devout exercises of the spiritual life . . . for the temporal punishment, which (as the Sacred Writings teach) is not always wholly remitted, as is done in baptism . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 807; from *Welcome*)
            3. Trent (*Canons On Justification*, canon 30, ad 1547): it is false that, “after the reception of the grace of justification, to every penitent sinner the guilt is so remitted and the penalty of eternal punishment so blotted out that no penalty of temporal punishment remains to be discharged either in this world or in the world to come in purgatory . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 840; from *Welcome*)
            4. Trent (*Doctrine on the Sacrifice of the Mass*, 1562): the Mass is offered, “not only for the sins of the faithful living, for their punishments and other necessities, but also for the dead in Christ not yet fully purged.” (Den­zing­er, *Sources* § 940; from *Welcome*)
            5. Trent (*Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass*, canon 3, 1562): it is false that “the sacrifice of the Mass . . . is of profit to him alone who receives; or that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities . . . ” (Den­zing­er, *Sources* § 950; from *Welcome*)
            6. Trent (*Decree on Purgatory*, 1563): “there is a purgatory [and] the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, and especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 983; from *Wel­come*)
            7. Trent (*Profession of Faith*, 1565): “I steadfastly hold that a purgatory exists, and that the souls there detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 998; from *Wel­come*)
   5. speculation
      1. “. . . the cleansing fire can be derived from the concept of the sanctity and justice of God.” (Ott 484)
         1. The sanctity of God “demands that only completely pure souls be assumed into Hea­ven . . .” (Ott 484) Rev 21:27, “nothing unclean will enter it [the heavenly Jerusalem], nor anyone who practices abomination or falsehood, but only those who are written in the Lamb’s book of life.”
         2. The justice of God “demands that the punishments of sins still present be effected, but, on the other hand, forbids that souls that are united in love with God should be cast into hell. Therefore, an intermediate state is to be assumed, whose purpose is final purification and which for this reason is of limited duration.” (Ott 484)
      2. See Aquinas, *Sent*. 4 d. 21 q. 1 a. 1 qc. 1; *SG* 4.91. (Ott 484)
2. **nature of purgatory**
   1. “On the analogy of the punishment of hell a distinction is made between poena damni and the poena sensus.” (Ott 484)
      1. *Poena damni* “consists in the temporary exclusion from the beatific vision of God. On the ground of the special judgment which has gone before, it is, however, associated with the certainty of the final beatification . . .” (Ott 484)
         1. Leo X (bull *Exsurge Domine*, 1520): it is false that “The souls in purgatory are not sure of their salvation, at least not all; nor is it proved by any arguments or by the Scriptures that they are beyond the state of meriting or of increasing in charity.” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 778; from *Wel­come*)
         2. “The poor souls are conscious that they are children and friends of God and long for the most intimate unification with Him. Thus the temporary separation is all the more painful to them.” (Ott 484)
      2. *Poena sensus*: “The Latin Fathers, the Schoolmen, and many theologians of modern times, in view of [1 Cor 3:15], assume a physical fire.” (Ott 485)
         1. “However, the biblical foundation for this is inadequate.” (Ott 485)
         2. “Out of consideration for the separated Greeks, who reject the notion of a purifying fire, the official declarations of the Councils speak only of purifying punishments (poena purgatoriae), not of purifying fire.” See the councils of Lyons and Florence above, under “doctrinal declarations.” (Ott 485)
         3. See Aquinas, *Sent*. 4 d. 21 q. 1 a. 1 qc. 3. (Ott 485)
   2. “Formerly, a third condition was required, namely, the Re­deemer’s entrance into heaven. But since the Ascension, this con­dition no longer holds. It was fitting that no one be admitted to heaven before our Lord Himself entered in body and soul, to demonstrate that all men owe this blessing to His merits. It was fitting that the Head should precede His members. . . . the just who died before the Ascension ascended into heaven only after Christ. It is believed that they had enjoyed a certain happiness (in limbo), but not the beatific vision. This effect of grace [46] re­mained in abeyance just as it does in purgatory.” (Cuttaz 46-47)
3. **purpose of purgatory**
   1. “The remission of the venial sins which are not yet remitted, occurs, according to the teaching of St. Thomas [*De male* 7.11], as it does in this life, by an act of contrition deriving from charity and performed with the help of grace. This act of contrition, which is presumably awakened immediately after entry into the purifying fire, does not, however, effect the abrogation or the diminution of the punishment for sins, since in the other world there is no longer any possibility of merit.” (Ott 485)
   2. “The temporal punishments for sins are atoned for in the purifying fire by the so-called suffering of atonement (satispassio), that is, by the willing bearing of the expiatory punishments imposed by God.” (Ott 485)
4. **duration of purgatory**
   1. “The purifying fire will not continue after the General Judgment.” (*sententia communis*) (Ott 485)
   2. scripture
      1. Matt 25:34, 41, “the king will say to those at his right hand, ‘Come, . . . inherit the kingdom’ . . . 41Then he will say to those at his left hand, ‘You that are accursed, depart from me into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels’ . . .”
   3. tradition
      1. Church Fathers: Augustine (*De civ. Dei* 21.16, 21.13): “Let purification punishments be counted on only before that last and terrible judgment.”
      2. Alexander VII (decree condemning errors on moral matters, 1666): it is false that “An annual legacy left for the soul does not bind for more than ten years.” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 1143; from *Wel­come*) I.e., “As to the length of the purification process for the individual souls, nothing can be said in terms of years.” (Ott 485)
   4. “For the individual souls the purifying fire endures until they are free from all guilt and punishment. Immediately on the conclusion of the purification they will be assumed into the bliss of Heaven.” (Ott 485)
      1. Benedict XII (edict *Benedictus Deus*, 1336): “immediately after . . . purgation in those who were in need of a purgation of this kind, even before the resumption of their bodies and the general judgment . . . [such persons] will be in heaven . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 530; from *Wel­come*)
      2. (17th ecumenical) Council of Florence (bull *Laetentur coeli*, 1439): “the souls of those, . . . who after the contraction of the stain of sin whether in their bodies, or when released from the same bodies, . . . are purged, are immediately received into heaven . . .” (Denzinger, *Sources* § 693; from *Wel­come*)

## Temporal Punishment

1. ***The Baltimore Catechism***
   1. part 3 q. 629 “What punishments are due to actual sins? A. Two punishments are due to actual sins: one, called the eternal, is inflicted in hell; and the other, called the temporal, is inflicted in this world or in purgatory. The Sacrament of Penance remits or frees us from the eternal punishment and generally only from part of the temporal. Prayer, good works and indulgences in this world and the sufferings of purgatory in the next remit the remainder of the temporal punishment.”
   2. part 4 lesson 19 “In the Sacrament of Penance God forgives the insult offered by sinning, but requires us to make restitution for that of which the sin has deprived Him . . . We pay the temporal debt due to our sins, that is, make the restitution, by our penances upon earth, or by our suffering in Purgatory, or by both combined.”
   3. part 3 q. 804 “Why does God require a temporal punishment as a satisfaction for sin? A. God requires a temporal punishment as a satisfaction for sin to teach us the great evil of sin and to prevent us from falling again.”
   4. part 3 q. 805 “Which are the chief means by which we satisfy God for the temporal punishment due to sin? A. The chief means by which we satisfy God for the temporal punishment due to sin are: Prayer, Fasting, Almsgiving; all spiritual and corporal works of mercy, and the patient suffering of the ills of life.”
2. ***The Catechism of St Pius******X***
   1. 105 “Q: What is satisfaction? A: Satisfaction, which is also called sacramental penance, is one of the acts of the penitent by which he makes a certain reparation to the justice of God for his sins, by performing the works the confessor imposes on him.”
   2. 109 “Q: Why is a penance imposed in confession? A: A penance is imposed because, after sacramental absolution which remits sin and its eternal punishment, there generally remains a temporal punishment to be undergone, either in this world or in Purgatory.”
   3. 118 “Q: Do those who die after having received absolution but before they have fully satisfied the justice of God, go straight to Heaven? A: No, they go to Purgatory there to satisfy the justice of God and be perfectly purified.”
3. **addendum**
   1. “To say that an indulgence of so many days or years is granted means that it cancels an amount of purgatorial punishment equivalent to that which would have been remitted, in the sight of God, by the performance of so many days or years of the ancient canonical penance. Here, evidently, the reckoning makes no claim to absolute exactness; it has only a relative value.” (Kent)

## The Catholic Teaching on Indulgences

1. **indulgences in general**
   1. definition: “An indulgence is the remission before God of the temporal punishment due for sins already forgiven . . .” (Paul VI 21)
   2. Indulgences cannot be applied to another living person but can always be applied to a dead person. (Paul VI 21)
   3. To receive an indulgence, one must be baptized, not excommunicated, in the state of grace at the completion of the work, and subject to the grantor of the indulgence. (Paul VI 25)
   4. One must have at least a general intention to gain indulgences. (Paul VI 25)
   5. An indulgence cannot be gained by a work one is obligated to do. (Paul VI 27)
2. **partial indulgences** (eliminate some temporal punishment)
   1. Perform the work with contrition or at least attrition. (Paul VI 26)
      1. Contrition excludes all attachment to sin, even venial. (Paul VI 26)
      2. Attrition detests sin from fear of punishment. (Paul VI 26)
   2. A partial indulgence done with contrition receives a remission of punishment acquired by the act and an equal remission through the intervention of the Church. (Paul VI 21)
3. **plenary indulgences** (eliminate all temporal punishment)
   1. Perform the work with contrition. (Paul VI 26)
   2. fulfill three conditions within several days before or after the work (preferably on the day itself):
      1. go to confession
      2. go to Mass
      3. pray for the pope’s intention (one Our Father and one Hail Mary suffice) (Paul VI 26)
   3. The indul­gence is partial if the dis­pos­i­tion is imperfect. (Paul VI 26)
4. **three general indulgences** (all are partial)
   1. “The main concern has been to attach greater importance to a Christian way of life and to lead souls to cultivate the spirit of prayer and penance and to practice the theological virtues, rather than merely to repeat certain formulas and acts.” (Paul VI 17)
   2. *prayer*: Perform duties and bear trials; then think or say a pious invocation (see “examples of prayers with a partial indulgence attached,” below. to God, with humble confidence. (Paul VI 33)
   3. *charity*: Give of oneself or one’s goods to others in need, in a spirit of faith and mercy. (Paul VI 35)
   4. *penance*: Give up what is licit and pleasing, in a spirit of penitence. (Paul VI 38)
   5. “Acts of this kind [referring to all three general indulgences], considering the frailty of human nature, are not frequent.” (Paul VI 32)
5. **examples of acts with a partial indulgence attached**
   1. do the sign of the cross (Paul VI 70)
   2. use an article of devotion blessed by a priest (crucifix or cross, rosary, scapular, medal) (Paul VI 24, 64)
   3. pay attention to preaching (plenary if at a parish mission and you attend the close of the mission) (Paul VI 65)
   4. teach or learn Christian doctrine (Paul VI 55)
   5. recite the missal oration of a saint on his feast day (Paul VI 70)
   6. attend a novena before Pentecost, before the feast of the Immaculate Conception (December 8), or before Christmas (Paul VI 63)
   7. perform part of a work enriched with a plenary indulgence (Paul VI 44) Examples:
      1. only a decade of the Rosary (Paul VI 44)
      2. adoration of the Most Blessed Sacrament for less than ½ hour (Paul VI 46)
      3. reading of scripture devoutly for less than ½ hour (Paul VI 45, 68)
6. **examples of prayers with a partial indulgence attached**
   1. “In the matter of prayers, a selection has been made in favor of those which have a more universal appeal.” (Paul VI 18)
   2. The *Enchiridion* lists hundreds of pious invocations, shorter prayers, and longer prayers. Here are a few examples:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *pious invocations* | *shorter prayers* |
| “My God”  “Father”  “Jesus”  “O God, help me”  “I love you”  “I thank you”  “Jesus, Mary, Joseph”  “Holy Mary, pray for us”  “O Lord, increase our faith” | “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit”  “Jesus, meek and humble of heart, make my heart like your Heart”  “O Heart of Jesus, burning with love for us, inflame our hearts with love for you”  “Angel of God” (Paul VI 49)  “Angelus” (Paul VI 50)  “Direct, We Beg You, O Lord” (Paul VI 46)  “We Give You Thanks” (Paul VI 49)  “Remember” (“Memorare”) (Paul VI 62) |
| *longer prayers* | |
| the Apostles’ Creed  the Nicene Creed  the Lord’s Prayer  the Rosary | the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55)  “Come, Holy Spirit” (Veni, Sancte Spiritus) (Paul VI 74)  “Have Mercy on Me” (“Miserere,” Ps 50)  “Out of the Depths” (“De Profundis,” Ps 129) |
| “Act of Love”: “O my God, because you are infinite goodness and worthy of infinite love, I love you with my whole heart above all things, and for love of you I love my fellowmen as my­self.”  “Act of Contrition”: “O my God, I repent with my whole heart of all my sins, and I detest them, because I have deserved the loss of heaven and the pains of hell, but most of all because I have offended you, infinite Goodness. I firmly purpose with the help of your grace, which I pray you to grant me now and always, to do penance and rather to die than offend you again. I purpose also to receive the holy Sacraments during my life and at my death.”  a litany (“The Litany of the Most Holy Name of Jesus,” “of the Most Precious Blood of Jesus,” “of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus,” “of the Blessed Virgin Mary,” “of the Saints,” etc.) | |

* 1. An indulgenced prayer can be said alternately with a companion or followed mentally while recited by another. (Paul VI 27)
  2. sacraments: The sacraments themselves never have indulgences attached. (Paul VI 15) But prayers associated with them may. For example:
     1. Mass prayers (if you attend every Sunday)
     2. confession penances (if you confess at least yearly)

1. **examples of acts with a plenary indulgence attached**
   1. adore the Blessed Sacrament for ½ hour (Paul VI 45)
   2. read scripture devoutly for ½ hour (Paul VI 45, 68)
   3. do the Way of the Cross (Paul VI 45, 131)
   4. say the Rosary with your family or in a church with a group
   5. spend three days in spiritual exercises on a retreat (Paul VI 57)
   6. pray for the dead in a cemetery (applicable only to those in purgatory) (Paul VI 52)
   7. take first communion or attend a first communion (Paul VI 66)
   8. recite “Look Down Upon Me” before a crucifix after communion on the Fridays of Lent (Paul VI 56)
   9. renew baptismal vows on Easter Vigil or the anniversary of one’s baptism (Paul VI 78, 131)
   10. recite the “Our Father” and a creed at a church or oratory on All Souls Day (November 2) (applicable only to those in purgatory) (Paul VI 77)
   11. die properly disposed, if in the habit of reciting some prayers during one’s lifetime (these substitute for confession, Mass, and prayer for the pope’s intentions [see “fulfill three condi­tions,” above]) (Paul VI 60)
2. **examples of prayers with a plenary indulgence attached**
   1. “Down in Adoration Falling” (*Tantum Ergo*) on Holy Thursday or Corpus Christi (Paul VI 71)
   2. “O God” (*Te Deum*) publicly on December 31 (Paul VI 72)
   3. “Come, Holy Spirit” (*Veni*, *Creator*) publicly on January 1 or Pentecost (Paul VI 73)

## The Development of Luther’s Theology, 1517-20

1. **1483-1517**: **youth**
   1. Luther was born in 1483. His father was an owner of mines and physically abusive.
      1. “According to Luther himself, the strict life his parents had required of him as a child sent him into holy orders.” [54] “They meant well,” Luther later wrote of his parents, “but they did not understand the art of adjusting their punishments.” [54 n. 9] (Jones 54, 54 n. 9)
      2. Here add quotes from Heiko Oberman and/or Erik Erikson on physically abusive father (or the other bio—Haile?).
      3. “Luther recalled that his mother had once beat him until his hands bled merely for taking a nut from the kitchen table.” (Kittelson 33)
      4. “The methods used by his teachers were . . . barbaric . . . Coercion and ridicule were chief among their techniques. Any child caught speaking German was beaten with a rod. The one who had done least well in the morning was required to wear a dunce’s cap and was addressed as an ass all afternoon. Demerits were then added up for the week, and each student went home with one more caning to make the accounts balance.” (Kittelson 37)
      5. “Luther was caned 15 times in only one morning for not having mastered the tables of Latin grammar.” (Kittelson 37)
   2. “In 1497, at the age of 13, Luther had learned Latin well enough to be sent away to school. [At Magdeburg] he lived and studied at a foundation operated by the Brethren of the Common Life, an extremely pious lay religious organization.” (Kittelson 37)
   3. “Having been nearly struck down by a bolt of light­ning, he had resolved then and there to follow the noblest and most certain path.” He entered an Augustinian monastery. (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
2. **Luther’s scrupulosity**
   1. He believed that “God was a righteous God who demanded one’s unswerving [15] obedience and destined one to salvation only if salvation was merited.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15-16)
   2. “. . . every time he tried to fan his own spark of goodness, he found that all he was doing was focusing his attention on himself. From his own teachers he knew that to think of himself was to be in his most sinful state. How then could he “do what was within him” without yielding to the basest of motives, the desire to save his own skin? How could he possibly confess every one of his sins when he knew that he did so only for the purpose of currying the favor of a righteous God who would surely condemn him for them? Every act of confession therefore became yet another sin. The sincerity of the confession and of the acts of penance that followed was always in question. And if he himself questioned his motives, how could they not have been more than dubious in the mind of a God who knew all and was always right?” (Kittelson 80)
   3. Luther confessed daily. [55] “After the fact, he would suddenly remember a thought or an emotion that contradicted his vocation and stained his heart. He knew that it would rightly bring the wrath of God down on him.” (Kittelson 55-56)
   4. “. . . the question of certainty under God . . . drove him to confess his sins so frequently to his fellow monks as to annoy them.” (Dillenberger and Welch 16)
   5. “In this turmoil, Luther came to Staupitz so frequently to confess his doubts, misgivings, sins, and outright hatred of a righteous God that Staupitz once commanded him to go and commit a real sin. “Pay attention,” Staupitz said. “You want to be without sin, but you don’t have any real sins anyway. Christ is the forgiveness of awful sins, like the murder of one’s parents, public vices, blasphemy, adultery, and the like. These are real sins. . . . You must not inflate your halting, artificial sins out of proportion!”” (Kittelson 84)
   6. “. . . his saintly superior, Staupitz, advising Luther to relax and to trust in the grace of God, did not help.” (Dillenberger and Welch 16)
   7. Luther (referring to Apr. 1511-fall 1513): “. . . I hoped I might find peace of conscience with fasts, prayer, and the vigils with which I miserably afflicted my body . . .” [AE 8.326 (WA 44.819)] “. . . I often repeated my confession . . . but I was always doubting and said, ‘You did not perform that correctly. You were not contrite enough. You left that out of your confession.’ . . . If it had not been for Dr. Staupitz, I would have sunk into hell.” (WATr 6.106-07; AE 27.13 [WA 402.15]) (Kittelson 84)
   8. “He could not put aside the question of certainty . . . Perhaps God was a tyr­ant who never gave peace and who was not even trustworthy. According to late me­dieval nominal­ism, God could act in opposition to his declared intention. There were mo­ments when Luther hated God . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 16)
3. **c**. **February 1519**: **Luther’s** “**tower experience**” (from his 1545 *Reflectiones*)
   1. introduction
      1. Luther “made a very important discovery [134] . . . during the relative calm that followed . . . the death of the emperor [Maximilian, January 1519]. But Luther was well aware that it had been building for years.” (Kittelson 134-35)
      2. “In a moment, perhaps in the twinkling of an eye, Luther suddenly realized that what he had been teaching for four years all fit together. . . . His conscious realization of it came in a rush . . .” (Kittelson 135)
      3. This discovery is known as the “tower experience.” (Lapple 5)
      4. Our knowledge of this insight comes from a work of ??reflections written many years later. The reminiscence was written in 1544 (published in 1545), when Luther was 61 years old; he is remembering an experience from when he was 35. (Dillenberger and Welch 17)
   2. text from the 1545 *Reflections*??
      1. (The following is Kittelson’s translation. For a different translation, see: “Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther’s Latin Writings, 1545.” *Luther’s Works*. Vol. 34. Philadelphia: 1960. 336-37.])
      2. “I was seized with the conviction that I must understand his [Paul’s] letter to the Romans. I did not have a heart of stone, but to that moment one phrase in chapter 1 [:17] stood in my way. I hated the idea, “in it the righteousness of God is revealed,” for I had been taught to understand the term, “the righteousness of God,” in the formal or active sense, as the philosophers called it, according to which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner.
      3. “I lived without reproach as a monk, but my conscience was disturbed to its very depths and all I knew about myself was that I was a sinner. I could not believe that anything that I thought or did or prayed satisfied God. I did not love, nay, I hated the righteous God who punishes sinners. Certainly, and with intense grumbling (perhaps even blasphemy), I was angry with God and said, “As if it were indeed not enough that miserable sinners who are eternally lost through original sin and are crushed again by every kind of calamity through the Ten Commandments, God himself adds pain to pain in the gospel by threatening us with his righteousness and wrath!”
      4. “At last, meditating day and night and by the mercy of God, I gave heed to the context of the words, “In it the righteousness of God is revealed, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’ Then I began to understand that the righteousness of God is that through which the righteous live by a gift of God, namely by faith. . . . Here I felt as if I were entirely born again and had entered paradise itself through gates that had been flung open. An entirely new side of the Scriptures opened itself to me . . . and I extolled my sweetest word with a love as great as the loathing with which before I had hated the term, “the righteousness of God.” Thus, that verse in Paul was for me truly the gate of paradise. [134] . . .
      5. “This is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which the merciful God justifies us by faith, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’” (WA 54, 185-86 [AE 34, 336-338]) (Kittelson 134-35)
   3. Luther’s insight relies primarily upon three passages in Romans and Galatians.
      1. Rom 1:17, “in it [the gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.””
      2. Rom 3:21-31, “But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, 22the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, 23since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; 24they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, 25whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed; 26it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus. 27Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. 28For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. 29Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, 30since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through that same faith. 31Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.”
      3. Gal 2:16, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law.”
   4. “. . . by early 1519 he was consistently teaching that the sinner is justified (accepted, acquited, forgiven) before God by faith *alone* . . .” (Walker 425)
   5. “Protestants affirm that this renewed religious outlook [i.e., justification by faith,] [was] an act of God in which . . . the burden of a message was laid upon a human being.” In other words, Luther was a prophet sent by God. (Dillenberger and Welch 22)
4. **1517**: **the 95 theses**
   1. “Others, too, had repudiated the practice of purchasing and selling indulgences as a way of shortening the time of the departed in purgatory . . . It was as if one’s relation to God was on the level of barter and trade.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   2. “In the ninety-five theses, Luther did not reject indulgences outright. He rejected only the abuses.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      1. But he limited indulgences to penalties initiated by the pope: “The Pope could change or cancel only those penalties imposed by his own authority or by the canons of the church. Indulgences were valid only when confined to such human and organizational dis­cipline . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      2. He denied “the extension of indulgences to purgatory.” (Walker 426) Indulgences could not “be said to have any effect on purgatory. . . . [They] had no necessary relation to the final destiny of any individual believer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
      3. In fact, “The papacy, he declared, did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   3. “Repentance is not a single act of penance, but a constant change of heart and mind extend­ing over one’s lifetime.” (Walker 426)
      1. “The Christian seeks rather than avoids divine discipline.” (Walker 426)
      2. “The true treasure of the church is not the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, subject to papal control, but “the most holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God,” freely offered to repentant sinners by faithful preachers.” (Walker 426)
5. **developing heresies, 1517-1519**
   1. A heresy is a “doctrine held in opposition to the . . . ­­doctrine of the Catholic Church.” (*Oxford English Dictionary*)
   2. October 31, 1517 (*Ninety-Five Theses*): Luther declared that the pope “did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   3. October 31, 1517 (*Ninety-Five Theses*): Luther declared that indulgences do not “have any effect on purgatory. . . . [They have] no necessary relation to the final destiny of any individual believer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   4. October 14, 1518 (Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan): “a council was above the pope on [123] matters of doctrine . . . [and] the Scriptures were finally authoritative in matters of doctrine because all human beings could err.” (Kittelson 123-24)
   5. “by early 1519”: Luther “was consistently teaching that the sinner is justified . . . before God by faith *alone* . . .” (Walker 425)
   6. June-July, 1519 (Leipzig debate with Eck): Luther proposed “that the supremacy of the Roman church is unsupported by his­tory or Scripture.” Thus he “rejected the . . . final authority of the pope . . .” (Walker 428)
   7. June-July, 1519 (Leipzig debate with Eck): Luther “proclaimed the fallibility of general councils [and restricted] final appeal only to the Scriptures.” (Walker 428)
6. **developing heresies, 1520**
   1. June 15, 1520: the pope issued a bull, *Exsurge domine*, condemning 41 propositions from Luther’s writings. (Walker 428) “Its publication was prohibited in Wittenberg, [but it was published] in the Netherlands [accompanied by] the burning of Luther’s books at Louvain, Liège, Antwerp, and Cologne.” (Walker 430)
   2. August 1520: *An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Re­form of the Christian Faith*
      1. “Three years after the posting of the theses, Luther rejected indulgences themselves as . . . the “knavish trick of the Roman Sycophants.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
      2. Luther said “the church had built around itself three walls which prevented” reform. (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         1. The first wall “was the claim for supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal order. The church claimed exclusive and absolute authority over one’s spiritual life. Such a unique position under God clearly argued for the church’s supremacy over all earthly affairs . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         2. The second wall was that “One could not utilize the Bible to correct the church since the final right to interpret scripture was in the hands of the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         3. The third wall was that one could not utilize a council to correct the church “since the Pope alone was authorized to call a council.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
      3. He denied “the claim for supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal order.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19) The “superiority of the spirit­ual to the temporal estate is baseless, since all believers are priests by virtue of baptism.” (Walker 429)
         1. “. . . Luther called upon the nobles and princes to effect the reformation. . . . This, too, had been done by Wyclife and Hus . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         2. He denied “that a reformatory council can be called by none but the pope. “A true, free council” for reform of the church should be sum­moned by the temporal authorities.” (Walker 429)
      4. He denied that “the final right to interpret scripture was in the hands of the papacy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 19) The “universal priesthood casts down [also the] exclusive papal right to interpret the Scriptures . . .” (Walker 429)
      5. “Luther then proceeded to lay down a reform program . . .” (Walker 429)
      6. “Papal misgovernment [was] to be curbed [and] German ecclesiastical interests placed under a “primate of Germany” . . .” (Walker 429)
      7. “. . . clerical marriage [was to be] permitted . . .” (Walker 429)
      8. “. . . beggary “including that of the mendicant orders” [was to be] forbidden . . .” (Walker 429)
   3. October 1520: *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*
      1. Luther “appealed to the New Testament for the repudiation of many aspects of the develop­ment of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
      2. Luther “had in mind . . . nothing less than the rejection of the entire sacramental system . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 19)
         1. “In such a system [one’s] relation to God was of necessity channeled through the agency of the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         2. Also, one’s “relation to God . . . assumed a quantitative character, becoming a question of the amount of merit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         3. “Luther’s insistence that . . . grace was not confined to sacramental realities mediated by priests, challenged the very nature of the constituted church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
      3. the number of sacraments
         1. Of the seven sacraments of the Church (baptism, reconciliation [confession, penance], Eucharist [communion, the Lord’s Supper], confirmation, anointing of the sick [extreme unction], marriage, and ordination), Luther retained only two: baptism and the Eucharist.
            1. “Restricting the name of sacrament to “those promises [of forgiveness] which have signs attached to them,” Luther held that Scripture recognizes only two such sacraments instituted by Christ himself: baptism and the Lord’s Supper.” (Walker 429)
            2. “Only baptism and the Lord’s Supper were instituted in the New Testament as events in which act, word and participation were involved. These three aspects . . . implied that a sacrament had been instituted.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
         2. The other five “were rejected as sacraments, though all of them were considered significant acts in the Christian life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
         3. Though not a sacrament, Luther “wished private confession retained as “a cure without equal for distressed consciences.”” (Walker 430)
      4. He repudiated three aspects of the medieval Mass.
         1. “The first was the withhold­ing of the cup from the laity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         2. “The second [was] transubstantiation . . . the miracle of transforming the bread and wine into the actual blood and body of Christ appeared magical to Luther . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
         3. Third “was the idea that the mass was a good work [in which] Christ was offered as a sacrifice to God each time the mass was said.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
            1. “. . . this made the mass a worthy act quite apart from the presence of any believers, except for the priest . . .” According to Luther’s reading of the New Testament, the Eucharist “had no efficacy apart from the believers who received it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)
            2. Luther could not find in the New Testament “any basis for the notion of sacrifice [in relation to the Eucharist], since Christ was not offered to God but rather was given by God to us.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20)

—————

|  |
| --- |
| An Aside: On the Eucharist as Sacrifice Luther is surely wrong to say that there is no basis in the New Testament for the Eucharist as a sacrifice.  That the bread and wine lie separate on the table foreshadows the impending violent separation of Jesus’ body and blood. (This separation is found in all four institution narratives: Matt 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, 1 Cor 11.)  “. . . he *broke* it” (the bread) anticipates the breaking of his “body” (Matt 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, 1 Cor 11:24).  “This is *my body*” and “*my blood*” is sacrificial language (Matt 26:26, 28; Mark 14:22, 24; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor 11:24-25).  “This is my body, which is *given*” and “this is my blood . . . which is *poured out*” is sacrificial language (Matt 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:19-20).  “This is my body, which is given *for you*” and “this is my blood . . . which is poured out *for many*” is sacrificial language (Matt 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor 11:24). Matt 26:28 even adds, “poured out for many *for the forgiveness of sins* . . .”  “This cup . . . is the *new covenant* in my *blood*” (Luke 22:20, 1 Cor 11:25). This recalls the blood that sealed the first covenant, at Sinai.  Exod 24:5-8, “He sent young men of the people of Israel, who offered burnt offerings and sacrificed oxen as offerings of well-being to the Lord. 6Moses took half of the blood and put it in basins, and half of the blood he dashed against the altar. 7Then he took the book of the covenant, and read it in the hearing of the people; and they said, “All that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient.” 8Moses took the blood and dashed it on the people, and said, “See the blood of the covenant that the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words.””  See Jer 31:31-34, “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. 32It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt—a covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. 33But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. 34No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other, “Know the Lord,” for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.”  The references to “new covenant” and “blood” indicate that Jesus was alluding to Isaiah’s “Servant of Yahweh,” a sacrificial figure. (The “Servant of Yahweh” or “of the Lord” shows up in four passages in Isaiah: 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12.)  Isa 42:6, “I am the Lord . . . I have given you [the Servant] as a *covenant* to the people . . .”  Isa 49:8, “I have kept you and given you as a *covenant* to the people . . .”  Isa 53:12, “he [the Servant] *poured out* himself to *death*, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the *sin* *of many*, and made intercession for the transgressors.”  Compare Matt 26:28, “this is my *blood* of the *covenant*, which is *poured out* for *many* for the forgiveness of *sins*.”  In his Eucharistic words, Jesus “lets it be known that His approaching death is going to replace the sacrifices of the old covenant and free men [from] sin. For such a work God had need of the Servant.” (Benoit 125) |

—————

* + - * 1. “In the theory of the mass, of course, Christ is sacrificed to God in order for us to receive Christ also. There is both an upward and [20] a downward motion. For Luther there could be no upward motion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 20-21) He wrote in *Babylonian Captivity*: “the only worthy preparation and proper observance is faith, the faith by which we believe in the mass, that is, in the divine promise.” (Luther, *Luther’s Works* 36.44, qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 21)
        2. For most Protestants (including most Anglicans), “the sacri­ficing of Christ to God is an event of the past and is not repeatable by priest­ly function.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
      1. “. . . monastic vows, pilgrimages, and works of merit are seen to be man-made substitutes for the forgiveness of sins freely promised to faith in baptism.” (Walker 430)
  1. 1520: *The Freedom of a Christian*: “his third great tractate of 1520” was largely ethical in con­tent. (Walker 430)
  2. December 10, 1520: Luther burned the papal bull, *Exsurge domine*, and the canon law. (Walker 430)

1. **establishment of Lutheranism**
   1. “Throughout 1522 and 1523 the movement spread rapidly and took root. Moreover, those who took these first steps [e.g., Huldreich Zwingli in Zurich, John Oecolampadius in Basel, Fabricius Capito and Martin Bucer in Strasbourg] were themselves men of learning and position. They had decided that Luther was right, and the masses followed them.” (Kittelson 187)
   2. From Luther’s divergence from the Catholic faith, “there resulted the constitution of parishes independent of Rome.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)

## Luther’s Divergences from Catholicism

1. **Luther’s divergences from Catholic doctrine on grace**
   1. severe wounding of human nature after the fall
      1. Luther said: “all things in you are altogether blameworthy, sinful, and damnable.”
      2. Luther said: “we do everything by necessity and nothing by our free will, since the power of the free will is nothing and neither does the good nor is capable of it in the absence of grace . . .”
      3. Luther said: “‘Free will’ after the fall is nothing but a word, and so long as it does what is within it, it is committing deadly sin.”
   2. justification by faith alone
      1. Rom 3:21-31, “the righteousness of God has been disclosed, . . . 22 the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. . . . 25 God put [Christ] forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this . . . 26 to prove at the present time that he him­self is right­eous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus. 27 Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded . . . by the law of faith. 28 For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. . . . 30 God . . . will justify the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through that same faith. 31 Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.”
      2. “Luther was once again reducing everything in the life of a Christian to the promises of God that called forth trust in his goodwill.” (Kittelson 149)
      3. Luther said: “faith justifies without and before love.”
   3. justification as forgiveness of sins only (without transformation of human nature also)
      1. “By defining justification as the forgiveness of sins, Luther emphasized even more sharply its gratuitous character.” (Pelikan 4: 148)
      2. Compare Trent, *Decree on Justification* ch. 7: justification “is not merely remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renewal of the interior man …” Trent based itself on (among other passages):
         1. *new creation*: 2 Cor 5:17, “if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!”
         2. *new self*: Eph 4:23-24, “be renewed in the spirit of your minds, 24 [and] clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.”
         3. *one body*: 1 Cor 10:17, “Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.”
         4. *indwelling*: Rom 8:9, 11, “the Spirit of God dwells in you. . . . 11 If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.”
   4. imputed righteousness
      1. “. . . the Father in heaven looks upon Jesus Christ and sees his love and obedience. Christ stands in front of sinful man as a shield so that God the Father no longer sees their sinfulness. In gazing on his beloved Son, he declares the sinner guiltless and justified for the sake of his Son. Justification is a nonimputation of sin for the sake of Christ.” (Schmaus 57-58)
      2. “… in Luther’s understanding, one is not yet righteous and needs to be covered by God’s cloak of righteousness.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
      3. Luther said (*Gal*. 3:6 [1535]): “God reckons imperfect righteousness as perfect righteousness and sin as not sin, even though it really is sin.”
      4. The “alien righteousness of Christ, a righteousness ‘outside ourselves,’ [proves] that justification must be through faith alone …” (Pelikan 4.150)
   5. *simul justus et peccator*
      1. “*Simul justus et peccator*” means “at the same time justified and a sinner.”
      2. For Catholicism, “there is a residual sinfulness in the justified man.” In that sense a justified person is at the same time justified and a sinner. (Schmaus 65)
      3. But Luther said: “the Christian who is consecrated by his faith does good works, but the works do not make him holier or more Christian . . .”
      4. A primary effect of the doctrine is that there is no increasing holiness; hence, there are no saints.
   6. good works are useless
      1. Luther said: “How can anyone prepare himself to be good with works when he never does a good work without some reluctance or reticence inside him?”
      2. Trent opposed this, citing (among other passages):
         1. James 2:14-21, “What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? 15 If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, 16 and one of you says to them, “Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill,” and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? 17 So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead.”
         2. 1 Cor 7:19, “obeying the commandments of God is everything.”
         3. 1 Cor 13:2, “if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing.”
         4. Gal 5:6, “the only thing that counts is faith working through love.”
         5. Phil 2:12-13, “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; 13 for it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”
2. **Luther’s other divergences from Catholic doctrine**: according to Luther,
   1. indulgences
      1. The pope can give indulgences only to remit penalties he or the canons of the church have imposed.
      2. Indulgences do not extend to purgatory.
   2. Church authority
      1. A council is above the pope on matters of doctrine.
      2. Scripture is above both popes and councils, because all humans can err.
      3. So neither ecumenical councils nor popes are infallible.
      4. There are two churches: the external (pope, hierarchy, etc.) and the spiritual.
      5. Luther said: “the papacy is identical with the kingdom of Babylon and the Antichrist itself.”
   3. *sola scriptura* (scripture alone)
      1. Andreas Carlstadt (fellow professor at Wittenberg) insisted that only scripture—not Church Fathers, papal decrees, councils, etc.—are authoritative in religion; Luther adopts Carlstadt’s position.
      2. Luther removes seven books from the Old Testament (Tobit, Judith, 1-2 Maccabees, Wisdom, Sirach, and Baruch) and four books from the New Testament (Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation), claiming they are not inspired; he puts the excised books in appendices after the Old and New Testaments; later Lutherans reinsert the New-Testament books.
   4. Church-state relations
      1. All political leaders, from emperor to city council, receive their authority directly from God; therefore, no one can rebel against them.
      2. Political leaders must reform the Church.
   5. baptism
      1. Baptism is a ritual whose purpose is to remind us throughout our life of our faith.
   6. reconciliation
      1. 1519: Luther says there are three sacraments: baptism, the Eucharist, and reconciliation.
      2. 1520: Luther says there are only two sacraments: baptism and the Eucharist.
      3. Since Christ only ordered that Christians confess to one another, confessing to a priest was not necessary.
   7. the Eucharist
      1. The Eucharist is a sign that points to Christ and so strengthens our faith.
      2. The Church reserved wine to priests for fear the laity might spill it.
      3. Luther adopts the Hussite practice of communion in both species.
      4. 1524-36: the “sacramentarian controversy” over Christ’s real presence
         1. Wyclif and Hus said, and some fellow-Protestants (Calvin, Zwing­li, Carlstadt, Oecolampadius, Bucer) say, that the bread and wine are mere sym­bols of Christ’s body and blood.
         2. Luther maintains Christ’s real presence in the Eucharist.
         3. But he denies transubstantiation (the bread and wine cease to be bread and wine and become Christ’s body and blood).
         4. Instead, he says Christ is “in, with, and under” the bread and wine (*Large Catechism*, 1527); this is perhaps consubstantiation (the bread and wine remain bread and wine but become Christ’s body and blood as well).

## Ten Pauline Images for the Effects of the Christ-Event

Paul uses ten terms to describe “the effects of the salvation event.” Each of these terms is at root an image, borrowed by Paul from his Jewish or Hellenistic background and applied by him to Jesus. (Fitzmyer 59)

justification “acquitted or vindicated before a judge’s tribunal” (Fitzmyer 59)

salvation “rescue from evil or harm”[[3]](#footnote-3) (Fitzmyer 62)

reconciliation “from . . . enmity to friendship”; “atonement” (Fitzmyer 63)

expiation “wiped out, smeared away [sc. “sin”]” (Fitzmyer 64)

redemption “setting free an enslaved person by . . . ransom”[[4]](#footnote-4)

freedom “the rights of a citizen of a free city or state” (Fitzmyer 68)

sanctification “the dedication of things or persons to the awesome service of Yahweh” (Fitz­myer 68-69)

transformation “gradually reshaping human beings” (Fitzmyer 69)

new creation “God in Christ has created humanity anew” (Fitzmyer 70)

glorification giving Christians “in advance a share in the glory that [Christ] now enjoys with the Father” (Fitzmyer 71)

## The State of Justification: Some Scriptural Images

1. **new era**
   1. newness
      1. Rev 21:5, “And the one who was seated on the throne said, “See, I am making all things new.””
      2. Isa 43:19, “I am about to do a new thing; now it springs forth, do you not perceive it? I will make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert.”
   2. new covenant
      1. Jer 31:31-40, “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. 32 It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt—a covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. 33 But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.”
      2. Luke 22:20, “And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, “This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.””
      3. 1 Cor 11:25, “In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood.””
      4. 2 Cor 3:6, God “has made us competent to be ministers of a new covenant, not of letter but of spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.”
      5. 2 Cor 3:14, “their minds were hardened. Indeed, to this very day, when they hear the reading of the old covenant, that same veil is still there, since only in Christ is it set aside.”
      6. Heb 8:8, 13, “God finds fault with them when he says: “The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will establish a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah . . . 13 In speaking of “a new covenant,” he has made the first one obsolete.”
      7. Heb 9:15, “he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, because a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions under the first covenant.”
      8. Heb 12:24, Jesus is “the mediator of a new covenant . . .”
   3. new song
      1. Rev 5:9, “They will sing a new song: “You are worthy to take the scroll and to open its seals, for you were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed for God saints from every tribe and language and people and nation” . . .”
      2. Rev 14:3, “they sing a new song before the throne and before the four living creatures and before the elders. No one could learn that song except the one hundred forty-four thousand who have been redeemed from the earth.”
   4. new Jerusalem
      1. Rev 3:12, “I will write on you the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem that comes down from my God out of heaven, and my own new name.”
      2. Rev 21:2, “I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.”
      3. “The new order will achieve its final shape at the termination of worldly history . . .” (Schmaus 49)
2. **new persons**
   1. new self
      1. Eph 4:22-24, “You were taught to put away your former way of life, your old self, corrupt and deluded by its lusts, 23 and to be renewed in the spirit of your minds, 24 and to clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.” (Compare Rom 6:6, “our old self was crucified with him . . .”)
      2. Col 3:3, “you have died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God.”
   2. new spirit
      1. Joel 3:1-2 (Protestant Bibles, 2:28-29), “Then afterward I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions. 29 Even on the male and female slaves, in those days, I will pour out my spirit.”
      2. Acts 2:16-21, “this is what was spoken through the prophet Joel: 17 ‘In the last days it will be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. 18 Even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.’”
      3. Rom 7:6, “But now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we are slaves not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit.”
   3. new nature
      1. 2 Cor 4:16, “Even though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed day by day.”
   4. new creation
      1. 2 Cor 5:17, “if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!”
      2. Gal 6:15, “neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything; but a new creation is everything!”
      3. Eph 2:10, “we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life.”
      4. Eph 4:23-24, “be renewed in the spirit of your minds, 24 [and] clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.”
   5. old yeast, new batch
      1. 1 Cor 5:7-8, “Clean out the old yeast so that you may be a new batch, as you really are unleavened. For our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed. 8 Therefore, let us celebrate the festival, not with the old yeast, the yeast of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.”
3. **new life**
   1. John 1:14, “And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father’s only son, full of grace and truth.”
   2. 1 John 1:2, “this life was revealed, and we have seen it and testify to it, and declare to you the eternal life that was with the Father and was revealed to us . . .”
   3. John 3:5, “no one can enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and Spirit.”
   4. John 3:15-16, “whoever believes in him may have eternal life. 16 For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life.”
   5. John 3:36, “Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life; whoever disobeys the Son will not see life, but must endure God’s wrath.”
   6. John 10:10, “The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy. I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly.”
   7. John 14:6, “I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.”
   8. John 14:19, “In a little while the world will no longer see me, but you will see me; because I live, you also will live.”
   9. John 20:31, “these are written so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name.”
   10. Acts 3:15, “you killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses.”
   11. Rom 6:3-23, “Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? 4 Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. 5 For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. 6 We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. 7 For whoever has died is freed from sin. 8 But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him. . . . 11 So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. . . . 13 present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life . . . 21 what advantage did you then get from the things of which you now are ashamed? The end of those things is death. 22 But now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
   12. Rom 7:6, “we are slaves not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit.”
   13. Col 3:3-4, “for you have died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God. 4 When Christ who is your life is revealed, then you also will be revealed with him in glory.”
   14. 1 Pet 1:23, “You have been born anew, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, through the living and enduring word of God.”
   15. Heb 2:10, “It was fitting that God, for whom and through whom all things exist, in bringing many children to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”
4. **friendship with God**
   1. Exod 33:11, “Thus the Lord used to speak to Moses face to face, as one speaks to a friend.”
   2. Wis 7:14, “those who get it [wisdom] obtain friendship with God . . .”
   3. John 15:13-15, “No one has greater love than this, to lay down one’s life for one’s friends. 14 You are my friends if you do what I command you. 15 I do not call you servants any longer, because the servant does not know what the master is doing; but I have called you friends, because I have made known to you everything that I have heard from my Father.”
   4. See Eph 2:19, “you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God . . .”
   5. See James 2:23, “Thus the scripture was fulfilled that says, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness,” and he was called the friend of God.”
5. **incorporation into Christ**’**s** “**one body**”
   1. Rom 12:4-5, “For as in one body we have many members, and not all the members have the same function, 5 so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually we are members one of another.”
   2. 1 Cor 6:16, “Do you not know that whoever is united to a prostitute becomes one body with her? For it is said, “The two shall be one flesh.””
   3. 1 Cor 10:17, “Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.”
   4. 1 Cor 12:12-13, “For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. 13 For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and we were all made to drink of one Spirit.”
   5. 1 Cor 12:20, “As it is, there are many members, yet one body.”
   6. Eph 2:10-15, “we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life. 11 So then, remember that at one time you Gentiles by birth . . . 13 who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. 14 For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. 15 He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new humanity in place of the two, thus making peace, 16 and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, thus putting to death that hostility through it.”
   7. Eph 3:6, “the Gentiles have become fellow heirs, members of the same body . . .”
   8. Eph 4:4, “There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling . . .”
   9. Col 3:15, “let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which indeed you were called in the one body. And be thankful.”
   10. the Church as Christ’s “body”: Rom 12:4-5, 1 Cor 10:17; 1 Cor 12:12-27; Eph 1:22-23; 3:6; 4:4, 15; 5:23; Col 1:18; 2:19; 3:15
   11. the Church as Christ’s “temple”: 1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:19-21
6. **God’s** “**indwelling**”
   1. Matt 6:9, “Our Father in heaven, hallowed by your name.”
   2. Luke 11:13, “If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him!”
   3. John 4:23, “the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for the Father seeks such as these to worship him.”
   4. John 14:23, “Those who love me will keep my word, and my Father will love them, and we will come to them and make our home with them.”
   5. John 15:1-5, “I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinegrower. . . . 4 Abide in me as I abide in you. Just as the branch cannot bear fruit by itself unless it abides in the vine, neither can you unless you abide in me. 5 I am the vine, you are the branches. Those who abide in me and I in them bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing.”
   6. Rom 8:9, 11, “the Spirit of God dwells in you. . . . 11 If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.”
   7. Rom 8:15-16, “you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!” 16 it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God . . .”
   8. Rom 8:23, “we ourselves . . . have the firstfruits of the Spirit . . .”
   9. 1 Cor 2:10-16, “these things God has revealed to us through the Spirit; for the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God. 11 For what human being knows what is truly human except the human spirit that is within? So also no one comprehends what is truly God’s except the Spirit of God. 12 Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that is from God, so that we may understand the gifts bestowed on us by God. 13 And we speak of these things in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual. 14 Those who are unspiritual do not receive the gifts of God’s Spirit, for they are foolishness to them, and they are unable to understand them because they are spiritually discerned. 15 Those who are spiritual discern all things, and they are themselves subject to no one else’s scrutiny. 16 “For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?” But we have the mind of Christ.”
   10. 1 Cor 3:16, “Do you not know that you are God’s temple and that God’s Spirit dwells in you?”
   11. 1 Cor 12:3, “no one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says “Let Jesus be cursed!” and no one can say “Jesus is Lord” except by the Holy Spirit.”
   12. 1 Cor 14:25, “After the secrets of the unbeliever’s heart are disclosed, that person will bow down before God and worship him, declaring, “God is really among you.””
   13. 2 Cor 12:9, “I will boast all the more gladly of my weaknesses, that the power of Christ may dwell in me . . .”
   14. Gal 4:6, “because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!””
   15. Eph 3:16-17, “I pray that . . . he may grant that you may be strengthened in your inner being with power through his Spirit, 17 and that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith . . .”
   16. the seal of the Holy Spirit
       1. 2 Cor 1:21-22, “But it is God who establishes us with you in Christ and has anointed us, 22by putting his seal on us and giving us his Spirit in our hearts as a first installment.”
       2. Eph 1:13, “In him you . . . were marked with the seal of the promised Holy Spirit . . .”
       3. Eph 4:30, “do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, with which you were marked with a seal for the day of redemption.”
       4. Rev 7:2-3, “I saw another angel ascending from the rising of the sun, having the seal of the living God, and he called with a loud voice to the four angels who had been given power to damage earth and sea, 3 saying, “Do not damage the earth or the sea or the trees, until we have marked the servants of our God with a seal on their foreheads.””
       5. Rev 9:4, “They were told not to damage the grass of the earth or any green growth or any tree, but only those people who do not have the seal of God on their foreheads.”
7. **sonship**
   1. Christ the brother of Christians
      1. Matt 18:15, “If another member of the church [Greek, “your brother”] sins against you, go and point out the fault when the two of you are alone. If the member listens to you, you have regained that one [Greek, “your brother”].”
      2. Matt 18:21, “Then Peter came and said to him, “Lord, if another member of the church sins against me, how often should I forgive? As many as seven times?””
      3. Matt 25:35-40, “I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, 36 I was naked and you gave me clothing, I was sick and you took care of me, I was in prison and you visited me. . . . 40 just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me.”
      4. Mark 3:34-35, “Here are my mother and my brothers! 35 Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother.””
      5. Luke 8:21, “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.”
      6. Rom 8:29, “For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
      7. Rom 9:3, “I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my own people, my kindred according to the flesh.”
      8. Heb 2:10-17, “It was fitting that God, for whom and through whom all things exist, in bringing many children to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings. 11 For the one who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one Father. For this reason Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers and sisters, 12 saying, “I will proclaim your name to my brothers and sisters, in the midst of the congregation I will praise you.” 13 And again, “I will put my trust in him.” And again, “Here am I and the children whom God has given me.” 14 Since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared the same things, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil, 15 and free those who all their lives were held in slavery by the fear of death. 16 For it is clear that he did not come to help angels, but the descendants of Abraham. 17 Therefore he had to become like his brothers and sisters in every respect, so that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the people.”
      9. Christ the *firstborn* among many brothers
         1. Matt 6:9, “Pray then in this way: Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name.”
         2. Rom 8:19-30, “the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the children of God . . . 21 the creation itself . . . will obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God. . . . 29 For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
         3. Col 1:15, “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation . . .”
         4. Col 1:18, “He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, so that he might come to have first place in everything.”
         5. Heb 1:6, “when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, “Let all God’s angels worship him.””
   2. participation in the sonship of Christ
      1. John 3:16, “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life.”
      2. 2 Cor 3:18, “all of us . . . are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit.”
      3. Gal 3:26-27, “in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith. 27 As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.”
      4. Eph 1:4-6, “he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love. 5 He destined us for adoption as his children through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will, 6 to the praise of his glorious grace that he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved.”
      5. participation in Christ’s sonship through the Spirit
         1. Rom 8:14-17, “all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God. 15 For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father!” 16 it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, 17 and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ . . .”
         2. Gal 4:1-7, “My point is this: heirs, as long as they are minors, are no better than slaves, though they are the owners of all the property; 2but they remain under guardians and trustees until the date set by the father. 3 So with us; while we were minors, we were enslaved to the elemental spirits of the world. 4 But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, 5 in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children. 6 And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” 7 So you are no longer a slave but a child, and if a child then also an heir, through God.”
         3. Titus 3:7, “so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”
         4. Heb 2:10-14, “It was fitting that God, for whom and through whom all things exist, in bringing many children to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings. 11 For the one who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one Father. For this reason Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers and sisters, 12 saying, “I will proclaim your name to my brothers and sisters, in the midst of the congregation I will praise you.” 13 And again, “I will put my trust in him.” And again, “Here am I and the children whom God has given me.” 14 Since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared the same things, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil . . .”
         5. Heb 3:6, Christ “was faithful over God’s house as a son, and we are his house if we hold firm the confidence and the pride that belong to hope.”
         6. Heb 4:12-13, “the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides soul from spirit, joints from marrow; it is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart. 13 And before him no creature is hidden, but all are naked and laid bare to the eyes of the one to whom we must render an account.”
         7. 1 John 2:29-3:10, “If you know that he is righteous, you may be sure that everyone who does right has been born of him. 3:1 See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and that is what we are. The reason the world does not know us is that it did not know him. 2 Beloved, we are God’s children now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is. 3 And all who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure. 4 Everyone who commits sin is guilty of lawlessness; sin is lawlessness. 5 You know that he was revealed to take away sins, and in him there is no sin. 6 No one who abides in him sins; no one who sins has either seen him or known him. 7 Little children, let no one deceive you. Everyone who does what is right is righteous, just as he is righteous. 8 Everyone who commits sin is a child of the devil; for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The Son of God was revealed for this purpose, to destroy the works of the devil. 9 Those who have been born of God do not sin, because God’s seed abides in them; they cannot sin, because they have been born of God. 10 The children of God and the children of the devil are revealed in this way: all who do not do what is right are not from God, nor are those who do not love their brothers and sisters.”
   3. son as heir
      1. Rom 8:17, “and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ . . .”
      2. Rom 8:29, “those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family.”
      3. 1 Cor 3:1, “I could not speak to you as spiritual people, but rather as people of the flesh, as infants in Christ.”
      4. 1 Cor 13:11, “When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became an adult, I put an end to childish ways.”
      5. Gal 4, “heirs, as long as they are minors, are no better than slaves, though they are the owners of all the property; 2 but they remain under guardians and trustees until the date set by the father. 3 So with us; while we were minors, we were enslaved to the elemental spirits of the world. 4 But . . . God sent his Son . . . 5 so that we might receive adoption as children. 6 And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” 7 So you are no longer a slave but a child, and if a child then also an heir, through God. 8 Formerly, when you did not know God, you were enslaved to beings that by nature are not gods. 9 Now, however, that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits? How can you want to be enslaved to them again? 10 You are observing special days, and months, and seasons, and years. . . . 19 My little children, for whom I am again in the pain of childbirth until Christ is formed in you, 20 I wish I were present with you now and could change my tone, for I am perplexed about you.”
      6. Eph 4:14, “We must no longer be children, tossed to and fro and blown about by every wind of doctrine, by people's trickery, by their craftiness in deceitful scheming.”
      7. Titus 3:7, “so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”

## The State of Justification: Forgiveness of Sin

1. **scripture**
   1. the paralytic
      1. Mark 2:5-12 (= Matt 9:1-8), “When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the paralytic, “Son, your sins are forgiven.” 6 Now some of the scribes were sitting there, questioning in their hearts, 7 “Why does this fellow speak in this way? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone?” 8 At once Jesus perceived in his spirit that they were discussing these questions among themselves; and he said to them, “Why do you raise such questions in your hearts? 9 Which is easier, to say to the paralytic, ‘Your sins are forgiven,’ or to say, ‘Stand up and take your mat and walk’? 10 But so that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins”—he said to the paralytic—11 “I say to you, stand up, take your mat and go to your home.” 12 And he stood up, and immediately took the mat and went out before all of them; so that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, “We have never seen anything like this!””
   2. the woman who anointed Jesus’ feet
      1. Luke 7:36-50, “One of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee’s house and took his place at the table. 37 And a woman in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he was eating in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster jar of ointment. 38 She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment. 39 Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, “If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman this is who is touching him—that she is a sinner.” 40 Jesus spoke up and said to him, “Simon, I have something to say to you.” “Teacher,” he replied, “Speak.” 41 “A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. 42 When they could not pay, he canceled the debts for both of them. Now which of them will love him more?” 43 Simon answered, “I suppose the one for whom he canceled the greater debt.” And Jesus said to him, “You have judged rightly.” 44 Then turning toward the woman, he said to Simon, “Do you see this woman? I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. 45 You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet. 46 You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment. 47 Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.” 48 Then he said to her, “Your sins are forgiven.” 49 But those who were at the table with him began to say among themselves, “Who is this who even forgives sins?” 50 And he said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.””
   3. Zacchaeus
      1. Luke 19:3-10, “He was trying to see who Jesus was, but on account of the crowd he could not, because he was short in stature. 4 So he ran ahead and climbed a sycamore tree to see him, because he was going to pass that way. 5 When Jesus came to the place, he looked up and said to him, “Zacchaeus, hurry and come down; for I must stay at your house today.” 6 So he hurried down and was happy to welcome him. 7 All who saw it began to grumble and said, “He has gone to be the guest of one who is a sinner.” 8 Zacchaeus stood there and said to the Lord, “Look, half of my possessions, Lord, I will give to the poor; and if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will pay back four times as much.” 9 Then Jesus said to him, “Today salvation has come to this house, because he too is a son of Abraham. 10 For the Son of Man came to seek out and to save the lost.”
   4. the good thief
      1. Luke 23:39-42, “One of the criminals who were hanged there kept deriding him and saying, “Are you not the Messiah? Save yourself and us!” 40 But the other rebuked him, saying, “Do you not fear God, since you are under the same sentence of condemnation? 41 And we indeed have been condemned justly, for we are getting what we deserve for our deeds, but this man has done nothing wrong.” 42 Then he said, “Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom.””
   5. In John, “Jesus is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (1,29). The image of the lamb may be referred either to the paschal lamb or to the daily offering of two lambs in the temple. It is possible that the first formulation of the phrase Lamb of God did not come from John the Baptist but was attributed to him by the primitive Christian community as a testimony to those truths believed by John the evangelist. In John’s gospel the formula of the washing away of sin also occurs (Jn. 13,10). Jesus says to the disciples: “You have already been cleansed by the word that I spoke to you” (Jn. 15,3). This passage testifies not only to the fact of forgiveness but also to the means, namely the word. The word by which sin is forgiven is an effec­tive word, a word of spiritual force and dynamism. According to Jn. 2,12, the faithful have received forgiveness of sins.” (Schmaus 56)
      1. John 2:12, “After this he went down to Capernaum with his mother, his brothers, and his disciples; and they remained there a few days.”
      2. John 13:10, “One who has bathed does not need to wash, except for the feet, but is entirely clean. And you are clean, though not all of you.”
   6. In Acts, “The remission of guilt is the first fruit of the act of turning in faith to Christ . . . What is meant here is the remission of a debt; sin is to be understood as a debt charged to our account, and in the forgiveness of sin this debt is cancelled.” (Schmaus 54)
      1. Acts 2:38, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”
      2. Acts 5:31, “God exalted him at his right hand as Leader and Savior that he might give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.”
      3. Acts 8:22, “Repent therefore of this wickedness of yours, and pray to the Lord that, if possible, the intent of your heart may be forgiven you.”
      4. Acts 10:43, “All the prophets testify about him that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name.”
      5. Acts 13:38, “Let it be known to you therefore, my brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you . . .”
   7. “Paul speaks of pardon (Col. 2,13; 3,13; Eph. 4,32) and of God’s “no longer holding men’s misdeeds against them” (2 Cor. 5,19; Rom. 4,8-11; cf. also [1] Pet. 4,8) as well as the forgiveness of sin (Rom. 4,7; Col. 1,14; Eph. 1,7). These passages show that one expression cannot be set against the other. In Paul’s view, man is a debtor before God, and his debt is entered into a ledger. God relinquishes his claim; he remits, he waives, the penalty. This is an act of grace whereby he makes a divine value judgment upon the sinner that has creative force, effecting what it says. It so changes man that he ceases to be a sinner; he becomes a new man. Thus Paul can speak of taking away, of cleansing, of purifying, of freeing from sin (1 Cor. 6,11; Rom. 6; 7,24; Eph. 5,26; Heb. 9,28; see also 1 Pet. 3,21).” (Schmaus 56)
      1. Col 2:13, “when you were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made you alive together with him, when he forgave us all our trespasses . . .”
      2. Col 3:13, “just as the Lord has forgiven you, so you also must forgive.”
      3. Eph 4:32, “be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, as God in Christ has forgiven you.”
      4. 2 Cor 5:19, “in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them . . .”
      5. Rom 4:8-11, ““blessed is the one against whom the Lord will not reckon sin.” 9 Is this blessedness, then, pronounced only on the circumcised, or also on the uncircumcised?”
      6. 1 Pet 4:8, “maintain constant love for one another, for love covers a multitude of sins.”
      7. Rom 4:7, “Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered . . .”
      8. Col 1:14, “in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.”
      9. Eph 1:7, “In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses . . .”
      10. 1 Cor 6:11, “And this is what some of you used to be. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.”
      11. Rom 6:4-23, “we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that [we] might walk in newness of life. . . . 6 our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. 7 For whoever has died is freed from sin. 8But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him. 9 We know that Christ, being raised from the dead, will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him. 10 The death he died, he died to sin, once for all; but the life he lives, he lives to God. 11 So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. 12 Therefore, do not let sin exercise dominion in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions. 13 No longer present your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life, and present your members to God as instruments of righteousness. 14 For sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not under law but under grace. 15 What then? Should we sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means! 16 Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness? 17 But thanks be to God that you, having once been slaves of sin, have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching to which you were entrusted, 18 and that you, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. 19 I am speaking in human terms because of your natural limitations. For just as you once presented your members as slaves to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now present your members as slaves to righteousness for sanctification. 20 When you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. 21 So what advantage did you then get from the things of which you now are ashamed? The end of those things is death. 22 But now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
      12. Rom 7:24, “Wretched man that I am! Who will rescue me from this body of death?”
      13. Eph 5:26, “to make her holy by cleansing her with the washing of water by the word . . .”
      14. Heb 9:28, “Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to deal with sin, but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him.”
      15. 1 Pet 3:21, baptism “now saves you—not as a removal of dirt from the body, but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ . . .”
   8. “We find the same orientation in the apostle’s statement that the forgiveness of sin takes place through participation in the death of Jesus. In his death Jesus took upon himself the curse uttered by God after the first sin. He fulfilled the law of suffering and death and thereby nullified it. Jesus’ death becomes effective for man through faith and baptism. The person who is baptized is taken up into the living power of the death on Golgotha, and his sinful existence in Adam is transcen­ded. Inasmuch as man, through faith and the sacraments, achieves a share in the dying of Jesus, he is liberated from sin . . .” (Schmaus 55)
      1. Rom 3:25-26, “God put forward [Christ] as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed; 26 it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus.”
      2. Col 2:13, “And when you were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made you alive together with him, when he forgave us all our trespasses . . .”
2. **the meaning of forgiveness**
   1. what is cancelled: guilt
      1. “God’s forgiveness of sin means first of all his taking away of the guilt which man has incurred against God himself. Thus only can sin be overcome: through God’s action. . . . Through the forgiveness of sin the *reatus* *culpa*, the indebtedness for sin, is overcome.” (Schmaus 63)
   2. what is not cancelled: ones’ having sinned, the deed, and its consequences
      1. “. . . the failure involved in an action done at one time within history is not annulled by the forgiveness of sin. The justified sinner remains a sinner in the sense that he remains always the doer of his once committed sin. This fact is emphasized even more strongly in Protestant theology than in Catholic.” (Schmaus 60)
      2. “Catholic as well as Protestant theology is naturally aware that sins, as historical happenings, cannot be cancelled out. On this point neither of the two teachings maintains more nor less than the other.” [60] “. . . sin as an historical event is not nullified; there is no reversal of history.” (Schmaus 60, 63)
      3. “Much less does the divine forgiveness eliminate the consequences of the sinful act in history—the spiritual and bodily damage . . .” Forgiveness of sin also does not eliminate the consequences of one’s sins on other in­dividuals and the human community at large, consequences which ramify throughout the remainder of history. (Schmaus 63)
   3. “. . . the meaning of forgiveness cannot be established experimentally but must be grasped in faith. Whereas [64] . . . there are signs to show that a man is living in God’s love, the chief of these being love of the brethren [1 John 3:14-23], . . . The wiping out of sinfulness is imperceptible.” (Schmaus 64-65)

## The State of Justification in Scripture: Transformation

1. **John**
   1. John 1:12, “But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God . . .”
   2. John 1:12-13, “to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God, 13 who were born, not of blood or of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, but of God.”
   3. John 3:3, 5-6, “no one can see the kingdom of God without being born from above. . . . 5 no one can enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and Spirit. 6 What is born of the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit.”
   4. John 6:57, “Just as the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so whoever eats me will live because of me.”
   5. John 17:19, “for their sakes I sanctify myself, so that they also may be sanctified in truth.”
   6. 1 John 3:2, “we are God’s children now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is.”
   7. 1 John 5:1, “Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ has been born of God, and everyone who loves the parent loves the child.”
   8. 1 John 5:18, “We know that those who are born of God do not sin, but the one who was born of God protects them, and the evil one does not touch them.”
2. **Paul**
   1. Rom 5:5, “God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.”
   2. Rom 6:4-23, “we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. . . . 6 our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. 7 For whoever has died is freed from sin. 8But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we will also live with him. . . . 11 So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. . . . 17 thanks be to God that you, having once been slaves of sin, have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching to which you were entrusted, 18 and that you, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. . . . 22 now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
   3. 1 Cor 3:17, “God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple.”
   4. 1 Cor 6:11, “you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.”
   5. 1 Cor 6:19, “do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own?”
   6. 2 Cor 3:18, “all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit.”
   7. 2 Cor 4:4, “the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God.”
   8. Gal 4:6, “because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!””
   9. Gal 4:19, “I am again in the pain of childbirth until Christ is formed in you . . .”
   10. Col 1:15, “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation . . .”
   11. Col 2:9-10, “For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily, 10 and you have come to fullness in him, who is the head of every ruler and authority.”
   12. Col 3:9, “you have stripped off the old self with its practices . . .”
   13. Col 3:10, you “have clothed yourselves with the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge according to the image of its creator.”
3. **1 Peter**
   1. 1 Pet 1:3-5, God “has given us a new birth into a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, 4 and into an inheritance that is imperishable, undefiled, and unfading, kept in heaven for you, 5who are being protected by the power of God through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.”
   2. 1 Pet 1:22-23, “Now that you have purified your souls by your obedience to the truth so that you have genuine mutual love, love one another deeply from the heart. 23 You have been born anew, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, through the living and enduring word of God.”
   3. 1 Pet 2:9, those who are reborn “are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people, in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.”
4. **2 Peter**
   1. 2 Pet 1:3-4, “His divine power has given us everything needed for life and godliness, through the knowledge of him who called us by his own glory and goodness. 4 Thus [you] may become participants of the divine nature.”
   2. 2 Pet 3:9, “The Lord is . . . not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance.”
   3. 2 Pet 3:13, “we wait for new heavens and a new earth, where righteousness is at home.”

## Scripture References That Oppose “Faith Alone”

1. **Jesus**
   1. “On occasion Jesus himself declares that love is the cause of justifica­tion: the love of God and of the neighbour together represent the fullness of justice . . .” (Schmaus 31)
      1. Matt 22:34-40 (par. Mark 12:28-34, Luke 10:25-28), “When the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together, 35 and one of them, a lawyer [Mark 12:28, “One of the scribes”], asked him a question to test him. 36 “Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?” 37 He said to him, “‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, [Luke 10:27 adds, “and with all your strength,”] and with all your mind.’ 38 This is the greatest and first commandment. 39 And a second is like it: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ 40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”
      2. Mark 8:34, “If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me.”
      3. Luke 7:47, “her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.”
      4. 1 John 3:14-4:21, “we have passed from death to life because we love one another. Whoever does not love abides in death. 15 All who hate a brother or sister are murderers, and you know that murderers do not have eternal life abiding in them. 16 We know love by this, that he laid down his life for us—and we ought to lay down our lives for one another. 17 How does God’s love abide in anyone who has the world’s goods and sees a brother or sister in need and yet refuses help? 18 Little children, let us love, not in word or speech, but in truth and action. 19 And by this we will know that we are from the truth and will reassure our hearts before him 20 whenever our hearts condemn us; for God is greater than our hearts, and he knows everything. 21 Beloved, if our hearts do not condemn us, we have boldness before God; 22 and we receive from him whatever we ask, because we obey his commandments and do what pleases him. 23 And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another, just as he has commanded us. 24 All who obey his commandments abide in him, and he abides in them. And by this we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit that he has given us. . . . 4:7 Beloved, let us love one another, because love is from God; everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. 8 Whoever does not love does not know God, for God is love. . . . 12 No one has ever seen God; if we love one another, God lives in us, and his love is perfected in us. 13 By this we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit. 14 And we have seen and do testify that the Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world. 15 God abides in those who confess that Jesus is the Son of God, and they abide in God. 16 So we have known and believe the love that God has for us. God is love, and those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them. 17 Love has been perfected among us in this: that we may have boldness on the day of judgment, because as he is, so are we in this world. 18 There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear; for fear has to do with punishment, and whoever fears has not reached perfection in love. 19 We love because he first loved us. 20 Those who say, “I love God,” and hate their brothers or sisters, are liars; for those who do not love a brother or sister whom they have seen, cannot love God whom they have not seen. 21 The commandment we have from him is this: those who love God must love their brothers and sisters also.”
   2. Elsewhere Jesus says that the cause of justifica­tion is repentance. (Schmaus 31)
      1. Luke 15:11-32, prodigal son
   3. “What he rejects is mere orthodoxy . . .” (Schmaus 31)
      1. Matt 7:21, “Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven.”
      2. Luke 6:46, “Why do you call me ‘Lord, Lord,’ and do not do what I tell you?”
   4. “Thus for Jesus faith is equivalent to conversion.” I.e., for Jesus true faith includes repentance. (Schmaus 31)
   5. reward language
      1. “. . . Jesus spoke unconstrainedly about reward and punishment . . .” (Schnackenburg 151)
      2. “It is clear from the idea of judgment, which cannot be excised from Jesus’ teaching . . .” (Schnackenburg 152)
         1. Matt 16:27, “For the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay everyone for what has been done.”
         2. Matt 10:15; 11:22, 24 par; 12:36; 12:41-42 par; 18:34-35; 25:31-46 (sheep and goats)
      3. The Twelve are promised judgment, and perhaps rule.
         1. Matt 19:28b, “you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”
      4. But “The reward promised by Jesus is almost always the future kingdom of God or one of its blessings, such as eternal life . . .” (Schnackenburg 154)
         1. Matt 6:4b, 6b, 18b, “and your Father who sees in secret will reward you.”
            1. This is “to be understood eschatologically.” (Schnackenburg 154)
         2. Matt 25:46, “And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.”
         3. “Only one text speaks of “reward” in this world: Mark 10:30 and parallels . . .” (Matt 19:29; Luke 18:30) (Schnackenburg 156)
            1. Mark 10:29-30, “there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news, 30 who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age—houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields with persecutions—and in the age to come eternal life.”
            2. “With persecutions” makes the hundredfold family and fields “rather a solace than a reward.” (Schnackenburg 156)
         4. Eschatological rewards (“sharing in th kingdom of God and enjoyment of its blessings”) “are strictly supernatural and depend on grace.” (Schnackenburg 156)
            1. Luke 17:10, “So you also, when you have done all that you were ordered to do, say, ‘We are worthless slaves; we have done only what we ought to have done!’”

“This rejection of all claims to reward can only be harmonized with [Jesus’ reward language] if the recompense coming to us from God is a reward of grace; that is, a reward conceded to us by God of his own accord . . .” (Schnackenburg 157)

* + - * 1. In the laborers in the vineyard (Matt 20:1-16), the owner promises a reward commensurate with an amount of labor. But “the point of the parable . . . [is that] the master freely out of kindness had the late-comers paid a sum larger than he owed them . . .” (Schnackenburg 157)
        2. “The recompense promised by Jesus is a gratuitous gift . . . also because of its superabundance.” (Schnackenburg 159)

Luke 6:38ab, “give, and it will be given to you. A good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be put into your lap . . .”

Matt 20:14b-15; 25:21, 23;

(“Just as the “reward” given by God exceeds all measure, so too the punishment he imoses.” (e.g., Matt 18:34; 25:30, 41, 46; Luke 12:46) [Schnackenburg 159])

* + 1. “The thought of reward and punishment should not supplant the more important one that we should serve God in straitforward loyalty . . . the motive of retribution remains subordinate to the motive of the kingdom of God,” but it is still a motive. (Schnackenburg 160)

1. **Paul**
   1. Rom 6:12-23, “do not let sin exercise dominion in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions. 13 No longer present your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life, and present your members to God as instruments of righteousness. 14 For sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not under law but under grace. 15 What then? Should we sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means! 16 Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness? 17 But thanks be to God that you, having once been slaves of sin, have become obedient from the heart to the form of teaching to which you were entrusted, 18 and that you, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. 19 I am speaking in human terms because of your natural limitations. For just as you once presented your members as slaves to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now present your members as slaves to righteousness for sanctification. 20 When you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. 21 So what advantage did you then get from the things of which you now are ashamed? The end of those things is death. 22 But now that you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God, the advantage you get is sanctification. The end is eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.”
   2. Rom 8:4, “the just requirement of the law [is] fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.”
   3. Rom 12:1-2, “present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. 2 Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your minds, so that you may discern what is the will of God—what is good and acceptable and perfect.”
   4. 1 Cor 7:19, “Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but obeying the commandments of God is everything.”
      1. See Gal 5:6, “in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love.”
   5. 1 Cor 9:24-27, “Do you not know that in a race the runners all compete, but only one receives the prize? Run in such a way that you may win it. 25 Ath­letes exercise self-control in all things; they do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. 26 So I do not run aimlessly, nor do I box as though beating the air; 27 but I punish my body and enslave it, so that after proclaiming to others I myself should not be disqualified.”
   6. 1 Cor 10:12, “So if you think you are standing, watch out that you do not fall.”
   7. 1 Cor 13:2-13, “if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing. . . . 8 Love never ends. But as for . . . knowledge, it will come to an end. . . . 12 For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known. 13 And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.”
   8. Gal 5:25, “If we live by the Spirit, let us also be guided by the Spirit.”
   9. Eph 2:1-3, “You were dead through the trespasses and sins 2 in which you once lived, following the course of this world, following the ruler of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work among those who are disobedient. 3 All of us once lived among them in the passions of our flesh, following the desires of flesh and senses, and we were by nature children of wrath, like everyone else.”
   10. Phil 1:29, “For he has graciously granted you the privilege not only of believing in Christ, but of suffering for him as well . . .”
   11. Phil 2:12-13, “Therefore, my beloved, just as you have always obeyed me, not only in my presence, but much more now in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; 13 for it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure.”
   12. Phil 3:12-16, “Not that I have already obtained this or have already reached the goal; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own. 13 Beloved, I do not consider that I have made it my own; but this one thing I do: forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, 14 I press on toward the goal for the prize of the heavenly call of God in Christ Jesus. 15 Let those of us then who are mature be of the same mind; and if you think differently about anything, this too God will reveal to you. 16 Only let us hold fast to what we have attained.”
   13. 2 Thess 1:11, “we always pray [that God] will fulfill by his power every good resolve and work of faith . . .”
       1. Here “work of faith” means “an act which is the manifestation of a living faith.” (Schmaus 30)
   14. 1 Tim 1:5, “But the aim of such instruction is love that comes from a pure heart, a good conscience, and sincere faith.”
2. **James**
   1. James 2:14-21, “What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? 15 If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, 16 and one of you says to them, “Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill,” and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? 17 So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead. 18 But someone will say, “You have faith and I have works.” Show me your faith apart from your works, and I by my works will show you my faith. 19 You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder. 20 Do you want to be shown, you senseless person, that faith apart from works is barren? 21 Was not our ancestor Abraham justified by works when he offered his son Isaac on the altar?”
   2. “If James 2,14-21 declares that faith alone is insufficient, the opposi­tion to Paul here is only ap­parent. . . . [Dead faith] does not live in actions . . . Thus James does not minimize the importance of faith but on the contrary demands that the community must live its faith.” (Schmaus 30-31)

## The Development of Lutheranism

1. **1521**: **events**
   1. January 3, 1521: the Pope issued a bull excommunicating Luther, *Decet pontificem roman­um*. (Walker 431)
   2. 1521: the Diet (Assembly) of Worms
      1. The Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, summoned Luther to a meeting of the German Reichstag at Worms.
         1. Charles controlled Spain, the Netherlands, most of Aus­tria, and much of Italy. “In Germany, however, [his] authority [was] greatly limited by the ter­ri­torial powers of the local princes. . . . he was an earnest Catholic of the type of his grand­mother, Isa­bella of Castile, sharing her reformatory views, desirous of im­provement in cler­i­cal morals, education, and adminis­tration, but wholly unsympathetic with any departure from the doctrinal or hierarchical system . . .” (Walker 431)
      2. April 1521: at the Diet of Worms Luther ac­knowledged that “the sub­stance of what he had written ­he could not retract, unless con­vinced of its wrong­fulness “by the testimony of the Scriptures or by clear reason.” The em­peror, who could hardly believe that such temerity as to deny the infallibility of a gen­eral council was possible, cut the dis­cus­sion short. That Luther cried out, “I cannot do other­wise. Here I stand. God help me, A­men,” is not certain, but seems not improbable.” (Walker 431)
   3. “A month after Luther started on his homeward journey, he was formally put under the ban of the empire . . . he was to be seized for punishment and his books burned.” Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony and Luther’s secular ruler, was “a master of diplomatic intrigue [431] . . . Unwilling to come out openly as his defender, he had Luther seized by friendly hands . . . and brought secretly to the Wartburg castle, near Eisenach. For months, Luther’s hiding place was practically unknown . . .” (Walker 431-32)
2. **attempts at reconciliation**
   1. “Precisely because the emperor had other urgent problems, he could not give time to stamping out the Lutheran “heresy.” Lutheran churches prospered in this atmosphere . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 73)
   2. 1521: the Diet of Worms produces the Edict of Worms. (Lapple 66)
   3. 1524: the Diet of Nuremberg says that the decision of the Diet of Worms against Luther should be enforced “insofar as possible.” “This qualification was itself a sign of the strength of the new movement.” (Dillenberger and Welch 73)
   4. 1529: the Marburg Colloquium between Luther and Zwingli (Lapple 66)
   5. 1529: the second Diet of Speyer “accepted the principle of a territorial solution . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 73)
      1. The Diet decided that, “pending a final solution in a subsequent meeting, Lutheranism should be tolerated where it could not be suppressed. Catholic minorities in such Lutheran communities should be given religious liberty, but [73] Lutheran minorities in Roman Catholic areas were not to be granted liberty of worship.” (Dillenberger and Welch 73-74)
      2. “Against this decision, the Lutherans declared “they must protest and testify publicly before God that they could do nothing contrary to His word.” It was this witness and protest from which the name “Protestant” was first derived . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   6. 1530: Diet of Augsburg
      1. For this meeting, Philipp Melanchthon drafted the Augsburg Confession (*Confessio Augustana*). (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
      2. In it “the common elements of the new group and Rome were featured, though . . . justification by faith was affirmed and transubstantiation repudiated. The doc­u­ment did not bring unity nor did outright conflict result.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   7. 1541: Diet of Regensberg
      1. “. . . transubstantiation proved to be a decisive dividing line . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
      2. “In addition, some Protestants, such as Martin Bucer, would not grant papal dominion even if the other issues could have been resolved.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   8. 1555: Peace of Augsburg
      1. Here was adopted “the principle of territorialism, viz., that the religion of a territory was to be that of its ruler [“*Cuius regio, eius et religio*” (Lapple 63)].” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
      2. “In principle one could move to another territory if the religion where one lived turned out to be different from one’s own.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
      3. The Peace of Augsburg “recognized only Lutherans and Roman Catholics. The exclusion of other Protestant groups later became one of the contributory causes of the Thirty Years’ War.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
3. **establishment of Lutheranism**
   1. “Throughout 1522 and 1523 the movement spread rapidly and took root. Moreover, those who took these first steps [e.g., Huldreich Zwingli in Zurich, John Oecolampadius in Basel, Fabricius Capito and Martin Bucer in Strasbourg] were themselves men of learning and position. They had decided that Luther was right, and the masses followed them.” (Kittelson 187)
   2. From Luther’s divergence from the Catholic faith, “there resulted the constitution of parishes independent of Rome.” (Dillenberger and Welch 21)
   3. 1527: the Reformation is introduced into Sweden. (Lapple 66) “The Church of Sweden rejected the authority of Rome and adopted Luther’s theology but did not take the name Lutheran and maintained the episcopal succession.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   4. 1536: the Reformation is introduced into Denmark and Norway. (Lapple 67) “Lutheranism became the established faith in Denmark and Norway.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   5. Germany: “By 1555, Lutheranism had established itself in Germany as one of the two major groups.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   6. “In the same century, Lutheran bodies were formed in East Prussia, Poland, Estonia, Hungary, and Transylvania.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   7. In the 1600s, “Lutheran congregations were organized . . . in the Dutch settlement of New Amster­dam [and] among the Swedes in Delaware.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
   8. In the 1700s, “a wave of German Lutherans settled in Pennsylvania, and it was this group which firmly planted Lutheranism in the new world.” (Dillenberger and Welch 74)
4. **Lutheran theology after Luther**
   1. Melanchthon
      1. “. . . differences between the prophet of the Reformation, Luther, and its systematic exponent, Melanchthon [were] nuances rather than fundamental dis­agreements . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
      2. “Melanchthon [was] a man of broad cultural, humanist, and classical interests [and] was more disposed . . . to use the utmost of tact and mediation . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
      3. His “*Loci Communes*, or “Common-Places in Theology,” is a sys­tem­atic discussion of the nature and implications of justification by faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
      4. Melanchthon revised “the *Loci* and the Augsburg Confession . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
   2. controversies
      1. Eucharist: “The first controversy centered in the nature of Christ’s presence . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
         1. “Melanchthon, Calvin, and Luther rejected the Zwinglian conception of the Lord’s Supper as a memorial or sign representing the drama of Christ’s life and death.” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
         2. “But on the nature of the presence of Christ in the sacrament, Melanchthon found himself nearer to Calvin than to Luther.” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
         3. “All agreed that faith alone guarantees Christ’s presence, but Luther also insisted upon the corporeal or physical presence of Christ . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
         4. But “Melanchthon rewrote the Augsburg Confession to permit [a spiritual] interpretation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 75)
         5. “In the conflict that ensued, the [75] conservative party won the victory over Melanchthon and believed that Luther’s views had been vindicated. Actually, their literal under­standing of the bodily presence of Christ in the elements led them to miss the point of Luther’s insistence. They shifted the emphasis from the *meaning* of the bodily presence to a mere factual assertion of its necessity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 75-76)
      2. nature and grace (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
         1. “It was agreed that God initiates and sustains faith. But [are] we active or passive as the Spirit lays hold of us and directs us?” (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
         2. The conservatives insisted we are passive. (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
            1. “Flacius, one of the “extreme conservatives,” defined total depravity as the complete loss of everything which makes us human, including every capacity for good. Regeneration then meant the cre­ation of a new self, completely unrelated to the old self. In this analysis, one could only be said to be passive in respect to the activity of grace.” (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
            2. “Flacius contended that he expressed Luther’s views and quoted nu­merous passages in support. But . . . Luther’s statements on total depravity, one’s inability to determine one’s relation to God, and his accent upon the directing activity of the Spirit even in faith, reflect [experience.] . . . it is doubtful that [he intended] his statements to be understood as a doctrine simply of human nature, either before or in faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
         3. Melanchthon “contended that we are active . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
            1. “God and human beings are co­workers. (Theologically, this is known as *synergism*.) . . . [But] some of Melanchthon’s followers . . . shifted the accent too far in the direction of human striving.” (Dillenberger and Welch 76)
            2. “Such views were rejected, as were, on the other side, the views of Flacius. [76] Melanchthon’s views were a compromise . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 76-77)
      3. law and works (Dillenberger and Welch 77)
         1. antinomianism
            1. Johann Agricola “rightly saw that Luther’s understanding of the gospel de­mand­ed the abrogation of law. But he interpreted this to mean that one had no obligation to fulfill the requirements of God as laid down in the law and that good works were even detrimental to salvation. Such a position is called *antinomian* . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 77)
            2. “Although this interpretation arose from Luther’s emphasis upon the freedom of the Christian man and the new life in the Spirit, it disregarded his concern that the law be fulfilled in the Spirit. The antinomians generally were . . . examples of Christian grace. On the other hand, the lack of concern for standards occasionally led instead to acts of license.” (Dillenberger and Welch 77)
         2. legalism
            1. George Major “insisted upon justification; he merely added that good works were necessary for salvation. Thus justification and merit to­ge­ther defined the Christian concept of salvation. This obviously con­tra­dicted Luther.” (Dillenberger and Welch 77)
            2. “Melanchthon, who acted as a mediator in the controversy, suggested that one could not say that good works were necessary for salvation, but one must say that good works were necessary. [But] There is a difference between saying that the central emphasis is faith, not without works, and that works are neces­sary. The former places works in the context of faith at every point and leaves the definition of their “necessity” in unavoidable suspension. Melanchthon only verbally escaped the conclusion that if something is necessary in faith, it is necessary for salvation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 77)
            3. “At the most, Luther’s [77] writings ascribe relative necessity to works by casting every reference to human activity into the context of faith and the fruits of the Spirit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 77-78)
            4. “It was a Swiss Reformed theologian, Heinrich Bullinger, who, in the title of a book pub­lished in 1554 . . ., managed to include all the constituents of this common confession more trenchantly than any one title had: *The Grace of God that Justifies Us for the Sake of Christ through Faith Alone, without Good Works, while Faith Meanwhile Abounds in Good Works*.” (Pelikan 139)
5. **Protestant scholasticism**
   1. “Protestant scholasti­cism” [88] is also called “Protestant orthodoxy” [88] or “baroque theology.” [89] Dillenberger and Welch 88-89)
   2. “. . . there was a discernible shift from religious thinking which always arises out of the experience of faith to a stress upon proper and right thinking. . . . The dynamic religious thinking of Luther and Calvin was arrested by a concern whether or not particular formulations were true to Luther or Calvin. Frequently, this concern led to statements which differed greatly from the spirit of Luther and Calvin.” (Dillenberger and Welch 88)
   3. “. . . where the goal is orthodoxy, the precise definition of truth is all important.” (Dillenberger and Welch 88)
   4. “Instead of statements reflecting an experience of encounter with truth, truth now was tantamount to the statement itself. . . . Theology came before the Bible, as the key to its interpretation, rather than after it, as its explication.” (Dillenberger and Welch 88)
6. **Lutheran scholasticism**
   1. 1577: *Formula of Concord*: issues raised during the decades after Luther “were settled in the Formula of Con­cord in 1577 . . . In all cases, it was a victory for the conservative wing.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
   2. *Book of Concord*: “The Augsburg Confession (and Melanchthon’s defense of it), the Formula of Concord, and the catechisms of Luther were assembled and became the Book of Concord.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
      1. “This became the doctrinal standard for Lutheranism in Germany . . . and continues to have tremendous influence among conservative Lutheran groups . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
         1. c 1600-1800: “For many in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Book of Concord was a veritable textbook for the resolution of all problems. It was as indispensable as the Bible . . . Lutherans looked to it and to the Bible for all knowledge, including knowledge of the world.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
         2. “Luther’s stress upon the Spirit as the agent through which the Bible is and becomes the Word of God was consid­ered too sub­jec­tive. The Bible as Bible, understood through the Book of Concord, was synonymous with the Word of God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
         3. “Men were now more concerned with being correct than with the revivi­fying power of the Spirit. This kind of faith was subsequently chal­lenged within the churches by the Pietist movement.” (Dillenberger and Welch 79)
   3. less conservative Lutheran groups: “among other Lutherans, only the Augsburg Confession and Luther’s Small Catechism are the generally accepted standards . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)

## Calvinism

1. **John Calvin** (1509-1564)
   1. Calvin engaged in “Classical studies under leading humanists . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 23 n. 1)
   2. 1533: he and other Protestants are forced to leave Paris. He settles in Basel, Switzerland. (Dillenberger and Welch 23 n. 1)
   3. 1536: first edition of his major work, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. (Dillenberger and Welch 23 n. 1)
   4. 1541: at Geneva, “with the aid of Protestant refugees from all over Europe, he under­took to make the city into a model Christian community. After the expulsion of his opponents from the city in 1555, Calvin was virtually master of the city (although officially only a pastor in the church) until his death in 1564.” (Dillenberger and Welch 23 n. 1)
2. **spread of the Reformed churches**
   1. “The Reformed groups early established themselves [in Zurich] and the northern Swiss cantons. As a result the principle of territorialism was applied in Switzerland as well as in Germany.” (Dillenberger and Welch 79)
   2. “the iron collectivism of Geneva” (under Calvin from 1541 to 1564) (Dillenberger and Welch 80)
      1. “In Lutheranism, the individual in relation to God was the paramount concern. People expressed their faith . . . through the existing social structures. . . . [But] the Reformed churches [felt] the need for reordering the total life of the community into a truly Christian society. No activity was to be omitted . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 79)
      2. At Geneva, “Elders made up a court of discipline, charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that all men obeyed the precepts of the gospel (willingly or unwill­ingly). The Consistory, which was made up of clergy and laity, but with lay members predominating, had the responsibility of supervising the corporate life of the community. . . . its decisions were enforced by the council of the city. ” (Dillenberger and Welch 79)
      3. “The intolerance toward dissent (e. g., the execution of Servetus) and the rigid control through the Consistory over every detail of public and private life must be understood in their historical context . . . [It was] a time when death was the ac­cepted penalty for heretics who refused to recant, and when religious uniformity within a given territory was taken for granted . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 80)
      4. “. . . only in America was it possible to carry out a similar experiment [i. e., “the iron collectivism of Geneva,” 80], and then only for a time. In the other areas, there was considerable opposition on the part of constituted au­thorities . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 80)
   3. France
      1. “Initially, the “Huguenot” communities met little opposition, but as they grew they increasingly became a problem in a country which [80] had accepted the principle of “one land, one religion.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 80-81)
      2. “They were persecuted extensively, but in the Edict of January 1562 won limited toleration.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
      3. “Wars and intrigues followed, with the Massacre of St. Bar­tholomew’s Day in 1572 acting as a call for the elimination of all Huguenots. Over ten thousand fell in Paris alone.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
      4. “As a result of revul­sion to this act, but primarily because of changes in the crown, the Edict of Toleration in 1598 granted Calvinism full toleration.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
      5. “But this was revoked in 1685 under the reign of Louis XIV, who insisted on one faith, one king, one land.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
      6. “French Protestantism continued as a definite minority group.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
   4. the Empire
      1. “In the Empire, . . . Reformed churches emerged among the Magyars of Hungary, and even more in the valley of the Rhine, particularly in the Palatinate.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
      2. In the Palatinate, “a contro­versy concerning the Lord’s Supper resulted in . . . the Heidelberg Catechism, written by Peter Ursinus and Caspar Olevianus, a balanced statement . . . It was accepted by nearly all of the Reformed churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
   5. the Low Countries
      1. “In the Low Countries, the Reformed tradition did not have any strength until about 1560. Before that, this area had been a center for Anabaptists and Lutheran groups. For a period, there was consider­able tension between the Protestant groups, though common fear of the Roman Catholic influence through the domination of Spain gener­ally kept them from fighting each other.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
      2. “The Anabaptists, however, had been weakened by persecution and expulsion, and the Lutherans were not aggressive. In this situation the Calvinists won the ascendancy and also the favor of Prince William (probably because the concept of justifiable resistance by the lower magistrates appealed to him).” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
      3. “In the long run the territorial solution prevailed. In the southern regions (Belgium), Roman Catholicism became the established religion, while in the North (Holland), Calvinism was established.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
   6. Scotland
      1. “A man who had suffered under the Inquisition and who had drunk at the Reformation fountains of Zurich and Ge­neva, Knox feared nothing, and openly and successfully challenged the Roman Catholic queen, Mary Stuart.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81)
   7. North America
      1. “Many of the national groups discussed here found their [81] way to the New World and brought their respective traditions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 81-82)
      2. “Even the Huguenots made a settlement.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
      3. “The Dutch Reformed Church arose out of the Dutch Calvinist development and the first congregation in the New World was in New York, then New Amsterdam, in 1628.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
      4. “In the early eighteenth century, the Scotch-Irish migrated to the New World. From them came the Presbyterian churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
      5. “The German Reformed groups came in large numbers after the first quarter of the eighteenth century.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)

### Calvinist Scholasticism

1. **confessions of faith**
   1. “Most of the Reformed groups in Europe formulated confessions of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
   2. “The Second Helvetic or Swiss Confession of 1566 [was] written by Bullinger . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
   3. “The Gallican Confession in France reflected a strong emphasis on predestination.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
   4. “The Belgic Confession of 1561 in the Low Countries has the earmarks of the influence of Geneva.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
   5. The Scottish “Confession of 1560, written largely by Knox. This Confession remained the standard of faith until the completion of the Westminster Confession in 1647 . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
   6. “The confessions of faith served originally as guides and often as dikes against distortion. But increasingly, in the midst of controversy, individuals pointed to the confessions as correct Christian thinking. People were asked to believe the confessions, and the faith these were meant to safeguard often took second place. That was the beginning of Protestant “orthodoxy” . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
2. **controversies**
   1. “The development toward orthodoxy was accelerated through theo­logical con­tro­ver­sies in which the conservative groups were consistently the victors.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
   2. *Arminianism*
      1. In Holland in the early 1600’s, a pious Christian named Koornheert was troubled “that God damned individuals from all eternity. Arminius, who had been asked to refute Koorn­heert, instead became convinced that the traditional view must be rejected. He then became the leader of the group which now bears his name. The brunt of the controversy was borne by a disciple of Arminius named Bisschop. Another important supporter was the well-known jurist, Hugo Grotius.” (Dillenberger and Welch 82)
      2. The Arminians published a series of articles, [82] the *Remonstrance.* A *Counter-Remonstrance* was largely by Gomar. (Dillenberger and Welch 82-83)
      3. “A contributory cause of decline [of Puritanism in America] was the Arminian influence which had also penetrated to America. It was part of a general tendency to stress reason above all else in matters of religious doctrine.” (Dillenberger and Welch 111)
   3. *Synod of Dort:* “the controversy was settled in the Synod of Dort in Holland in the year 1618 . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 83)
   4. the issues
      1. predestination theories
         1. *Calvin:* Calvin “had a deterministic understanding of the operation of God in relation to predestination. But he intended only one thing: the exclusion of works.” (Dillenberger and Welch 84)
         2. *Supralapsarianism:* pre­destination was before creation, but with no reference to the fall, and it was the motive of creation. (This was the conservative Gomar’s position.)
         3. *Infralap­sarianism:* predestination was before creation, but with reference to the fall. “This view provided a rationale for assigning individuals to hell and put creation in a better light.” There were “two types of infralapsarian think­ers.” (Dillenberger and Welch 83)
         4. *double predestination:* “God had directly willed both the salvation of elect individuals and the damnation of all others.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 83)
         5. *single predestination:* “God had decided who should be saved but had made no decision concerning those who did not belong to the pre­destined. For all practical purposes, the latter were left to their own devices (which was hardly more tolerable than to be among the damned).” (Dillenberger and Welch 83)
         6. The “lapsarian theories . . . safeguard the priority of God’s activity by ascribing all events and happenings to God. They lost the experiential character [83] of faith and accepted a form of determinism as the basis of faith. . . . Whereas faith [in Calvin was] the foundation of predestination, now predestina­tion was the basis of faith, a view already expressed previously by John Farel.” (Dillenberger and Welch 83-84)
         7. *Arminianism*
            1. “. . . the idea of a decree has reference merely to the ser­i­ous nature of God’s plan for the world. . . . the decree means no more than that God has declared that whoever ac­cepts Christ will be saved and whoever does not will be ex­cluded.” (Dillenberger and Welch 83)
            2. “The Arminians anchored the concept of predestination in faith and experience, but they reduced the decision of faith simply to a human, rational possibility.” (Dillenberger and Welch 83)
         8. *Synod of Dort*
            1. It was lapsarian (“God’s decree [was] before the foun­da­tion of the world”), though “neither clearly supra nor in­fra­lap­sarian . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 84)
            2. It affirmed single predestination: “God had not specifically ordained anyone for damnation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 84)
            3. Most think the Synod was infralapsarian, but that’s be­cause single predestination has been “as­so­ci­at­ed only with the infralapsarian position.” (Dillenberger and Welch 84 n. 2)
            4. “In subsequent devel­opments, double predestination was reaffirmed in spite of the Synod of Dort.” (Dillenberger and Welch 84)
      2. whether Christ died for all or only for the elect
         1. *Arminianism:* “Christ had died for all and obtained forgiveness for all, though forgiveness could be effective only as one accepted Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 84)
         2. *Synod of Dort:* since “whatever happens is determined by God, [Christ] died only for the faithful. Otherwise God would be frustrated since what God intended did not happen.” (Dillenberger and Welch 84)
      3. faith in relation to rejecting God’s grace
         1. *both*
            1. “Both Arminians [84] and orthodox agreed that there is no salvation apart from faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 84-85)
            2. Both “defined faith as a decision . . . [though] it is clear that the conserva­tives should have disagreed with the Ar­min­ians on the nature of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 85)
         2. *Arminians*
            1. If one could not reject God’s grace, then “one was no more than a puppet.” (Dillenberger and Welch 85)
         3. *Synod of Dort*
            1. “The orthodox refused to distinguish between God’s will to redeem and one’s acceptance. If God willed faith for anyone, it happened.” (Dillenberger and Welch 85)
            2. God “produces both the will to believe and the act of believing also.” [Quotation from Synod of Dort.] “This statement . . . makes one into an object maneuvered by God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 85)
      4. losing grace
         1. *Arminians:* yes, one can lose grace (“This was in accord with their concern for the vo­litional nature of the self”). (Dillenberger and Welch 85)
         2. *Synod of Dort:* “Just as one could not resist grace, so one could not lose it. To say that one could, would mean that God was defeated in specific instances.” (Dillenberger and Welch 85)
         3. *authors’ opinion:* “No one deliberately departs from grace, and the one who stands under its power can reasonably expect to remain under it. But this hope is based in the sustaining and trustworthy [85] activity of God. This was the truth in the orthodox system, though distorted by a deterministic view of God’s nature and activity. Neverthe­less, it does happen that individuals do not remain in the state of grace. This was the truth of the other side, in which the activity of God and of human beings were not simply identified.” (Dillenberger and Welch 85-86)
      5. So the Synod of Dort consistently held “that what God wills and what happens were virtually identified. Only the Fall as such was excluded from the divine decree; all else, including the results of the Fall for human life and destiny, was the outworking of God’s immutable will.” (Dillenberger and Welch 86)
   5. Calvinism after Dort
      1. *theologians:* Calvinist theologians of the next centuries were: “Dan­aeus (1588), Dusanus (1599), Bucanus (1609), Polanus (1623), Crocius (1636), Mar­tinius (1603), Cocceius (1648), Van Til (1704), and Heideggerus (1696).” (Dillenberger and Welch 86)
      2. *predestination:* Though the Synod of Dort affirmed single predestination, the subsequent theological development emphasized double pre­des­tin­a­tion. This was because of “an increas­ing emphasis upon the glory, majesty, and honor of God. Others before, including Calvin, had stressed the majesty of God, but as grounded always in God’s justifying activity. In the later tradition, God’s honor and glory *per se* become the dominant motif . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 86)
      3. *Word of God and scripture*
         1. Luther and Calvin
            1. Luther and Calvin “dis­tin­guished between the Word of God and the Bible. Word and Bible were brought together through the testimony of the Holy Spirit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 87)
            2. “. . . the Bible contained or might become the Word of God in faith . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 87)
         2. later Calvinists
            1. “To later Calvinists . . . this opened the door to purely subjective interpretations. Their fears had been partially fostered by [Anabaptists who] claimed the direct presence of God through the Spirit apart from Bible.” (Dillenberger and Welch 87)
            2. The result was “an unqualified identification of Word and Scripture.” (Dillenberger and Welch 87)
            3. second Helvetic Confession (1566): the “canonical Scrip­tures are the actual true word of God.” [Quotation.] (Dillenberger and Welch 87)
            4. The Holy Spirit “was now the agent of God’s authorship of the biblical record. Inspiration no longer included participation in the reception and experience of revelation.So the Bible was the Word of God from cover to cover.” (Dillenberger and Welch 87)
3. **Calvinism and capitalism**
   1. “The same drive which lay behind the Genevan community was involved in the support that industrious Calvinists gave to the new capitalist order.” [See ch. 5 and especially ch. 11.] (Dillenberger and Welch 80)
4. **conclusion**
   1. “. . . the Calvinistic tradition . . . acknowledged the inscrutability of God’s ways and the radical corruption of the world.” (Dillenberger and Welch 178)

## Calvin on Predestination

1. **providence and predestination**
   1. Calvin’s determinism
      1. *Institutes* 1.16.3: “there is no erratic power, or action, or motion in creatures, [but] they are governed by God’s secret plan in such a way that nothing happens [33] except what is knowingly and willingly decreed by him.” (qtd. in Klooster 34)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.6: God’s foreknowledge rests on “the fact that he decreed that they take place . . . the disposition of all things is in God’s hand. . . . it is clear that all things take place . . . by his determination and bidding.” (qtd. in Klooster 74)
   2. *Institutes* 1.18.2: “since God’s will is said to be the cause of all things, I have made his providence the determinative principle for all human plans and works . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 34)
   3. Predestination “is related to the counsel of God that is executed through His providential direction and government of all things.” (Klooster 33)
2. **double predestination**
   1. “. . . Calvin held to double predestination, that is, to both election and reprobation.” (Klooster 27)
   2. *Institutes* 3.21.5: “We call predestination God’s eternal decree, by which he determined with himself what he willed to become of each man. For all are not created in equal condition; rather, eternal life is foreordained for some, eternal damnation for others. Therefore, as any man has been created to one or the other of these ends, we speak of him as predestined to life or death.” (qtd. in Klooster 25)
      1. “. . . Calvin used the term *election* as equivalent to *predestination.*” (Klooster 16)
   3. *Institutes* 3.21.7: “God once established by his eternal and unchangeable plan those whom he long before determined once for all to receive into salvation, and those whom, on the other hand, he would devote to destruction. We assert that, with respect to the elect, this plan was founded upon his freely given mercy, without regard to human worth; but by his just and irreprehensible but incomprehensible judgment he has barred the door of life to those whom he has given over to damnation.” (qtd. in Klooster 25)
   4. *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*: “the eternal predestination of God, by which before the fall of Adam He decreed what should take place concerning the whole human race and every individual, was fixed and determined.” (qtd. in Klooster 26)
   5. *Institutes* 3.22.6: “Jacob, therefore, is chosen and distinguished from the rejected Esau by God’s predestination, while not differing from him in merits.” (qtd. in Klooster 56-57)
   6. *Institutes* 3.24.13: we should “not be ashamed to say with Augustine: ‘God could . . . turn the will of evil men to good because he is almighty. Obviously he could. Why, then, does he not? Because he wills otherwise. Why he wills otherwise rests with him.’” (qtd. in Klooster 84)
   7. *Institutes* 3.23.6: “Since the disposition of all things is in God’s hand, since the decision of salvation or of death rests in his power, he so ordains by his plan and will that among men some are born destined for certain death from the womb . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 62)
   8. Reprobation, like election, “concerns specific individuals . . . The decree of reprobation does not refer to a general intention of God . . .” (Klooster 59)
   9. *Institutes* 2.1.8: “infants bring their own damnation with them from their mothers’ wombs; the moment they are born their natures are odious and abominable to God.” (Oakes)
   10. Klooster (a Calvinist) comments: “When the reprobate finally receive the eternal punishment that awaits them, they receive precisely what they deserve. But when the elect receive the eternal salvation that awaits them, they receive what they do not deserve. The elect receive graciously, though also justly, the continued favor and undeserved mercy of God through Jesus Christ.” (Klooster 79)
3. **Why did God elect some persons and reprobate others**?
   1. The cause is not good works or sins.
   2. The cause is not God’s foreknowledge of good works or sins.
      1. *Institutes* 3.23.6: “since he foresees future events only by reason of the fact that he decreed that they take place, they vainly raise a quarrel over foreknowledge, when it is clear that all things take place rather by his determination and [61] bidding.” (qtd. in Klooster 61-62)
      2. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians* (on Eph 1:4): the argument that God foresaw what the reprobate would do “has no force . . . [for] in the nature of corrupt men, . . . nothing can be seen but materials for destruction. . . . there was nothing to be forseen [*sic*].” (qtd. in Klooster 38-39)
   3. The cause is simply: the good pleasure of God’s will.
      1. *Institutes* 3.23.2: “his will is . . . the cause of all things that are.” (qtd. in Klooster 40)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.2: “whatever he wills, by the very fact that he wills it, must be considered righteous. When, therefore, one asks why God has so done, we must reply: because he has willed it. But if you proceed further to ask why he so willed, you are seeking something greater and higher than God’s will, which cannot be found. Let men’s rashness, then, restrain itself, and not seek what does not exist . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 64)
      3. *Sermons on the Epistles of S. Paule to Timothie and Titus* (on 2 Tim 1:8-9): “The everlasting decree of God . . . hath no causes whatsoever. . . . his bare will [should] suffice us for all reasons. . . . It is wisdom in us to do whatever God appointed and never ask why.” (qtd. in Klooster 40)
4. **objections**
   1. objection: predestination to retribution promotes laxity; it frees the sinner from responsibility; it removes all incentive to do good deeds
      1. “Sadoleto was one who charged that Calvin’s doctrine of predestination led to indolence . . .” (Klooster 48) In *Reply to Sadoleto* (in *Tracts and Treatises* 1:43-44), Calvin wrote: “Christ regenerates to a blessed life those whom he justifies, and . . . transforms them . . .” (qtd. in Klooster 48)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.12: “If election has as its goal holiness of life [Eph 1:4, “he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love”], it ought rather to arouse and goad us eagerly to set our mind upon it than to serve as a pretext for doing nothing.” (qtd. in Klooster 48)
   2. objection: since God causes sins, he should not condemn sinners
      1. *Institutes* 3.23.2: “Foolish men [ask] by what right the Lord becomes angry at his creatures who have not provoked him by any previous offense; for to devote to destruction whomever he pleases is more like the caprice of a tyrant than the lawful sentence of a judge. It therefore seems to them that men have reason to expostulate with God if they are predestined to eternal death solely by his decision, apart from their own merit.” (qtd. in Klooster 63)
      2. *Institutes* 3.23.5: “. . . the Lord has created those whom he unquestionably foreknew would go to destruction. This has happened because he has so willed it. But why he so willed it is not for our reason to inquire, for we cannot comprehend it.” (qtd. in Klooster 65)

## The Five Points of Calvinism

This system of theology was reaffirmed by the Synod of Dort in 1619 as the doctrine of salvation contained in the Holy Scriptures. The system was at that time formulated into “five points” in answer to the unscriptural five points submitted by the Arminians to the Church of Holland in 1610.

According to Calvinism: Salvation is accomplished by the almighty power of the triune God. The Father chose a people, the Son died for them, the Holy Spirit makes Christ’s death effective by bringing the elect to faith and repentance, thereby causing them to willingly obey the Gospel. The entire process (election, redemption, regeneration) is the work of God and is by grace alone. Thus God, not man, determines who will be the recipients of the gift of salvation.

The Five Points of Calvinism are easily remembered by the acrostic [*sic*: sc. “acronym”] TULIP.

T: Total Depravity (Total Inability)

Total Depravity is probably the most misunderstood tenet of Calvinism. When Cal­vin­ists speak of humans as “totally depraved,” they are making an extensive, rather than an in­tensive statement. The effect of the fall upon man is that sin has extended to every part of his per­sonality—his thinking, his emo­tions, and his will. Not necessarily that he is intensely sinful, but that sin has extended to his entire being.

The unregenerate (unsaved) man is dead in his sins (Romans 5:12). Without the power of the Holy Spirit, the natural man is blind and deaf to the message of the gospel (Mark 4:11f). This is why Total Depravity has also been called “Total Inability.” The man without a knowledge of God will never come to this knowledge without God’s making him alive through Christ (Ephesians 2:1‑5).

U: Unconditional Election

Unconditional Election is the doctrine which states that God chose those whom he was pleased to bring to a knowledge of himself, not based upon any merit shown by the object of his grace and not based upon his looking forward to discover who would “accept” the offer of the gospel. God has elected, based solely upon the counsel of his own will, some for glory and others for damnation (Romans 9:15, 21). He has done this act before the foundations of the world (Ephesians 1:4‑8).

This doctrine does not rule out, however, man’s responsibility to believe in the redeeming work of God the Son (John 3:16‑18). Scripture presents a tension between God’s sovereignty in salvation, and man’s responsibility to believe which it does not try to resolve. Both are true—to deny man’s res­pon­si­bility is to affirm an unbiblical hyper‑Calvinism; to deny God’s sovereignty is to affirm an unbiblical Arminianism.

The elect are saved unto good works (Ephesians 2:10). Thus, though good works will never bridge the cleavage between man and God that was formed in the Fall, good works are a result of God’s saving grace. This is what Peter means when he admonishes the Christian reader to make his “calling” and “election” sure (I Peter 2:10). Bearing the fruit of good works is an indication that God has sewn seeds of grace in fertile soil.

L: Limited Atonement (Particular Redemption)

Limited Atonement is a doctrine offered in answer to the question, “for whose sins did Christ atone?” The Bible teaches that Christ died for those whom God gave him to save (John 17:9). Christ died, indeed, for many people, but not all (Matthew 26:28). Specifically, Christ died for the invisible Church—the sum total of all those who would ever rightly bear the name “Christian” (Ephesians 5:25).

This doctrine often finds many objections, mostly from those who think that Limited Atonement does damage to evangelism. We have already seen that Christ will not lose any that the father has given to him (John 6:37). Christ’s death was not a death of potential atonement for all people. Believing that Je­sus’s death was a potential, symbolic atonement for anyone who might possibly, in the future, accept him trivializes Christ’s act of atonement. Christ died to atone for specific sins of specific sinners. Christ died to make holy the church. He did not atone for all men, because obviously all men are not saved. Evange­lism is actually lifted up in this doctrine, for the evangelist may tell his congre­gation that Christ died for sinners, and that he will not lose any of those for whom he died!

I: Irresistible Grace

The result of God’s Irresistible Grace is the certain response by the elect to the inward call of the Holy Spirit, when the outward call is given by the evangelist or minister of the Word of God. Christ, himself, teaches that all whom God has elected will come to a knowledge of him (John 6:37). Men come to Christ in salvation when the Father calls them (John 6:44), and the very Spirit of God leads God’s beloved to repentance (Romans 8:14). What a comfort it is to know that the gospel of Christ will penetrate our hard, sinful hearts and wondrously save us through the gracious inward call of the Holy Spirit (I Peter 5:10)!

P: Perseverance of the Saints

Perseverance of the Saints is a doctrine which states that the saints (those whom God has saved) will remain in God’s hand until they are glorified and brought to abide with him in heaven. Romans 8:28‑39 makes it clear that when a person truly has been regenerated by God, he will remain in God’s stead. The work of sanctification which God has brought about in his elect will continue until it reaches its fulfillment in eternal life (Phil. 1:6). Christ assures the elect that he will not lose them and that they will be glorified at the “last day” (John 6:39). The Calvinist stands upon the Word of God and trusts in Christ’s promise that he will perfectly fulfill the will of the Father in saving all the elect.

This description of the Five Points of Calvinism was written by Jonathan Barlow who acknowledges that not all those bearing the name “Calvinist” would agree with every jot and tittle of this document.

## Tulip

“**TULIP**” is an acronym for five doctrines accepted by most Calvinists. Jacobus Arminius was a Calvinist professor in Holland who, around ad 1600, diverged from Calvinist beliefs. In 1610, the year after his death, Arminius’s followers submitted a statement of their beliefs—the *Remonstrance* (or “Protest”)—to the Dutch government for consideration. In that document, the five doctrines were first singled out for treatment together. The *Remonstrance* was answered by the Synod of Dort, an international council of Calvinists, in 1619; its *Canons of Dort* is one of the foundational documents for Calvinist churches today.

1. **total depravity**: Calvinists do not mean that we are as sinful as we possibly can be, but that we can serve God only out of fear (attrition), not out of unselfish love (contrition). (But see the *Heidelberg Catechism* question 8: “Are we then so corrupt that we are wholly incapable of doing any good, and inclined to all wickedness? Answer. Indeed we are; except that we are regenerated by the Spirit of God.”) (Catholics believe that to love God out of love for him, and not out of love for ourselves, requires grace.)
2. **unconditional election**
   1. Calvinists say: God chooses (elects) some people and not others for no other reason than his free-will choice. The elect accept God’s offer of salvation because God has chosen them, and the reprobate reject it because God has not chosen them. (Catholic theologians called “Thomists” agree with this.)
   2. Methodists, Pentecostals, and most Baptists say: God chooses based on his foreknowledge of which individuals will accept his offer of salvation. (Around 1600, Arminius led some Calvinists away from Calvinism to this position.) (Catholic theologians called “Molinists” agree with this.)
   3. From unconditional election, Calvinists infer double predestination: that God positively wills some to heaven and positively wills some to hell. (Catholics are not free to agree with this.)
3. **limited atonement**: Christ died only for the elect, but not for all people. (Catholics believe that Christ died for everyone [objective redemption], but only those who accept Christ’s sacrifice are saved [subjective redemption].)
4. **irresistible grace**: a person always accepts a grace that results in salvation. (Catholic theologians called “Thomists” agree with this. Catholic theologians called “Molinists” say that a person’s free will must accept such a grace for it to result in salvation.)
5. **perseverance of the saints**: once a person is in the state of grace, that person will persevere in it till the end of life. (Catholics believe that one can fall out of the state of grace, by choosing to commit mortal sin.)

## Theologies of Luther and Calvin Compared

1. **introduction**
   1. “Luther was the first of the reformers, [Calvin] of the second generation . . . Luther and Calvin provided restatements of faith that touched all facets of life and thought with a passion, thoroughness, and competence that makes their work classical.” [23] Luther’s writing is unsystematic, Calvin’s systematic. (Dillenberger and Welch 23, 24)
   2. Other Reformation theologians were “Andreas Karlstadt and Philip Melanchthon, originally from the Lu­theran side, and Theodore Beza, Heinrich Bullinger, Martin Bucer, Johannes Oecolam­padius, and UI­rich Zwingli from the reformed . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 23)
2. **foundation doctrines**
   1. “Luther and Calvin assumed the existence of God. This was not seriously challenged in their own time.” (Dillenberger and Welch 36)
   2. “Luther, who made very pointed remarks against reason as an avenue to know­ledge of God, did not deny the possibility of such natural knowledge. He only denied its usefulness in respect to decisive issues. Calvin stated that all people are naturally endowed with the knowledge of God. [36] . . . Luther and Calvin com­pletely agreed that God is known adequately only in Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 36-37)
   3. “. . . true and sound wisdom, consists of two parts: the knowledge of God and of ourselves.” (*Institutes* 1.1.1-2) (Dillenberger and Welch 37)
   4. Creator
      1. “Both Luther and Calvin were convinced that the concept of God as the creator distin­guishes the biblical idea of God from all other gods in the history of religion. Such a positive affirmation of the world is to be found nowhere else.” (Dillenberger and Welch 39)
      2. “As men of their time, the reformers accepted the Genesis story in its cosmological detail . . . God as creator was an item of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 39)
   5. Providence
      1. “It was also affirmed that the God who made the world was still at work in it . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 39)
      2. Luther, “more often than not, could find no reason for believing in God on the basis of ordinary observation of the world. The world appeared to him as a spectacle of disorder . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 39)
      3. “Calvin was willing to offer some evidence of God’s activity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 39)
   6. Trinity and Incarnation
      1. “. . . the Incarnation and the Trinity were largely taken as part of the received faith . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 37)
      2. “Luther expressed some distaste for the formulations which emerged from the early controversies, but he accepted” them. (Dillenberger and Welch 37)
   7. atonement
      1. “Far more important for the reformers was the claim that God as­sumed the sins of humankind in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. [37] . . . On the *way* in which God assumed our sin, Luther and Calvin dif­fered.” (Dillenberger and Welch 37-38)
      2. For Luther, “the recurring theme is the majesty of God descending to the lowliness of a human form in which no titles of honor are implied. God’s strength is hidden in weakness . . . Recalling the early Greek Fathers, Luther declared Christ to be the bait with which God caught the devil, for the latter expected a display of power, not a power of weakness . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 38)
      3. “Stressing the titles *prophet*, *priest*,and *king*,Calvin described . . . the exalted majesty of Christ in roles which took him through suffering to glory.” (Dillenberger and Welch 38)
3. **Bible**, **Church**, **and Tradition**
   1. Bible
      1. “For Luther and Calvin, God can be known adequately only through the Bible.” (Dillenberger and Welch 39)
      2. “. . . they did not in the first instance mean that the book and the revelation were the same. Calvin, more than Luther, insisted also upon the text of the Bible as itself the Word of God, but he did so on the basis of . . . its central message. There was no acceptance of the Bible simply as “sacred book.” [But] Even the content of the Bible must be *experienced* . . . At [39] the same time, that which the Spirit confirms corresponds to the Christ portrayed in the Bible. Calvin declared that “the Word itself is not quite certain for us unless it be confirmed by the testimony of the Spirit. . . . For by a kind of mutual bond the Lord has joined together the certainty of his Word and of his Spirit . . . ”” (*Institutes* 1.9.3) (Dillenberger and Welch 39-40)
      3. “Neither the preached nor the written word was in itself the Word of God. They became the Word of God when they became alive in the heart and mind of people through the Spirit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 43)
      4. “They differed in the understanding of the scope of the content. For Luther there is a Bible within the Bible. This inner Bible is Christ . . . James [is] a “right strawy epistle,” since [instead] of anchoring works in faith, it made works a clue to faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 40)
      5. “. . . the Bible within the Bible resulted neither in subjectivism (that is, taking what one wants and leaving the rest) nor in the inability to determine what is the core of the Bible. . . . a clear reading of [40] the Bible would result in the emergence of God’s justifying work as the central point.” (*Institutes* 4.9.8) (Dillenberger and Welch ??)
      6. “This has always been the contention of Protestants and there is ample evidence of its validity. Protestants, as the following chapters show, have not always seen this as the central point nor understood it in the same way. But they have frequently been driven back to it. Even the many denominations and sects do not destroy this principle. This diversity is not considered too great a price for the freedom which each individual has of direct access through the Bible to God’s disclosure. As a matter of fact, the stress on individual interpretation arose partly out of this Reformation emphasis, but partly also as a reaction to the fact that the original churches of the Reformation themselves did not permit the freedom which their principle of interpretation demanded.” (Dillenberger and Welch 41 n. 17)
      7. Calvin “was distinctly different. Calvin insisted on the fundamental unity of the Bible and therefore on the validity of most everything within it. . . . this principle made it necessary for Calvin to devote pages to reconciling contradictory passages of Scripture. [But he was not a fundamentalist:] He did not move from a conviction of verbal inspiration to faith, but from faith in Christ, grounded in the Bible, to a concept of total inspiration.” (Dillenberger and Welch 41)
   2. Church
      1. “Since faith is born and based in a gospel indissolubly connected with the Bible, the Bible must stand over the church . . . Luther and Calvin were, of course, aware that the Bible was originally the product of the church, but [41] [the gospel is] based in the inspired character of books which in a unique way become the means of faith.The gospel is associated with the Bible in a way it is not with the church. Through its impact on us, the Bible creates the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 41-42)
      2. “The concept of the priesthood of all believers did not mean that the clergy are superfluous. But [between] self and God, there can stand no priest. Here one is one’s own priest. . . . We are all priests in mediating Christ to our fellows . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 42)
      3. “The cobbler who exercises a calling with Chris­tian responsibility is doing a task under God with the same significance as the minister who functions in the church. . . . The minister may know more of the intricacies [42] of the Bible and of its mean­ing, but this will provide neither more faith nor more certainty in what is believed.” (Dillenberger and Welch 42-43)
      4. Calvin (*Institutes* IV) described the church “as the place where the Word is rightly preached and the sacraments rightly adminis­tered. . . . For Ulrich Zwingli in Zurich and Martin Bucer in Stras­bourg, a third mark of the church was added, namely, discipline in the believing community. Whereas Calvin saw to it that discipline was exercised in the Genevan community, both he and Luther did not accept the third mark . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 43)
      5. “. . . preaching assumed an importance it did not have in churches that were primarily sacramental. The faithful exercise of expounding Scripture was a criterion for the adequacy of the minister . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 43)
      6. “One came to the faith either through the written or preached word, usually the latter. In this sense, preaching, as the explication of the biblical word, could be said to be more primary than sacraments.” (Dillenberger and Welch 43)
      7. “ Preaching was for the imparting of faith, [and] one of the prerequisites of a proper sacrament was” faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 43)
   3. Tradition
      1. “Such differences in theological formulation must be seen in the light of the reformers’ insistence that the authority of the Word can be guaranteed neither by ecclesiastical authority nor by tradition.” (Dillenberger and Welch 47)
      2. Catholics said ­that Luther was ignoring the “wisdom of the ages and setting himself up as the interpreter and custodian of truth. He finally insisted that his conscience was captive to the Word of God and that this was his authority over against all tradition.” (Dillenberger and Welch 47)
      3. Luther and Calvin “both studied and knew the church fathers. They quoted Augustine most. [But both] (Luther particularly) felt that the fathers generally led not to the clarity of the gospel, but away from it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 47)
      4. “Even the councils of the church could not be taken as finally authoritative or necessarily correct.” (Dillenberger and Welch 47)
      5. “Luther pointed out frequently that it was often a council which called the results of a previous council heretical.” (Dillenberger and Welch 47)
      6. “Calvin remarked that one ought to argue from Scripture and that from this perspective, “councils would come to have the majesty that is their due; yet in the meantime Scripture would stand out in the higher place, with everything subject to its standard.”“ (*Institutes* 4.9.8) (Dillenberger and Welch 47)
      7. “The reformers did not believe they were start­ing a new church. They believed that they were calling the church to a more adequate reflection of the gospel which was its base. More­over, they believed this is a continual necessity. When, therefore, Rome would not reform, they felt that it was no longer the church. . . . the church in each age is nourished by the biblical faith, not tradition. The gospel itself is the only proper tradition . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 48)
4. **grace**
   1. total depravity
      1. “For the reformers, this state of humanity is depicted in the Genesis story of the Fall—a story which they interpreted as histori­cal—and can be characterized as “total depravity.” Depravity, how­ever, does not mean terrible acts which some people commit. Depravity concerns one’s *acts* only as they reflect the broken character of one’s relation to God and fellow humans. It refers to the inability to institute a relation with God on the basis of human activity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 25)
      2. “Depravity is consid­ered “total” because no aspect of life or activity is exempt from the corruptions of self.” (Dillenberger and Welch 25)
   2. sin
      1. “Sin is . . . the tendency of humans to build the world around themselves, to corrupt even their best achievements by . . . pride and self-concern . . . [It is acts done not] only for God and neighbor but also for self. This is why Luther spoke of sin as separation from God, or unbelief. It was not that the activity of the good pagans was bad. Their acts might even have been [25] better than those of many Christians.” (Dillenberger and Welch 25-26)
      2. “What is not of faith is sin. That is why Luther [says,] “if a man were not first a believer and a Christian, all his work would amount to nothing at all and would be freely wicked and damnable sins.”“ [Source not given.] (Dillenberger and Welch 26)
      3. The Old Testament law “was a preparation for the gospel, exactly because it made God’s demand so crystal clear that one ought to see oneself as sinner and therefore turn to the mercies of Christ. . . . The law convicts of sin.” (Dillenberger and Welch 26)
      4. “For Luther and Calvin, the teachings of Jesus also belong to the level of law. They are the most concrete and graphic presentation of the kind of life required under God. Instead of joyfully accepting the teachings of Jesus as the new disclosure of God, Luther saw in them the last barrier which stood between God and ourselves. Even when the spirit and intent of the teachings were stressed, he found them no more tolerable, since that only focused the issue more clearly. . . . the teachings of Jesus were so depressing, apart from justi­fying faith, that they became a new source of despair.” (Dillenberger and Welch 26)
      5. “To believe even partly in the merit of one’s works or righteousness is pride, i. e., sin. To insist upon contributing anything to one’s justification is to invert and reject the gospel. It is itself an [26] expression of sin. Justification is the declaration of God that the sinner is accepted, not that one is no longer sinner. For Luther and Calvin, one is inevitably sinner.” (Dillenberger and Welch 26-27)
      6. “Luther, as St. Paul before him, said that we wrestle not only with flesh and blood (human beings), but also with principalities and powers (that is, struc­tures of evil and sin which are more powerful than individuals and the sum of their evil activities)[,] powers to be opposed and overcome by a strength not one’s own.” (Dillenberger and Welch 38)
   3. justification
      1. “. . . neither Luther nor Calvin counseled that one should sit by, with folded hands, waiting for something to happen. They merely asserted that activity in the world would not guarantee the reconstitution of a satisfactory relation to God . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 27)
      2. “Calvin, discussing the familiar medieval view that repentance came before faith (repentance was the medieval description of a deci­sion), inverted the order, explaining that “. . . when we refer the origin of repentance to faith we do not imagine some space of time during which it brings it to birth; but we mean to show that a man cannot apply himself seriously to repentance without knowing himself [27] to belong to God.”“ (*Institutes* 3.3.2) (Dillenberger and Welch 27-28)
      3. “The question at issue was not chronological or psychological prece­dence, but that of foundation in a specific reality, either divine or human. . . . God’s offer of mercy is not like an object which one takes or leaves; God both confronts and is at work in the decision. Yet this does not exclude human responsibility and decision.” (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
   4. bondage of the will
      1. “When Luther and Calvin denied freedom of the will, they were emphatically not interested in reducing the human will to a subpersonal object of mechanical determination.” (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
      2. “. . . neither the divine nor the human will does what it does, whether good or evil, under any compulsion, but from sheer pleasure or desire, as with true freedom; and yet the will of God is immutable and infallible, and it governs our mutable will . . . and our will, especially when it is evil, cannot of itself do good.” (Luther, Martin. *The Bondage of the Will*. In *Luther*’*s Works*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972. 33.39.] (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
      3. “The denial of freedom of the will (as well as the concept of total depravity) refers only to the inability of one as sinner to will oneself to faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
      4. “If faith is the experience of God’s mercy, it must therefore also be trust. In this sense, it is an attitude or a decision, based on the promise and hope of God’s trustworthiness. . . . trust must be anchored in a prior experience of God’s mercy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 28)
   5. predestination
      1. “Luther finally rejected the notion of “double” predestination [29] . . . apart from faith, people naturally excluded themselves from God’s kingdom. (This did not solve the problem, of course, for it must be recalled that there is nothing one can do to change one’s lot but to seek God with no guarantee of finding God.)” (Dillenberger and Welch 29-30)
      2. Calvin accepted double predestination to show “that God is wholly the author of our faith and that every notion of work or merit must be rejected.” (Dillenberger and Welch 30)
      3. Calvin (*Institutes* 3.22.2): “By saying that they were elected before the creation of the world, he [St. Paul] precludes every consider­ation of merit.” (Qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 30)
      4. “It may be necessary to reject his determinism, but it should also be remembered that he developed it in contrast to . . . to the darkness of fate or the un­de­pend­ableness of fortune.” (Dillenberger and Welch 30)
      5. “. . . Calvin moved from faith to predestination, not from predestination to faith. Predestination as the basis of faith and as the expression of the sovereignty of God was elaborated by Theodore Beza, Calvin’s succes­sor in Geneva . . . Accent on the sovereignty of God as the expression of God’s overarching plan and activity in the world was more characteristic of Beza than of Calvin, for whom sovereignty implied the reality of grace. For Beza, predestination and sovereignty meant God’s plan for the world from all eternity, in which the Fall and the elect are embedded in God’s determinate activity. The resolve of God is prior to the Fall; hence, it is called supralapsarian. In Beza’s thought, all things happen as the result of God’s will and purpose [30] . . . That such a God could appear to be arbitrary did not occur in” Beza’s system. (Dillenberger and Welch 30-31)
   6. works
      1. Luther
         1. “One is always related to God finally on the basis of faith . . . One can also trust that this faith is more trustworthy than actions or one’s own nature. Forgiveness stands and needs to stand over the best of human hopes, aspirations, and activities. . . . That is why the Christian makes no claims for works.” (Dillenberger and Welch 35)
         2. “The biblical passages sometimes cited in support of a stress upon works actually places these in the context of faith. The injunction to “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling” needs to be quoted in its entirety, “for it is God who works in you both to will and to do.” . . . Likewise, the biblical statement that “not every one who says unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that does the will of my father who is in heaven” does not preclude but rather affirms the necessity of [first] saying “Lord, Lord” . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 35)
         3. Luther asserted, “sin bravely, yet more bravely still believe.” “This is not a counsel to sin; it is the recognition that life involves sin . . . We can venture confidently, because our resource is not a state of sinlessness but the mercy of God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 36)
      2. Calvin
         1. Calvin declares: “I say that the best work that can be brought forward from them is still always spotted and corrupted [33] . . . We have not a single work going forth from the saints that if it be judged in itself deserves not shame as its just reward.” (*Institutes* 3.14.9) (Dillenberger and Welch 33-34)
         2. But works “could be a sign for the believer of faith and therefore of election. . . . “the Christian mind may not be turned back to the merit of works as to a help toward salvation but should rely wholly on the free promise of righ­teousness. But we do not forbid him from undergirding and strength­ening this faith by signs of the divine benevolence toward him.”“ (*Institutes* 3.14.18) (Dillenberger and Welch 34)
      3. both
         1. “. . . both seriously affirmed that the Christian remains a sinner who needs God’s justifying mercy at all times.” (Dillenberger and Welch 33)
         2. “Luther’s and Calvin’s basic approach can perhaps best be expressed by speaking of “faith not without works.” . . . The phrase, faith not without works, expresses Luther’s and Calvin’s insistence upon the priority of the mercy of God at every point, and the necessity of works as a result. It carefully avoids making works the basis of redemption and takes away every quantitative calculation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 35)
         3. “It was Luther’s genius which saw what the presence of Christ automati­cally does without reference to signs of any type. It was a liability that some of his successors interpreted this unconcern in the direction of license and freedom from all restraint. It was Calvin’s greatness which saw that guidance and results both belong to the Christian life. But this could become a liability when individuals began to look at their works to discover whether or not they were truly of Christ’s company. Such self-consciousness leads easily to self-righteousness.” (Dillenberger and Welch 34)
         4. “. . . the reformers speak not against works, but against a false understanding of the place of works. “Our faith in Christ does not free us from works, but from false opinions concerning works, that is, from the foolish presumption that justification is acquired by works,” wrote Luther in *The Freedom of a Christian*. [Luther, Martin. *The Freedom of a Christian*. In *Luther*’*s Works*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1957. 31.312-373.) Calvin makes the same point many times in the *Institutes*. The following sentence is typical: “For justification is withdrawn from works, not that no good works may be done, or that what is done may be denied to be good, but that we may not rely upon them, glory in them or ascribe salvation to them.”“ (*Institutes* 3.17.1) (Dillenberger and Welch 31)
   7. law
      1. “Luther went so far as to say that Christians would not need the restraints of the state, since they would naturally live together in love and unity, but that they were obliged to obey the state out of love for the un-Christian neighbor who did need it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 32)
      2. Luther knew “that more often one fell . . . Where gratitude for redemption in Christ did not suffice, law necessarily enters the Christian life. Luther did not mean primarily the biblical law, but the law of the conscience captive to God and the law of society for justice and order. . . . its necessity is a reminder that the Christian remains a sinner . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 32)
      3. “Luther speaks with great exuberance about the presence of Christ and almost regrets the necessity of law within the Christian life. Calvin, too, stresses the new life in Christ, but he is sober rather than ecstatic in his account. . . . Calvin preferred usually to speak of the path in which the Christian walks, and in which, with diligence, one can make some progress.” (Dillenberger and Welch 32)
      4. “. . . Calvin sees a very positive role for biblical law (i. e., the moral law, in­clud­ing both the moral demand of the Old Testament and the teaching of Jesus). Not only does this law convict of sin and lead to Christ and preserve order in a world of sin; its most significant place is that it supplies the Christian with a better and more certain understanding of the divine will . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 33)
5. **sacraments**
   1. “. . . the criteria of a sacrament included an instituted sign or visible act (water in baptism and bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper) and a spoken word of promise in connection with the acts (the forgiveness of sins)—these signs having been given in the New Testament. The application of these criteria required the reduction of the number of sacraments to two: baptism and the Lord’s Supper.” (Dillenberger and Welch 43)
   2. baptism
      1. The Anabaptists (see Ch. III) rejected infant baptism because an infant could not be considered to have faith. . . . [But for Luther] faith is more than intellectual [43] assent . . . [It] includes a total commitment based upon the activity of God . . . ”“ (Dillenberger and Welch 43-44)
      2. In Catholicism, “baptism automatically restored the grace lost through original sin. Luther resorted to the idea of “infantile faith” as his way of stressing the importance of faith against all magical theories. . . . It is perhaps just as well that Luther did not explain the term “infantile faith” . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 44)
      3. “For both Luther and Calvin, baptism is the sacrament in which, through God’s promise and its acceptance in faith, one dies to sin and is reborn in faith [even] when faith is not a conscious possibility . . . emphasis falls upon the faith of the congregation . . . It is the symbol and sign of the Christian’s forgiveness.” (Dillenberger and Welch 44)
      4. For Calvin, “the seeds of future repentance and faith, while not fully formed, are already present in infants by the power of the Spirit.” (*Institutes* 4.16.20) (Dillenberger and Welch 44)
      5. For Zwingli, baptism “does not indicate an inward change . . . He believes in the baptism of infants, not because something happens, but because infants belong to families . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 44)
   3. Eucharist
      1. Luther
         1. Luther did not accept transubstantiation. [44] “The sixth chapter of John . . . for Luther has nothing to do with the Lord’s Supper . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 44-45)
         2. But he did believe in Christ’s bodily presence in the sacrament. “This is my body” “surely meant no less than actual body. . . . in faith God in Christ is present, in, with, and under the elements, both in bodily and spir­itual form.” (Dillenberger and Welch 44-45)
         3. He asserted “the ubiquity of Christ’s body . . . Christ is bodily present, even as he is spiritually present. Christ therefore is not bodily sitting on the right hand of God. His body or his spirit is potentially everywhere. Without this, Luther insisted, Christ is not fully present. [44] . . . Lu­ther’s view that what is said of the humanity of Christ must also be said of the divinity and vice versa.” (Dillenberger and Welch 44, 46)
      2. Calvin
         1. “Calvin, too, emphasized bodily as well as spiritual presence, but still maintained that Christ is [44] seated at the right hand of the Father in glory. . . . “Even though it seems unbelievable that Christ’s flesh, separated from us by such great distance, penetrates to us, so that it becomes our food, let us remember . . . that the Spirit truly unites things separated in space.” (*Institutes* 4.17.10) Calvin also suggested that the Spirit may lift us to Christ as well as Christ descending to us.” (*Institutes* 4.17.31) (Dillenberger and Welch 44-45)
      3. Karlstadt
         1. “For Karlstadt, the sacrament has no relation to the forgiveness of sins. It is a rite in which we remember the meaning of Christ’s death for us . . . “The remembrance, however, is a passionate and loving knowledge or perception of the body and blood of Christ.” [“Concerning the Anti-Christian Misuse of the Lord’s Bread and Cup . . .” In *Karl­stadt*’*s Battle with Luther*, *Documents in a Liberal-Radical Debate*. Ed. Ronald J. Sider. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978. 78-79.] . . . The sacrament is a lively expression of faith, not of the possibility of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 45)
      4. Zwingli
         1. Zwingli saw John 6 as interpreting “Christ’s presence in spiritual terms to those inclined to confuse the material and the spiritual. [45] . . . mastication of the body and blood of Christ . . . is not possible, for Christ has ascended to heaven in a fleshly form not present there before.” (Dillenberger and Welch 45-46)
         2. “Divinity’s presence is spiritual, that is, presence after a divine nature. The “is” in *this is my body* or *this is my blood*,is to be understood as signifies, represents, as a sign, figure, or memorial.” (Dillenberger and Welch 46)
         3. “. . . if you believe in him you have already partaken of him . . . all that you do is to confess publicly that you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.” [“On the Lord’s Supper,” in *Zwingli and Bullinger*,Library of Christian Classics (Phila­delphia, 1953), 198.] (Dillenberger and Welch 46)
         4. The Eucharist “is a visible sign in which is telescoped the totality of the gospel in a way words alone could not achieve.” (Dillenberger and Welch 46)
      5. later tradition
         1. Martin Bucer and Philipp Melanchthon tried to reconcile Lutherans and Calvinists at Marburg, and both with Catholics at Augsburg and Re­gens­burg. Though “all agreed on the relation of faith to the sacraments, it was pre­cisely the differences in the understanding of faith that kept the groups apart. Humanist, mystical, and metaphysical ingredients in the understanding [46] of faith” were irreconcilable. (Dillenberger and Welch 46-47)
         2. Later Lutheranism greatly debated “Luther’s views of bodily presence and Melanchthon’s apparent drift toward a position close to that of Calvin, while [Calvinism] followed the views of Zwingli much more than those of Calvin.” (Dillenberger and Welch 47)
6. **Church and state**
   1. “For both reformers, the state is ordained of God and a gift for this life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 48)
   2. Luther and Calvin hoped for “community or territorial churches, enforced through the arms of the state . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
   3. “Luther had such confidence in Christians that he believed they do not need the state themselves, but obey it out of love for their neighbor. For Luther, the state is a remedy for sin, preventing disorder and anarchy. In accord with his own understanding that the Christian is still sinner, it would have been logical to assume that the state, too, would still be needed if all men were Christians. Luther’s statement must, however, be understood in an ideal sense; he never anticipated that it would be realized in this life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 48)
   4. Calvin “insisted that Christians, too, need the state . . . The state is a remedy for sin. But even more, it exists as a place of concord” for Christians.One of its tasks is to guarantee and protect pure religion. (Luther did not consider this a necessary function of the state, but he was willing to call upon Christian princes to reform a church which would not reform itself.) [48] . . . Calvin’s notion [was] that the state [79] . . . existed for the sake of maintaining and protecting the faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 48, 79-80)
   5. “Those in authority are like gods under God . . . Rulers ought, to be sure, to govern justly . . . They can and must be called to account by the Word of God, even the preached Word of God. But, Luther held, they cannot be actively resisted. In the face of injustice, Christians can only suffer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 49)
   6. In the Peas­ants’ Revolt (1524-1525), “Although personally sympathetic to the cause of the peasants, Luther wrote vitriolic attacks against them . . . ” (He also “lived in an explosive period and, as is usual in such times, had a much greater fear of anarchy than of tyranny.”) (Dillenberger and Welch 49)
   7. “Yet Luther [claimed that] obedience to God is more ultimate than one’s duty to the state. . . . Luther did not see the full implications of this position. (It was just this claim of loyalty to God above all else which was used by Norwegian Lutherans as the basis for their valiant resistance against the Nazis.)” (Dillenberger and Welch 49)
   8. “Calvin, no less than Luther, urged obedience to duly constituted authority, but he made at least two significant qualifying statements . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 49)
      1. “. . . if they [parents] spur us to transgress the law, we have a perfect right to regard them not as parents, but as strangers who are trying to lead us away from obedience to our true Father. So should we act toward princes, lords, and every kind of superiors.” (*Institutes* 2.8.38) (Dillenberger and Welch 49)
      2. “Resistance to evil rulers is not the right of private persons but of lesser magistrates. [49] . . . “if they wink at kings who violently fall upon and as­sault the lowly common folk, [they] betray the free­dom of the people, of which they know that they have been appointed protectors by God’s or­din­ance.” (*Institutes* 4.20.31) (Dillenberger and Welch 49-50)
   9. “Luther showed a similar understanding in changing his support from the emperor to the princes in the struggle over Roman Catholi­cism. He shifted his support when a number of jurists declared that the princes were the duly constituted authority since the emperor no longer acted as such. Luther also suggested that in an extraordinary situation, one like that which faced Samson, one needed to take things in one’s own hands.” (Dillenberger and Welch 50)
   10. “. . . neither Luther nor Calvin paid much attention to the form and structure of govern­ment. Yet there is a passage in Calvin’s *Institutes* which may be more related to subsequent constitutional developments of the distribution of power, particularly the United States Constitution, than the usual ascription of such developments solely to Montesquieu. “Men’s fault or failing causes it to be safer and more bearable for a number to exercise government . . . if one asserts himself unfairly, there may be a number of censors . . . ”“ (*Institutes* 4.20.9) (Dillenberger and Welch 50)
   11. “If [Luther and Calvin] they believed that rulers should also be responsible for true religion, this did not mean a religious society, ordered in every respect on the basis of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 50)
   12. “. . . the Strasbourg reformer, Martin Bucer, stressed the need for transformation of corporate life from top to bottom, a change in which monarchs were asked to play a major role. It is perhaps not by accident that, in addition to Bucer’s personal destiny to spend the last years of his life in Cambridge, En­gland, his ideas on the ordering of society were more nearly imple­mented in England than on the continent.” (Dillenberger and Welch 51)
7. **moral issues**
   1. “Calvin emphasized progress in the Christian life much more than did Luther . . . ” (Dillenberger and Welch 48)
   2. Calvin’s doctrine of the “calling” of the Christian in the secular world
   3. “The all-controlling purpose and duty of the elect is to glor­ify God. Every aspect of individual and social life must be brought into line with this aim.” (Dillenberger and Welch 213)
   4. “Conversely, every aspect of life can be the means of exhibiting the glory of God. And the elect individual will glorify God in daily work precisely by honesty, diligence, moderation, sobriety, and thrift.” (Dillenberger and Welch 213)
   5. polygamy
      1. Luther did not have “a wholly good record on this problem, as his consent to the bigamy of Philip of Hesse indicates, though that consent was given grudgingly and under peculiar circumstances.” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
8. **the last things**
   1. “. . . without present faith as its authentic basis, people believe in the kingdom because of fear. For Luther “the fear of the gallows” was an impossible reason for being a Christian.” (Dillenberger and Welch 51)
   2. “Luther believed that God’s kingdom would soon be at hand.” (Dillenberger and Welch 51)
   3. “Neither Luther nor Calvin speculated on the nature of the future life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 51)

## The Radical Reformation

1. **introduction**
   1. “For the Anabaptists, Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli had not gone far enough in the restoration of the New Testament church forms . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 53)
   2. “The phrase *radical Reformation* has rightly largely replaced the *left wing of the Reformation* . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 54)
   3. Included are: (Dillenberger and Welch 54)
      1. the “Anabaptist tradition”;
      2. “fringe individuals and movements”; and
      3. “the anti-trinitarianism of Servetus . . .”
2. **early Anabaptism**
   1. “The beginnings date from activities in the Swiss cantons, where there were such leaders as Michael Schlatter, the cultured Conrad Grebel, and the distinguished scholar Balthasar Hubmaier.” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
   2. Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed alike believed Anabaptists “had no right to exist. This was an age in which toleration of fundamental differences was hardly on the horizon of consciousness.” [54] (Dillenberger and Welch 58, 54)
   3. “Conflict early emerged with the Zwinglians in Zurich [where] the initially friendly disputations about the faith between Anabaptist and Reformed leaders turned into an [57] outright campaign against the former, with the latter receiving the support of civil authorities.” (Dillenberger and Welch 57-58)
   4. The most visible and disturbing Anabaptist practice was baptizing persons already baptized as infants. “Hence the nickname Anabaptist (i.e., “rebaptizer”). Since as the Anabaptists held that there could be no valid baptism apart from the faith of the believer, they rejected the notion that they “rebaptized.” . . . [The Calvinists found a] legal basis for suppression of the Anabaptists in an ancient legal code of the Emperor Justinian, which forbade rebaptism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   5. “The good moral character of many of the Anabaptists, including their leaders, was conceded by the opposition. Nevertheless, [their “radical emphasis upon the spirit”] threatened the orderly affairs of the newly emerging Reformation churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   6. “. . . most of the leaders became martyrs through burning or drowning. (The latter was a particularly taunting form of death . . .)” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   7. Nevertheless, “In Bern, Basel, Strasbourg, Augsburg, Nuremberg, and Münster, there continued to be thriving communities, and numerous groups sprang up in south Germany.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   8. “But the core of the Anabaptist movement as it was destined to have its major impact upon posterity did not develop in either Switzerland or Germany. It came instead from Moravia and Holland, where the chief leaders respectively were Jakob Hutter [hence the Hutterites] and Menno Simons [hence the Mennonites].” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   9. “Neither the English Baptists nor the Quakers can be traced directly to the Mennonites, but there were points of contact [with their] type of spirituality . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   10. “Later, the Mennonites in Holland surrendered much of their distinctive witness. The Anabaptist tradition continued with vitality in settlements in Poland, Russia, and Paraguay, but most of all in the Mennonite communities in Pennsylvania.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
3. **formation of the Anabaptist tradition**
   1. The Anabaptists’ aim was to establish their community “in accord with the descriptions of the church in the New Testament . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
   2. The movement began “in the Swiss cantons, [with] such leaders as Michael Schlatter, the cultured Conrad Grebel, and the distinguished scholar Balthasar Hubmaier.” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
   3. “. . . the Anabaptist leaders, who shared much with Zwingli, believed that Zwingli’s views demanded baptism of believers, not infants.” So “Conflict early emerged with the Zwinglians in Zurich . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
   4. “In Zurich, the initially friendly disputations about the faith between Anabaptist and Reformed leaders turned into an [57] outright campaign against the former, with the latter receiving the support of civil authorities.” (Dillenberger and Welch 57-58)
   5. The Anabaptists believed that the New Testament required them to baptize persons already been baptized as infants. . . . there could be no valid baptism apart from the faith of the believer . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
      1. That was the most visible “conflict with the Reformed groups . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
      2. “Hence the nickname Anabaptist (i.e., “rebaptizer”).” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
      3. The Anabaptists “rejected the notion that they “rebaptized.” Infant baptism was no baptism at all.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
4. **theology**
   1. Luther allowed “practices having no basis in the New Testament, provided they did not contradict the essentials of the faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
   2. The Anabaptists felt that that Luther and Zwingli did not go far enough. (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
   3. “One of the recurring sources of confusion in Protestantism is that those who stand in the Lutheran and Reformed tradition see only anarchy in the outlook of those who stress the Spirit and voluntary association, and that those who stand in the ”free church” tradition prefer to view themselves as having carried the Reformation to its logical conclusion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59 n 1)
   4. “We have to do here with a fundamentally different understanding of the church and the Christian life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
      1. The reformers believed the church “is a community of believers in which faith is related to every aspect of its life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
      2. The Anabaptists, too, believed “that the church is a voluntary association of Christians patterned after the New Testament.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
      3. But the reformers believed “that faith is decisive for the church,” whereas the Anabaptists believed that Christian faith and life demand “a particular form of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
      4. The Anabaptists claimed that they were finishing “a Reformation only halfway completed by the reformers.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
   5. “Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and the Anabaptists” agreed “that the church is a community of those who have experienced the living Christ . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
   6. “But the Anabaptists drew the further inference that a new pattern of life is at the heart of the New Testament, and that therefore the New Testament forms must be followed in every respect, including the order and practice of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
   7. “For the Anabaptists, then, the new life in Christ through the Spirit rather than justification by faith is the center of the New Testament [59] faith and therefore of the church. The life of the redeemed, the presence of the Spirit in believers, is foremost. Not the Word of God as found in the Bible, but the experience of Christ’s presence is the foundation of the church. The Spirit of Christ spread abroad in the human heart is more important than any endeavor to understand the content of God’s disclosure, whether found in the Bible or expressed in theological statements. The New Testament is a book of the Christian life, and authoritative in that sense.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59-60)
   8. “. . . the two criteria of the church [are] the voluntary nature of faith and the New Testament pattern.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
   9. “. . . all that matters is the manifest vitality of Christian saints. That conviction provides the clue to what they rejected and what they affirmed.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
      1. They rejected theology. (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         1. “Theology was considered a highly suspicious enterprise in which theologians spun out theses which were a stumbling block to those of simple but genuine faith. Anabaptists trusted farmers and craftsmen more than theologians.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         2. “They were not interested in how individuals became saints . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         3. “. . . justification was not central to their outlook and frequently appeared to them as theological bickering.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
            1. “. . . the regenerate constituted the church, quite apart from how they understood the relation of faith and works.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
            2. “Important was, not that God forgave sins, but the new life possible in Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
      2. They rejected the institutional church. (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         1. “The church also lost its true nature when it was no longer confined to the regenerated and their own tests for membership in the community.
         2. “. . . the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the empire (under Constantine) marked the “fall” of the church. Belonging to the church became no longer a matter of decision but of birth and social destiny. The vitality and very essence of the church as a voluntary association was destroyed.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         3. Others “dated the fall of the church [to] the Council of Nicaea in 325. This represented the crystallization of trinitarian thought, precipitated by the intrigues of the powerful Roman empire and expressed through the speculation of philosophers.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         4. “For others, it was the enforcement of infant baptism in 407 (with penalty for failure to comply).” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         5. Luther and Calvin’s “hopes of community or territorial churches, enforced through the arms of the state, were themselves considered a part of the pattern which characterized a fallen church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
      3. They rejected clergy. (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         1. “Since the only possible church is a voluntary but disciplined community [60] of saints patterned after the New Testament community, there is no distinction, not even of function, between clergy and laity. Those who have the Spirit are Christians and therefore equally a source of Christian truth and action.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60-61)
            1. For Luther, “The priesthood of all believers refers . . . to each person’s relation to God and to one’s priesthood to neighbor . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
            2. But for Aanabaptists, “it refers also to the equality of all people in the Christian community with respect to formal function. No person has any status not possessed by all.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
         2. “Reluctantly, many of the Anabaptist communities did have to separate functions in such a way that some functioned as “clergy.” But nowhere, except among the Quakers, has lay responsibility been greater.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
      4. They affirmed the new life in Christ. (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         1. They were interested in “the life of people as they walked on a path leading toward perfection.
         2. “They were interested in the “life” of the church rather than in its thought.” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
         3. The church is “a voluntary, disciplined community of saints . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 60)
      5. They affirmed discipline.
         1. “The church was a voluntary and free association; but it implied a discipline and a way of life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
         2. Community leaders chiefly “exercised the discipline required in the life of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
         3. “Those who violated God’s commands and did not exhibit the presence of the Spirit were warned, sometimes placed on probation, not infrequently punished, and occasionally barred from the community.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
         4. “The purity of the community had to be maintained . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
            1. First “by the inclusion only of those who are Christians by free decisions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
            2. Second “by internal discipline . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
      6. They affirmed withdrawal.
         1. “But the church could maintain its discipline and life only by being a society “withdrawn.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
            1. “Therefore, Anabaptists were concerned primarily with fellow Christians, except in the case of missionary preaching (the object of which obviously was to bring others into the fold).” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
            2. “Thus, the church must be a separate community . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
         2. church and state
            1. “Most Anabaptists admitted that the state was a necessary institution for humankind and even for themselves, but they did not find it possible to assume any responsibility for it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)

A Christian “could not be a magistrate because that would contaminate and perhaps vitiate the witness one must make to the peace and order of the new life in Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)

A Christian could not “participate in war . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)

A Christian could not “swear oaths of any kind.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)

“These acts violated the new life in Christ as exhibited in the injunctions of the New Testament.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)

* 1. baptism
     1. “It was the insistence upon the church as a community life, patterned after the New Testament, which led to the Anabaptist view of baptism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 61)
     2. Menno Simons: “We are not regenerated because we have been baptized . . . but we are baptized because we have been regenerated by faith and the Word of God [1 Pet 1:23]. Regeneration is not the result of baptism, but baptism the result of regeneration. This can indeed not be controverted by any man, or disproved by the Scriptures.” (Qtd. from Bender, Harold S. *Menno Simons*’ *Life and Writings*. Scottdale PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1936. 78.) (Qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 61)
     3. “Baptism is the indication that one believes in the forgiveness of sins and the new life in Christ. It is not a medium for either, but rather an expression of the acceptance of both. It is not absolutely necessary, being one of the least of the commandments given by Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
     4. infant baptism
        1. “Such a view of baptism demands believers who have reached some degree of consciousness and maturity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
        2. “Simons rejected Luther’s concept of infantile faith. By definition, infant baptism is meaningless.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
        3. “Moreover, the Anabaptists could find no basis whatsoever for infant baptism in the Bible. Infant baptism, therefore, violates the two criteria of the church, the voluntary nature of faith and the New Testament pattern.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
        4. “. . . baptism must follow faith, not precede it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
        5. “Baptism is not an instrument of grace; it is an expression of the fact of grace already visibly present.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
  2. eucharist
     1. “The same logic applies to the Lord’s Supper.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
     2. Balthasar Hubmaier (*A Form for the Celebration of the Lord*’*s Supper*. In Fosdick, Harry Emerson, ed. *Great Voices of the Reformation*. New York: 1952. 312-13): “That is the true communion of the saints, which is not a communion because the bread is broken; but where the bread is broken because the communion has preceded and been enclosed in the heart since Christ has come in the flesh. For not all who break the bread are partakers of the body and blood of Christ, which I prove by the traitor Judas. But those who are now in communion inwardly and in spirit, they may also use this bread and wine worthily in an outward way.” (Qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 62)
     3. “In no sense does anything special happen as the elements of the Lord’s Supper are distributed. It is the outward expression of a communion and community which exists, the fellowship of forgiven sinners who are saints. It is a rite of fellowship inaugurated in the early church. There is no presence of Christ in the elements.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)
  3. “Such are the main tenets of this radical Reformation tradition. The church is a creation of the voluntary, free association of believers, uncoerced by either hierarchy or state. Everything which threatens this way of life of the church must be rejected; not violently, but through suffering if necessary. The faith of the Christian is nourished by the Bible. But more than that, the Bible provides a definite pattern for the expression of that faith through the discipline of the saints. In the Anabaptist tradition, the freedom of the Christian is combined with the utmost of discipline in community. While grace is affirmed, the freedom of the individual to both receive and live out the new life in Christ is accented. Hence, the sanctified rather than the justified life is featured. At the same time, that sanctified life, with its own discipline, represents a colony in the world, willing to accept the suffering that comes, a badge that one is truly a Christian.” (Dillenberger and Welch 62)

1. **fringe individuals and movements**
   1. Karlstadt and the Wittenberg prophets
      1. Karlstadt
         1. Karlstadt made a “pilgrimage through the Lutheran, Reformed, and Anabaptist alternatives . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 54)
         2. In “Wittenberg while Luther was in seclusion at the Wartburg (1521) . . . a group under the leadership of Andreas Karlstadt insisted that the reform of the church included the rejection of images and music . . . [These] interfered with the worship of God through genuinely spiritual means.” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         3. “He [Karlstadt] had been the dean of the theological faculty in Wittenberg . . . [He] performed the first evangelical eucharist, reading a simplified Latin mass with no reference to sacrifice, repeating the words of institution in German instead of Latin, and of having the lay people themselves take the bread and cup in their own hands.” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         4. “But Karlstadt, under pressure, removed himself from Wittenberg to a parish at Orlamunde, where he identified with the peasants, himself farming as one, and increasingly rejected the concept of presence in the Lord’s Supper.” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         5. He “was forced to flee from place to place, though in his last years he became a professor at Basel.” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
      2. the Wittenberg prophets
         1. The Wittenberg prophets arrived in Wittenberg “from the neighboring town of Zwickau. Insisting that God had spoken directly to them through the spirit, these individuals declared the Bible to be unnecessary. Moreover, they announced that God’s kingdom was at hand . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
   2. the “revolutionaries”
      1. “Revolutionaries” refers to “individuals and movements that tried to create a new Kingdom . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 54)
      2. Thomas Münzer (c. 1488-1525)
         1. “Of more radical temperament than either Andreas Karlstadt or the Zwickau prophets was Thomas Münzer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         2. “Like Karlstadt, he started with Luther but ended with a theology of a quite different order.” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         3. “His liturgical experiments in the city of Allstedt in 1523-1524 were widely hailed, even by traditional reformers . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         4. “Apparently, he was among the first to date the “fall” of the church in the early centuries, basing his judgments on his reading of Eusebius.” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         5. According to Münzer, “God’s spirit spoke directly to the human spirit—Scripture not being its source but merely its confirmation . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 55)
         6. He said that truth must be “established, by the saints, using the sword if necessary . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
         7. He attempted “to establish the rule of the saints, particularly in Allstedt and then in Mulhausen . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
         8. While it is doubtful that Münzer had any direct responsibility for the revolt of the peasants in l524-1525, he did identify with them, seeing their struggles as a medium through which the reign of the Spirit would be realized . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
         9. “Münzer shared with the other reformers the idea that the ungodly should not be permitted; but [while] the other reformers felt that the rulers alone could exercise such power, Münzer firmly believed that it belonged to the saints.” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
         10. “Münzer was present at the decisive battle at Frankenhausen, in which the peasants were unequivocally routed. . . . He was found in hiding, identified, interrogated, and beheaded.” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
      3. Münster
         1. Münster, “first under the sway of the preaching of Bernard Rothmann, soon found itself under the successive leadership of two lay Dutch individuals, Jan Matthias and Jan van Leyden.” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
         2. “Here, all books except the Bible were burned and those individuals who did not submit to baptism, though baptized already in infancy, were exiled from the city. The goods of life were shared [as in] Acts . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 56)
         3. “The groups also instituted the practice of polygamy [though there were] powerful sociological reasons . . . (notably the surplus of women over men in certain areas) . . . the practice in Münster led to immorality, [56] [though] polygamy was intended as an answer to the temptation of immorality.” (Dillenberger and Welch 56-57)
         4. “Münster was of course besieged and, eventually, . . . fell, its principal leaders hung in cages . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
   3. other fringe individuals
      1. Melchior Hofmann “believed in the imminent end [but] counseled patient waiting for the end . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
      2. Hans Denck “believed in the direct accessibility of the Spirit apart from the Bible [and] considered the Scriptures unnecessary for salvation . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
      3. “Schwenkfeld’s and Franck’s individual spiritualism” (Dillenberger and Welch 54)
         1. Caspar Schwenkfeld and Sebastian Franck “emphasized the individual relation to God without reference to the community . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
         2. “Franck had no interest in returning to the primitive Christian church, considering Scripture and the sacraments as necessary only for the infancy of faith. Hence, community was a name for the aggregate of free spirits under the sway of the Holy Spirit, not a group formed in a common ethos.” (Dillenberger and Welch 57)
2. **later Anabaptism**
   1. fear of antinomianism
      1. Many “feared the radical emphasis upon the spirit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
      2. “The good moral character of many of the Anabaptists, including their leaders, was conceded . . . [But] their position . . . threatened the orderly affairs of the newly emerging Reformation churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
      3. “. . . the excesses of some Anabaptist groups unfortunately fed fuel to the fire . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   2. persecutions
      1. “. . . those who accepted infant baptism [found] legal basis for suppression of the Anabaptists in an ancient legal code of the Emperor Justinian, which forbade rebaptism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
      2. “. . . Anabaptist groups were banished and persecuted, while most of the leaders became martyrs through burning or drowning. (The latter was a particularly taunting form of death because of its associations with immersion in baptism.)” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
   3. locations
      1. Nevertheless, “Anabaptist communities arose throughout north central Europe. In Bern, Basel, Strasbourg, Augsburg, Nuremberg, and Münster, there continued to be thriving communities, and numerous groups sprang up in south Germany.” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
      2. “But the core of the Anabaptist movement as it was destined to have its major impact . . . came instead from Moravia and Holland . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
         1. In Moravia the chief leader was Jakob Hutter. (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
         2. In Holland the chief leader was Menno Simons. (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
         3. The Hutterites were a disciplined community. (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
         4. The Mennonites were influential.
            1. “Neither the English Baptists nor the Quakers can be traced directly to the Mennonites, but there were points of contact. It is not too much to say that these Anabaptists provided a type of spirituality that had its effects upon all those with whom they came into contact. (Dillenberger and Welch 58)
            2. “Later, the Mennonites in Holland surrendered much of their distinctive witness.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)
      3. “The Anabaptist tradition continued with vitality in settlements in Poland, Russia, and Paraguay, but most of all in the Mennonite communities in Pennsylvania.” (Dillenberger and Welch 59)

## Anabaptists

1. **definition**
   1. “Anabaptists were groups organized around the baptism of mature believers . . . in the German-speaking Reformation.” (Stayer 31)
   2. qualifications
      1. “. . . small numbers of French, Italians, English, and Slavs joined Anabaptist groups . . .” (Stayer 31)
      2. “. . . the commitment to baptism was unsteady among the followers of Melchior Hoffman and some of their successor sects, such as Jorites and Batenburgers.” (Stayer 31)
2. **general characteristics**
   1. “. . . a desire for restoration of the practices of the New Testament church . . .” (Stayer 31)
   2. “. . . an expectation of the end of the world . . .” (Stayer 31)
   3. “. . . commitment to individual holiness of conduct . . .” (Stayer 31)
   4. “. . . aversion to clerical, scholarly, mercantile, and governmental elites.” (Stayer 31)
   5. “. . . a nonscholarly vernacular biblicism as their authority [together with] beliefs in the direct inspiration of ordinary people by the Holy Spirit . . .” (Stayer 31)
      1. “Hence the cultural gap between educated leadership and uneducated clergy and laity characteristic of the Roman church and the Protestant established churches was narrowed drastically among Anabaptists.” (Stayer 31)
   6. “. . . the domination of men over women was sometimes articulated and generally practiced among Anabaptists.” (Stayer 31)
3. **Anabaptism in relation to pamphlets and the Peasants’ War**
   1. “There were three primary, overlapping expressions of the popular Reformation: the popularly directed Reformation [31] pamphlets (*Flugschriften*), the German Peasants’ War of 1525, and the Anabaptists.” (Stayer 31-32)
   2. “. . . resistance to tithes and rents . . . connected the *Flugschriften*, the Peasants’ War programs, and early Anabaptism.” (Stayer 32)
   3. “In Switzerland, the Tirol, Franconia, Thuringia, and Hesse the commoners’ resistance of 1525 had significant connections with Anabaptism: quite a few important Anabaptist leaders had formerly participated in the Peasants’ War, and the experience of the Peasants’ War often turned commoners against the established churches and made them receptive to Anabaptist missionaries.” (Stayer 32)
4. **origin**
   1. “Reformation nonconformity began when radical supporters of the Reformation found their anticlerical projects and activities opposed not only by the Roman clergy and the governments but also by major reformers who had come into increasingly friendly and settled connections with governments of the sort that led to the gradual establishment of Protestant confessions.” (Stayer 32)
   2. “Among Luther’s radical opponents in Saxony, persons such as Andreas Bodenstein Karlstadt, Jakob Strauss, Thomas Muntzer, and Nicholas Storch attacked infant baptism as a glaring example of the empty ceremonialism that distracted the laity from a genuine experience of the Holy Spirit, but they did not organize their followers around a renewed baptism of mature believers.” (Stayer 32)
   3. “The antipedobaptism of Karlstadt and Muntzer did, however, become known to radical adherents of the Zurich reformation, persons already estranged from Huldrych Zwingli because he supported and they rejected the continued collection of clerical tithes in the villages around Zurich.” (Stayer 32)
   4. “Mennonite and Hutterite tradition assigns the beginning of Anabaptism, correctly, to an adult baptism in Zurich in early 1525 involving Conrad Grebel, a Zurich patrician with a humanist education, and Georg Blaurock, a priest from Chur. This event probably occurred at Felix Mantz’s house on 21 January 1525; besides Mantz, Wilhelm Reublin and Johannes Brotli, priests serving the villages of Witikon and Zollikon, and Andreas Castelberger, a peddler of Reformation pamphlets, were almost certainly participants. The adult baptisms occurred immediately following the Zurich government’s decision that this group’s objections to infant baptism were unfounded, and they were followed by household Communions, at a time when the Zurich council and pastors had not yet instituted a Protestant Lord’s Supper. Accordingly the household baptisms and Communions were acts of defiance against the Zurich council and the Zurich church, which under Zwingli’s leadership had been in the process of throwing off Roman obedience since 1522.” (Stayer 32)
   5. “Zwingli accused Grebel and his followers of aiming at a schism among the followers of the Reformation and the creation of a separate church. But the symbolic interpretation of the Lord’s Supper advanced by Zwingli was as equally radical a departure from Catholic sacramental theology as [32] was adult believers’ baptism, and the Reformed churches had no intrinsic theological reason to continue infant baptism. The dispute over baptism in the Zurich reformation was not intentionally schismatic but part of a struggle over the forms of Reformed Protestantism.” (Stayer 32-33)
   6. “Similarly the issue of whether the civil government or an independent church should control the ecclesiastical ban was settled differently by Zwingli in Zurich than by Johann Oecolampadius in Basel or Calvin in Geneva. In the late sixteenth century the Reformed church of the northern Netherlands was more a believers’ church with government sponsorship (such as Balthasar Hubmaier tried to establish in Anabaptism) than an established church as in Geneva and Scotland.” (Stayer 33)
   7. “Community chests, ostensibly to assist the poor, were a common feature of all Protestant congregations, but they had different social functions: to consolidate the wealth of the conciliar elite in Lutheran Zwickau, to enforce social discipline against “sturdy beggars” in Reformed Zurich, and to expropriate the wealth of *rentiers*, who were henceforth to live from their trades, among the Swiss Anabaptists.” (Stayer 33)
   8. “Anabaptism began, then, as a struggle over the character of Reformed churches, and traditional scholarship has overlooked the continuing affinity between Anabaptist and Reformed. The later English observation that a disestablished Calvinist was a Baptist and an established Baptist a Calvinist applies as well to the earlier Reformation in central Europe.” (Stayer 33)
5. **early Anabaptist groups**
   1. “The aim of the first Anabaptists in Zurich was to restore the practices of the church of the apostles, but it is a mistake to try to derive the character of Anabaptism generally from what we know of the first Swiss Anabaptists.” (Stayer 33)
   2. “The Anabaptist congregations were radically decentralized. Claus-Peter Clasen enumerates twenty Anabaptist groups in a study that does not even include the numerous groups in northern Germany and the Netherlands; there were in fact many Anabaptist groups, most of them making exclusivist claims and condemning the others.” (Stayer 33)
   3. “Current scholarship distinguishes three major historical families among sixteenth-century Anabaptists . . .” (Stayer 33)
      1. “. . . those stemming from Conrad Grebel and Michael Sattler . . .” (Stayer 33)
      2. “. . . those from Hans Denck and Hans Hut . . .” (Stayer 33)
         1. “The Hut-Denck grouping are the heirs of Thomas Müntzer, who might well himself have become an Anabaptist had he survived the Peasants’ War.” (Stayer 33)
      3. “. . . those from Melchior Hoffman and Jan Matthijs.” (Stayer 33)
         1. “Before his Anabaptist career Hoffman was a radical apocalyptic lay preacher in the Baltic lands.” (Stayer 33)
   4. “Until the 1960s scholars thought Anabaptism had spread from Zurich throughout the German-speaking lands.” (Stayer 33)
      1. “In fact we do not know who baptized Denck, although he may have received baptism in Switzerland in 1525 after fleeing from Muhlhausen at the end of the Peasants’ War.” (Stayer 33)
      2. “Nor do we know who baptized Hoffman, although he had contacts with Hut-Denck Anabaptists in Strasbourg in 1529 and may have been baptized there.” (Stayer 33)
   5. “. . . it has become conventional to regard Anabaptism as having had three beginnings: at Zurich in 1525, at Augsburg in 1526 when Denck baptized Hut, and at Emden in 1530, when Hoffman brought Anabaptism to north Germany.” (Stayer 33)
      1. The reason is that “. . . Denck, Hut, and Hoffman set a markedly different tone for Anabaptists in most of south and central Germany, north Germany, and the Netherlands. The piety of Anabaptists in these regions differed widely from that of Swiss Anabaptists, whose influence was predominant in neighboring Alsace, the Palatinate, and parts of Swabia.” (Stayer 33)
      2. “But this classification is not entirely satisfactory in accounting for the Anabaptism of the Hutterites in Moravia, who organized refugees from Swiss and south German Anabaptism into communities that blended the piety of the various Anabaptist regions from which their followers originated.” (Stayer 33)
      3. This classification does not “allow a place for the Marpeck brotherhood, led by the civil engineer and lay theologian Pilgram Marpeck, whose eclectic theology combined ideas taken from Luther, Kaspar von Schwenckfeld, and Bernhard Rothmann, the spokesman of the Munster Anabaptists.” (Stayer 33)
6. **Anabaptist theology**
   1. “Anabaptist groups differed in both belief and practice. Although all thought of themselves as living in the last days, the apocalyptic urgency (and latent violence) of the followers of Hut, Hoffman, and Matthijs, the prophet of Münster, far surpassed that of the first Swiss Anabaptists, the Marpeck brotherhood, and the followers of Menno Simons. (The Hutterites, the group around Melchior Rinck, and the adherents of David Joris occupied an intermediate position.) Adult baptism was for the Swiss Anabaptists a ceremony handed down from Christ and the apostles, to be literally observed. For Hut’s followers it was the sign of the covenant of the apocalyptic elect, protecting them from the wrath of Christ returning in judgment. Hoffman suspended believers’ baptism in 1531 when it led to the persecution of his followers, and although it was resumed by the Munster Anabaptists and the Mennonites it was abandoned by the Batenburgers and Joris’s followers. Hence the Melchiorite sects were less firm in their commitment to believers’ baptism than the Anabaptists of the south. Belief in direct inspiration by the Spirit was strong in Hut-Denck Anabaptism and in the Melchiorite-Munsterite-Jorite tradition, but it was eclipsed by a more prosaic biblicism among the Swiss Anabaptists, the Mennonites, and the Hutterites; only the Marpeck brotherhood became self-consciously antispiritualist. The Melchiorite belief that Christ’s flesh came directly from heaven was a theological signature for all north German and Dutch Anabaptist groups until the Waterlanders abandoned it in the second half of the sixteenth century. In Anabaptism it was opposed forcefully only by Marpeck, who developed a more orthodox Christology that emphasized the reality of Christ’s human nature. Denck and Hubmaier articulated a soteriology of synergism, a belief in the cooperation of the will of God and the human will in the salvation process; this belief was implicit among all Anabaptist sects, which in the manner of lay religion avoided the paradoxes about predestination so dear to the theologically sophisticated major reformers.” (Stayer 33)
   2. “Among Anabaptists, however, theology was rudimentary and differences of religious ideas were secondary to differences of practice, which were more widely understood. Relations to rulers combined belief and practice. Aversion to temporal governments, which protected the established churches and persecuted Anabaptists, expressed itself most commonly in the declaration that rulers could not be Christians (Sattler and the Schleitheim Articles) or that they could be Christians only with great difficulty (Marpeck and Simons). But the hostility to government could take militant forms among Munsterites and Batenburgers, the “covenanters of the sword,” who convinced themselves that they were unsheathing their swords for apocalyptic vengeance, a possibility that Hans Hut had earlier held before his followers. Only when Anabaptists lived under friendly, nonpersecuting governments, as in Moravia and in the Dutch Republic in the late sixteenth century, could “nonresistance” exhaust itself in exemption from military service and other civic duties thought to be religiously prohibited.” (Stayer 33)
   3. “Restoration of the Christian community of goods described in *Acts* 2 and 4 was a common ideal differently expressed among the early Anabaptist groups. At first in Switzerland and south and central Germany community of goods was assumed to be compatible with the continuance of the single-family household as the focus of living and working. Among the Swiss Anabaptists the rule of community of goods was that everyone should work and that the wealthy should distribute their property among the needy and eschew all profit from usury. Among south and central German Anabaptists Müntzer’s mystical piety of *Gelassenheit* (“yieldedness”) was focused on renunciation of ties to material possessions, a communist spirituality. The two traditions blended in the highly organized Hutterite settlements in Moravia, which went beyond the economics of the family to create economic units of about five hundred people living from the profits of advanced craft production. By contrast, in Munster, community of goods was proclaimed but distorted by the prominence among the Anabaptists of civic notables who continued in possession of their houses, by the lavish royal court, and by the necessities of the constant siege. In reaction against Munster and the Hutterites, the Marpeck brotherhood and the Mennonites abandoned the ideal of imitating the communism of the early church, but the Dutch Mennonites for centuries maintained a strong tradition of philanthropy toward needy groups, some of them non-Anabaptist. The Swiss Brethren, as the Grebel-Sattler heirs came to be called (c. 1540), were the most radically laicist of the Anabaptists, repeatedly humbling and disciplining their would-be leaders. Their religion centered on distinctive practices rather than on ideas or emotive piety.” (Stayer 33)
   4. “Throughout the spectrum of Anabaptist groups the administration of the ban, which led to shunning of the excommunicated, was a source of unending controversy. Particularly the issue of “marital avoidance,” that is, whether a banned member should be shut off from family intimacies, aroused strong emotions and led to schisms. This and the closely associated matter of whether Anabaptists should separate from non-Anabaptist spouses, and whether separated Anabaptists were permitted to remarry in the lifetime of their spouses, were the questions most productive of sectarian division. This issue of “mixed marriages” arose in Moravia and Munster, where many Anabaptists, in seeking refuge, had abandoned their spouses, and in central Germany among the Anabaptist heirs of Müntzer. In the Netherlands in the last years of the sixteenth century, when the Mennonites splintered into a half-dozen groups, the divisions began over the subject of marital avoidance. Quarrels over the ban and marriage required no theological acumen. Like the controversies over the proper form of community of goods that divided Anabaptists in Moravia, they fully involved ordinary Anabaptists as well as aspiring leaders.” (Stayer 34)
   5. “The social composition of Swiss-south German Anabaptism has been studied more carefully than that of Dutch-north German Anabaptism. The Anabaptism of the southern sects was a religion of commoners, including only 2 percent who were of aristocratic birth or who had higher education. The majority of Swiss-south German Anabaptists were peasants, although their leaders tended to be craftsmen, particularly after the persecutions of the late 1520s killed so many educated leaders. At first, in the 1520s, 40 percent of Swiss-south German Anabaptists of known residence lived in cities, the rest in the small towns, villages, and farms from which the Peasants’ War rebels came. But Anabaptism was more rapidly suppressed in the cities than in the countryside, so that in the later sixteenth century only one in twelve Swiss-south German Anabaptists was a town dweller. The limited studies of north German-Dutch Anabaptism suggest that townspeople were proportionately more numerous than in the south. It was above all a religion of craftsmen, although urban patricians joined the Anabaptists, not only in Munster but in the cities of the Netherlands. Joris was especially successful in attracting aristocratic supporters. The wave of apocalyptic fright that spread Anabaptism in the Netherlands in 1534 apparently affected all classes, while the social polarization created by the Peasants’ War in 1525 hardened the south German elites against popular initiatives in religion.” (Stayer 34)
   6. “Because of their defiance of governmental control over religion, their real and imagined connection with the Peasants’ War, and their insurrectionary militance in Munster and the Netherlands (1534-1535), the Anabaptists were severely persecuted. Catholic governments, such as the Habsburgs in the Netherlands and in the Tirol and the Bavarian [34] dukes, were particularly brutal, while many Protestant rulers evaded the imperial mandate of Speyer of 1529, which, with their agreement, had made Anabaptism a crime punishable by death. But Zwinglian Zurich and Bern and Lutheran Saxony have prominent Anabaptist martyrs to their account; Zwingli and Melanchthon showed particular enthusiasm for using the executioner to silence nonconformists. The Dutch Mennonites compiled martyrologies, *Het Offer des Heeren* and the subsequent *Martyrs’ Mirror*, which embedded memories of persecution at the center of their piety.” (Stayer 34-35)
   7. “Claus-Peter Clasen has raised the question of actual numbers: he has been able to document 845 certain and probable executions of Anabaptists in Switzerland, south and central Germany, and Austria in the period between 1525 and the Thirty Years’ War [1618-48], and he concedes the possibility of two or three hundred additional executions. Estimates by twentieth-century Dutch scholars of the number of Anabaptist martyrs in the Netherlands vary from about fifteen hundred (Samuel Cramer and W. J. Kuhler) to at least twenty-five hundred (N. van der Zijpp). More recently Alastair Duke writes that up to the beginning of the Revolt of the Netherlands the total number of executed heretics in the Netherlands, including Calvinists, “exceeded 1300.” In the *Mennonite Encyclopedia* in the 1950s Paul Schowalter made what was for that time a restrained estimate when he guessed that the number of Anabaptist martyrs “would probably exceed rather than fall below 4,000.” The more recent studies of Clasen and Duke suggest that that figure may be too high.” (Stayer 35)
   8. “Pursuing his quantitative research, Clasen concluded that the sixteenth-century Anabaptists were numerically insignificant, and therefore insignificant historically. He identified 12,522 Anabaptists in Switzerland, south and central Germany and Austria between 1525 and 1618, conceding that the aggregate number may have been as high as thirty thousand—still insignificant. It can be retorted that he studied the wrong regions. Anabaptism, to be sure, began in the Swiss-south German area, but it was severely reduced in those regions (despite the importance of the Swiss remnant in the Pennsylvania German settlements in America). Eighty percent of the Anabaptist executions that Clasen documented in his area of study occurred before the beginning of 1534;after that the flames of persecution ebbed because their tinder was exhausted. Thereafter Anabaptism continued predominantly in the refugee communities of Moravia and in north Germany and the Netherlands. At the end of the sixteenth century Anabaptists constituted about 10 percent of the population of southeastern Moravia and a similar percentage of the population of the Dutch Republic, roughly as numerous as the officially favored and politically influential Calvinists. According to Alastair Duke they outnumbered the Reformed in some parts of the Netherlands (for instance, Frisia, where another estimate puts them at one-quarter of the population). While not as prominent in the German Reformation as in the seventeenth-century struggles in England, Protestant nonconformity was not numerically insignificant in sixteenth-century central Europe.” (Stayer 35)
   9. “There are measures of significance other than numbers of adherents. The Anabaptists give us a window on the popular experience of the Reformation, because theirs was a movement initiated by ordinary laity free of the direction of clerical, political, and university elites. The court interrogations that constitute much of the Anabaptist source materials are what Arnold Snyder calls “oral deposits”—a sort of oral history of the Reformation of the common people of town and village. Even these sources under-represent the role that women must have played in sixteenth-century Anabaptism. Beyond more attention to prominent Anabaptist women such as Anna Jansz or Hille Feiken and more ingenious quantitative research, some of the history of Anabaptist women is no doubt irrecoverable, if one maintains the distinction between historical writing and fiction. But sixteenth-century Anabaptism as revealed in the sources gives the purest expression of the popular anticlericalism that animated the Reformation as a whole. Anabaptism preserved the radicalism of the early Reformation after it began to ebb in the established Lutheran and Reformed church­es.” (Stayer 35)
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# Protestantism in England, 1534-1900

## Anglicanism

1. **history to the Elizabethan settlement**
   1. Pre-Reformation unrest
      1. The Lollards had been suppressed, but their spirit survived. “There were other religious associations also, such as the “Christian brethren” or “known men.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 63)
      2. “In addition, the Renaissance humanist tradition was strong.” E.g., John Colet, Thomas More, and Erasmus. (Dillenberger and Welch 63)
      3. “The suppression by the papacy of some of the English monasteries (a practice later adopted by Henry VIII on a much wider scale and also mainly for financial reasons), with the revenue from sale of the properties going to Rome, raised the ire of many English . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 63)
      4. “The assignment of Italian priests, many of whom were unable to speak English, was a further source of offense.” (Dillenberger and Welch 63)
   2. Henry VIII
      1. annulment
         1. 1527: Henry announces his desire to divorce Catherine of Aragón and marry Anne of Boleyn.
         2. “. . . the papacy [refuses] to annul the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon,” his first wife. (Dillenberger and Welch 63)
         3. Henry’s six wives were
            1. Catherine of Aragon (mother of the future queen Mary I)
            2. Anne Boleyn (mother of the future queen Elizabeth I)
            3. Jane Seymour (mother of Henry’s successor, Edward VI)
            4. Anne of Cleves
            5. Catherine Howard
            6. Catherine Parr. (“Henry VIII.” *Encyclopædia Britannica 2002 Deluxe Edition CD-ROM*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 2002.)
         4. “ Although the papacy had waived canon law to permit Henry to marry the widow of his brother, it was unwilling to annul the marriage, primarily because [63] of the risk of finally alienating the Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain, Charles V (nephew of Catherine), upon whose good will the papacy had to depend at this time.” (Dillenberger and Welch 63-64)
         5. “. . . severe civil strife had been occasioned in an earlier time by lack of a male descendant . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
      2. schismatic acts
         1. “Having deposed Cardinal Wolsey, he [Henry VIII] forbade appeals to Rome without the King’s consent, and required through Parliamentary act that the clergy continue to function despite possible papal excommunication.” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
         2. “In Thomas Cranmer, who had been sympathetic to the annulment and had suggested a university rather than canon law decision, the King found a ready Archbishop of Canterbury who might be the primate of all England.” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
         3. “The Act of Supremacy (1534) declared: “The King’s majesty justly and rightly is and ought to be and shall be reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England called “*Anglicana Ecclesia*.” [*sic*] Nevertheless, he was not a priest. He appointed, but could not consecrate, bishops; he could defend the faith, but he could not declare dogma. But he was head of a new national church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
      3. doctrine under Henry
         1. “The Ten Articles of Religion of 1536 made reference to the authority of the Bible and justification by faith, but made these no more central than in the medieval church generally.” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
         2. “He insisted on a Bible in every parish, with a chapter to be read each Sunday.” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
         3. “In fact, Henry himself approved of
            1. the use of images,
            2. invocations to the departed saints,
            3. the concept of purgatory
            4. and masses for those who still sojourned there,
            5. transubstantiation
            6. together with communion in one element only,
            7. celibacy for the clergy,
            8. private masses,
            9. and auricular confessions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
         4. Nevertheless, “Henry destroyed images, turned into revenue those made of precious materials, and confiscated the properties of the monasteries . . . turning these assets to the advantage of the national treasury.” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
   3. Edward VI
      1. Edward VI was the “only son of Henry VIII. Edward was still a young boy at the time of his accession (1547) . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
      2. The influence of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, “reached its height in the reign of Edward . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 64)
      3. Many Continental reformers “found refuge in England. Among these were Martin Bucer, the Strasbourg reformer, and Peter Martyr, one of the early Lutheran theologians.” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      4. “Rome was declared wrong in faith,
         1. transubstantiation was decisively rejected,
         2. marriage of the clergy was permitted,
         3. auricular confession was abolished,
         4. and communion was administered to the people with both bread and wine. But . . .
         5. the episcopacy was accepted without question and pains were taken to guarantee adequate succession.” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      5. “Edward, always in poor health, died after only six years on the throne and was succeeded by his older sister Mary . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
   4. Mary (Mary Tudor, Mary I)
      1. Mary was “the first queen to rule England [1553-1558] in her own right. She was known as Bloody Mary for her persecution of Protestants . . .” (“Mary I.” *Encyclopædia Britannica 2002 Deluxe Edition CD-ROM*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 2002.)
      2. Mary was “the Roman Catholic daughter of Henry’s first wife [Catherine of Aragon].” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      3. “It was only natural that policy should be reversed. Many who leaned toward the continental reforms, including Cranmer, were burned at the stake.” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      4. “But after five years, Mary died and was followed by Elizabeth . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
2. **Elizabethan settlement**
   1. Elizabeth I
      1. Elizabeth was the daughter of Henry and Anne Boleyn. She reigned for 45 years. (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      2. “Her motivations were undoubtedly colored as much by the desire for order and peace in the church as a way to political stability as by definite religious convictions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      3. “While holding a firm grip, Elizabeth [took] the title of “supreme governor” rather than “supreme head” of the Church of England.” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      4. “She decided against Roman Catholicism and for a broad Protestantism . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
      5. “The Elizabethan settlement [67] . . . was a broad Catholicism, qualified by inclusion of Central Reformation concerns. The settlement was formalized by the Act of Supremacy, which reaffirmed the place of the Crown in matters of state and church against all foreign pressures, and the Act of Uniformity, which assured uniformity of worship and practice.” (Dillenberger and Welch 67-68)
      6. Two principal works of Elizabeth’s reign were the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the *Book of Common Prayer.*
   2. the *Thirty-Nine Articles*
      1. its doctrines
         1. The sufficiency of Scripture for salvation and the authority of the church are equally stressed. The church has the duty of settling both ceremonial matters and controversies in faith, though in no case dare it decide upon a course contrary to [65] God’s Word. The church, therefore, has a responsibility for the Bible and its proper interpretation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 65-66)
         2. “The papacy, purgatory, indulgences, and the veneration of the images and relics are rejected as unwarranted by Scripture . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
         3. “. . . justification by faith is affirmed as against works, and the concept of single predestination is affirmed . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
         4. “. . . transubstantiation is rejected, but the real presence of the body of Christ “after an heavenly and spiritual manner” is affirmed.” (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
         5. “The church is defined (as also by the continental reformers) as an institution in which the Word is properly preached and the sacraments rightly administered.” (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
      2. its authority
         1. “. . . the Thirty-nine Articles . . . were accepted primarily as a guide rather than as a binding rule of faith [65] . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 65)
         2. “Anglicanism has no doctrinal tests, and the Articles are viewed as but the setting forth of minimal aspects of the faith for the sake of direction in a period of history when foundations had to be laid.” (Dillenberger and Welch 65-66)
         3. “The Nicene Creed and Apostles’ Creed, which are affirmed in the Articles, are considered more truly normative. But even these are not thought of as complete and exclusive dogmatic statements. Rather they are accepted as precise and concise summaries of the broad dimensions of biblical faith, more adequately understood in intention through recitation or song than in exegesis or analysis.” (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
         4. There was “enforced subscription to the Articles by clergy in the time of Elizabeth,” but as John Bramhall said, “We do not suffer any man ‘to reject’ the Thirty-nine articles of the Church of England ‘at his pleasure’; yet neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving faith . . . [They are] pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity. Neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.” [John Bramhall, *Schism Guarded*, in More and Cross, *Anglicanism* (London, 1935) 186.] (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
         5. Nevertheless, “the Articles are included in the Prayer Book and have been revised from time to time . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
      3. its current status
         1. “The revised Book of Common Prayer for the Episcopal Church in the United States, approved in 1979, includes the Thirty-nine Articles among Historical Documents of the Church, along with a section from the Council of Chalcedon on the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, the Creed of Saint Athanasius, the Preface to the First Book of Common Prayer of 1549, [and] statements adopted [66] by the House of Bishops in connection with the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888 . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 66-67)
   3. the *Book of Common Prayer*
      1. In Elizabeth’s time, “Only in worship did uniformity appear essential . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 66)
      2. “The Prayer Book contains prayers and liturgical forms dating from the early history of the church [but] reflects an unmistakable biblical basis. . . . No single religious idea is singled out for emphasis.” (Dillenberger and Welch 67)
   4. reunion with Rome
      1. The 1979 Lambeth Conference dealt “with the basis upon which reunion of the churches would be possible.” (Dillenberger and Welch 67)
      2. It reiterated four bases for reunion that had been proposed at the 1888 Lambeth Conference. These four bases became known as the “Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.” (Guthrie 30)
         1. “The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as ‘containing all things necessary to salvation,’ and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith;
         2. “The Apostles’ Creed, as the Baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith;
         3. “The two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ’s words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him;
         4. “The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.” (Qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 67)
      3. “Hence, even in this 1979 collection of statements, the aim is to provide necessary benchmarks, but not to define them too scrupulously.” (Dillenberger and Welch 67)
3. **later developments**
   1. “The challenge of Puritanism, beginning during Elizabeth’s time, led Anglican thinkers to” justify their beliefs. (Dillenberger and Welch 68)
   2. Richard Hooker (d. 1600), *Ecclesiastical Polity*
      1. The Puritans (Cartwright and his followers) found no justification for the episcopacy in the Bible. Hooker wrote to defend it. “Unlike the Puritans, he did not rest his case upon the New Testament alone. Tradition and reason, too, were criteria for the church . . . For over fifteen hundred years, argued Hooker, episcopacy had been the dominant form of church government. Moreover, it was reasonable. It made for decent and proper order in the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 68)
      2. “Hooker’s concept of law and reason drew much from the medieval tradition, particularly Aquinas. The nature of God, the structure of the world, and the order of the church formed part of a single whole [68] in which the church completed and fulfilled the natural order. Continuity, rather than discontinuity, marked the relation of God and the world. But Hooker’s view of redemption in relation to the church was nearer to that of the Reformation . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 68-69)
   3. the Caroline divines (1600s)
      1. The Caroline divines were “Lancelot Andrewes, Thomas Barlow, William Beveridge, John Bramhall, Gilbert Burnet, William Laud, Robert Sanderson, Jeremy Taylor, John Wilkins, and John Woolton.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69)
      2. “These leaders considered themselves neither merely Protestant nor Roman Catholic, but those who held the “Middle Way,” as John Donne expressed it, or those who held “the mean between two extremes,” as Sanderson put it.” They saw Anglicanism as “Protestant and Reformed according to the Ancient Catholic Church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69)
      3. “They denied the authority of Rome because they considered it tyrannical, and the emphasis on the Bible of the Puritans because they considered it bibliolatry and an offense against reason. Hence, like Hooker, they insisted upon scripture, tradition, and reason.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69)
      4. “. . . a studied *via media* . . . meant an emphasis upon the early fathers . . . Aquinas was quoted extensively and when stripped of the distinctively Roman aspects, he was considered more congenial than Luther or Calvin. But the reformers, too, were quoted.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69)
      5. “If they did not usually push any religious affirmation to its logical conclusion or always relate it successfully to others, this was [because] the life of the church was more important than great emphasis upon one religious concept.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69)
   4. “In the civil strife of the mid-seventeenth century, the whole concept of the English church was threatened, though the restoration of the monarchy safely reestablished Anglicanism with greater strength than ever. This reestablishment was only slightly modified in the revolution of 1688 by the granting of greater privileges for dissenters.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69)
   5. Latitudinarians
      1. “The security of the restoration brought problems of its own, and [69] first with the rise of the Latitudinarians.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69-70)
      2. “The term *Latitudinarian* was a nickname for theological liberals who emphasized tolerance and the primary role of reason in the theological enterprise. . . . in fact, the religion of the Bible could be defended by appeal to reason.” (Dillenberger and Welch 69-70)
      3. “. . . the Latitudinarians sought to relate the new [scientific] knowledge to Christian faith by appeal to a common rational framework.” (Dillenberger and Welch 70)
      4. “They were among the first to advocate a genuine toleration . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 70)
      5. Latitudinarianism was followed by “the later more extreme accent upon the “reasonableness of religion,” as presented by Locke . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 70)
      6. “By the second decade of the eighteenth century, the stress upon reason had made such inroads into Anglicanism that the Christian evangelical witness had all but disappeared. . . . men such as Stillingfleet and Tillotson reflected scarcely any of the evangelical outlook of the New Testament with its offer of mercy to sinful people.” (Dillenberger and Welch 70)
   6. reactions to Latitudinarianism
      1. “Thus, the eighteenth century saw the rise of the Wesleyan Movement as an attempt to recapture for the English church the living experience of redemption from sin (see Ch. VI).” (Dillenberger and Welch 70)
      2. “And in the nineteenth century, the Oxford Movement sought to recall the church to its Catholic heritage . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 70)
   7. concluding comments
      1. “In sum, Anglicanism . . . surmounted the crises of Reformation influences in its battles with Puritanism, and of Roman claims in connection with the Oxford Movement. It lost much of its vitality in the Latitudinarian Movement, but managed under pressure to regain it. For many, these three instances” demonstrate its vitality. (Dillenberger and Welch 70)
      2. Anglicanism believes that it “antedates the Reformation and preserves the significant elements in the life of the church since its inception. It claims, too, that in England the church was under the rule of Rome for a shorter period of time than on the Continent and that it stands, therefore, for the genuine tradition in contrast both to the Roman church, which distorted the tradition, and to the Protestants, who too rashly broke it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 71)
      3. “For Anglicanism, the episcopal succession is the symbol and guarantee of the continuity of the faith in the life of the church. Anglicans differ as to whether the continuity is to be considered a continuity of the gospel symbolized by the line of bishops, or whether the succession of bishops is itself the continuity (through the laying on of hands since the time of the Apostles). The difference between the two ways of viewing succession is enormous.” (Dillenberger and Welch 71)
      4. “Anglicanism belongs to the history of the Reformation and to the history of Protestantism. [But most] consider themselves Protestant in respect to continual *re*-formation and Catholic in the sense of the tradition and continuity of the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 71)
      5. It is best “to leave the question of whether Anglicanism is Protestant to the self-understanding of each Anglican, though for most Anglicans, the question is neither relevant nor vital.” (Dillenberger and Welch 71)

## Six Articles

1. **introduction**
   1. 1530s: “The Ten Articles (1536) and the Bishops’ Book (1537) had been more radical formularies of faith, designed in part to appease the German Protestants at a time when Henry VIII feared a joint invasion by King Francis I of France and the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V.” (Redworth 4: 65)
   2. 1538: “Henry was edging away from the radical policies of the 1530s for two main reasons.” (Redworth 4: 65)
      1. “First, in 1538-1539 England genuinely feared an invasion by the Catholic powers of Europe, and the English coast was fortified in preparation. Henry clearly felt that he needed to display his orthodoxy.” (Redworth 4: 65)
      2. “Second, it seems that the king was concerned by the growth of radical religion in London and especially in his Continental toehold of Calais.” (Redworth 4: 65)
      3. The Act reveals “just how much the dynamics of the Henrician Reformation depended on events abroad.” (Redworth 4: 65)
   3. 1539: the Act of Six Articles
      1. The Act “marked an end to the doctrinal innovations of the 1530s.” (Redworth 4: 65)
      2. It “defined in thoroughly orthodox terms the essential doctrine of the Church of England.” (Redworth 4: 65)
2. **1538**: **events**
   1. September 1538: Henry VIII’s “refusal to concede over the matters of Communion in both kinds, private masses, and priestly marriage had been the principal reason why . . . talks with representatives of the German Protestants had broken down in London.” (Redworth 4: 65)
   2. November 1538: “a royal proclamation . . . demanded the greatest possible reverence for the sacrament of the Eucharist, and John Lambert, a sacramentarian, had been burned after a show-trial presided over by Henry himself.” (Redworth 4: 65) (“Sacramentarian”: one who believed in Jesus’ symbolic presence in the Eucharist only.)
   3. “. . . the substance of the [Act of Six Articles had already become] government policy” (Redworth 4: 65)
3. **summer 1539**: **contents of the Act of Six Articles**
   1. Death is “the automatic punishment for denial of transubstantiation . . .” (Redworth 4: 65)
   2. Death “might also be inflicted on those who denied
      1. “that God’s law required
         1. “Communion in both kinds,
         2. “clerical celibacy,
         3. “vows of chastity, and
         4. “private masses,
      2. “or that auricular confession was desirable.” (Redworth 4: 65)
4. **summer 1539**: **Parliament’s passage of the Act of Six Articles**
   1. “. . . the king had signaled at the beginning of the session his intention to introduce an act of religious conformity.” (Redworth 4: 65)
   2. Using his royal supremacy, Henry VIII “requested the Act of Six Articles.” (Jones 1.4)
   3. 16 May 1539: a speech by Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, “outlined the six topics” later included in the Act. (Redworth 4: 65)
   4. Two “conservatives at court, . . . Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, and Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, . . . promoted the bill as a means of putting political pressure on the reformist Thomas Cromwell (Baron Cromwell of Wimbledon and later earl of Essex) and the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer.” (Redworth 4: 65)
      1. “The bill was clearly a rebuff for Archbishop Cranmer. Many of his friends were caught by the act, and two bishops resigned on account of it.” (Redworth 4: 65)
   5. The Act reveals “the personal involvement of Henry VIII in the formulation of religious policy . . . Henry’s personal involvement with the passage of the act can be seen in the many emendations he made to drafts of the bill.” (Redworth 4: 65)
   6. “The act became the legal authority for many searches in London and other parts of the country, including the royal court. On account of its ferocity it soon became known as the “whip with six strings.”” (Redworth 4: 65)
5. **aftermath**
   1. 1544: “parliamentary pressure led to arrests under the act being made harder; prior indictment by a grand jury was required, along with other safeguards.” (Redworth 4: 65)
   2. 1547: Edward VI’s first Parliament “overturned the Act of Six Articles and abolished the heresy laws.” (Jones 1.4)
   3. “The act became the prototype for England’s religious Acts of Uniformity in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth I.” (Redworth 4: 65)

Pg. 66 was not included in the original scan of this article.

## Anglican Worship

1. **definition**
   1. “These acts represent the successive efforts of Edward VI and Elizabeth I to impose a standardized form of Protestant worship on the Church of England. Each incorporated a prayer book, and each re­quired the entire realm to use it in worship.” (Jones 1.4)
   2. “Legally [they] rested on the royal supremacy . . .” (Jones 1.4)
2. **c**. **1549**: **First Act of Uniformity**
   1. The First Act of Uniformity was passed by Parliament.
   2. c. 1549: during Edward VI’s second Parliament, “. . . Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset—acting as the king’s regent—requested it establish the first *Book of Com­mon Prayer*, written by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, as the single, Protestant form of worship.” (Jones 1.4)
   3. “The bill [made] the prayer book statutory, giving Parliament the right to amend it and establishing Parlia­ment’s right to determine, with the king, the form of English religion. This limitation on the royal supremacy became im­mediately obvious when the denial of transubstantiation contained in the bill was muddled by amendments.” (Jones 1.4)
   4. “The introduction of a Protestant service caused some dis­turbance among conservatives—as, for example, during the Prayer Book Revolt of 1549 in the West Country . . .” (Jones 1.4)
   5. “. . . some Protestants were unhappy with it, too. Though Protestant, it incorporated many Catholic elements, such as the com­memoration of the saints and the Virgin Mary.” (Jones 1.4)
   6. “Conse­quently, a reform of the first prayer book was prepared, aligning its theology more clearly with Swiss Protestantism.” (Jones 1.4)
3. **1552**: **Second Act of Uniformity**
   1. “The act . . . made statutory the Ordinal of 1550.” (“Ordinal”: “a directory of ecclesiastical services”; “a book containing the forms for the ordination of priests, consecration of bishops, etc.” *Random House Unabridged Dictionary* 2006.) (Jones 1.4)
   2. “The act . . . made statutory the . . . second *Book of Common Prayer* . . .” (Jones 1.4)
   3. Failure to abide by the second *Book of Common Prayer* “was defended by the act’s penal provisions, which culminated in life imprisonment.” (Jones 1.4)
4. **1553**: **Queen Mary**
   1. “When Mary Tudor came to the throne in 1553, she repealed the uniformity, declaring all English churches free to use any service legal when Henry VIII died.” (Jones 1.4)
5. **1559**: **Third Act of Uniformity**
   1. Nov. 1558: Elizabeth I becomes queen. She “began return­ing England to Protestantism.” (Jones 1.4)
   2. 1559: “A bill for a uniform order of service was introduced in the second week of her first Par­liament. It had a stormy passage because of Catholic op­position, passing by only three votes in the House of Lords.” (Jones 1.4)
   3. “This new Act of Uniformity [did not reinstate] the Ordinal of 1550 . . .” (Jones 1.4)
   4. It “reinstated the 1552 prayer book . . .” (Jones 1.4)
   5. “Most importantly, it combined the words of insti­tution from the 1549 and 1552 books, seeming to embrace both memorialist and real presence theologies.” (Jones 1.4)
   6. “It imposed the Ornaments Rubric that required the decor of churches and the dress of ministers to be those used in the second year of Edward VI’s reign.” (Jones 1.4)
   7. “The act reserved to the monarch the right to change rites and ceremonies for the edification of the people.” (Jones 1.4)
6. **present-day Anglican worship**
   1. “Although minor alterations were made in later centuries, the act of 1559 permanently determined the form of Anglican worship.” (Jones 1.4)

## Admonition Controversy

1. **definition**
   1. “Admonition controversy” is “A catchall term for the first large-scale debate about the government of the church in post-Reformation England . . .” (Lake 1.7)
   2. It “took its name from *An Admonition to the Parliament* . . .” (Lake 1.7)
2. **1572**: **assertion of Puritanism** (**Anglican presbyterianism**)
   1. 1572: *An Admonition to the Parliament*, “together with *A View of Popish Abuses*, was published in 1572 by two young Oxford graduates, John Field and Thomas Wilcox.” (Lake 1.7)
   2. “The *Admonition* contained the first full-scale assertion of *iure divino* presbyterianism in print in England.” (Lake 1.7)
      1. “. . . previous Puritan complaint had concerned the ceremonies, liturgy, and *de facto* abuses rather than the formal structure of government of the church.” (Lake 1.7)
      2. So the *Admonition* “This represented a significant escalation in Puritan rhetoric . . .” (Lake 1.7)
      3. “John Whitgift replied . . .” (Lake 1.7)
3. **1572-77**: **John Whitgift and Thomas Cartwright**
   1. Cartwright “had been a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, when Whitgift was master. Whitgift as vicechancellor had expelled him from the Lady Margaret chair of divinity and then from his fellowship, in large part because of lectures on the *Acts of the Apostles*, which had contained a number of proto-presbyterian assertions.” (Lake 1.7)
   2. “John Whitgift replied” to the *Admonition to the Parliament*; Cartwright replied to Whitgift. (Lake 1.7)
   3. “Their extremely acrimonious exchange [was] pursued through a number of replies and counterreplies published in the early 1570s . . . It is this exchange that constitutes the Admonition Controversy proper.” (Lake 1.7)
   4. the arguments
      1. Cartwright argued that “there was a form of government established in scripture that the church was bound to adopt”—presbyterianism. (Lake 1.7)
      2. Whitgift “contended that scripture prescribed no system of government for the church. Church polity and ceremony were matters inherently indifferent and were to be decided by the relevant human authorities; in England that meant the Crown. Episcopacy was praised as the form of church government most similar to and compatible with the monarchy, and the current ceremonial and jurisdictional arrangements of the church were justified in terms of the authority of the Crown and the demands of order, unity, uniformity, and obedience. Whitgift left the positive case for the status quo there and spent a good deal of time lambasting the Puritans as subversives and as potential sectaries and opponents of monarchical authority.” (Lake 1.7)
      3. “Doctrinally the two men had much in common, and they spent a good deal of their time manipulating the same polemical bugbears of popery and Anabaptism against one another.” (Lake 1.7)
   5. 1577: “The controversy petered out in 1577 with the publication of Cartwright’s *The Rest of the Seconde Replie*. This remained unanswered . . .” (Lake 1.7)
4. **1580s-90s**: **presbyterians vs**. **conformists**
   1. “. . . the confrontation between presbyterians and conformists continued through a second round in the 1580s and a final showdown in the early 1590s.” (Lake 1.7)
   2. contestants
      1. “On the Puritan side the fight was continued by the likes of Walter Travers, William Fulke, Lawrence Chaderton, and, less respectably, Martin Marprelate.” (Lake 1.7)
      2. “For the conformists the leading spokesmen were John Bridges and Thomas Cooper and later Richard Bancroft, Matthew Sutcliffe, and, most famously, Richard Hooker.” (Lake 1.7)
   3. arguments
      1. The Puritans “claimed the authority of scripture for the presbyterian platform; the adoption of this platform was said to represent the completion of the reform process, whereby both the doctrine and discipline of the church were to be purged of all popish remnants and reformed according scripture.” (Lake 1.7)
      2. The conformists “Bridges, Bancroft, and Adrianus Saravia” went beyond Whitgift’s argument and “claimed direct scriptural warrant for episcopacy . . .” (Lake 1.7)
      3. Later, “with Richard Hooker, . . . they developed a positive religious rationale for the ritual and ceremonial status quo.” (Lake 1.7)

## Puritanism and Related Movements

1. **Puritanism and related movements**
   1. “*Puritan*”: “The term *Puritan* refers to a particular Protestant outlook expressed in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England and New England. De­nom­in­a­tionally, the Puritans comprised primarily Presbyterian, Congre­gational, and Baptist groups. From a religious viewpoint, most of them represented a vital Calvinist tradition.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 91)
   2. “When one reads Puritan writings, one catches . . . the strong experiential quality of Puritan thinking.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 103)
   3. biblical foundations
      1. “For the Puritans, the Elizabethan settlement appeared as a halfway house between Rome and Geneva. The appeal to tradition, church authority, and reason obscured the only proper basis for the life of church and society alike. . . . [The Bible] provided an adequate criterion for all problems.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 91)
      2. “. . . God is in control of everything and predestines some to salvation and others to damnation.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 92)
      3. “. . . the Bible was a document that reflected the organization of the early Christian community. . . . Church order expressed faith and therefore no supplemental criteria, such as reason or tradition, could be used.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 92)
   4. election and faith
      1. “Like Calvinists generally, Puritans believed [in] the determi­nation of all things by God. . . . Even sin could not be excluded from God’s providential activity, though God was not held accountable for it. The guilt for sin was ours because of the Fall.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 92)
      2. “Although God controlled every­thing, God was not a tyrant. [92] . . . the God of majesty had already been revealed as merciful. . . . (As we saw, this had been the original basis for the declaration of God’s predestining activity.)” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 92-93)
      3. “Sometimes . . . with St. Augustine they stated that since no one deserved to be saved, there was no injustice in the election of some. At their best they insisted that the mystery of God would eventually be disclosed, but in the meantime one must simply accept it.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 93)
      4. “To be called by God was serious and demanded the redoubling of one’s activities. . . . [Though] God justified through faith, Puritans went on to assert that justification was but the first stage, followed by sanctification, or the new life in Christ.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 93)
      5. “As a result, many Puritans believed that the activity of Christians in the world was a mark of their election, a sign to themselves and to others that they were among God’s chosen. . . . “By their fruits you shall know them.” only in such activity could one gain reasonable certainty that one was not deluded in one’s faith. Necessary as justification was, it alone did not give assurance of one’s election. The believer’s experience of justification must be followed by actual holiness. (It was the fear that one might not really be among the righteous which sometimes manifested itself in self-righteousness.)” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 93)
      6. “. . . the outward was a sign of the inward. Could one be sure where one stood, particularly [93] when some unbelievers did so well? The result of such questioning was only a more resolute attempt to live one’s life as if only God mattered and as if one could not do enough in the world under God’s rule. Thus predestination, which was such a comfort to Luther, became the most baffling problem for the individual Puritan. . . . one is never certain whether the signs which appear are clear enough.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 93-94)
      7. “The anxiety caused by this problem was eased in a later stage of Puritanism through the notion that one could not lose one’s election. This did not mean that one could do as one pleased . . . This was a way of saying that God had an unending concern for humankind and that we need not be so preoccupied with ourselves. The impossibility of losing one’s election should have been asserted when the faith was vigorous. It was actually suggested when Puritanism had lost much of its vitality.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 94)
      8. “Inactivity was a sure sign that one was not a believer, no matter what one’s profession of faith. This is why the Puritans spoke of the warfare of life. . . . As long as one strove under God, there was some hope that one might be among the elect.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 94)
      9. “But could one, indeed must one, not do some­thing to lay oneself open to the possibility of faith . . .? Both in England and New England, a group of individuals began to emphasize the prepara­tion of the heart, citing passages of Scripture, such as I Samuel 7:3; Job 11:13,15; Psalm 10:17; Proverbs 16:1,9; or Luke 12:40. . . . While not all Puritan divines—William Perkins, William Ames, Rich­ard Sibbes, Thomas Hooker, Peter Bulkeley, to name but five—agreed on the steps one needed to take, there is a morphology of the conversion [94] process, involving the debasement of the self in light of God’s com­mandments, the desire for God’s grace, the emergence of strivings of the heart which need to be tested to see if they may be of God, absolute assurance being impossible. Hence, the process was endless, for the discipline of examination, utilizing sermons, meditation, intro­spection, was essential both before and in the situation of faith. The mere statement that one was a believer was not enough. One needed to be able to give an account of one’s faith, one’s conversion, and its fruits. In early New England, a conversion narrative was considered essential to full participation in the life of the church, from sacraments to voting rights . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 94-95)
      10. “. . . the covenant idea was congenial to the Puritans. But the concept was ambiguous, for it could be used by those who wished to accent God’s initiative in electing a special people or by those who felt it necessary to assess the mutual obligations of God and humankind. . . . While the Puritan idea of covenant was a way of maintaining great stress upon the will and responsibility of individuals without abandon­ing an equal stress upon the controlling and determining activity of God, it did not solve the problem of their relation.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 95)
      11. “. . . if baptism, in analogy with circumcision in the Old Testament, was the seal and sign of the covenant in the New Testament, infants were already a part of the new order of things. Hence, infant baptism . . . represented a context God had prepared . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 95)
   5. ordering all under God
      1. “. . . the covenant, expressed in the Bible . . . involved a holy community [95] . . . dedicated to doing all things in accord with God’s will and for God’s glory.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 95-96)
      2. “. . . everything is to be understood and ordered from the standpoint of the divine. This may be the aim of most Chris­tians; but never before or after Puritanism has it been so consciously or self-consciously expressed. . . . This dominant Puritan concern led to a high degree of sobriety and somberness toward life.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96)
      3. The “end was not too far away, for their reading of Scripture told them that they lived in the last times.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96)
      4. “Card playing was denounced not merely because it seemed to foster gambling, but primarily because it was a frivolous activity.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96)
      5. “The same could be said of the theater, though here it was also felt outright immorality was exhibited.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96)
      6. “Puritans read good literature, classical and secular as well as religious. Many were outstanding scholars . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96)
      7. Many were “people of culture, enjoying good clothing, good food, good wine, and exquisite china and furniture, the visual arts alone having dropped out of their lives.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96)
      8. “. . . the imbibing of wine (the teetotal­ism of a later generation should not be blamed on the Puritans) and dancing were accepted . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96)
      9. “. . . this outlook was conducive to the utmost thrift [96] and industry. . . . When thrift was coupled with the zealous activity of Christians who saw in diligent performance of their work a service of God, and in success perhaps a sign of election, a combination was produced which could powerfully affect the economic developments of the age. Many Puritans belonged to the rising business class . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 96-97)
      10. “The relation between Calvinism and the rising capitalist economy has been studied in detail in Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York, 1930), and R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York, 1926).” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 97 n. 1)
      11. “. . . the Puritans naturally hoped to organize all social and political life along Christian patterns. For this, Geneva remained a model.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 97)
      12. “. . . the Puritans’ faith led them to challenge tyranny and abuse of power, whether in state or church. . . . With this sense of responsibility to God alone, Puritans provided the spiritual foundation for a democratic society. [Yet] many Puritans were so interested in establishing a society which reflected God from top to bottom that they did not see this implication of their faith . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 97)
   6. church order
      1. Anglicans viewed the church “as part of the ongoing charac­ter of God’s incarnation with historical and theological significance alongside of, though based upon, the Bible. Most Anglicans did not rest the case for bishops entirely upon the Bible, but also upon the dominant tradition of the church and upon its basic reasonableness.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98)
      2. For the Puritans, “It was not enough to say that a church pattern does not contradict the Bible; rather, only that order is permissible when it is specifically founded in the Bible.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98)
      3. The Anglicans felt the Puritans “made the history of the church unimportant. The Puri­tans, on the other hand, insisted that they were returning to the church in its original state.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98)
2. “**major Puritan bodies**” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 97)
   1. “the first major Anglican Puritan group” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99—see below, p. 98)
   2. Presbyterian Puritans
      1. “. . . the largest body of Puritan dissent­ers . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      2. “In England, after the first major Anglican Puritan group, came the Presbyterians led by the Cambridge professor Thomas Cartwright.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98)
      3. “This group believed that the Genevan experiment and the Presbyterian pattern in Scotland represented the New Testament con­cept of the church. But the aim was not severance from the established Church of England. Rather, that church was to be purified [of] the remnants of Roman corruption.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98)
      4. “The Puritan Presbyterians called upon Parliament . . . if neither Queen nor bishops were ready to reform, then Parlia­ment should. But the Queen insisted on keeping the religious settle­ment . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98)
      5. “They organized groups of ministers who met together to study [the Bible, though] the Queen insisted on the suppression of those groups . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98)
      6. “Ministers of Presbyterian­ [98] per­suasion were ordained to episcopal orders, but would not accept a congregation without its express approval. They called them­selves pastors rather than priests . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 98-99)
   3. Congrega­tionalists
      1. Or “Independents.” They were “Closest to the Presbyterians . . .” [99] (But: “the Congregationalists . . . emerged out of the Sep­ar­a­tist tradition.” [100]) (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99-100)
      2. Like the Presbyterians, they “wanted to purify the church without separating from it.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      3. But they emphasized “the local church as an independent body of believers, subject neither to a presbyterian nor episcopal system.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
   4. Separatists
      1. These also saw “the local church as an independent body of believers . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      2. But “The church was not a church of the land or nation, including all who are born into it. It was truly the community of believers who entered into a covenant on the basis of their profession of faith.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      3. Thus, church matters “could not be dictated by magistrates”: the “Presbyterians . . . [wrongly, the Separatists said] tarried for the magistrates to undertake reformation.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      4. Therefore, “no good could come out of staying in the Church of England . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      5. “Their outlook was ex­pressed in a tract by Robert Browne entitled “A Treatise of Reformation Without Tarrying for Any.”” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
   5. Congregationalists’ and Separatists’ church order (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      1. “. . . they were mainly in agreement. Profession of faith was the *sine qua non* for church membership.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      2. “No accident of birth sufficed; not even one’s own decision. The church was based on a covenant of believers, dedicated to making sure that the church expressed the spirit of its Lord. Hence, entrance into such a com­munity required the approval of the other covenanted members.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      3. “Hence the term *Congregationalists*—those who believed [there is] no such thing as a combination of churches forming the church. The church is always a concrete community . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 99)
      4. “Since the church was the local church and it was the believers who made the decisions, there was a tendency toward democracy in the congregations. But responsibility was still heavily focused on an edu­cated clergy. . . . all believers were on an equal footing, [but] particular responsibilities [were] in the hands of a selected number.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
      5. However, “although this pattern might be in accord with the spirit of the Bible, it could not be found directly in Scripture.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
   6. Baptists
      1. “. . . Baptist churches also emerged out of the Separatist tradition.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
      2. “The first Baptist church was probably organized by John Smyth while in exile from England in Holland. This group migrated back to England under Thomas Helwys, a fol­lower of Smyth. In spite of certain religious affinities and some possible direct relation with the Anabaptists in Holland, the Baptist movement was nourished primarily by the Separatist tradition in the English scene.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
      3. “Generally, Baptists, in contrast to Congregationalists, were non-Cal­vinistic Puritans (though there were some Calvinistic Baptists, known as Particular Baptists).” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
         1. “They preferred to steer a course between the concepts of free will and predestination, but were not interested in working out how this could be accomplished. Their strength did not lie in theological astuteness.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
      4. They believed in “believers’ baptism” . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
      5. “Like the Congregationalists, they believed that the church was a cove­nanted community in which all were on an equal footing . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
      6. “Like the Anabaptists, the Baptists [held to] believ­ers’ baptism . . . the church was the community of those who were believers and had made a covenant together . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101)
      7. Some Baptists required minimal educational qualifications of their clergy, but many said “education was wholly irrele­vant to the operation of the Spirit. [They] knew all too well that education has a way of producing class levels [100] . . . Many belonged to the lower economic strata of society and acutely sensed any drift toward social differentiation.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100-101)
      8. Immersion “was not required originally . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101)
      9. “Baptism was not a sacramental means of grace, but an “ordinance” symbolizing a regeneration which had already taken place.” [101] The sacraments were, “as the Westminster Confession of Faith put it, holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace. They thus belonged to those who know and who have experienced grace, who could provide the evidence that they indeed were true believers in thought and in deed. Sacraments thus were a sequel, a condescension to our corporeality in a situation in which religion was fundamentally spiritual.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101, 107)
      10. They believed in “the separation of church and state.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 100)
          1. “Unlike the Anabaptists, the Baptists accommodated themselves to the demands of the state and supported it in the duties of citizenship up to the point where religious liberty was involved.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101)
          2. “Congregationalists, too, were for religious freedom, unhampered by magistrates in any way. But [English Congregationalists] had no other choice, with Anglicans on the one side and Presbyterians on the other, both determined that there must be a national church. For the Baptists, . . . the church was a strictly voluntary association, its very nature was destroyed by any gov­ernmental decisions respecting its life.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101)
          3. Vitality in the church “could only be maintained where the church itself was a “gathered” group of real Christians, as opposed to state churches which sought to include all . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101)
          4. “. . . doctrinal tests violated the rights of those whose consciences under God led to different convictions. Perhaps this principle was partially reinforced by the fact that Baptists did not accept the prevailing Calvinism of Presbyterian and Congregation­alist alike.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101)
      11. Baptists in America
          1. “Roger Williams, who came to New England as a Puritan turning Separatist, [was] banished from the New En­gland Puritan community . . . [He] became a Baptist in conviction and is credited with founding the first Baptist church in the New World in Providence. . . . he established religious toleration in his own area. He, too, believed in a Christian society, but one in which the church influenced the community through the quality of its life and [101] not by means of laws. The separation of church and state . . . did not mean the separation of religion and culture.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 101-102)
          2. Because of “the principle of individual decision in relation to God . . . there can be no imposed liturgy. Prayers express a particular person’s faith and therefore ought to be extemporaneous.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102)
3. **1600s England**
   1. “. . . James of Scotland, king of a Presbyterian stronghold, [was] successor of Elizabeth . . . the Presbyterian clergy sent a restrained petition to the king, calling for the reform of the church but carefully pointing out that they were not schismatics seeking the dissolution of the state church. To their great disappointment, the king decided in favor of the Anglicans.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102)
   2. “A group of Separatists migrated to Holland to escape persecution and to gain freedom, and some of them later sailed to America and founded the Plymouth Colony.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102)
   3. “With the succession to the throne of Charles I and the increasing influence of William Laud, . . . conformity to Anglican practice was demanded, and countless Puritan preachers were deprived of position and not infrequently persecuted.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102)
   4. “. . . many Puritans, most of whom were not Separatists but of Congregationalist leaning, left England and founded the Puritan settlement in Salem, Massa­chusetts.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102)
   5. The “Anglicans sided with the king . . . when he dismissed Parliament in 1629. But when the Long Parliament [102] was convened in 1640, the Presbyterians were in the majority. Laud was cast into prison,” and civil war broke out in 1642. (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102-103)
   6. “Parliament forbade episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 103)
   7. the Westminster Confession (1647)
      1. Parliament called the Westminster Assembly to decide on a church order. Scotland’s help was needed in the war, and Presbyterian divines dominated the assembly. So the Westminster Confession of Faith was strongly Presbyterian. (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 103)
      2. The Westminster Confession “is a concise and formal statement of points to be accepted [but is] devoid of the usual vitality of Puritanism. . . . More than anything else, the Westminster Confession is responsible for later negative attitudes toward Calvinism.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 103)
      3. “The Westminster Confession . . . still holds a prominent place in some segments of the Presbyterian church . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 103)
   8. later developments
      1. “Many Independents or Congregationalists (who had held a congregational understanding of the church combined with a Calvinistic view of the relation of religion to all of life) had not been Separatists but became so under Presbyterian pressure for uniformity. John Milton was convinced that the “new Presbyter is but old Priest writ large” . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 103)
      2. “In the [103] Commonwealth and Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell, who had defeated Charles I, the Pres­byterians were unable to assume control as they had expected. Cromwell himself was an Independent and insisted upon toleration . . . [Yet he] insisted upon some control of church order . . . unfit clergy to the number of over six thousand were deprived of their positions, while . . . the vacancies were filled from among Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 103-104)
      3. Cromwell’s “son Richard had neither the understanding nor forcefulness of his father. Pres­byt­er­ians and Royalists alike longed for the restoration of the monarchy.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 104)
      4. “. . . in the Convention Parliament, which was to work out the details of the recall of Charles II, the Presbyterians had a majority. Their intention was to work out a system which would include Presbyterians and Anglicans in one national church. [But] the king, with the support of the Anglicans, dismissed the Convention Parliament, and the newly elected Cavalier Parliament, composed primarily of Royalists and Anglicans, reestablished Anglicanism more securely than ever.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 104)
      5. “Now Presbyterians shared the lot of Independents and Baptists. In the Act of Uniformity of 1662, episcopal ordination was required and all clergy had to subscribe to the revised Book of Common Prayer. It was a serious offense even to attend a service which was not conducted in accord with the Prayer Book. Now the Puritans were definitely forced out of the Anglican fold into the role of “Protestant” dissenters; and severe penalties were attached to dissent.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 104)
      6. William and Mary “came to the throne [104] partly through Protestant support . . .” The Act of Toleration of 1689 eliminated penalties for dissenters, but “such Protestants had to be trinitarian, and their places of meeting had to be registered. Clergy had to subscribe to the doctrinal, though not liturgical, aspects of the Thirty-nine Articles.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 104-105)
      7. “Not until 1779 was the authority of the Bible substituted for the Thirty-nine Articles . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
      8. And “not until 1813 were nontrinitarians tolerated.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
4. **Puritanism in New England**
   1. Under James I, “A group of Separatists migrated to Holland to escape persecution and to gain freedom, and some of them later sailed to America and founded the Plymouth Colony.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102)
   2. Under Charles I and Bishop Laud, “many Puritans, most of whom were not Separatists but of Congregationalist leaning, left England and founded the Pur­i­tan settlement in Salem, Massa­chusetts.” [102] “Salem was established by Congregational groups . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 102, 105)
   3. “. . . the churches were protected by the Charter which the Puritans had wrung from Charles I before leaving England.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 106)
   4. “Within ten years’ time over twenty thousand men and women came to [Salem], including such distinguished divines as John Cotton, John Davenport, and Richard Mather.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
   5. “The relations between Plymouth and Salem were friendly . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
   6. New England Puritanism was formed more by Salem than by Plymouth. (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
   7. Salem
      1. “The Puritan ideal of ordering all under God was combined with a congregational view of the church.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
      2. “Most of the [Salem] Puritans were non-Separatist Congre­ga­tionalists who had hoped to reform the Church of England from within. They felt that they were doing just this in America. The church was to be made up only of professed believers, covenanted together in local churches, but dominated by the Calvinistic ideal of a society ordered in worship and in all realms of life by a single religious understanding.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
      3. The first generation’s “chief characteristic was its vibrant purity.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
      4. “. . . proclamation of the Word and the rightful adminisration of the sacraments was not an adequate way to characterize the church. In addition, purity of worship and a visible Christian life needed to be guaranteed and tested through one’s own conversion narrative if one was to be fully a member of the church.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 105)
      5. “In the second generation, . . . the religious dimensions took on social and political forms.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 106)
      6. “While the faith of the Old Testament had always been a paradigm or analogue to the Puritan consciousness, in the second and succeeding generations the religion of the Old Testament was supplemented by a regard for Israel as a total religious-political commonwealth. In that context, the Puritans could think of New England as the place which God had saved for the last, most complete manifestation of the divine purpose. Like Israel, they had a special destiny, the one standing at the beginning of God’s plan, the other at the end . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 106)
      7. “. . . some of the descendants of the first generation did not have the vibrancy of faith characteristic of their parents . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 106)
      8. Also, settlers arrived “who had less interest in Christianity and more interest in social betterment ” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 106)
      9. “A Christian commonwealth could only be secured, it was felt, if voting and political rights were restricted to pure Christians . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 106)
      10. “In that situation of personal and social lukewarmness with respect to matters of faith, the jeremiad sermons became new lightning rods with which to prod the unwilling . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 106)
      11. “. . . baptism was interpreted as a sign that you belonged to the covenant, not that one had been launched as an infant on a path one would oneself eventually appropriate . . . [But believers] wanted their children baptized. Under the terms of the Halfway Covenant, such persons could be baptized. Moreover, all who believed in God but could not give the testimonies necessary for full membership, while barred from communion and voting on spiritual matters, were still considered members of the church and had the rights of citizenship.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
      12. Solomon Stoddard of Northampton “saw the sacraments as themselves converting instruments. Hence, the communion, as the sermon, was available to all who believed . . .” Stoddard was widely resisted (even by his grandson, Jonathan Edwards), but “the two-tiered membership was doomed, including the rigors of church membership as originally understood.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
      13. “. . . it became necessary to modify the stress on the local church in the direction of some overall control.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
          1. “. . . associations of clergy arose to deal with . . . education and the combating of divisions . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
          2. “. . . the Separatist views of Roger Williams, the remarks of Anne Hutchinson, and later still the coming of Quakers, demanded more than local treatment.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
          3. “Moreover, criticism from Puritans abroad concerning the exclusion of Presbyterians from full communion could not be answered by a local church.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
          4. “Nor could individual local bodies effectively protest against the Separatist views which came to dominate English Congregationalists after 1640.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
          5. “Further, the loss of the Charter in 1684 made it more important for the church to have an overall structure.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 107)
          6. “Thus New England Congregationalism, in order to maintain its Calvinistic ideals in relation to society, moved administratively closer to a Presbyterian conception of the ordering of the church by bodies more inclusive than the local church.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 108)
          7. But the “conception that the local church alone is the church . . . has continued to this day in the United Church of Christ . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 108)
      14. There was “conflict between Puritan Congregationalists, Baptists, and Quakers in New England . . .”” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 125)
5. **Quakers**
   1. “. . . most distinctive of the movements related to Puritanism.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 108)
   2. history
      1. “They arose [in] England during the period of Cromwell . . . Small groups of “Friends” (as they called themselves) first met in the Lake District of England, and the movement spread throughout England.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 108)
      2. George Fox “went up and down [England,] interrupting sermons to challenge what was said and turning the challenge into a sermon itself. Fox felt called upon by God to gather people to the truth from out of the steeple-houses . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 108)
      3. They were “so named because they quaked at the Word of God . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      4. “The essential seriousness of Quakers . . . won the respect of many and even a degree of toleration under Cromwell.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      5. “In America, they suffered at the hands of the Puritans . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      6. They “had freedom in Rhode Island (though Roger Williams considered them wrong) . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      7. Pennsylvania was a “colony started by Quaker William Penn with the principle of toleration as one of its cornerstones.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
   3. theology “the Socinians, a late-sixteenth-century rationalistic group . . .”” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch, *Pro­tes­tant Chris­ti­an­ity* 109)
      1. They thought “of themselves as the third way in Christendom, over against Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 108)
      2. “The fundamental tenet of the Quakers was that God is directly approachable and experienced within themselves. They spoke of the light within, or of Christ within, even of God within. God’s spirit was immediately present and discernible to all who sought God in sincerity. God’s truth and way of life could be directly apprehended.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      3. “The Puritans found sin rather than God within. Quakers, in contrast, insisted on the essential goddness of humanity.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      4. “Puritans felt that the emphasis upon immediate revelation of the Spirit within led to uncertainty as to knowledge of the true God, disclosed in the Bible. . . . Barclay in his *Apology* was quick to point out [that] Protestants contended over the meaning of the Bible even as they idolized it.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      5. “. . . the Quakers were in a heritage related to mysticism, though they were not directly its heirs.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      6. Jesus and the Bible were important but should not “be in the way of the believer’s direct apprehension of God.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
         1. “In Jesus of Nazareth the love of God was historically manifest, and in the eternal Christ present in humanity, God is continually accessible and available.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
         2. “The Bible is an account of the historical manifestations of this love and it contains much truth [but] it is neither the word of God nor truth. Truth be found directly by those who wait quietly for the Lord.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109)
      7. “. . . they were a part of the Puritan ethos, in which life was ordered from top to bottom by the truth as perceived. For Quakers, a life, simple and elegant in its dignity, [109] was more important than all thought. Plain speech and simple clothes were adopted. Integrity in all things was prized above all else. A life given in suffering was more important than all striving, since it witnessed to the truth and peace of God.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 109-110)
      8. At Quaker meetings each “meditated silently upon God’s presence and spoke only as one felt called to do so, whether on God’s presence itself or on the meaning of God’s presence for some problem. Such directness excluded an organized ministry as well as a special church building, or a liturgical order of worship.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 110)
      9. “All decisions involving action were jointly agreed upon, not by vote, but by a kind of consensus which the secretary recorded as the sense of the meeting. Until a consensus could be safely affirmed, nothing was recorded.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 110)
      10. “. . . Quaker concern early manifested itself in the alleviation of suffering and in philanthropic works.” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 110)
      11. “Most Quakers have also believed in nonresistance . . . Although this at times proved embarrassing, as in the Revolutionary War, it frequently made Quakers emissaries of relief . . .” (Dil­len­ber­ger and Welch 110)

## Separatists

1. **bibliography**
   1. Brachlow, Stephen. *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Sep­aratist Ecclesiology*, *1570-1625*. Oxford, 1988. Definitive account; emphasizes the close relationship of Separatist and radical Puritan principles.
   2. Collinson, Patrick. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. Rpt., Ox­ford, 1990. Magisterial history of the Puritans that gives considerable attention to the Separatists.
   3. Greaves, Richard L. *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England*. Min­neapolis, 1981. Includes a full account of Separatist social views.
   4. Martin, J.W. *Religious Radicals in Tudor England*. London, 1989. De­voted primarily to unorthodox groups such as the Freewillers and the Family of Love, but useful for the wider context of religious dissidents.
   5. Sprunger, Keith L. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden, 1982. Includes a definitive discussion of the Separatists dur­ing their sojourn in the Netherlands. [46]
   6. Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution*. Oxford, 1978. First chapter places the Separatists in his­torical context.
   7. White, B.R. *The English Separatist Tradition: From the Marian Martyrs to the Pilgrim Fathers*. London, 1971. Standard historical account, but on Separatist thought superseded by Brachlow.
2. **history**
   1. 1550: “congregations of for­eign refugees had been founded in London as early as 1550, providing an example of Reformed congregations indepen­dent of episcopal authority.” (Greaves 4.45)
   2. June 1568: the bishop of London “complained that there were four or five Separatist ministers in the City, with approximately two hundred followers, the majority of whom were women from the lowest social order. They met on ships and in fields and private houses . . .” (Greaves 4.45)
   3. spring 1581: Robert Browne and Robert Harrison, Cambridge graduates, “organized a Separatist congregation in Norwich, Norfolk . . .” After imprisonment, Browne “led his followers into exile . . . in the Netherlands.” (Greaves 4.46)
   4. April 1593: the new leaders of the movement—“two former Puritans, Henry Bar­row [and] John Greenwood”—are hung for “seeking the overthrow of the estab­lished church and royal supremacy.” (Greaves 4.46)
   5. 1592: the London Separatist church elects Francis Johnson, another Cambridge graduate, as their pastor. (In jail, Johnson writes the first Separatist handbook, *A True Con­fession of Faith*.) (Greaves 4.46)
   6. 1597: some London Separatists emi­grate to Amsterdam; Johnson joins them in 1597. (Greaves 4.46)
   7. 1609: the Amsterdam church grows from about 40 to about 300 members. Many die “en route to Virginia a decade later.” (Greaves 4.46)
3. **theology** (“fundamental principles of the Separatists,” Greaves 4.46)
   1. *sola scriptura*
      1. The Separatists “severely devalued both religious and social traditions by their es­pousal of strict biblical standards.” (Greaves 4.46)
   2. holy living (= New-Testament living)
      1. “Church membership was limited to visible saints; evidence of an in­ward experience of grace was mandatory. The two marks of saving faith were knowledge of Christian doctrine and obedience to biblical ordinances.” (Greaves 4.46)
      2. “The heart of Separatist piety was deeply existential, and the Sep­aratists’ quest for New Testament discipline and polity grew out of their preeminent concern with holy living.” (Greaves 4.46)
      3. “. . . they enunciated their desire to recover the spiritual life of the New Testament church.” (Greaves 4.46)
      4. Separatist churches consisted “of visible saints alone, that is, only those who lived manifestly godly lives.” (Greaves 4.45)
      5. “. . . those who did not adhere to the New Testa­ment in ecclesial matters violated the second command­ment [Exod 20:4-6, no idols]. Because of their bilateral (conditional) interpretation of the covenant, assurance of salvation required fidelity to New Testament polity.” (Greaves 4.46)
   3. separation from the Church of England
      1. They “repudiated the Church of En­gland as unreformed and unbiblical . . .” (Greaves 4.45)
      2. “. . . the Separatists were extreme Protestants who established their own congrega­tions . . .” (Greaves 4.45)
      3. The “radical wing of the Puritans” influenced Separatist theology. The two groups were [primarily] distinguished by . . . the willingness of the Separatists to break with the established church rather than seek its further reformation. In most areas the Separatists borrowed heavily from the radical Puritans . . .” (Greaves 4.46)
   4. congregationalist polity
      1. “Each Separatist con­gregation was independent and possessed the right to elect its minister and officers, so long as they were spiritually gifted, though some Separatists, such as Browne, advocated a role for synods.” (Greaves 4.46)
   5. church-state relations
      1. “Separatists accepted the princes’ right to exercise authority over the church as custodians but did not allow them priestly power. Magistrates could compel people to attend church, though acceptance of the gospel had to be voluntary. The Separatists did not advocate the complete separation of church and state.” (Greaves 4.46)
   6. apocalypticism
      1. “The apocalyptic vision that they shared with radical Puritans depicted history as a stage on which the cosmic war between Christ and Satan was staged. They saw themselves as key players in this drama because they were receptive to fresh revelation from God and were unyielding in their opposition to the Antichrist.” (Greaves 4.46)
4. **lasting significance**
   1. The Separatists “provided the seedbed out of which the Baptists and Con­gregationalists later emerged.” (Greaves 4.46)
   2. “Moreover, they destroyed any hope for a unified Protestant church in England . . .” (Greaves 4.46)

## Anglican Rationalism

1. **introduction**
   1. Before 1689 (the Act of Toleration, eliminating penalties for dissenters), rationalism had been present in Anglicanism. (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      1. The Caroline divines “had emphasized the role of reason and morality . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      2. “It was more evident in the Latitudinarians, who had tried to reconcile the faith with broad philosophical and scientific assumptions by showing the reasonableness of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      3. But “struggles with the Puritans [kept] rationalist elements from becoming dom­in­ant.” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
   2. But after 1689, when Anglican and Protestant bodies settled into a stable situation, rationalism increasingly manifested itself. (Dillenberger and Welch 114-115)
      1. To rationalists “the controversy between Puritans and the Anglicans . . . seemed like sterile and irrelevant bickering . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
   3. “Until the time of Christian Wolff (d. 1754), orthodox theologians reflected a ra­tio­nal­istic spirit but did not consciously relate their thinking to the new philosophical currents. Theirs was a scholasticism whose roots were plant­ed more in medieval categories of thinking than in the newer state of opinion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
2. **relations between** “**the church and the new faith in reason**” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
   1. phase 1: “the supernatural character of the Christian revelation was maintained . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      1. “Prophecy and miracle were considered the two major supernatural and natural evidences of the truth of Christianity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      2. “The preeminence of Christianity over all other religious views was still assumed . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
   2. phase 2: Christianity is an instance “of the “natural religion” . . . found in religions generally.” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      1. “Almost a century earlier, Lord Herbert of Cherbury had announced five principal tenets of such a religion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 115) “They were:
         1. “that there is a divine being,
         2. “that this divine being is to be worshipped,
         3. “that proper worship consists in moral obedience and piety,
         4. “that obedience is to be rewarded and disobedience to be punished, and
         5. “that reward and punishment continue after this life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      2. Most people, it was said, have always held these tenets; thus “Matthew Tindal could write a book called *Christianity as Old as Creation*. In essence, Christianity is older than Christ . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 115)
      3. “The second phase had already meant abandoning crucial points of the faith.” [116] “Bishop Butler’s *Analogy* was written particularly to refute the views of Tindal, by pointing out that there were as many difficulties and obscurities in natural religion as in revealed religion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 116)
   3. phase three: deism
      1. “. . . outright opposition between Christianity and a form of natural religion called deism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 116)
      2. Deists “attacked the miracles of the Bible, including the resurrection, as mythol­ogical. And by mythological, they meant fanciful and devoid of truth.” (Dillenberger and Welch 116)
      3. Authors’ comment: none of the phases “seriously touched people’s hearts or lives. That had to happen apart from all arguments. The spirit of rationalism was met by another spirit, name­ly, the Holy Spirit, as it laid hold of people’s lives.” (Dillenberger and Welch 116)
      4. “The natural religion of the eighteenth century was the product of a Rationalism which abandoned the tradition [178] in favor of a thoroughly “scientific” world­view—in this case, the machine-like world of Newtonian physics, in which all events were to be explained as parts of a network of natural causes. Thus Rationalism logically led to the superannuated deity of deism, whose function it was merely to start the machine, to guarantee the validity of moral laws, and to insure the rewards of heaven for the righteous.” (Dillenberger and Welch 178-179)

## Pietism

1. **reactions against formalism**
   1. Reactions against formalism included pietism, Methodism, and the great awakenings.
   2. “Pietism on the Continent, Methodism in England, and the great awakenings in America shared in a common pattern.” (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
   3. “. . . the movements were largely independent of each other in origin.” (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
   4. But “Connections between them can be traced. Wesley visited a Pietist community on the Continent and read the Pietist writings. White­field, originally associated with Wesley, was the most noted preach­er in the American awakenings.” (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
2. ***collegia societatis***
   1. The German Lutherans, Philipp Spener and August Francke, his disciple, organized *col­legia societatis* (associations of piety), small groups in private homes to enrich piety, especially by New Testament study. (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
   2. “. . . in emphasizing the new life in Christ, they also felt they were bringing the Reformation understanding of justification to its fulfillment. [One must be] as nearly perfect as possible. Perfection, however, was not interpreted as sinlessness; it meant definite progress in the Christian life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
   3. Pietism attracted “people disillusioned by theological bickering, religious wars, and rationalist patterns of thought . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 114)
   4. “. . . the small communities in the midst of the churches [were] the truly saved and redeemed community.” (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
   5. Many expected the end to be soon, though “salvation was already present in their communities.” (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
   6. The “churches could be transformed, but [not] the world as such . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 112)
   7. “By intention, Pietism was lay minded. The concept of the priesthood of all believers” underlay it. (Dillenberger and Welch 113)
   8. “Unfortunately, . . . they often were not themselves excellent examples of forgive­ness . . . toward those who had gone astray. . . . excessive emphasis upon the new life made many impatient of professions of piety which still exhibited marks of worldliness. . . . those not in sympathy with this outlook felt judged rather than exhorted . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 113)
   9. “From the standpoint of new life in Christ, doctrinal differences were unimportant. The truth in this contention was that theology had lost its vitality and was no longer an adequate representation of the faith. It had become a substitute for faith. Nevertheless, every confession of the presence of Christ has theological implications . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 113)
   10. Pietists “tended to gloss over the depth of sin. Although they asserted [justification,] they quickly moved to sanctification, or the new life in Christ. . . . [They] cultivated Christ’s presence as if he could not and would not be absent from consciousness even for a moment.” (Dillenberger and Welch 113)
   11. (Dillenberger and Welch 114)
3. **Moravians**
   1. “Moravians” is(“a name derived from the province of their origin . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 114)
   2. Pietists usually remained in the churches “as the leaven in the dough.” But Pietism did result in one separate denomination. “Count Zinzendorf, a German nobleman whose pietistic tendencies were confirmed by contact with Francke, offered his estate at Herrnhut to the remnants of the Bohemian Hus­sites. The latter, suffering under persecution, gladly accepted.” Zinzendorf was soon their religious leader; their unwillingness to become Lutheran made them a separate community. (Dillenberger and Welch 114)
   3. “Christians from all over Europe visited the community . . . Missionaries were sent throughout Europe, [and under] August Spangenberg, a settlement was made in Georgia. Several years later some of the Moravians in Georgia moved to Pennsylvania. Zinzendorf, on a visit to America, named this settlement Bethlehem, and it is still the center of Moravian influence in America.” (Dillenberger and Welch 114)
   4. The universities of Halle and, later, Tübingen were centers of Pietism. The movement influenced, e. g., Kant and Schleiermacher. (Dillenberger and Welch 114)

## Methodism

1. **introduction**
   1. 1700s: England was “permeated by a deism and rationalism that sapped the established Anglican Church of its vitality and reduced it in many ways to a mere formalism incapable of holding the hearts of the average English hearer.” (Panning)
   2. 1700s: there were “tremendous social and economic changes . . . There was a growing mass of poor and underprivileged, counterbalanced by a class of new rich who were generally closely connected with the Established church. The potential for violent popular reaction against both church and state, as indeed happened in France, was certainly present also in England. That it did not happen was due, in part at least, to the new view, the optimistic dream of the perfectibility of man, that John Wesley brought . . .” (Panning)
2. **John Wesley** (**1703-91**)
   1. “John Wesley was the son of a devout mother and of an Anglican priest of High Church leanings.” (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
   2. teenage reading
      1. “. . . Wesley took to reading and following the principles laid out in Thomas à Kempis’ *Imitation of Christ*. The peace and quiet of the *Imitatio Christi* was” a balm. (Panning)
      2. “. . . Jeremy Taylor’s *Rule and Exercise of Holy Living and Dying*. Wesley was enthusiastic enough about holy living, but the prospect of holy dying disturbed him, for he found himself wholly unprepared for that.” (Panning)
      3. William Law
         1. “In a state of agitation he addressed himself to two volumes that came to be most influential in the formation of his perfectionist theology, namely, William Law’s *Treatise on Christian Perfection* and its companion volume, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. These became a roadmap for life.” (Panning)
         2. Nevertheless, “Wesley found Law’s writings too mystical and not suffi­ci­ently based on Jesus Christ. But he was forever impressed by their depth and warmth of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
   3. at Oxford
      1. At Oxford were John’s brother Charles and his friend George Whitefield.
      2. “Charles Wesley is primarily known for [his] hymns . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 116)
      3. George Whitefield was “noted for his preaching in both England and America.” [116] “Whitefield was undoubtedly the greater preacher . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 116, 120)
      4. 1729: the Holy Club (Panning)
         1. Charles organized a group for study and discipline. (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
         2. It “became known as the “Holy Club” or as the “Method­ists,” both originally being terms of derision.” (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
         3. John, a distinguished student, became the leader. (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
         4. The purpose of the Club was “to further their own sanctification.” “John, however, found the attempt discouraging . . .” (Panning)
   4. Georgia
      1. 1735: Wesley, now an Anglican priest, “was sent to Georgia as a missionary.” (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
         1. John Wesley (in a letter): “My chief motive, to which all the rest are subordinate, is the hope of saving my own soul.” (Qtd. in: Synan, Vinson. *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement*. 15.) (Panning)
      2. 1735: encounter with Moravians aboard ship
         1. “En route to America, he was much impressed by the faith of a band of Morav­ians in the midst of a terrible storm.” (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
         2. “. . . in the terrors of crossing the high seas he had become mightily impressed with the quiet serenity of his Moravian fellow-passengers. They shared with him their conviction that saving faith brings with it both dominion over sin and true peace of mind—both holiness and happiness.” (Panning)
      3. In Georgia, the Indians were slow to accept Christianity, and the settlers found his “High Churchmanship and rigorous demands not at all to their liking.” (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
      4. “His inability to decide between celibacy and marriage, though he had given a young lady some reason to believe his intentions were matrimony, did not help his situation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
   5. conversion
      1. 1738: returning to England, Wesley “allied himself with the Moravian society in Fetter Lane . . .” (“John Wes­ley”)
      2. 24 May 1738: a Moravian “religious society meeting on Aldersgate Street in London [is] the turning point in his life.” (Panning)
      3. John Wesley (*John Wesley’s Journal*. London, 1949. 51): “In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street, where one was reading Luther’s preface to the *Epistle to the Romans*.About a quarter of nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for my salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and of death.” (Qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 117)
      4. “He had known about God’s grace and presence; but now he had experienced it. He had known that he could not come to God through work, but now he knew that he had been trying to do so nevertheless. From this he was now free . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 117)
   6. 1738: visit to Moravian headquarters, Herrnhut, Germany
      1. Wesley “spent six months at the Moravian settlement of Herrnhut . . .” (Panning)
      2. The German Moravians “left an ineradicable impression upon him.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
      3. “Nevertheless, he found the members of the community, much as Law, too subjective in their faith and therefore not sufficiently based in Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
      4. “Moreover, they appeared too complacent, assuming that piety would automatically produce fruit in personal and social life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
   7. 1738-39: Wesley and the English Moravians
      1. 1738: “On his return to England he drew up rules for the “bands” into which the [Moravians’] Fetter Lane Society was divided, and published a collection of hymns for them.” (“John Wesley”)
      2. The “bands” or “classes” were “Patterned on the “choir” system that Wesley had observed [at] Herrnhut . . .” (Panning)
      3. “Ten or twelve new converts (“a class”) were put under the supervision of a “class leader” who was closely to monitor the spiritual progress of each convert. At least once a week the leader was to sit down with each of his charges and to discuss his spiritual life, suggesting areas for improvement and receiving the convert’s “free will” offering for advancement of the “method.”” (Panning)
   8. 1739: the Methodist denomination begins
      1. late 1739: “Wesley broke with the Moravians in London. Wesley had helped them organize the Fetter Lane Society; and those converted by his preaching and that of his brother and Whitefield had become members of their bands. But finding, as he said, that they had fallen into heresies, especially quietism, he decided to form his own followers into a separate society.” (“John Wesley”)
      2. late 1739: Wesley forms “the United Society, a group of about ten men “. . . seeking the power of godliness, united in order to pray together, to receive the work of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other work out their salvation.”” (*Book of Discipline*, qtd. in: Mayer, *Religious Bodies* 297.) (Panning)
      3. Wesley: “Thus, without any previous plan, began the Methodist Society in England.” (qtd. in “John Wesley”)
   9. lay preaching
      1. early 1739: Wesley’s Oxford friend, the evangelist George Whitefield, upon his return from America, . . . preached in the open air, in February 1739, to a company of miners . . . These open-air services were very successful . . .” (“John Wesley”)
      2. late 1739 (after founding the United Society): Wesley approves lay preaching: “men and women who were not episcopally ordained were permitted to preach and do pastoral work.” (“John Wesley”)
      3. Many of the open-air services, “especially the evening meetings, turned out to be lengthy “watches” in which seekers after perfection earnestly prayed for and waited for the tangible and palpable intervention of the Holy Spirit.” (Panning)
      4. Lay preaching is “one of the great features of Methodism, to which it has largely owed its success . . .” (“John Wesley”)
   10. Wesley’s “method”
       1. The second blessing “came to men in connection with a distinct and clearly perceived spiritual experience. This spiritual experience could be, if not induced, at least aided and prepared for by following a “method.”” (Panning)
       2. Primary in the method is the “class” system.
          1. 1738 on: small groups of 10 or 12 new converts are “put under the supervision of a “class leader” who was closely to monitor the spiritual progress of each convert.” (Panning)
          2. “. . . this system of organizing into small groups became the standard unit among Wesley’s followers.” (Panning)
       3. organization above the classes
          1. early 1740s: “The individual classes were organized into “circuits” and placed under the supervision of lay preachers. Not content to entrust the perfecting of the saints entirely to lay preachers, Wesley soon organized a corps of “itinerant” clergymen who as “circuit riders” traveled regularly from station to station, supervising the whole.” (Panning)
          2. 1744: “. . . Wesley for the first time convened all the workers into a general assembly and in so doing established what became the regular feature of “annual conferences.” Thus, in about five years, Wesley developed virtually all the forms that were to become the distinctive features when Wesley’s movement within the church came to be a separate denomination.” (Panning)
   11. 1741: Wesley’s friend from college, George Whitefield, was Calvinist. A sermon by Wesley on “Free Grace” caused a temporary rift in their friendship (1741). (“John Wesley”)
   12. growth of the denomination
       1. Wesley preached throughout England. “I looked upon all the world as my parish . . . [It was] my bounden duty to declare unto all that are willing to hear . . .” (Qtd. in Dillenberger and Welch 120)
       2. Wesley “reached thousands of individuals who were never touched by the established church. In the increasing concentration of workers in towns as the industrial revolution progressed, Methodism was always near . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 121)
       3. “He established societies which met together separately to hear the Word and encourage a strict discipline. Wesley even issued tickets which need­ed renewal from time to time if one was to remain in good standing.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
       4. “Later he organized Methodist groups in “classes,” each group consisting of twelve with a class leader. Aside from providing a convenient way to collect necessary funds, this device also helped to strengthen control over the societies.” (Dillenberger and Welch 121)
       5. “Contrary to his expectations, Wesley’s work was not well received in the Anglican church. [So] Wesley had to depend upon a number of lay preachers.” (Dillenberger and Welch 121)
       6. Wesley “had come to hold that in the New Testament, a presbyter was the same as a bishop, and because of the need of clergy, he began to ordain, first for America and then also for England.” (Dillenberger and Welch 121)
       7. “Nevertheless, Methodism in England remained within Anglicanism until after Wes­ley’s death.” (Dillenberger and Welch 121)
       8. 1770: controversy with Calvinists breaks out.
       9. 1778: Wesley founds *The Arminian Magazine*. (“John Wesley”)
   13. an American denomination
       1. Wesley’s “missionaries to America . . . worked in the New York area, others in the South . . .” The greatest was Francis Asbury. (Dillenberger and Welch 121)
       2. “During the Revolutionary War, Asbury favored the American cause while Wesley counseled neutrality. By the end of the war, American Methodists were restive . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 121)
       3. “By this time Wesley was in agreement on the desirability of a separate American church. But both Asbury and Thomas Coke, set apart by Wesley to be superintendents in America, believed that they must also be independent of John Wesley. Out of this feeling, supported by Methodist groups, came the Methodist Episcopal Church in America.” (Dillenberger and Welch 121)

1. **theology**
   1. Anglicanism: Wesley was “quite satisfied with . . . the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer Book.” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
   2. nature and grace
      1. the fall
         1. Wesley “did not believe that we redeem ourselves. . . . he had a deep sense for the catastrophic and fateful character of the Fall. . . . Apart from grace, we could do nothing good.” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
         2. “But the Fall did not destroy our nature as responsible beings.” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
      2. predestination
         1. Wesley rejected “the concept of predestination. If God is just, individuals are not foreordained to damnation. The issue of their destiny must remain open.” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
         2. Did Wesley reject predestination, or only double predestination?—Hahn
   3. prevenient grace
      1. God’s grace “was continually given to sinful people, making it possible for them to respond to God’s call. This was not the grace of faith, but the prior grace which enabled us to make the decision of faith. It was the ground of the freedom from which one might begin.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
      2. “. . . those who nurtured this prior grace could expect God to respond in being present. Their seeking in grace was the precondition for God’s full redeeming activity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
      3. “But an individual was not justified, however, by this prior grace or by seeking.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
   4. justification
      1. “One was justified by the fresh activity of God. But this came only to those who freely responded.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
      2. “The advent of justifying grace could be sudden, but it could also be experienced as a moment in a gradual process of growth in grace. Justification was simply the forgiveness of sins.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
   5. sanctification
      1. “Justification was simply the forgiveness of sins. Sanctification, on the other hand, was the process of growth initiated by justification. It was the increasing presence of the grace of God in the human heart.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
      2. “He considered the new life in grace so important that he relegated many other aspects of the faith to a peripheral position. It was not that he rejected these; on the contrary, Wesley was quite satisfied with the general theol­o­gi­cal tradition of [Anglicanism].” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
      3. “Nothing was more characteristic of Methodism than the insistence that the Christian grows in grace and increasingly exhibits the perfect qualities of Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
      4. works
         1. Sanctification “was the increasing presence of the grace of God in the human heart. But it was likewise the act of individuals expressing in works and discipline the new life which had come to them. Grace and works thus belonged together, mutually reinforcing each other.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
         2. “In fact, Wesley did not reject the notion of “saving works,” provided they were understood as emerging from the regenerative power of the presence of Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 120)
   6. perfection
      1. Perfection is “full devotion to Christ, expressed in every act.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
      2. “It is important to stress the element of devotion rather than the acts.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
         1. “At times, Wesley did speak of perfection in terms of perfect acts or an achieved pattern of life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
         2. “But when he did, he usually denied, as did Calvin, that perfection is a possibility for the Christian.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
      3. “Perfection is the state of being in Christ. Christ fills and permeates one’s being . . . Perfect acts are but the consequence . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
      4. “If, as a result [of singular devotion to Christ], the Christian’s life is almost morally perfect, Wesley’s real point was still that perfection refers to the power of the ever-present Christ so to transform our nature that we will do nothing but good and pure acts.” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
      5. “At times Wesley’s enthusiastic description of the life in Christ led him to make affirmations about moral perfection which appeared to shift the base from which he spoke. In the same way, his opposition to particular flagrant violations of God’s will led him to denounce these in such a way that it sometimes seemed as if sin meant simply particular sins.” But “Perfection is living in the presence of Christ and sin is failure to live in the fullness of that presence.” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
      6. “Wesley’s insistence that activity emerges out of grace was thoroughly in the Reformation tradition. But he gave this insight a distinctive turn by his emphasis on the life of experienced grace, zealous moral endeavor, and growth toward perfection. . . . this powerful concern with inward experi­ence and moral living, however, . . . did often lead in later generations of Methodists to subjectivism and legalistic moralism . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 119)
   7. ethics
      1. tendency to rigorism
         1. “The rigor of the Holy Club at Oxford was never lost. It became part of the intense ethical concern that all life be lived in the service of God, much as in Puritanism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
            1. “Card playing and other amusements were rejected . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
            2. “Drinking, which in the England of this period was an acute social problem, was particularly rejected.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
      2. social activism
         1. Moreover, the members of Herrnhut “appeared too complacent . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)
         2. “For Wesley, faith must express itself in a definite pattern and direction. . . . Neither Wesley nor the Pietists challenged the *status quo*.Econ­om­ically and politically, they were conservative. But Wesley’s sense for meaningful discipline and direction had tremendous social consequences. His dictum [was], “earn all you can, save all you can, give all you can” . . . fostered economic development . . . Methodists as a result were often in the forefront of reform movements [of] the new industrialism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 118)

## The Great Awakenings

1. **introduction**
   1. The usual term is “Great Awakening,” but “we have accepted the term “great awakenings,” which was first suggested to us by Professor Robert T. Handy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 122 n. 3)
   2. “We are also indebted to him [Robert T. Handy] for the term “great revivals” to cover the various expressions of vitality in early-nineteenth-century America . . . This phrase, in contrast to the term “Second Awakening,” suggests both the diversity of the movement and its greater stress on emotions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 122 n. 3)
2. **beginnings**
   1. “. . . the eighteenth-century rebirth of religious vitality . . . manifested itself in America [1] in the Middle Colonies, [2] in New England, and [3] in the South, particularly in Virginia.” (Dillenberger and Welch 122)
   2. Middle Colonies
      1. “The first stirrings of the awakenings occurred among the Dutch Reformed in the Middle Colonies in the 1720’s. It was inspired by the emotional preaching of Theodore J. Frelinghuysen who demanded a conversion of the heart . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 122)
      2. “Among the Presbyterians in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, the awakening was spearheaded by the Tennents, father and son.” (Dillenberger and Welch 123)
      3. George Whitefield
         1. Whitefield “did more than any other in spreading the awakenings throughout the colonies . . . He was virtually the only link between the awakenings. Both Edwards and the Tennents welcomed him.” (Dillenberger and Welch 123)
         2. “Part of the secret of his success, apart from his own personal ability and charm, was his insistence that the power of the gospel was greater and more important than the traditional denominations.” (Dillenberger and Welch 123)
         3. Whitefield declared: “Father Abraham, whom have you in Heaven? Any Episcopalians? ‘No.’ Any Presbyterians? ‘No.’ Have you any Independents or Seceders? ‘No.’ Have you any Methodists? ‘No, no, no!’ Whom have [123] you there? ‘We don’t know those names here. All who are here are Christians—believers in Christ—men who have been overcome by the blood of the Lamb and the word of his testimony.’ Oh, is this the case? Then God help us, God help us all, to forget party names, and to become Christians in deed and in truth.” [Sweet, William W. *The Story* of *Religion in America*. New York: 1939. 206.] (Dillenberger and Welch 123-24)
         4. He taught “the simple conviction that the experience of Christ would release one from one’s afflictions and make one into a Christian . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 124)
      4. opposition
         1. “The Old Side Presbyterians . . . already distrusted the New Side Presbyterians, many of whom were trained either in New England or in the log college instituted by one of the Tennents. When the New Side joined in the awakening, the Old Side decided that this was the last straw. The New Side insisted that only a converted person was a true minister, no matter what education or credentials that person had. The Old Side responded by having the pro-awakening New Brunswick Presbytery forced out of the Synod. This split lasted only for the years 1741-1758.” (Dillenberger and Welch 124)
   3. New England
      1. “It was not much later that similar manifestations of awakenings occurred in Northampton, Massachusetts, and from there spread sporadically throughout New England.” (Dillenberger and Welch 122)
      2. “Within the [New-England Puritan] churches themselves there was a spirit of indifference to vibrant religious passions, represented significantly in an increasing interest in Arminian views. Judging by the fact that Arminianism was so frequently attacked by the preachers of the awakening in New England, it was undoubtedly one of the chief occasions for the awakenings.” (Dillenberger and Welch 122)
      3. Jonathan Edwards (“probably the greatest theologian America has produced,” Dillenberger and Welch 123)
         1. “He attempted to make Calvinism relevant again [but] without its previous theocratic orientation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 123)
         2. “Moreover, his theological thinking was undertaken in the context of new philosophies in Europe, such as that of Locke (though he did not succumb to their religious presuppositions).” (Dillenberger and Welch 123)
         3. “In his battle with the Arminians, he attempted to recapture the living experience of God in Christ which had once informed Puritanism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 123)
         4. “His sermons on a judging, redeeming God, though read from manuscript and devoid of apparent passion, hit the hearts of people and not infrequently were received with great emotion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 123)
      4. opposition
         1. Many clergy “were appalled by the display of emotion in the awakening and by the impolite conduct of many revival preachers. A militant group formed under the leadership of Charles Chauncy. Over against the new movement, he defended sobriety and reason in matters of religion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 124)
         2. “Jonathan Edwards, admitting the excesses of the awakening, took issue with Chauncy and maintained that the whole person must be involved in the Christian experience.” (Dillenberger and Welch 124)
         3. “Unfortunately, his [Edwards’s] warning to the revivalists was not heeded. They went their way, the conservative theologians claimed Edwards as their spiritual leader, and the position maintained by Chaun­cy eventually developed in Unitarianism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 124)
   4. the South
      1. “Among Presbyterians who had settled in Hanover County, Virginia, the awakening had slowly begun under lay leadership through the reading of sermons of Whitefield and some of Luther’s writings.” (Dillenberger and Welch 124)
      2. “But it came to prominence only after the arrival of William Robinson, sent to this area by the New Brunswick Presbytery of the New Side Presbyterians.” (Dillenberger and Welch 124)
      3. Baptists in the South
         1. “. . . there were Baptist groups in the South early in the [124] eighteenth century . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 124-125)
         2. “The regular Baptists in New England had not been sympathetic to the awakenings, but many individuals and even Separatist churches became Baptist because the emphasis upon decision and voluntary association identified with the awakening made them feel most at home.” (Dillenberger and Welch 125)
         3. “Among the Baptist groups in the South, the awakening had a strong “revivalistic” tone and the enthusiasm engendered caused them to be the victims of persecution. Their calmness . . . brought respect where there had been ridicule.” (Dillenberger and Welch 125)
         4. “It was too much to expect that the intensity of religious experience inaugurated by the awakenings could last more than a few decades.” (Dillenberger and Welch 125)
         5. “The movement made a great contribution to education. Many of the colleges and universities grew out of the need to prepare clergy to serve a revitalized church. Princeton, Rutgers, Brown, and Dartmouth . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 125)
      4. “In Europe, the Pietist movement and Methodism were more confined to special denominational groups. In America, geographical proximity and the intermixture of divergent groups were favorable to movements cutting through traditional lines. This tendency, so evident in the awakenings, was truly the beginning of a process which gave a distinctive character to American Protestantism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 125)

# Liberalism

## From Orthodoxy to Enlightenment

1. **introduction**
   1. “The older orthodoxy found perpetuation into the twentieth century . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 136)
      1. “Charles Hodge, the most eminent professor of the newly organized Princeton Theological Seminary from 1825 on, was a follower of François Turretin, one of the foremost orthodox Swiss theologians of the seventeenth century.” (Dillenberger and Welch 136)
      2. “. . . the Orthodox Presbyterian and the Bible Presbyterian churches” kept orthodoxy alive. (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
      3. “In Lutheranism, orthodox thought continued especially through the Missouri Synod Lutherans.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
   2. But “the Enlightenment moved into Protestant thinking and effectively ended orthodoxy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
   3. The Continental change from orthodoxy to rationalism “was quite similar to the growth of natural religion and deism in England at a slightly earlier time.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137 n. 2) The Enlightenment influenced British and American theology, too: “one [can move] from Locke to Jefferson or Franklin.” But because the Christian attempt to respond to the Enlightenment occurs with Kant and Schleiermacher, Dillenberger and Welch concentrate on Europe. (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
2. **Christian Wolff** (1679-1754)
   1. Wolff believed that rationalism, especially Leibnitz, “provided essentially the same truth as Christianity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
      1. “. . . one can use the traditional proofs for the existence of God and ascribe attributes to God which are in accord with reason.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
      2. Life “ought to be directed toward virtue,” which God rewards. (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
      3. Miracle is “the interruption and the restoration of a natural order created by God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
      4. “The Bible is rational . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
      5. “God is righteous, holy, and good. Nevertheless, sin is a fact. Therefore, atonement is both rational and necessary.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
   2. Some items “were supplied by revelation, such as the Trinity, Christology, and Grace. But these were above reason, not contrary to it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 137)
   3. Wolff tried to be orthodox, but rationalism, “rather than the Christian substance, was determinative.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
   4. “The Pietists were up in arms and had him removed from his professional position. And the philosopher Kant directed his attack against the rational proofs of God’s existence as elaborated by Wolff.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
3. “**transitional**” **theologians** (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
   1. introduction
      1. Usually “theirs was a position between Pietism and Rationalism. . . . [They rejected] the tight philosophical system of Wolff. They reflected a rational, but not a rationalistic, spirit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      2. They included “Buddeus, Waich, Mosheim, Baumgarten,” and Alphonse Turretin (François Turretin’s son). (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      3. “. . . revelation does not contradict reason.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      4. “Some of them were influenced by English deist literature . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      5. “Like the deists, they were opposed to any system of thought which is essentially rigorous in what it asks people to accept, as in the systems of Wolff and of traditional orthodoxy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      6. Knowledge of Eastern religions was growing. “Convinced that Christianity in its Protestant form is preeminent, they nevertheless were searching for a rubric which encompassed the variety of religions and the natural religion of reason.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      7. “Moreover, they were bothered by the divisions within Protestantism and by what they took to be quarrels about nonessentials.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
   2. Alphonse Turretin’s *Discourse on Fundamental Articles in Religion*
      1. To reason “belongs the knowledge that God is and that those who seek God are rewarded.” Other consequences followed, “none of which disagreed with revelation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      2. Still, revelation contains “necessary articles of belief, if one is to escape damnation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      3. Nevertheless, “these are necessary only to those to whom the gospel is preached and who are endowed with sufficient faculties to receive them.” (Dillenberger and Welch 138)
      4. “In Christian history, Turretin found many contradictory statements as to what is fundamental. He concluded that the fundamentals are few and that people have fought mainly over nonessentials, such as predestination. Let people confess that they are free, that God rewards according to works, and that God is in control of everything. But they need not make any of these points into a necessary article of belief.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
      5. “For Protestants, there are criteria. These consist in the Word and in prudence.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
      6. “In respect to the Word, individuals may err . . . they must be tolerant. They must not confuse their interpretations with the total truth.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
      7. “He did not foresee that the canons of reasonableness which he proposed would not [preserve] Protestantism, but would instead tend to become a substitute.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
4. “**innovating**” **theologians** (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   1. “This group [included] J.F.W. Jerusalem, J.J. Spalding, J.S. Semler, J.A. Ernesti, and Joh. David Michaelis.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   2. Revelation “was genuine, [but] at no point [beyond] reason.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   3. “Formerly, the activity of reason had been construed as the participation of thought in a universal rational structure in the nature of things. This had been the view of Wolff and of rationalism in general. Now reason was understood as personal and inner, functioning as an expression of the self, practical and partly expressed in moral terms.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   4. “Revelation had now been reduced to that which is comprehensible to such a reasoning self. It was no longer a mystery . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   5. “For some [the] Roman Catholic and Protestant orthodox positions reflected the addition of incidentals . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   6. For others, in the Bible itself are “beginnings of developments which betrayed reason and revelation in the practical sense. The genuine elements in the Bible, according to Semler, are the moral truths taught by Christ . . . the true revelation [in the Bible] is essentially akin to natural religion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   7. “The world view or [139] cosmology of the Bible was now no longer essential . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 139)
   8. “. . . the ordered Newtonian world no longer needed to be repaired [by] miracles.” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
   9. “Moreover, such a procedure made it possible to maintain that there was truth in the Bible in spite of its contradictions. . . . Semler was one of the first to see the real implications of some of the contradictions and differences of viewpoint in the Bible.” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
   10. “For the “innovators,” revelation was still real and related to the Bible. But its content was not different from that of natural religion in general.” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
   11. “English writings on natural religion and deism were now read by German scholars, though their effectiveness in England was already being challenged . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
       1. Methodism was challenging it. (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
       2. “The Scottish philosopher David Hume had also called natural religion into question by doubting that there was a stable human nature which was the same everywhere. . . . But Hume was not taken that seriously by the Enlightenment, except by Kant.” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
   12. Lessing (1729-1781): Gotthold Lessing believed that all religions essentially are concerned with “virtue and the good life. . . . helpfulness in the common good was the only criterion of their worth. That which helped humanity was enlightened, and that which hindered was superstition.” (Dillenberger and Welch 141)
5. **Enlightenment religion**
   1. Enlightenment religion “no longer felt bound by [past] theological or liturgical formulations . . . This new feeling . . . was itself religious in nature. It was a devotion to truth wherever it might be found. [But with it] went the conviction that such devotion would lead to the best of religion and humanity.” Enlightenment religion was unduly optimistic. (Dillenberger and Welch 141)
   2. “Only among a limited number of French thinkers was there a strong antireligious protest.” (Dillenberger and Welch 141)
   3. But “Where the Enlightenment view was accepted, concern for revelation had ended. If revelation disclosed no more than we can naturally know of God and God’s relation to the world, it was certainly dispensable.” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)

## Christian Responses to the Enlightenment

1. **introduction**
   1. “. . . the new push toward a revitalized Christianity—which took the Enlightenment seriously and simultaneously set for itself the goal of overcoming it—occurred on the Continent, [in] Kant and Schleiermacher.” (Dillenberger and Welch 140)
2. **Kant** (1724-1804)
   1. Immanuel Kant was professor of philosophy at the University of Königsberg (1755-1804). “The order, regularity, and modesty of his life was undisturbed by the notoriety caused by the publication of his “critical philosophy;” particularly The Critique of Pure Reason (1781), Critique of Practical Reason (1788), and Critique of Judgment (1790).” (*Random House Encyclopedia,* 1990 [software])
   2. “. . . one of the central features in the transition from eighteenth- to nineteenth-century modes of thought [was] the critical philosophy of Kant . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 145)
   3. Kant rejected both orthodoxy and rationalism. (Dillenberger and Welch 141)
   4. “Rationalism’s claims to knowledge were too broad. Hence, Kant began, in the *Critique of Pure Reason,* by limiting *knowledge* to the experienced world. He did not deny the existence of “noumenal” reality, which lay behind the phenomena we experience directly; but this was not given to us in perception. Nor did he deny the reality of *a priori,* universal concepts of reason; but these were to be understood as patterns of the mind, brought by us to experience and used in organizing the data of perception. Therefore, claims to knowledge must be limited to the experienced world, shaped by the rational structures of mind.” (Dillenberger and Welch 141)
   5. “Within these proper limits, knowledge could be certain, philosophy could be rehabilitated (in spite of Hume’s attack), and the scientific (i. e., Newtonian) picture of an orderly world could [141] be given philosophical certification.” (Dillenberger and Welch 141-142)
   6. “Obviously, claims to knowledge of God through “pure reason” were quite impossible, and Kant systematically attacked the traditional proofs for God’s existence (and in a way which many have felt conclusive).” (Dillenberger and Welch 142)
   7. Religion’s “ground is practical reason, [which] apprehends the moral law within. A concept of duty or law is universal in all human beings, and therefore valid for all. Right action always proceeds from the motive of obedience to this law, rather than any desire for happiness or satisfaction. All activity ought then to be based on the universal law of duty . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 142)
   8. “Kant knew of the tensions which beset us and lead us to activity counter to our moral nature. In fact, Kant’s description of radical evil was more penetrating than most theological analyses. But Kant found it impossible to believe that evil could not be broken by the deliberate act of individuals. He maintained that this must be possible by a herculean effort of will. Otherwise the world would not be moral and therefore would be meaningless. Above all else, Kant was convinced that this is a moral world.” (Dillenberger and Welch 142)
   9. Since “we do not fully succeed in this world in living in accord with the moral law, . . . we are justified in postulating immortality as the necessary extension of time requisite for the final perfection of virtue.” (Dillenberger and Welch 142)
   10. “Kant had rejected the idea that happiness could be a proper motive for action—duty was the only right motive. But he was still convinced that the virtuous individual must somehow be the happy one. Since one must not act from the desire for happiness, and since happiness and virtue do not seem to be commensurate in life, Kant concluded that we must postulate the existence of God to guarantee the proper correlation of virtue and happiness.” (Dillenberger and Welch 142)
   11. “Such a reconstruction of the religious in connection with the ethical was more in line with the tradition of natural religion than with the prevailing currents of the Enlightenment. In some respects, Kant’s views on religion were not so much an advance as a return to a tradition in which individuals insisted on establishing the religious by way of the moral.” (Dillenberger and Welch 142)
       1. “Kant’s sharp distinction between phenomena, which we know in our experience, and noumena, or things in themselves, which pure reason cannot know, was a severe blow to the traditional arguments for the existence of God, indeed to all claims to “knowledge” of God. Knowledge of the world could not lead to the knowledge of God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 162)
       2. “Kant said that he destroyed speculative knowledge in order to make room for “faith.” The affirmations of religion were to rest, not upon [162] inference from our sensory experience (and certainly not upon revelation), but upon our apprehension of the moral law. God and immortality were to be accepted as necessary postulates of moral experience. Thus, Kant was squarely in the tradition of natural religion. Religion was still to be seen as a combination of beliefs and moral principles, only now morality was even more dominant, for religious beliefs were wholly dependent upon the dictates of the practical reason (moral experience). But at the same time Kant went quite beyond the perspective of natural religion in rejecting its view of nature as the prime datum for religious beliefs and in seeking to ground religion in another sphere of immediate experience. Both in his radical distinction between the knowledge of the world and the domain of religion and in his positive conception of religion, Kant was a source and a sign of the reordering of theology in the following century.” (Dillenberger and Welch 162-163)
   12. influence: “In the groping for new ways of thinking about the biblical message in relation to contemporary currents of thought, Kant’s work played an important role.” (Dillenberger and Welch 143)
       1. Schleiermacher thought that Kant “made religion merely [164] an implication of ethics.” [164-165] “Instead of relating the domain of religion to the ethical realm of Kant’s second critique, he [Schleiermacher] drew from the *a priori* categories of the first.” [143] (Dillenberger and Welch 164-165, 143)
       2. On the other hand, Albrecht Ritschl “believed that Kant had begun a path in the second critique which opened the way for the revival of the Protestant Reformation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 143)
       3. “Kant’s sharp distinction between phenomena, which we know in our experience, and noumena, or things in themselves, which pure reason cannot know, was a severe blow to the traditional arguments for the existence of God, indeed to all claims to “knowledge” of God. Knowledge of the world could not lead to the knowledge of God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 162)
       4. “Kant said that he destroyed speculative knowledge in order to make room for “faith.” The affirmations of religion were to rest, not upon [162] inference from our sensory experience (and certainly not upon revelation), but upon our apprehension of the moral law. God and immortality were to be accepted as necessary postulates of moral experience. Thus, Kant was squarely in the tradition of natural religion. Religion was still to be seen as a combination of beliefs and moral principles, only now morality was even more dominant, for religious beliefs were wholly dependent upon the dictates of the practical reason (moral experience). But at the same time Kant went quite beyond the perspective of natural religion in rejecting its view of nature as the prime datum for religious beliefs and in seeking to ground religion in another sphere of immediate experience. Both in his radical distinction between the knowledge of the world and the domain of religion and in his positive conception of religion, Kant was a source and a sign of the reordering of theology in the following century.” (Dillenberger and Welch 162-163)
3. **Friedrich Schleiermacher** (1768-1834)
   1. Schleiermacher has “been called the father of modern liberal theology.” (Dillenberger and Welch 163)
   2. “In Britain, it was Schleiermacher’s contemporary, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who quite independently . . . was concerned with the same central problems—the character of religious knowledge and authority. And he effected a similar reorientation of thought . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 163 n. 1)
   3. Schleiermacher “went to a German Moravian school and later to the theological seminary of the brotherhood.” (Dillenberger and Welch 163)
   4. “Subsequently, at the University of Halle, Schleiermacher made an intensive study of Kant and read widely in Greek philosophy.” (Dillenberger and Welch 163)
   5. A “circle of intimate friends who were caught up in the Romantic movement. . . pointed instead to imagination and to creative fancy, to freedom and individuality, and to the spontaneity and mystery of life . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 164)
   6. “Schleiermacher wrote his first work on religion, which he called *Speeches on Religion to its Cultured Despisers* (1799). The “cultured despisers” were, of course, these same friends . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 164)
   7. Religion is not “a way of thinking or a set of beliefs,” nor “a way of acting, with ethics or art.” [164] One must look to “those pious exaltations of the mind in which all other known activities are set aside or almost suppressed, and the whole soul is dissolved in the immediate feeling of the Infinite and the Eternal . . .” (Qtd. from *Speeches on Religion to its Cultured Despisers*. Rpt. New York, 1958. 15-16.) (Dillenberger and Welch 164)
   8. Religion is not found “in the human faculty of knowing (science, metaphysics) or acting (ethics, art) [but in] the realm of “feeling” (*Gefühl*) or “affection.” By these terms, Schleiermacher means a kind of primal and immediate self-awareness, a unique element in human experience which is really more basic than either ordinary knowing or acting. In both knowing and acting, I find myself over against the world as the object of my knowledge and action. But in the religious apprehension, I am immediately aware of the deeper unity of the whole. I know God, not indirectly by inference from the world of the senses or from morality, but directly . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 165)
   9. “The contemplation of the pious is the immediate consciousness of the universal existence of all finite things . . . it is a life in the infinite nature of the Whole, in the One and in the All, in God, having and possessing all things in God, and God in all.” (Quotation from *Speeches on Religion to its Cultured Despisers* (New York, 1958) 36.) (Dillenberger and Welch 165)
   10. “. . . where morality rests on the consciousness of freedom and seeks to manipulate, religion or piety begins in surrender and submission to the One.” (Dillenberger and Welch 165)
   11. “. . . dogmas come into existence as a result of refection on this basic intuition, and are [165] thus important. . . . [But,] Though doctrines are unavoidable when feeling is made the subject of reflection, piety can exist without doctrines. Moreover, doctrines are not necessary for the communication of piety.” (Dillenberger and Welch 165-166)
   12. Religion, or piety, “is an experience that is *sui generis.* It can be understood only through itself and it needs no certification . . . In religion, “all is immediately true.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 166)
   13. Schleiermacher “has not only replied to the Romantics, but also has faced the difficulties raised by Kant’s critique of knowledge. Schleiermacher can readily accept the destruction of the traditional arguments for the existence of God, for he sees that these are not at all the foundation of religion. Drawing on his pietist heritage, he looks rather to the living experience . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 166)
   14. Schleiermacher’s greatest work is *The Christian Faith* (1821), in which the essence of religion is more precisely formulated: it is “the feeling (or immediate consciousness) of being absolutely dependent upon God. This awareness [is always] modified in various ways in the different religions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 166)
   15. “Christianity is “a monotheistic faith, belonging to the teleological [i. e., ethical] type of religion, and is essentially distinguished from other such faiths by the fact that in it everything is related to the redemption accomplished by Jesus of Nazareth.” (Quotation from *Christian Faith* § 11.) (Dillenberger and Welch 167)
   16. “The Christian faith is rooted not only in the experience of dependence upon God, but also in a further duality of experience: the consciousness of sin and the consciousness of grace. Sin means our lack of God-consciousness (i. e., “God-forgetful-ness”), the hostility and alienation from God which is the failure to recognize our absolute dependence upon God. Redemption is the overcoming of sin, and transformation into full communion with God. This we cannot accomplish for ourselves. Redemption comes only by divine grace, and is communicated to us through the perfect God-consciousness of Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 167)
   17. “All the Christian teachings, Schleiermacher says, are derived from reflection on this unique and complex experience. For example, the conceptions of God’s eternity, omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience, and of creation, spring from the sense of absolute dependence on God. The conceptions of original sin, and of the holiness and justice of God, are elaborations of the consciousness of sin. And the doctrines of the love of God, of Christ as the redeemer, and of justification by faith, are all developed out of the awareness of grace.” (Dillenberger and Welch 167)
   18. “. . . “original sin” is not to be understood as referring to a first sin of the first human parents, but as an expression of the fact that the whole human race is involved in sin . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 167)
   19. “. . . our faith in Christ is not composed of the particular events of his life, or his miracles or teachings, but the total impression which he makes upon us.” (Dillenberger and Welch 168)
   20. “Finally, Schleiermacher ignores the differences between Protestant branches of Christianity. There is, he feels, an important difference between Protestant and Roman Catholic piety: in Protestantism an individual’s relation to the church depends upon the relation to Christ; in Roman Catholicism the individual’s relation to Christ depends upon the relation to the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 168)
   21. “Though Kant had anticipated the turn to a realm of subjective experience as the beginning point for theology, Schleiermacher first made explicit the understanding . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 168)
   22. “The Bible and the creeds are important, but as records and interpretations of the experience of Christians. The Christian does not have faith in Christ because of the Bible; rather the Bible gains its authority from the believer’s faith in Christ. The heart of Christianity, Schleiermacher had learned from the Moravians, is not doctrine or ethic, but a new life in Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 168)
   23. “. . . “liberal theology” [is] sometimes also called “empirical theology,” or the “theology of religious experience” . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 169)
   24. Schleiermacher “became central in Protestant “liberal theology” . . . even his sharpest critics are one with Schleiermacher in the recognition that God and faith belong together. . . . We know God only as we meet God in a venture of trust and obedience, as we respond in faith to the forgiving and liberating work in Christ. This was genuinely a renewal of the Reformation . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 169)

## Liberal Theology

1. **introduction**
   1. major factors in 19th-century religious thought (Dillenberger and Welch 145)
      1. “the critical philosophy of Kant”;
      2. “the continuing influence of Pietism”;
      3. “Romanticism”;
      4. “new tools for the study of the Bible”;
      5. advances in the sciences of nature and society”;
      6. “striking institutional and geographical expansion in the Protestant churches”;
      7. “the further growth of nationalism”;
      8. “the social upheavals attendant upon the rise of an industrial society.”
   2. “Along with the historical criticism of the Bible and the theological reconstruction led by Schleiermacher and Ritschl, a third central feature in the rise of Protestant liberalism was the opening of a new phase in the relations of science and religion.” [Note: three factors.] (Dillenberger and Welch 178)
2. **c**. **1800**: **theological positions**
   1. orthodoxy (though “the massive theological systems of the Protestant scholastics . . . had fallen into disrepute”). (Dillenberger and Welch 161)
   2. Nonreligious rationalism, “which insisted on the full competence of human reason to solve all problems . . .” [162] Jesus is “important only as a teacher of moral principles, but not as in his person the redeeming act of God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 162, 167)
   3. deism and natural religion, which “sought to work out various compromises between Rationalism and Christian faith by reducing religion to those “essentials” which could be “rationally” defended.” (Dillenberger and Welch 162)
   4. evangelical revivals (Pietism, Methodism, and the awakenings) These were “concerned with recalling people to an immediate personal experience of the working of God in Christ, and were generally indifferent or even hostile to theological endeavors. No real attempt was made to answer the questions posed by Rationalism and natural religion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 162)
   5. Immanuel Kant
   6. Friedrich Schleiermacher
3. **biblical criticism**
   1. “Criticism” here does not mean “finding fault” or “attacking.” Greek *kritikos* means “literary expert.” (Dillenberger and Welch 169)
   2. text criticism
      1. Textual criticism (often called in the nineteenth century “lower criticism”) had long been accepted in the churches; it examined all available manuscripts to establish the Bible’s original wording.” (Dillenberger and Welch 169)
      2. “Such criticism had been given strong impetus by the Reformation which challenged the authority of the Latin Vulgate . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 169)
         1. “Thus Luther used a Greek edition of the New Testament published in 1516 by the great Renaissance scholar Erasmus.” (Dillenberger and Welch 169)
         2. In the King James version (1611), “a number of errors in the Vulgate version were corrected . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 169-170)
   3. Leaving aside “traditional notions about the authorship or inspiration of the Scriptures, the critics now sought to answer afresh such questions as the following: what is the relation of the biblical books to each other? how were they written? by whom? when? what did the writers intend to say? were there historical causes which might account for the recorded developments in the Scriptures? what is the relation of the biblical record to other records of ancient times?” (Dillenberger and Welch 170)
   4. “There were important works of critics outside orthodox circles, such as Spinoza’s study of the miracles and Old Testament sources (in the *Tractatus* [170] *Theologico-politicus,* 1670) and Thomas Hobbes’s outline of methods for critical study of the Old Testament (in the *Leviathan,* 1651). But these began to receive sympathetic attention from Protestant scholars only in the late eighteenth century, in such men as Ernesti and Semler . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 170-171)
   5. “The goal of biblical study came to be historical objectivity: the task was to be purely factual and descriptive.” (Dillenberger and Welch 171)
   6. “There are certain striking differences between the Synoptics and John . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 171)
   7. the four-source theory: “The logical conclusion is that in addition to Mark, the writers of Matthew and Luke had another common source of information which each one incorporated into his gospel, together with the material from Mark and information which each had secured from other sources.” (Dillenberger and Welch 172)
   8. “. . . various parts of the New Testament reveal distinctive “points of view,” [indicating] different and sometimes antagonistic wings or parties in the church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 172)
   9. “Historical criticism had been applied even earlier to the Old Testament” [172]
      1. Old Testament books (e. g., Isaiah) were now found to be composite.” (Dillenberger and Welch 172)
      2. “Moreover, Old Testament prophecy in general could no longer be understood as specific prediction of details in the life of Christ, but only as expressions of the general hope of the Hebrews for a Messiah, and thus perhaps as a general preparation for the revelation in Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 172)
      3. The four sources of the pentateuch: “the traditional view of Israel’s development was exactly reversed: the great law codes did not come before but after the prophets.” (Dillenberger and Welch 173)
      4. Biblical criticism “reveals to us the gradual development of Hebrew religion into the ethical monotheism of the great prophets.” (Dillenberger and Welch 176)
   10. The “history of religions (*religionsgeschichtlich*) school of criticism began to show clearly how deeply imbedded were both the Old and New Testaments in the other religious traditions of the ancient Near East.” (Dillenberger and Welch 174)
   11. “The decisive issue was not the specific interpretations of historical criticism, but . . . the *significance* and *authority* of the Bible as a whole [174] . . . In short, it was all up with the dogma of the inerrancy of Scripture. This was perhaps the most important development in nineteenth-century Protestant thought . . . comparable to the Reformation itself.” (Dillenberger and Welch 174-175)
   12. philosophical theology’s influence on biblical criticism
       1. “This does not mean, however, that the new conception of the Bible which came to characterize Protestant liberalism originated simply as a reaction to the discoveries of historical criticism. In fact, the situation was more nearly the reverse. It was new conceptions of religious authority and of the meaning of revelation which made possible the development of biblical criticism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 175)
       2. Georg W. F. Hegel (l770-1831) “influenced several of the leading biblical critics . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 175)
          1. The essence of Christianity is such great ideas as the trinity and the incarnation. “The truth of these was not dependent on the historical accuracy of the Bible [175] . . . The Hegelian interpretation was, however, relatively short-lived . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 175-176)
       3. Schleiermacher
          1. “Schleiermacher had insisted [that] Christian doctrines, creeds, and confessions are human interpretations of the experience of redemption through Jesus Christ. Not any external authority, Bible, or creed, or church, is finally normative, but only the living experience of Christians.” (Dillenberger and Welch 176)
          2. “The theology of religious experience had taught that the doctrines of the church, including even the biblical statements, were not infallible revealed truths, but human interpretations of religious experience. All doctrinal formulations were thus subject to continual restatement.” (Dillenberger and Welch 179)
          3. The authority of the Bible was “not the authority of a purely objective and external revelation [but] the authority of a record of religious experience. . . . it serves to communicate the experience to later generations.” (Dillenberger and Welch 176)
          4. “The central fact to which the New Testament points, the presence of God in Christ, is of all-embracing import, but differences in interpretation and in the reporting of events are to be expected.” (Dillenberger and Welch 176)
4. **Albrecht Ritschl** (1822-1889)
   1. Ritschl “stood in the tradition of Schleiermacher, emphasizing the absolute centrality of Christ and seeking to ground all faith affirmations in Christian experience (though for Ritschl, religious experience was essentially *moral* in nature).” (Dillenberger and Welch 177)
   2. But “Ritschl was deeply influenced by the critical philosophy of Kant.” (Dillenberger and Welch 177)
      1. Ritschl “agreed with Kant’s limitation of theoretical “knowledge” of God . . ., for religion is not at all concerned with abstract and speculative assertions about God, but only with judgments made on the basis of living experience . . . of Christ’s significance or value for us.” (Dillenberger and Welch 177)
      2. “Second, Ritschl accepted Kant’s close identification of religion and morality. Religion is essentially a practical affair. It is concerned with winning the victory of spirit over nature in human life.” (Dillenberger and Welch 177)
   3. kingdom of God
      1. Ritschl’s “rediscovery of the central place of the idea of the kingdom of God in the New Testament gave powerful impetus to the development of the “social gospel” . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 178)
      2. God’s purpose is “the establishment of a fellowship of redeemed persons. [177] . . . He misunderstood the New Testament view of the kingdom and [this] led to the development of what the Germans call *KuIturprotestantismus* (i. e., the confusion of Protestantism with cultural faith and goals).” (Dillenberger and Welch 177-178)
   4. God is love
      1. Another of Ritschl’s emphases “became central in liberal theology . . . love is [not] one of the attributes of God, along with justice, power, etc., but that God is love. This is God’s inmost nature, God’s very being. Thus the notion of God’s holiness and justice was suppressed (and the idea of God’s wrath was denied). This teaching resulted in the practical abandonment of the traditional doctrines of punishment of the damned.” (Dillenberger and Welch 178)
   5. original sin
      1. “Partly because of his notion of the religious problem as one of spirit versus nature, partly because of the prevailing mood of the late nineteenth century, partly because of his opposition to “theoretical” doctrines, Ritschl rejected the idea of “original sin.” He was much more optimistic about the possibility of overcoming sin than either traditional Protestantism or Protestant thought since the First World War.” (Dillenberger and Welch 178)
5. **religion and science**
   1. Since Copernicus and especially “the discoveries of Galileo and Kepler, which destroyed traditional conceptions of an earth-centered universe, the problem of the relation between the biblical conception of the world and the scientific conception of the world had been acute. . . . Now in the nineteenth century, the whole discussion took a significantly new turn” with *Origin of Species* (1859). (Dillenberger and Welch 179)
   2. Darwinism, rather than, e. g., discoveries in geology, “appeared [179] to contradict the biblical story of human origins. . . . And by setting back the date of the origin of the human race by countless thousands of years, it led to doubts as to the traditional view concerning the central place of Hebrew-Christian history in the history of humanity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 179-180)
   3. “. . . by setting back the date of the origin of the human race by countless thousands of years, it led to doubts as to the traditional view concerning the central place of Hebrew-Christian history in the history of humanity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 180)
   4. “Moreover, to some there now seemed to be no room for the working of a beneficent purpose in nature or in history. For the eighteenth century, the worlds of nature and of humanity obeyed the same inexorable laws, prescribed by a just and all-wise God. Now the natural law . . ., “red in tooth and claw,” dominated by the struggle for existence, was anything but moral.” (Dillenberger and Welch 180)
   5. “Biblical studies had shown that [Gen 1-3 were not] God’s own description of human origins, but . . . ancient Hebrew traditions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 180)
   6. For many, “The discovery that the human species had come into being as a result of a very long process of development from lower forms of life did require a drastic alteration of the traditional views as to “how” God created, yet it did not affect at all the conviction that God is the creator (nor did it say anything as to the purpose, the “why” of creation).” (Dillenberger and Welch 181)
   7. “It is the province of science to tell us the *structure* of the physical universe and to describe the processes by which it has come to be what it is. But religion is concerned with more ultimate questions of origin and meaning, and from religious experience we know that God is the creator . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 181)
   8. “Indeed, the Bible itself shows no interest in natural processes for their own sake. It affirms that nature as well as history is ordered by the purpose of God, but its primary concern is with the redeeming work of God in human history.” (Dillenberger and Welch 181)
   9. “. . . evolution caught the public eye because of the bizarre Scopes trial (1925).” (Dillenberger and Welch 182)
   10. Also, the concept of evolution was fruitfully applied to the Old Testament’s “great variety of religious insights . . . God was progressively revealed, with the climax being reached in Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 182)
   11. “A similar pattern of explanation was widely adopted in the study of the history of religions (or “comparative religions”) . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 182)
   12. Evolution reinforced “three trends in Protestant thought which may properly be associated with liberal theology.” (Dillenberger and Welch 182)
       1. “One was an increased emphasis on the “immanence” of God, that is, on the working of God *within* natural processes rather than by miraculous interruptions . . . This trend of thought had been given earlier impetus by Spinoza, by the Romantics, by Schleiermacher and Hegel, and by the nineteenth-century poets . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 183)
       2. Evolution caused a “reinterpretation of traditional conceptions of sin and redemption. The view that human beings had been created in a condition of perfect innocence and had then fallen into sinfulness from which they had to be redeemed, was exchanged for a view which put the golden age in the future. That we need to be redeemed from sin was not denied, but redemption was likened more to a process of gradual education . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 183)
       3. “Finally, the relation of Christianity to non-Christian religions was increasingly understood in evolutionary terms. The relation is not one of white and black, entire truth and utter falsity. Rather, the religions of mankind represent stages in the development of religious insight, Christianity being the highest and fullest revelation of God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 183)

## Protestant Expansion in the 1800s

1. **indications of religious decline**
   1. “Separationist tendencies,” i. e., “the powerful tendency toward formal separation of religious institutions from the political institutions . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
      1. the American and French Revolutions;
      2. “the Napoleonic reforms, [which] brought to an end the 1648 settlement of the Peace of Westphalia, *cuius regio, eius religio.*” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
      3. “the English reforms of the 1830’s which limited” Anglican prerogatives;
      4. “And through the first half of the century, partly as a result of the revivals stemming from British Evangelicalism and Moravian centers, there were pressures for (at least spiritual) independence from state establishments in the Reformed churches in Switzerland, France, Scotland, and Holland.” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
   2. “hostility to the church” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
      1. “the revolutions of 1848, which were mostly met by negative reactions from Protestant and Catholic authorities alike (note, e.g., the turn to conservatism by Pope Pius IX and the Throne and Altar theology of German Lutheranism)”; (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
      2. “growing anticlericalism” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
         1. especially in Roman Catholic countries (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
            1. 1870: liquidation of the papal states in Italy
            2. 1905: “formal separation of church and state in France” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
         2. For Protestants “the trend toward separation of church and state is seen as a significant advance . . . But anticlericalism, in its nineteenth-century form of broad critique of institutional religion as such rather than mere suspicion of clergy (which certainly was not new), could be just as characteristic of Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican settings . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
      3. “the support and control of education were taken over increasingly by the state . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 146)
      4. “the increasingly sharp distinction between the “religious” and the “secular,” so that the life of faith became a thing apart from the world of government and of commerce . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 147)
      5. secular societies, “whose goal was to emphasize the present world”;
      6. charges that the church was simply the “opiate of the people” and the tool of class interests . . .” (For many “the church seemed to be so tied to racial, economic, and national consciousnesses as to have no independent life of its own.”) (Dillenberger and Welch 147)
      7. “Particularly in the latter half of the century, the progress of science” (especially biology, geology, anthropology, and later sociology and psychology). (Dillenberger and Welch 147)
      8. “. . . the successes of the scientific method suggested that here at last was found the means to all truth . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 147)
      9. With “the industrialization of the West [came] the belief that the era of plenty was at hand . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 147)
      10. “At the same time, to [most] industrial workers, [the church] did not speak to the difficulties which had been created . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 147)
2. **indications of religious vigor**
   1. The 19th century experienced “a genuine rebirth of religious vitality, . . . expressed in the [missions, the] theological vigor and the growing social concern of the century.” (Dillenberger and Welch 153)
   2. “the missionary movement”;
   3. “the religious revivals at the beginning of the century”;
   4. “church members in the American population [which] rose from less than 10 percent in 1800 to over 40 percent in 1910 (and to a high point of 58 percent in 1951).” (Dillenberger and Welch 147)
   5. “the appearance of new denominations [which] continued apace in consequence of”: [148]
      1. “the revivals”;
      2. “secessions from established denominations”;
      3. “transplantation of European national churches through immigration”;
      4. “social cleavages (as in the division of several major bodies into Northern and Southern branches over the issue of slavery).” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   6. youth organizations within the churches: “e. g., the Methodist Epworth League, the Baptist Young People’s Union, and the Luther League.” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   7. youth organizations outside the churches: these “cut across denominational lines [and were] peculiarly though not exclusively characteristic of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
      1. “. . . student Christian societies . . . grew rapidly toward the end of the century . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
      2. Many “joined in the World’s Student Christian Federation.” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
      3. “Similar [were] such organizations as the YMCA and YWCA . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
      4. “These groups were mainly concerned to work in urban areas in universities and colleges.” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   8. Sunday schools
      1. They first appeared in the late 1700s in England; they “were designed to give religious and moral instruction to the poor and to teach the young to read the Bible.” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
      2. “. . . the Sunday School became the characteristic Protestant method of religious instruction.” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   9. denominational colleges: in the United States 25 seminaries were founded from 1808 to 1840. (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   10. theological seminaries: “the universities ceased to be the primary places for clergy education . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   11. the creative German theological faculties, “especially at the new University of Berlin . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   12. interdenominational Bible societies: “the dual aim [was] evangelism and religious instruction . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 149)
   13. “. . . there appeared also in this century a new and profound sense, on the part of the churches, of their responsibility for the well-being of the social whole.” (Dillenberger and Welch 149)
       1. “organizations concerned with particular social evils (such as the temperance and antislavery groups)”;
       2. “general philanthropic enterprises”;
       3. “efforts to Christianize the whole of the social and economic order (as in the Christian socialist programs or the “social gospel” movement).” (Dillenberger and Welch 149)
   14. “theological ferment” (149)
       1. This began especially in Germany. (Dillenberger and Welch 149)
       2. “. . . one of the most marked developments of the century was a decline in concern for theological differences among the denominations and the consequent cross-fertilization among Protestant theological systems. It is fair to say that by the beginning of the First World War, “liberal” Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, and Baptists in America, Lutheran and Reformed thinkers on the Continent, and Anglicans and Nonconformists in the United Kingdom, were much closer to each other in religious outlook than they were to the extreme conservative or “fundamentalist” Christians within their own denominations.” (Dillenberger and Welch 150)
   15. conclusion: “These general tendencies can be summarized under three main heads: 1) the growth of the Protestant missionary enterprise; 2) the rise of “liberal” theology; and 3) Protestant reactions to the social and economic changes of the century, particularly as these are seen in the rise of the “social gospel.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 149)
3. **the missionary movement**
   1. before the 19th century
      1. why little missionary activity
         1. “Often, it was held that the New Testament instruction to go to all nations applied only to the original disciples, and in the minds of some the doctrine of predestination seemed to make human efforts to convert the heathen both unnecessary and presumptuous.” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
         2. “. . . the monastic orders had carried on the principal Christian missionary activity, and Protestants, opposed to the religious principle underlying monasticism, had no practical means of performing the missionary functions of the monks.” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
         3. “. . . the energies of the Reformers were wholly absorbed in the work of reforming the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
         4. Then came “the intense theological disputes in Protestant scholasticism . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
         5. Also, “the internal wars in nations which were part Protestant and part Roman Catholic (e. g., France, Germany, and the Netherlands) occupied the center of attention.” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
      2. missionary activity
         1. There was “evangelistic effort where the church already existed [but few] attempts to transmit the gospel to those outside the Western European cultural milieu . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
         2. “The forerunners of the modern movement were few and ill-supported; they were largely confined to colonial areas [Walter Raleigh, Wesley]; and they were often abortive because they accepted converts without adequate instruction and failed to develop native pastors and leaders.” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
         3. “And among the Moravians, whole communities of families had devoted themselves to the propagation of the faith, chiefly in Greenland and the West Indies. Mainly because of the Moravians, Germany was the chief source of missionaries prior to 1800.” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
         4. “An English missionary society was formed as early as 1649, and two other groups, which are still in existence, were organized at the beginning of the eighteenth century (the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts).” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
   2. “The nineteenth century was the period of the greatest geographic spread of Christianity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 150)
   3. “The beginning of large-scale Protestant missionary activity is popularly dated from the publication in 1792 of a small book by a British shoemaker, schoolteacher, and preacher, William Carey, entitled *An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens*.” (Dillenberger and Welch 150)
      1. “Carey opposed the view “that since God is omnipotent and has predetermined who are the elect, he will save whom he chooses [150] . . . the president of a Baptist conference told William Carey when he first made his proposal for a missionary society, that when it pleased God to convert the heathen, God would do it without Carey’s help.” (Dillenberger and Welch 150, 153)
      2. Carey said “the New Testament command to “preach the Gospel to every creature” and to “make disciples of all nations” was directed to Christians of the present time as much as to the original apostles.” (Dillenberger and Welch 150)
   4. “Another sort of factor was the economic and political context of the Protestant churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 151)
      1. “During the first century of Protestant history, it was the Roman Catholic countries of Spain and Portugal which [151] dominated the commercial and imperial expansion . . . This was the age of the great Roman Catholic missionary activity, symbolized especially by the work of Francis Xavier and Ignatius Loyola.” (Dillenberger and Welch 151-152)
      2. “Not until after the defeat of the Spanish Armada and the emergence of the British and the Dutch as colonial powers were the new continents open to Protestant missionaries.” (Dillenberger and Welch 152)
      3. There was “the general peace and prosperity of the century”;
      4. the close relation of Protestantism to the economic and political liberalism”;
      5. “the powerful spirit of optimism and confidence which was so deeply a part of the nineteenth-century temper.” [152] “. . . optimism and confident belief in progress which pervaded the West during this period . . .”” (Dillenberger and Welch 152, 154)
   5. “It has even become quite common to interpret the missionary effort as a function of cultural imperialism, in which the religious motives were confused with bringing Western civilization to “backward and ignorant” people. [But] the new concern for missions sprang from an impulse within the life of the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 152)
   6. “And there was certainly no simple correlation of commercial and religious expansion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 152)
      1. After 1800 “the East India Company, acting for the British government, vigorously opposed the entrance of missionaries into India.” (Dillenberger and Welch 152)
      2. “It was not until after the First World War that the United States became a major power in world affairs, whereas in the nineteenth century it had already, with Great Britain, played the dominant role . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 152)
      3. Missions free “of all direct commercial or political interests” distinguish the 19th century. (Dillenberger and Welch 153)
   7. “. . . the missionary impulse had its roots in the revivals of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The portions of Protestantism in which the missionary motive was the strongest were those which had been most affected by Pietism, by the Wesleyan revival, and by the awakenings . . . [Here was] a living experience of God’s gracious forgiveness in Jesus Christ.” (Dillenberger and Welch 154)
   8. motives of individual Protestants
      1. For many, the dominant impulse was found in the authority of the Scriptures, especially” Matt 28:19-20, Phil 2:10-11, Col 1:20.” (Dillenberger and Welch 154-155)
      2. For others, the missions were “a call to be faithful to the example of the earliest Christians.” (Dillenberger and Welch 155)
      3. For others, “the nearness of God’s kingdom provided a note of special urgency.” (Dillenberger and Welch 155)
      4. “. . . the Reformation doctrine of the “calling,” particularly as interpreted in the Calvinist tradition, took on renewed meaning among those who became missionaries. Many felt impelled by a specific call of the Spirit to missionary fields. (This had been all along a characteristic feature of the Moravian communities.)” (Dillenberger and Welch 155)
   9. “a few of the hundreds of organizations” [155]
      1. England
         1. “. . . the Baptist Missionary Society was organized in 1793 as a direct result of William Carey’s *Enquiry* . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 155)
         2. In 1796 “the Scottish Missionary Society and the Glasgow Missionary Society were organized, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland adopted an official policy for missionary work in India.” (Dillenberger and Welch 155)
         3. “Just before the turn of the century, the Church Missionary Society was formed [by] the Church of England, and this eventually became the greatest of all the missionary societies . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 155)
         4. “Already, an interdenominational group, the London Missionary Society, had been organized by those [155] of “evangelical sentiments” . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 155-156)
         5. “. . . an official organ of the British Methodist Conference was established in 1817-1818.” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
      2. Europe
         1. “A society was founded in the Netherlands in 1797, reflecting the influence of the work in Britain . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
         2. “. . . missionary interest began to develop strongly in Germany and Switzerland after 1825.” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
         3. But “the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society [only had its] beginning in 1882.” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
      3. America
         1. “. . . eventually the United States supplied the majority of the missionaries and over half the financial support for Protestant missions.” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
         2. “Much effort had been previously directed toward the conversion of the American Indians . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
         3. “. . . an earlier mission had been sent to Africa . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
         4. Samuel J. Mills at Williams College formed “a secret Society of the Brethren, in which each member pledged to devote his life to missionary service.” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
         5. Adoniram Judson (“the later famous missionary to India and Burma”) joined Mills’s Society at “the newly created Congregational Andover Theological Seminary,” where the students later founded “the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (1810) . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
         6. It was “shortly followed by the Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel in India and other Foreign Parts, the United Christian Missionary Society (for the work of Presbyterian and other Reformed churches) . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
   10. what “distinguished this movement from the efforts of the preceding centuries.” (Dillenberger and Welch 156)
       1. “. . . particularly in Protestant nations, the foreign missions received neither financial assistance from the governments, nor (and this is equally important) the state control . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 157)
       2. “Not only did the support come entirely from private philanthropy, but it came from a growing minority of lay people of moderate or small incomes.” (Dillenberger and Welch 157)
       3. Because of “Protestant emphasis [157] on the position of the individual before God and the disappearance of group conversions,” prebaptismal instruction became more strict. (Dillenberger and Welch 157-158)
       4. “. . . confusion of Christian ethics with Western social customs . . . was a problem of which the missionaries were increasingly conscious . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 158)
       5. “nonevangelistic humanitarian activities” [158]
          1. “In some cases these activities were closely related to the goal of conversion, as in the case of the schools . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 158)
          2. “Particularly in medical work, the ideal of pure service irrespective of religious influence has been prominent.” (Dillenberger and Welch 158)
          3. “. . . the missionaries were frequently plagued by the problem of “rice Christians,” or persons who accepted baptism not out of conviction but in order to receive food, education, medical care, etc.” (Dillenberger and Welch 158)
   11. results
       1. “The work was significantly successful in the islands of the Pacific, the East Indies, Ceylon, Burma, Korea, the coastal provinces and lower Yangtze in China, Japan (mainly in the intellectual and professional classes), India (especially among the lower castes and the hill tribes), Madagascar, and South and Central Africa.” (Dillenberger and Welch 159)
       2. “Anticlerical developments against Roman Catholicism in Meso- and South America helped to open the way for Protestant missions [to] converts from nominal Roman Catholicism.” (Dillenberger and Welch 159)
       3. “. . . though the percentage of Christians in non-Western nations more than doubled in the first half of the present century, the proportion of the population which is Christian had reached by the mid-1970s only about 3.5 percent in India, 3 percent in Japan, and 6.7 percent in Taiwan, though perhaps as much as 40 percent in parts of Africa.” (Dillenberger and Welch 159)
       4. “The missionaries had least success in appealing to those from the highly developed Eastern religions and cultures, and almost no success among Moslems.” (Dillenberger and Welch 159)
       5. In the later twentieth century, “the new nationalisms tended to discourage missionary efforts.” (Dillenberger and Welch 159)
       6. The “development of indigenous leadership . . . meant that [159] . . . Western Christians could no longer conceive of the Christian truth as” European. (Dillenberger and Welch 159-160)
       7. The “missionary movement called for new and profound concern for the problem of Protestant divisions . . . The non-Christian was not frequently attracted by the appalling variety of Protestant sects . . . duplication of effort and organization among the denominations, led, in the latter part of the century, to more cooperative and interdenominational activity, culminating in the International Missionary Council . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 160)

# Protestantism in America, 1607-1950

## Colonial Religious Groups

1. **colonial Calvinists**
   1. introduction
      1. “The Calvinist heritage of the colonial churches is emphasized by Ralph Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (1940).” (Hudson 183)
      2. Ralph Gabriel (*The Course of American Democratic Thought*. 1940): in the American colonies, “The God most worshipped was the deity to whom John Calvin prayed with such intensity of devotion and singularity of purpose.” (Hudson 18)
      3. “Both chronologically and numerically, the predominant Old World religious heritage in the American colonies was the Reformed or Calvinist tradition as it found expression in English Puritanism and the related Presbyterianism of Scotland and northern Ireland.” (Hudson 18)
      4. The Protestant groups “did not arrive at the same time, nor did they arrive in equal numbers.” (Hudson 18)
   2. history
      1. 1606: “William Brewster led a group of Separatists to the Netherlands to escape religious persecution in England.” (“Mayflower.” *Encarta 98 Desk Encyclopedia*. Redmond, WA: Microsoft, 1997.)
      2. 1616: some vote to emigrate to America.
      3. 1620: “these Separatists were part of a group that left for America on the *Mayflower*.” Pilgrims (the 102 “early English settlers who founded Plymouth Colony”) sail from Plymouth, England, to Provincetown, MA, then found Plymouth Colony, the first permanent settlement in New England. (“Mayflower.” *Encarta 98 Desk Encyclopedia*. Redmond, WA: Microsoft, 1997.)
      4. Reformed churches in England and Wales (“Reformed and Presbyterian Church: History: After the Reformation in Europe: Reformed Churches in England and Wales.” *Encyclopædia Britannica 2002*)
         1. 1643-1652: the Puritans’ Westminster Assembly fails to establish a presbyterian system or “a looser arrangement of independent churches under Cromwell . . .”
         2. 1660: restoration of bishops. Reformed Christians who cannot accept this are persecuted as Nonconformists.
         3. 1688-1689: the Glorious Revolution expels Catholic James II. This “gave English Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists limited toleration outside the state church.”
      5. “The three old denominations of English Dissent [were the] Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Baptists . . .” (Hudson 20) Congregationalists and Baptists were “the Independent party . . .” (Hudson 14)
      6. The three played “a much larger role than the Anglicans in the shaping of American Protestantism.” (Hudson 20)
      7. By 1787:
         1. Congregationalists and Presbyterians “were the two largest religious groups,” each about 40% of the churches. (Hudson 20)
         2. Baptists and Anglicans came next, each about 15% of the churches.
      8. Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Baptists accepted the Westminster Confession of Faith. (Hudson 20)
         1. 1648: the Congregationalists adopt the Westminster Confession “for substance of doctrine.” (Hudson 20)
         2. 1729: the Presbyterians adopt the Westminster Confession. (Hudson 20)
         3. The “major Baptist group adhered to it in a slightly altered form that included the substitution of the hyper-Calvinist triple covenant for the double covenant of the original confession.” (Hudson 20)
   3. Congregationalists
      1. 1620: “The earliest [American] Congregational churches date from the founding of Plymouth colony . . .” (Hudson 20)
      2. 1630: The “great migration” to Massachusetts Bay begins. (Hudson 20)
      3. The migrators wanted “to create “a city set on a hill” that would force, by the very power of its example, thoroughgoing religious reform at home.” (Hudson 20)
      4. During the Puritan Revolution in England, “it appeared that their expectation of producing sufficient ferment at home to effect the desired reform might be fulfilled . . .” (Hudson 20)
      5. 1660: the restoration of the Stuarts. “New England rather than old England was to be the domain of Congregationalism . . .” (Hudson 20)
      6. New England was “a land of small communities gathered about the village church. [20] Schools as well as churches were established,” so that knowledge of scripture might abound. (Hudson 20-21)
      7. 1636: Harvard is founded “for the education of additional ministers” . . . Harvard thus antedated the establishment in any systematic fashion, of primary and grammar schools . . .” (Hudson 21)
   4. Presbyterians
      1. Presbyterian churches were established, “first on Long Island, and then in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and South Carolina.” (Hudson 21)
      2. 1706: “Several of these churches were brought together to form the Presbytery of Philadelphia . . .” (Hudson 21)
      3. 1710: there was a “great influx of Scotch-Irish [21] population into the Middle colonies, the Piedmont region of the South, and the back country of New England.” (Hudson 21-22) [“Piedmont”: a “plateau region . . . from New York to Alabama between the Appalachian Mountains and the Atlantic coastal plain.” (*American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. 3d ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996).]
   5. Baptists
      1. “It was not the intent of the founders of New England to foster dissent, but it was here that Baptists and Presbyterians made their first appearance.” (Hudson 21)
      2. 1639: “Baptist beginnings date from the ejection of Roger Williams from Massachusetts Bay and his subsequent role in forming a Baptist church at Providence in 1639. . . . Rhode Island remained a center of Baptist activity . . .” (Hudson 21)
      3. Roger Williams (1603?-1683) (“Williams, Roger.” *Encarta 98 Desk Encyclopedia*. Redmond, WA: Microsoft, 1997.)
         1. Williams was an English Puritan clergyman.
         2. 1631: Williams immigrates from London to Boston in New England. He challenges the Boston authorities’ right to regulate religious matters and says that appropriation of land from Native Americans is illegal.
         3. 1635: Williams is banished from the colony.
         4. 1636: he escapes to Narragansett Bay, purchases land from the Narragansett tribe, and, with a few companions, establishes the settlement of Providence and the colony of Rhode Island (royal charter: 1644). The colony practices religious toleration and separation of church and state.
         5. 1638: Williams founds the first Baptist church in America. (He “later withdrew from the church he had founded and declared that he accepted Christianity but professed no particular creed.”)
         6. Rhode Island is a haven for Quakers persecuted in Boston.
      4. But “the major Baptist growth stemmed from the formation of the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1707. This association, which was to embrace churches from Connecticut to Virginia and which founded Brown University as a training center for its ministers, carried on vigorous missionary activity from Nova Scotia to Georgia which was to result in a marked Baptist growth toward the close of the colonial period.” (Hudson 21)
2. **Quakers**
   1. The Quakers’ “ethical and theological emphases betrayed many evidences of their origin within English Puritanism.” (Hudson 22)
   2. The Quakers “made their first appearance in the New World as itinerant “publishers of truth” . . .” (Hudson 22)
   3. 1656: “two of these Quaker itinerants were imprisoned at Boston.” (Hudson 22)
   4. “West Jersey was the earliest Quaker colony, being under the control of Quaker proprietors from 1675 to 1692 . . .” (Hudson 22)
   5. “The Quakers, who were widely dispersed throughout all the colonies, ranked fifth numerically among the colonial denominations . . . Quaker meetings had been formed in every colony from New Hampshire to South Carolina a full decade before Pennsylvania was founded in 1681.” (Hudson 22)
3. **unity of American Protestantism**
   1. 7 out of 10 colonists were English; 9 out of 10 were British. (Hudson 3)
   2. “. . . the vast majority of the population of colonial America was British in background, with approximately 70 per cent at the time of the first census in 1790 [17] being of English stock and an additional 15 per cent of Scottish or Scotch-Irish descent.” (Hudson 17-18) *Scotch-Irish*: “Eighteenth-century Ulster [9 counties in NE Ireland] had two elite and two lower classes. One of the elites was predominantly “English,” contained the most influential landowners, and was Protestant, affiliated with the Church of Ireland. The other elite was predominantly “commercial,” contained Scots as well as English, and included Protestants affiliated with various sects, especially Calvinistic ones. The two lower classes were divided by religion; one was Catholic, the other Protestant. Among the lower-class Protestants there was substantial emigration to North America in the middle decades of the century. These so-called Scotch-Irish, frustrated by limited economic opportunity in Ulster, became a mainstay of the Middle Atlantic colonies and the Appalachian frontier.” (“Northern Ireland.” *Encyclopædia Britannica 2002*)
   3. Most colonists did not belong to a church.
   4. The churches were all Christian; they were all Protestant; and “the overwhelming majority” were Calvinistic. (Hudson 17)
   5. There are 200+ Protestant bodies in America, but most have under 50,000 members and belong to half a dozen denominational families.
   6. Geography simplifies the picture further. There are:
      1. few Presbyterians in New England
      2. few Congregationalists in Pennsylvania
      3. few Lutherans in Mississippi
      4. no Episcopalians in the Dakotas
      5. few no Disciples in New Jersey.
4. **early amalgamation**
   1. 1776: “five English-speaking denominations—Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Anglicans, and Quakers—embraced 85 per cent of all the Protestant congregations . . .” (Hudson 22)
   2. “It was their predominance that accounts for many of the marked similarities of faith, practice, and outlook of the different Protestant churches in America.” (Hudson 22)
   3. “. . . German and Dutch colonists joined with others in the American Revolution to defend their rights as Englishmen . . .” (Hudson 22)
   4. “The early Swedish Lutherans along the Delaware and the French Reformed group in South Carolina both were absorbed into the Church of England . . .” (Hudson 22)
   5. “. . . the German Lutherans—after an initial resistance led by Henry M. Muhlenberg—were to varying degrees Anglicized and Americanized.” (Hudson 22)
   6. “. . . the English language became the common language of all the colonists . . .” (Hudson 22)
   7. Similarly, “. . . English patterns of church life tended to penetrate the churches of Continental origin.” (Hudson 22)
   8. “Gilbert Tennent, a Presbyterian, preached in Dutch Reformed pulpits.” (Hudson 22)
   9. Calvinism “left the deepest mark upon American Protestantism during this early period, when it was being shaped to a common pattern.” (Hudson 23)
      1. “. . . the English-speaking churches were Calvinistic . . .” (Hudson 23)
      2. They “were reinforced in this respect by the German, Dutch, and French Reformed churches representing an additional 9 per cent of the total number of congregations.” (Hudson 23)
      3. “. . . Calvinism was well adapted to the needs of men struggling to tame a wilderness. Sturdy virtues . . . were supplied by a religious faith which spoke . . . of stern imperatives and high destiny and expressed itself most characteristically in terms of restless energy, unfaltering confidence, and unblinking acceptance of the harsh facts of life.” (Hudson 23)
   10. Presbyterians and Baptists
       1. The “Westminster Confession of Faith and the [23] Philadelphia Confession of Faith [were] almost identical, forms of worship were the same, moral attitudes and political convictions were similar . . .” (Hudson 23-24)
       2. John Witherspoon, “the most famous colonial Presbyterian leader,” said about New Jersey (*Essays on Important Subjects* (1805), 4.203)
          1. Witherspoon: “Baptists are Presbyterians in all other respects, differing only in the point of infant baptism . . .” (Hudson 23)
          2. “. . . differences of church government apparently were not regarded by him to be sufficiently significant to be worth noting.” (Hudson 24)
       3. Baptists moved toward “a stronger and more centralized denominational life, whereas some of the more rigid features of Presbyterian polity had been softened by Scottish and American experience.” (Hudson 24)
   11. Presbyterians and Congregationalists
       1. “. . . their community of interest and identity was even more striking” than that of Presbyterians and Baptists. (Hudson 24)
       2. “The election of Jonathan Edwards, a Congregationalist, to the presidency of Presbyterian Princeton was a conspicuous illustration of the ease with which ministers moved back and forth between the two groups.” (Hudson 24)
       3. “In many ways, during the later colonial period, the two denominations were almost indistinguishable . . .” (Hudson 24)
       4. 1801: the two adopt a Plan of Union. (Hudson 24)
5. **colonial non-Calvinists**
   1. non-British Calvinists
      1. “With minor exceptions, the most significant being the Dutch Reformed, the non-British Protestant groups did not arrive until the beginning of the eighteenth century.” (Hudson 18)
      2. 1787: “the Reformed groups from the Continent . . . constituted [only] 9 per cent.” (Hudson 18)
   2. non-Calvinists
      1. “Protestants who stood completely outside the Reformed or Calvinist camp—Lutherans, Mennonites, Dunkers, and Moravians—made their appearance relatively late, and they were relatively few in numbers.” (Hudson 18)
      2. 1787: Lutherans, Mennonites, Dunkers, and Moravians are only 4.6% of Protestant congregations. (Hudson 18)

## Congregations’ Increasing Autonomy

1. **breakdown of the parish system**
   1. definitions
      1. *parish church*: “a whole community was embraced within the church and subjected to its [27] discipline . . . [It] presupposed that the whole community would belong to a single church.” (Hudson 27-28)
      2. *gathered church*: Hudson never defines “gathered church,” but the term suggests each church gathering its members from the wider community.
   2. In the 1700s in England, “the parish system had broken down owing to the movement of population from rural areas to new urban centers . . .” (Hudson 78)
   3. In America “it had never been established . . . In most of the colonies the churches were “gathered” churches from the start.” (Hudson 78)
   4. “. . . the abandonment of the effort to impose and maintain religious uniformity sounded the death knell to the parish system . . .” (Hudson 28)
   5. “. . . all the churches—whatever their traditional polity may have been—had become in effect “gathered” churches with a strong emphasis upon local autonomy and lay control.” (Hudson 27-29)
   6. New England
      1. “Only in New England [was] anything that even resembled the parish system . . . established.” (Hudson 28)
         1. There was religious homogeneity.
         2. The “pattern of settlement was on small landholdings gathered together into closely knit towns . . .” (Hudson 28)
      2. Congregationalists had insisted that “only those who could give some evident proofs of grace should belong to the church.” (Hudson 29)
      3. At first the population “was largely a “sifted” people, but later some of “the children of believers were unable to report having experienced the miracle of grace and thus were not able to qualify for church membership. This posed a very real threat to the parish system which was dependent upon the church embracing at least the larger portion of the population . . .” (Hudson 29)
      4. John Allin created “a “half-way” covenant by which the children of unregenerate children of believers might be baptized and brought within the scope of the church’s discipline. It was by this expedient that the collapse of the parish system in New England was deferred . . .” (Hudson 29)
      5. But later “the inroads of dissent dashed all hopes of maintaining it unimpaired.” (Hudson 29)
      6. 1730s: Jonathan Edwards “abandoned the effort to preserve the parish structure and insisted that Congregationalists must return to their initial emphasis upon the church as a covenanted community of convinced believers . . . he was only recognizing . . . the actualities of the changed situation.” (Hudson 29)
   7. Virginia
      1. The population was “thinly distributed on large plantations along the whole length of navigable rivers . . . [A parish] might be a hundred miles in length . . . How could he [a clergyman] even hope to keep in touch with his parishioners, to say nothing of maintaining the discipline of the church among them?” (Hudson 28)
      2. 1661: the author of *Virginia’s Cure* “proposed that money should be raised in England for the purpose of building towns in every county of Virginia. The planters could then be made to bring their families and servants to those centers on weekends so that they could be subjected to regular catechetical instruction and church attendance.” The plan never materialized. (Hudson 28)
2. **increased role of the laity**
   1. Mead, S.E. “The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry.” In Niebuhr, H.R., ed. *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives*. 1956.
   2. “. . . the ministerial office conferred little authority beyond that personal authority which a minister might be able to command . . .” (Hudson 26)
      1. “. . . the early ministers were far removed from the status-giving context of an ordered church life . . .” (Hudson 25)
      2. The ministers “were largely dependent upon the support they could marshal among the laity . . .” (Hudson 25)
      3. The “tough-grained individualism fostered by the hard conditions of life in a frontier society” left ministers with only moral persuasion.
   3. Congregationalists: in New England, “the early Congregational churches had been properly constituted with due recognition being given to ministerial authority, [but] this state of affairs did not long endure. The Congregational conception of the ministry as “a speaking aristocracy,” having powers independent of the laity, suffered rapid erosion . . . the ministers, as Perry Miller has observed, were soon “shorn of every weapon except moral persuasion.”” (Hudson 26)
   4. Anglicans: in Virginia, lay vestries hired ministers and determined their salaries . . .” After all, “the parishioners were the founders of the churches, having built and endowed them.” (Hudson 26)
   5. Lutherans: Henry M. Muhlenberg “arrived from Germany in 1742 with the intention of reducing the newly formed Lutheran churches to some degree of ecclesiastical order. “A preacher,” he confessed, “must fight his way through with the Sword of the Spirit alone . . .”” (Hudson 26)
3. **within denominations**
   1. Frontier churches were by nature completely local and could only later join to form a synod or diocese. Thus the transplanted churches “tended to become [26] independent self-governing units which resisted subsequent attempts to [subordinate] them to a wider ecclesiastical jurisdiction.” (Hudson 26-27)
   2. Anglicans
      1. The Anglicans “were never able to establish an episcopate in America throughout the whole colonial period . . .” (Hudson 27)
      2. 1782: William White (later bishop): “there cannot be produced an instance of laymen in America, unless in the very infancy of the settlements, soliciting the introduction of a bishop.” Most thought bishops were “a hazardous experiment . . . which would jeopardize their prerogatives.” (Hudson’s words) (Hudson 27)
   3. Congregationalists: “the proposal to complete the Congregational structure with a yearly consultative synod was rejected out of hand by the deputies of the General Court.” (Hudson 27)
   4. Presbyterians
      1. The Presbyterians established presbyteries and synods. But in “the struggle for dominance between synod and presbytery, the presbytery won the crucial right of control over examination for ordination. This represented a victory for a kind of localism, for one presbytery in an ordination examination could emphasize Christian experience as the important qualification and another could stress correctness of doctrine.” (Hudson 27)
      2. In the controversies of the 1700s, “even a local Presbyterian congregation could successfully defy control from above if it was determined to have its own way.” (Hudson 27)

## Colonial Religious Tolerance and Intolerance

1. **religious tolerance in Europe**
   1. France and Spain
      1. “The pressure of profit was no less strong in the French and Spanish colonies, but it was successfully resisted.” (Hudson 7)
   2. the Netherlands
      1. Calvin in the preface to his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* had said that “it is impossible to draw precise boundaries to the Church . . . it is not possible to determine with precision who is to be numbered among the faithful.” [Hudson’s words] (Hudson 9)
      2. Calvin also said that ““the purest churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error” [Calvin’s words] and that consequently even the wisest and holiest of men and even the most representative of synods can make no claim to infallibility.” (Hudson 9)
      3. Holland’s mild attitude toward dissent was influenced by its struggle for independence from Spain.
   3. England
      1. “. . . the “maxim of moderation” was already being practiced by the magistrates of old Amsterdam, while England was making halting progress in the same direction.” (Hudson 7-8)
      2. Elizabeth “had been completely emotional in her insistence upon outward conformity . . . [But] While she was careful to prevent any widespread organization of dissent . . ., a great deal of latitude and practical freedom was permitted within the parishes.” (Hudson 8)
      3. James I spoke of the need for religious conformity but did not rigorously enforce it. “. . . stringent measures initiated by Archbishop Laud in the 1630’s were regarded by many as intolerable innovations which justified the parliamentary revolt of the 1640’s.” (Hudson 8)
      4. “With the meeting of the Long Parliament in 1640 all effective ecclesiastical control broke down.” (Hudson 8)
      5. Civil war followed. “The victorious forces . . . were united in defense of . . . toleration that would include all save prelatists and papists.” (Hudson 8)
         1. “Prelatists” were “exponents of the views of Archbishop Laud”: since his intolerant policy had caused the civil war, prelatists “were regarded as a subversive element.” (Hudson 8)
         2. The papists “were excluded largely for reasons of state rather than for religion. . . . The papists were regarded as a danger to the state because they were suspected of plotting to overthrow the government with the aid of French arms.” (Hudson 8)
      6. “The restoration of the Stuarts in 1660 was followed in turn by the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the accompanying Act of Toleration of 1689. [8] Since the toleration granted by this Act was limited to trinitarian Protestants, and thus excluded Unitarians, Jews, and Roman Catholics, it had the curious effect of restricting rather than extending toleration in some of the colonies. But in England and the other colonies the reverse was true.” (Hudson 8-9)
      7. “The disputed points in England were largely related to the outward government of the church, and Archbishop Whitgift had acknowledged that “there is no one certain kind of government in the church which of necessity must be perpetually observed.” In such matters—all the early Anglican apologists had insisted—it is left to the Christian prince to determine what is most suitable and convenient within his realm. It was on this basis that churches in other lands possessing an essentially evangelical faith—such as the Lutheran churches in Germany and Scandinavia and the Reformed churches in Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland—[9] were recognized as true church­es.” (Hudson 9-10)
      8. Because church polity was “nowhere in the Scripture prescribed,” English authorities could not insist on conformity, at home or in the colonies. (Hudson 10)
      9. The British acknowledged as true churches the Protestant churches of Scotland, Holland, France, and Germany; how could they suppress their offspring in the colonies?
      10. British religious toleration created American Protestant diversity; and American Protestant diversity created “a situation in which there was no alternative to granting full religious freedom.” (Hudson 12)
   4. theological foundations of freedom
      1. For “the theological foundations of freedom,” see: W. S. Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* (1953). (Hudson 183)
      2. indifferentism
         1. Nathaniel Ward of Ipswich (1578-1652): a person who “is willing to tolerate any religion . . . either doubts of his own, or is not sincere in it.” (Hudson 13)
         2. “People are tolerant in those areas in which they have no strong convictions.” (Hudson 13)
         3. Religious indifference “did contribute to the achievement of religious freedom in America. Benjamin Franklin supported the cause of religious liberty, we may suppose, largely for this reason. A few weeks before his death, Franklin [wrote]: “As to Jesus of Nazareth, . . . I have . . . some doubts as to his Divinity, tho’ it is a question I do not dogmatize upon, having never studied it, and think it needless to busy myself with it now, when I expect soon an opportunity of knowing the truth with less trouble. I see no harm, however, in its being believed, if that belief has the good consequence . . . of making his doctrines more respected and better observed.”” (Hudson 13)
      3. But by 1787, most American denominations defended religious freedom on theological grounds.
      4. 1642-1648 (the English Civil War): “the Independent party (Congregationalists and Baptists)” elaborated three theological grounds. (Hudson 14)
         1. First: “*no mortal man and no human institution can be regarded as infallible*. . . . [So] humility and tentativeness must always be present.” (Hudson 14)
            1. Calvin had said that even the interpretation of scripture depended on the Holy Spirit, “and no one can be absolutely certain of possessing the Spirit.” (Hudson 14)
            2. 1636: Thomas Hooker (founder of Hartford, CT) writes, “We doubt not what we practice, but . . . either we do or may err, though we do not know it . . .” (Hudson 14)
            3. 1640s on: “there was an increasing insistence that the only way God’s will could be disclosed and confirmed was through unfettered discussion.” (Hudson 14)

A Puritan leader asked, “How can truth appear but by argumentation?” (Hudson 14)

Another wrote, “liberty of free disquisition is as great a means to keep the truth as to find it. The running water keeps pure and clear, when the standing [14] pool corrupts.”” (Hudson 14-15)

“God’s will was made known through discussion because his Spirit was no respecter of persons. Light might break forth from “the meanest of the brethren.” Truth might be perceived by any man. Every man, therefore, must be free to be convinced and in turn to convince.” (Hudson 15)

* + - * 1. 1788: the Presbyterian Church’s “Form of Government” said even churches consist of “fallible men”; so “all synods and councils may err through the frailty inseparable from humanity.”” (Hudson 14)
      1. Second: “*the church must be limited in power*.” (Hudson 15)
         1. Since everyone is sinful, “all unchecked power could lead only to a defiance of God and a contemptuous indifference to the common good. . . . political and ecclesiastical absolutism were equally to be feared.” (Hudson 15)
         2. John Cotton: people should “give mortal man no greater power than they are content they shall use, for use it they will. . . . It is necessary . . . that all power that is on earth be limited, church power or other.” (Hudson 15)
         3. John Cotton: giving the church the power of coercion makes “the church a monster.” and creates a “monstrous deformity.” (Hudson 15)
         4. Presbyterians: ecclesiastical discipline must not rely on “civil effects”; it “can derive no force whatever but from its own justice [and] the approbation of an impartial [15] public . . .” Thus [Hudson’s words] “The only power at the disposal of the church is the influence it may exert by persuasion.” (Hudson 15-16)
      2. Third: “*the church must also be free*—free to determine its own life [and] to endeavor to shape the life of the total community . . .” (Hudson 16)
         1. Roger Williams said, “in a tract which became a major manifesto of the Puritan Revolution,” that make the church subject to the state would be to make God subject “to natural, sinful, inconstant men, and so consequently to Satan himself, by whom all peoples naturally are guided.” (Hudson 16)
         2. Francis Makemie (1658-1708)

1683: Makemie, born in Ireland, becomes a Presbyterian leader in Maryland. For several years he “combined commercial traveling with gospel preaching.” (*Encarta 98 Desk Encyclopedia* [Microsoft: 1997])

1707: “he was imprisoned by the colonial governor of New York . . . for being a “strolling preacher” . . .” (*Encarta 98 Desk Encyclopedia* [Microsoft: 1997])

His “masterly defense won him acquittal . . . and benefited the cause of religious liberty in America.” (*Encarta 98 Desk Encyclopedia* [Microsoft: 1997])

Presbyterians believe that “God alone is Lord of the conscience”; [16] so no religion should be “aided by the civil power, further than may be necessary for protection and security.” (Hudson 16-17)

“The sole responsibility of the state was to make sure that no one, “either upon pretense of religion or infidelity,” be permitted “to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury to any other person whatsoever,” and to take proper precautions to insure that “all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies he [*sic*] held without molestation or disturbance.”” (Hudson 17)

1. **religious tolerance in the colonies**
   1. For centuries all Christians believed that a civil state necessitated religious uniformity.
      1. In the first charter of Virginia, by James I, the “service of God [must be] according to the doctrine, rites, and religion” of England. But conformity laws were rarely enforced. (Hudson 5)
      2. In the second charter of Virginia (1609), none could enter the colonies without taking the Oath of Supremacy. Yet “the Separatists from Leyden who landed at Plymouth in 1620 had set sail with permission from the Virginia Company to establish a settlement within its territory.” (Hudson 5)
      3. Only in Virginia “did the English authorities even attempt to impose” religious uniformity. (Hudson 5)
   2. But dissent was largely tolerated in the colonies.
      1. “. . . for almost two-thirds of the whole colonial period a rather extensive toleration was the official policy of the English government at home as well as in the colonies.” (Hudson 9)
      2. The diversity of American Protestantism “was largely a British importation . . .” [3] “. . . England did little more than export her own religious diversity.” (Hudson 7-8)
   3. Economic factors prompted toleration.
      1. The colonies needed settlers “to clear the forests and till the fields. It was not always easy to persuade people to leave their homes and run the risks of life in a new land.” (Hudson 5)
      2. The jails were emptied.
      3. The poor “had little to lose and much to gain”; they agreed to future indentured servitude until their passage money was repaid. (Hudson 5)
      4. But “a sturdier type of settler could be recruited among members of oppressed religious sects, to whom the prospect of toleration provided a powerful incentive . . .” (Hudson 6)
         1. mid-1500s: Edward Seymour (uncle of Edward VI, who ruled England for him, 1547-1553) received an appeal “for the establishment of a college in Virginia, such as Massachusetts had in Harvard, for the training of ministers. An effort was made to enlist Seymour’s help, and he was reminded that Virginians as well as New Englanders had souls to be saved. “Souls!” exclaimed Seymour, “Damn your souls. Make tobacco.”” (Hudson 7)
         2. c 1600: the Lords of Trade in London instructed the Council of Virginia: “A free exercise of religion . . . is essential to enriching and improving a trading nation; it should be ever held sacred in His Majesty’s colonies.” (Hudson 7)
   4. Pennsylvania
      1. William Penn recruited settlers from minority groups in the Rhineland. His policy of toleration provided a refuge for his fellow Quakers.
   5. Maryland
      1. Lord Baltimore’s policy of toleration provided a refuge for his fellow Catholics.
   6. New Jersey and Delaware had policies of toleration.
   7. The Carolinas’ and Georgia’s charters guaranteed religious freedom to Protestants.
   8. New York
      1. Peter Stuyvesant was governor (1647-1664) of New Amsterdam (later New York City) The charter of New Netherlands (later New York—the British took it in 1664) said, “no other religion shall be publicly admitted in New Netherlands except the Reformed, as it is at present preached and practiced by public authority in the United Netherlands.” (Hudson 6)
      2. Stuyvesant sternly suppressed dissent, but the Dutch West India Company wrote, “Although it is our cordial desire that similar and other sectarians might not be found there, yet [6] . . . vigorous proceedings against them ought [to] be discontinued, [unless] you intend to check and destroy your population.” (Hudson 6-7)
      3. The Company reminded Stuyvesant that people flocked to old Amsterdam because its magistrates dealt mildly with religious dissent, and prosperity ensued. “It is our opinion that some connivance would be useful; that the consciences of men, at least, ought ever to remain free and unshackled.” (Hudson 6-7)
      4. 1664: the Articles of Capitulation guaranteed Dutch inhabitants religious freedom.
      5. 1682: James II instructed the governor of New York to “permit all persons of what religion soever quietly to inhabit . . .” (Hudson 6)
2. **religious intolerace in New England**
   1. New England is “Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.” (“New England.” *Encyclopædia Britannica* 2002)
   2. manifest destiny
      1. “From the very beginning, many Americans thought of themselves as a “chosen people,” called of God to create in the New World a Christian society.” (Hudson 62)
         1. “Thus one writer began the history of Virginia with Adam and Eve in order to “show how God had so managed the past that English colonization in the present was the fulfillment of his plan.”” (Hudson 62)
         2. “William Penn intended his domain to be a “holy experiment,” designed to exhibit to the world the true character of a godly society.” (Hudson 62)
         3. “New Englanders were . . . convinced that God had “sifted a whole nation” in order to plant his “choice grain” in the American wilderness. When old England “began to decline in religion,” declared Edward Johnson, Christ raised “an army out of our English nation, for freeing his people from their long servitude” and created “a new England to muster up the first of his forces in.” This new England, he continued, “is the place where the Lord will create a new heaven and a new earth . . .”” (Hudson 62)
   3. “New England was the only area in colonial America in which a serious attempt was made to enforce religious uniformity . . .” (Hudson 10)
   4. “The pattern was set by Massachusetts Bay, where the early settlers, having left their homes to establish a new Zion in the American wilderness, were determined to erect a “due form of government both civil and ecclesiastical” that would permit no dissent.” (Hudson 10)
   5. The Massachusetts Bay colony’s charter accidentally omitted “the customary clause requiring the headquarters of the company to be in England and thus subject to the authority of the crown. . . . the Massachusetts Bay Company was in effect an independent republic . . .” This permitted the settlers to enforce a theocracy. (Hudson 10)
   6. Massachusetts’s “holy commonwealth”
      1. “Of all the colonies, Massachusetts Bay alone was, for an extended period of time, a completely [62] self-governing commonwealth, and it provides the best illustration of the concern to create a Christian society. . . . they proposed to knit the whole body of the community together according to God’s design. It was their special calling to be “a city set on a hill” to demonstrate before “the eyes of the world” what the result would be when a whole people were brought into open covenant with God.” [“The quotations illustrating the views of the Massachusetts Bay leaders are drawn from”: Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (1939) 398-431.] (Hudson 62-63)
      2. “The foundation of God’s design for a “holy commonwealth” was the social covenant—a conditional contract by which God bound himself to look with favor upon a people who yielded obedience to him. Briefly stated, the basic proposition was this: “If we will have God to be our God, to pardon us and bless us; we must have him a God over us to govern us after his own will.” A Christian people, if they are to enjoy the corporate blessings that God alone can bestow, must walk in his ways and fulfil his commands.” (Hudson 63)
      3. “A Christian society that seeks to yield active obedience to God must operate on two levels. On the level of the community as a whole, the level of the natural man, compulsion in the form of “wholesome laws” is necessary. Since the “sins of men are like raging sea[s], which would overwhelm all if they have not banks,” it is imperative that there be laws to curb the lusts of men and to restrain the overt expressions of their depravity. Such laws are to be deduced from Scripture or from nature and right reason. But, whether deduced directly from revealed [63] precepts or merely confirmed by biblical texts, the essential test of their validity is whether or not they “really advance or tend to promote the public good.” For to advance and promote the public good is to fulfil God’s end in civil society and thus to honor and glorify him. . . . it is necessary to compel many and perhaps most men to heed the public good rather than their own self-interest . . . The architects of the Bay Commonwealth were too realistic to suppose that they, as a people, would ever wholly escape from bondage to sin, and therefore they carefully devised “wholesome laws” to provide the necessary restraint and coercion.” (Hudson 63-64)
      4. But “. . . God was not content with enforced obedience alone. The mark of a truly Christian society is the voluntary obedience that is given to God. . . . [They prayed] that they might be granted a voluntary obedience, knowing that when “the Spirit is poured out upon a people, . . . the generality of them, or at least very many among them will be either enquiring for or walking in the way to Zion with their faces thitherward.”” (Hudson 64)
   7. “The attempt to suppress dissent in New England was never wholly successful.” (Hudson 11) Reasons:
      1. New England Puritanism recognized that, as New England divine John Robinson said, “the Lord hath more truth yet to break forth out of his Holy Word” . . .” (Hudson 11)
      2. New England Puritanism “was always spawning its own dissidents . . . who appealed to . . . “the written word of God.”” (Hudson 11)
      3. There was plenty of space. “When the authorities of Massachusetts Bay were being condemned by their fellow Independents at home for their intolerance in banishing Roger Williams from the colony, John Cotton [wrote]: “banishment in this country is not counted as much a confinement as an enlargement.”” (Hudson 11)
      4. When the authorities attempted harsher penalties, dissenters just moved.
      5. The “spirit generated by vast stretches of empty land” made people think of themselves a free and independent.
      6. Even “the New England Congregationalists [could not] suppress dissent without a lurking sense of guilt, as their involved casuistry makes clear.” (Hudson 16)
   8. Rhode Island was first in New England to permit dissent.
   9. Even Massachusetts Bay could enforce intolerance only for “some fifty years” (c 1634-1684?).
      1. 1684: Massachusetts Bay lost its charter; “the New Englanders had to conform to English policy . . .” (Hudson 12)
      2. 1687: the governor seized the Old South meetinghouse for Anglican worship.
      3. post-1687: “not only the Anglicans but even Baptists and Quakers could worship freely . . .” (Hudson 12)

## The Great Awakening (1726-c. 1750)

1. **definitions**
   1. *Evangelicalism*
      1. “. . . emphasis upon the necessity for a conversion experience as the beginning point of a Christian life . . .” (Hudson 78)
      2. Evangelicalism is “associated in the popular mind with the rise of Methodism.” But before Methodism, “In the colonies it [29] produced . . . the Great Awakening.” (Hudson 29-30)
      3. Evangelicalism “has often been pictured as a revolt against Calvinism, but it was scarcely that in the beginning. The ordered theological system of Calvinism was largely taken for granted, and most of the leaders regarded themselves as good Calvinists.” (Hudson 30)
      4. “Evangelicalism, however, was much more a mood and an emphasis than a theological system. Its stress was upon the importance of a personal religious or conversion experience. If it was a revolt against anything, it was a revolt against the notion that the Christian life involved little more than observing the outward formalities of religion.” (Hudson 30)
   2. *Great Awakening*
      1. This was the “tide of revivals” in America from 1726-c 1750. (Hudson 30)
      2. “Evangelicalism [is] the term by which this new surge of spiritual life is more properly designated . . .” (Hudson 30)
2. **cause**: **the unchurched**
   1. Because of the breakdown of the parish system, most colonists were unchurched and knew little about Christianity. “The Evangelical revivals had been a response to this situation . . .” (Hudson 78)
      1. “The fact that most of the colonial population stood outside the churches altogether and could only be brought into the “gathered” churches by whatever powers of persuasion they were able to exert made it almost inevitable that something analogous to the emphasis of Evangelicalism should make its appearance . . .” (Hudson 30)
   2. The churches saw a clear missionary need. “The great need was to reach the unchurched, and—given the circumstances of colonial society—this called for a type of preaching that would prick the conscience, convict men of sin, and lead them through a crisis of individual decision into a personal experience of God’s redeeming love.” (Hudson 30)
3. **development**
   1. origin
      1. “There were many scattered “awakenings” of new religious life in the eighteenth century—in England, Scotland, and Wales, as well as in America.” (Hudson 32)
      2. Some say the Great Awakening began through outside influence (Continental Pietistism. (Hudson 32)
      3. Others say it began through internal influence (“a renewal of Puritan “experimental” religion”). (Hudson 32)
      4. Probably “the revivals began in the American colonies with the preaching of Frelinghuysen, then spread to England through the activity and influence of George Whitefield, and returned once again through Wesleyan converts to strengthen the new life that had come out of the Great Awakening in America.” (Hudson 32)
   2. Dutch Reformed: 1726: “The Great Awakening began . . . with the revivalistic preaching of Theodore J. Frelinghuysen, the pastor of four Dutch Reformed churches in New Jersey . . .” (Hudson 31)
   3. Presbyterians: Frelinghuysen’s neighbor, “Gilbert Tennent, the young Presbyterian pastor in New Brunswick,” introduced Evangelicalism to them. (Hudson 31)
   4. Congregationalists: 1734: Jonathan Edwards introduces Evangelicalism in his church at Northampton, MA. Edwards’s *Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God* (1737) “was to have a profound influence upon the Wesleys and was to do much to stylize the pattern of future revivals.” (Hudson 31)
   5. the South: “the Awakening went through three phases.” (Hudson 31)
      1. “The initial phase was a Presbyterian revival initiated by men from the New Brunswick Presbytery in New Jersey.” (Hudson 31)
      2. “The second phase was a back-country revival under the leadership of Shubal Stearns, a “separate” Baptist from New England.” (Hudson 31)
      3. “The final phase, on the eve of the American Revolution, was a typically Methodist development among the Anglicans, stemming largely from the influence of Devereux Jarratt, an evangelical-minded rector in Dinwiddie County, Virginia.” (Hudson 31)
   6. George Whitefield: “While many of the leaders of the Awakening moved from colony to colony, the great figure that linked the local revivals into a single movement was George Whitefield, who made repeated preaching expeditions up and down the coast from Georgia to New Hampshire.” (Hudson 31)
4. **schisms**
   1. The revivalists’ “irregularities and excesses” disturbed many and split the churches into revivalist and antirevivalist camps. (Hudson 31)
   2. Presbyterians
      1. 1741: “A sermon by Gilbert Tennent on the “Danger of an Unconverted Ministry” in 1740 [divided] the Presbyterians the following year.” (Hudson 32)
      2. Those opposed were “Old Sides,” those in favor, “New Sides.” (Hudson 31)
      3. 1758: “when the two groups reunited in 1758 to form the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, the New Side had increased fourfold while the Old Side had not even held its own.” (Hudson 32)
   3. Dutch Reformed
      1. “The revivalists were equally victorious among the Dutch Reformed . . .” (Hudson 32)
   4. Congregationalists (New England)
      1. In New England, “opponents were able to command a majority [and condemn] “errors in doctrine and disorders in practice.”” (Hudson 32)
      2. Those opposed were “Old Lights,” those in favor, “New Lights.” (Hudson 31-32)
      3. In many New-England Congregational churches, the revivalist minority separated and formed their own churches. Since many of these separate Congregational churches became Baptist, the splits greatly contributed to Baptist growth. (Hudson 32)
      4. Ultimately “even the Old Lights [adopted revivalist] techniques . . .” (Hudson 32)
5. **influence**
   1. In all denominations, “The structure of public worship was modified, a more popular type of preaching dominated the pulpit, new forms of architecture were introduced, and even the churches’ understanding of their mission was altered.” (Hudson 33)
   2. William Warren Sweet: the revivals “marked the beginning of what might be termed the peculiar American emphasis in Christianity . . .” (Hudson 33)
   3. “Nineteenth-century Protestantism in America [was] the heir of . . . the Great Awakening, which contributed the aggressive missionary spirit that gave to nineteenth-century Protestant Action its dynamic thrust.” (Hudson 133)

## Denominationalism

1. **the denominational theory**
   1. “The whole structure of American Protestantism rests upon a particular understanding of the nature of the Church—the denominational theory of the Church.” (Hudson 33)
   2. “Denominationalism is the opposite of sectarianism.” (Hudson 34)
      1. “A “sect” claims the authority of Christ for itself alone. By definition a sect is exclusive—separate.” (Hudson 34)
      2. “The word “denomination,” on the other hand, is an inclusive term—an ecumenical term. It implies that the group referred to is but one member, called or *denominated* by a particular name, of a larger group—the Church—to which all denominations belong.” (Hudson 34)
   3. “The basic contention of the denominational theory of the Church is that the true Church is not to be identified exclusively with any single ecclesiastical structure. No denomination claims to represent the whole Church of Christ. No denomination claims that all other churches are false churches.” (Hudson 34)
   4. The denominational theory was “a means of expressing theologically the unity that existed among the major Protestant bodies . . .” (Hudson 47)
   5. “This lenient attitude was not born of doctrinal laxity and indifference . . .” (Hudson 46)
   6. “This lenient attitude was not . . . extended to all religious professions.” (Hudson 46)
      1. “. . . the sense of being one Church in differing manifestations was restricted to those who shared a common understanding of the core of the Christian faith. These were the “evangelical” Christians . . . (Hudson 46)
      2. “. . . those who did not share their [46] basic convictions—the Unitarians and Universalists at a later date, for example—stood outside the camp.” (Hudson 46-47)
      3. “But, since a firm belief in the natural depravity of man was part of that necessary core of doctrine, they regarded it as hopeless to expect even the godly to agree in all things. Where they differed on the implications of the Christian faith for the outward form of the Church, they must in obedience to Christ go their separate ways. On the other hand, excessive scrupulosity and sectarian bickering, which elevated subordinate convictions to the level of the “grand essentials” of the Christian faith, was only evidence of an unregenerate heart.” (Hudson 47)
   7. The concept of denominationalism “was designed to [47] serve them [American Protestants] as a counter to sectarian dogmatism and exclusiveness while, at the same time, avoiding the evil of indifference.” (Hudson 47-48)
2. **denominationalism in the Reformers**
   1. The Reformers insisted that “the true Church can never be identified in any exclusive sense with a particular ecclesiastical institution . . .” (Hudson 35)
   2. The true continuity of the Church is “a succession of believers . . .” (Hudson 35)
   3. Luther
      1. Luther said Catholicism “sought to imprison Christ within man-made historical forms.” [Hudson’s words] (Hudson 35)
      2. Luther: “the Church is not without place and body and yet the place and body do not make the Church and do not constitute it.” [Luther’s word,s quoted in Wilhelm Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation* (1950) 33.] (Hudson 35)
   4. Calvin
      1. “Calvin was more convinced than Luther that external ecclesiastical arrangements were prescribed in Scripture . . .” (Hudson 36)
      2. But he cautioned those who “are not satisfied unless the Church can always be pointed out with the finger.” [“Preface” to the *Institutes*?] (Hudson 36)
      3. “. . . the limits of the Church of Christ must be left to God, “since he alone ‘knoweth them that are his.’”” [“Preface,” *Institutes*] (Hudson 36)
   5. “Luther and Calvin made use of this insight only to a limited degree. It was a useful instrument for the criticism of others, but the broad-minded spirit it implied found only partial positive expression.” (Hudson 36)
      1. “The Reformers, as a whole, were willing to recognize as true churches all churches that possessed an essentially evangelical faith whether they were Lutheran churches in Germany and Scandinavia; Reformed churches in Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland; or an Anglican church in England. All these [were] manifestations of the one holy catholic Church which embraced them all.” (Hudson 36)
      2. “But the Reformers hesitated when there was religious diversity within a particular geographical area rather than between different geographical areas. They were firmly convinced that there must be religious uniformity within a particular political jurisdiction. For this reason, they found it difficult to accept the notion that churches of differing church order located on opposite corners in the same city could be regarded as sharing in the life of the whole Church.” (Hudson 36)
      3. “Yet this latter view was implicit in the whole structure of Reformation thinking concerning the nature of the Church. It was left for a later generation to point [that] out . . .” (Hudson 36)
3. **denominationalism in England**
   1. the Dissenting Brethren
      1. introduction
         1. Though the term “denomination” arose during the Great Awakening (1726-c 1750), “the theory it represented had been hammered out by a group of Puritan divines” in the 1600s. (Hudson 35)
         2. The Dissenting Brethren—a subset of Congregationalists [38]—were “The real architects of the denominational theory of the Church . . .” [37] (Hudson 37-38)
      2. exiles
         1. “These men had been in exile on the Continent during the years preceding the Puritan Revolution . . . While in exile abroad, they had been forced to inquire, as they put it, into the positive part of church government. They believed that being completely on their own had freed them from bias . . .” (Hudson 37)
         2. The Dissenting Brethren “could not profess such “sufficiency of knowledge” as to be able to “lay forth all those [37] rules” contained in Scripture, but they were confident that they had found “principles enough, . . . to us clear and certain . . .”” (W. S. Hudson, “Denominationalism as a Basis for Ecumenicity,” *Church History* (1955) 24:37-47.) (Hudson 37-38)
         3. “. . . when the issue between king and parliament was joined, they returned to participate in the struggle and to help remodel the English church.” (Hudson 37)
      3. at the Westminster Assembly (1643-1652)
         1. The Westminster Assembly “was summoned by Parliament in 1643 to propose a new form of government for the English church . . .” (Hudson 38)
         2. “The Westminster Assembly met in the midst of a civil war [1642-1649]
         3. At the Assembly, the Dissenting Brethren were the most prominent representatives of the Independent divines within the Church of England. (Hudson 37)
         4. But a “common form of church government that should replace the uprooted prelacy” was not easily had. “The Puritan party in England, which had been so firmly united in its opposition to the conformity imposed by “lordly bishops,” turned out to be badly fragmented when agreement was sought on specific proposals . . .” (Hudson 39)
            1. Some “were for a moderate episcopacy . . .” (Hudson 39)
            2. Some “were for a presbyterian establishment . . .” (Hudson 39)
            3. Some “were for a congregational form of church government” (this included the Dissenting Brethren). (Hudson 39)
            4. Some “were beginning to advocate the restriction of church membership to those who had been baptized as believers.” (Hudson 39)
         5. “It was at this juncture that the Dissenting Brethren formulated the denominational theory of the church [39] as a way out of the impasse in which the Puritan party found itself. (Hudson 39-40)
            1. The Dissenting Brethren were “eager to persuade the Assembly to adopt [their principles] as the basis for remodeling the established church.” (Hudson 38)
            2. The Dissenting Brethren “were keenly aware [that] . . . division threatened the cause of . . . reformation . . .” (Hudson 40)
            3. “If Christians are to be [40] united, “notwithstanding their differences,” there are several fundamental truths which these seventeenth-century divines insisted they must accept.” (Hudson 40-41)
         6. Jeremiah Burroughes [Citations are not given for quotations in the following entries, but indications suggest that they all come from Jeremiah Burroughes.]
            1. Jeremiah Burroughes: “Christ hath laid this charge upon [his followers] . . . that they must not believe anything in matters of religion but what they shall first see ground for out of his Word.” (Hudson 40)
            2. “First of all, “considering the wants and weaknesses that do ordinarily attend men’s apprehensions,” it is inevitable that there should be differences of opinion about the implications of the Christian faith for the outward life of the church. Christians in all ages have differed in judgment about the patterns of organization and worship that best serve to express and safeguard the Christian faith. Even the Apostles could not in their time wholly prevent such differences from arising.” (Hudson 41)
            3. Second, “even though these differences of opinion do not involve the fundamentals of the faith, they are not matters of mere indifference. Every Christian is under obligation to practice as he believes and to pursue to the end the implications of the convictions he honestly holds. To insist that he submit to the judgment of other men is to allow other men to become lords of his conscience, but those who fear God must first be persuaded themselves before they can accept another man’s judgment.” (Hudson 41)
            4. Third, “differences of opinion, honestly held, can lead to profitable and fruitful discussion out of which a fuller apprehension of truth may emerge. We must not forget, said Burroughes, that God may have a hand in our divisions to bring forth further light, for “sparks are beaten out by the flints striking together.” How can men “know they are right . . ., till they—by discussing, praying, reading, meditating—find that out”?” (Hudson 41)
            5. Fourth, “since no church has a final and unambiguous grasp of divine truth, the true Church of Christ can never be fully represented by any single ecclesiastical structure. God is not [41] the exclusive possession of any church, and the existence of different churches . . . serves as a constant corrective to the pretensions of all churches. By this means and by their mutual criticism, the tendency of all religious institutions to absolutize themselves is checked.” (Hudson 41-42)
            6. Fifth, “the unity that does exist among the godly, in spite of their differences, must not be forgotten.” (Hudson 42)

“Though our differences are sad enough, yet they come not up to this to make us men of different religions. We agree in the same end, though not in the same means. They are but different ways of opposing the common enemy. The agreeing in the same means, in the same way of opposing the common enemy, would be very comfortable. It would be our strength. But that cannot be expected in this world.”” (Hudson 42)

Burroughes?: “our divisions have been and still are between good men . . . there are as many godly Presbyterians as Independents. . . . though we are fully persuaded by God’s Word and Spirit that this our Way is Christ’s Way, yet we neither do nor dare judge others to be reprobates that walk not with us in it, but leave all judgment to God, and heartily pray for them.” [no citation given] (Hudson 42)

* + - * 1. Sixth, separation is not schism. Burroughes?: “the true nature of schism is . . . an uncharitable, unjust, rash, violent breaking from union with the church or members of it.” [42] Bur­roughes “pointed out that refugee groups from abroad and Scots from north of the Tweed had been permitted to have their own churches in England because they “could not acknowledge the bishops’ authority nor communicate in the sacraments in the parishes where they lived without sin to them,” yet they were not charged with being schismatics. Furthermore, it was perfectly lawful for a man to have the liberty of “choosing pastors” by “choosing houses,” moving from one parish where in good conscience he could not enjoy the means of grace to another parish where he could; and when he does so, no cry of schism is raised against him. It is not “the allowance of the state” that makes these instances no schism, said Burroughes, for “if it be schism . . . without the allowance of the state . . ., it is schism when the state does allow it.”” (Hudson 42)
        2. Jeremiah Burroughes: “soldiers who march against a common enemy all under the same captain, who follow the same colors in their ensign and wear them upon their hats or arms, may get the day though they be not all clothed alike, though they differ in things of less concernment [Christians must] join with all our might in all we know, and with peaceable, quiet, humble spirits seek to know more, and in the meantime carry ourselves humbly and peaceably toward those we differ from, and Christ will not charge us at the Great Day for retarding his cause.” (Hudson 44)
    1. Henry Burton: “the Catholic Church . . . includes all true churches throughout the world.” (Hudson 44)
    2. “What the Dissenting Brethren wanted was “the peaceable practices of our consciences” which the Reformed churches abroad had allowed them as exiles. But they wanted more than that. They were pleading for that which to them was much more important—the establishment of the type of relationship among the differing Puritan groups in England which had existed between the Dissenting Brethren and the Reformed churches [43] abroad . . .” (Hudson 43-44)
  1. “The restoration of the Stuarts in 1660 marked the collapse of Oliver Cromwell’s attempt to give concrete expression to the denominational theory in his “voluntary national establishment” . . .” (Hudson 44)
  2. But “the repressive legislation of the Clarendon code [kept] alive the sense of a common cause among the Nonconformist groups; [and] the fundamental convictions of the Dissenting Brethren concerning the nature of the Church penetrated the thinking even of members of the episcopate, and thus smoothed the way for the adoption of the Act of Toleration in 1689.” (Hudson 44)

1. **the denominational theory in colonial America**
   1. denominatonalism and the unchurched
      1. Around 1700, the Protestant churches “were confronted by a situation in which the vast majority of the population stood outside the churches altogether. The great need was for the various churches to co-operate with one another, in freedom and mutual respect, in the great task of reducing the rest of society to Christian obedience. It was this that the denominational theory of the Church, by emphasizing their essential unity while giving due recognition to their diversity, permitted them to do in good conscience.” (Hudson 34)
      2. “The denominational theory of the Church . . . made it possible for the colonial revivalists to make a concerted response to the missionary summons implicit in a situation in which the vast majority of the population stood outside the churches altogether. These revivalists were ready to preach in meetinghouses of various denominations, and they were not unduly disturbed when their converts chose to relate themselves to a denomination other than their own.” (Hudson 45)
   2. denominationalism and the Great Awakening
      1. “So thoroughly was the victory won that the leaders of the Evangelical Revival [i.e., Great Awakening] in England and [44] America could take the denominational conception of the Church largely for granted. Stiff-necked sectarians, to be sure, were to be found among all the Protestant bodies, but as the colonial period moved toward its close their point of view had become increasingly anachronistic. The future belonged to the colonial revivalists who had been nurtured by such writings as Henry Scougal’s *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*, which reminded them that they must not mistake the trappings of religion for religion itself. The stress was upon inward religious experience as fundamental to the Christian life, and that which was of central importance, therefore, was the work of grace in the individual believer.” (Hudson 44-45)
      2. “denomination”
         1. “The use of the word “denomination” to describe a religious group came into vogue during the early years of the Evangelical Revival [i.e., the Great Awakening, 1726-c1750].” (Hudson 33)
         2. “The word denomination was adopted by the leaders of the Evangelical Revival, both in England and America, [33] because it carried with it no implication of a negative value judgment.” (Hudson 33-34)
         3. John Wesley: “I . . . refuse to be distinguished from other men by any but the common principles of Christianity. . . . I renounce and detest all other marks of distinction. But from real Christians, of whatever *denomination*, I earnestly desire not to be distinguished at all. . . . Dost thou love and fear God? It is enough! I give thee the right hand of fellowship.”” [“The Character of a Methodist,” in *Works* (1841), 8.332-333. Hudson 184] (Hudson 33)
         4. Gilbert Tennent: “All societies who profess Christianity and retain the foundational principles thereof, notwithstanding their different denominations and diversity of sentiments in smaller things, are in reality but one Church of Christ, but several branches (more or less pure in minuter points) of one visible kingdom of the Messiah.” (Quoted in L. J. Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition* (1949) 132.) (Hudson 46)
         5. “George Whitefield was perhaps the greatest of the colonial revivalists, and his spirit was typical of them all. Preaching from a balcony in Philadelphia, he raised his eyes to the heavens and cried out: “Father Abraham, whom have you in heaven? Any Episcopalians? No! Any Presbyterians? No! Any Independents or Methodists? No, no, no! Whom have you there? We don’t know those names here. All who are here are Christians. . . . Oh, is this the case? Then God help us to forget party names and to become Christians in deed and truth.”” (Hudson 45)
2. **dangers of the denominational theory**
   1. “As the principle of religious liberty is misapplied when it is transferred from the civil to the ecclesiastical realm, thus making ecclesiastical discipline impossible and leaving a church with no confession to make to the world, so also the denominational theory contains within it the same reductionist potential.” (Hudson 47)
   2. “The great temptation . . . was to transform the denominational theory from a means of expressing unity into a means of securing unity—to seek to enlist all men of good will under the banner of righteousness by a progressive narrowing of the central core of the Christian faith until little remained that was theologically incisive or distinctively Christian.” (Hudson 47)

## The Shaping of American Protestantism

1. **introduction**
   1. “Protestantism in America lost its European stamp” partly because the Puritans in New England, the Baptists in Rhode Island, and the Quakers in Pennsylvania could engage in experiments not allowed in England. (Dillenberger and Welch 127)
   2. The English solution to dissent (a state church with dissident denominations functioning at a disadvantage) differed from America’s, where “a tradition even­tu­ally emerged in which the various churches were . . . free from governmental restriction or support.” (Dillenberger and Welch 127)
   3. religious factors that contributed to America’s position on church and state
      1. “Puritan theology in challenging all claims to absolute power”;
      2. “the Baptists, who in principle insisted upon the separation of church and state”;
      3. “contact across denominational lines engendered by the great awakenings”;
      4. “deism”;
      5. “later revivals”;
      6. “the frontier situation”;
      7. “and the practical impossibility of a state church.”” (Dillenberger and Welch 128)
2. **the American Revolution**
   1. By “the American Revolution, much of the enthusiasm of the awakenings was gone, except in the South where the awakening had begun somewhat later.” (Dillenberger and Welch 128)
   2. But “Clergy of Congregational and Presbyterian persuasion in New England and the Middle Colonies were predominantly on the side of the colonies.” (Dillenberger and Welch 128)
   3. “Moreover, they had prepared the soil of resistance for many through their preaching of a sovereign God who stands over all other sovereigns.” (Dillenberger and Welch 128)
   4. “. . . the awakenings . . . fostered a spirit of equality among people.” (Dillenberger and Welch 128)
      1. “. . . the evangelical thrust leveled hierarchical tendencies, thereby diminishing the social standing of clergy and magistrates alike.” (Dillenberger and Welch 128)
      2. “Gone was the idea of a single covenanted community with political overtones. In its place stood countless individuals, secure in their personal faith before God, freed of all allegiances to social entities.” (Dillenberger and Welch 128)
   5. Anglicans
      1. “Methodists and Anglicans did experience difficulty during the Revolution. Their churches were dependent on the mother country. In New England the Anglican clergy had already pled for bishops from England. Fulfillment of this request would demand an act of Parliament. . . . It is clear why New England Anglicans vigorously favored the Royalist cause.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)
      2. “But to the other churches in New England, such an act was foreign interference which violated the spirit of the original charter. Nor had Presbyterians and Congregationalists forgotten the difficulties caused by Bishop Laud.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)
      3. “In the South, on the other hand, Anglicans favored the Revolution. . . . Thus, the Anglicans were divided.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)
   6. deists
      1. “. . . natural religion or deism [was] a form of the Enlightenment . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 132)
      2. “the moderate enlightenment” (Henry F. May’s term)
         1. “By the middle of the eighteenth century, the tide of deism and natural religion had been effectively defeated in England by the Methodist movement. But it was only beginning to appear in the new world at this time. Only after the great awakenings did one find deists in America in appreciable numbers. They were neither antichurch nor aggressive in their outlook. Many of them belonged to the churches. They were what one might call gentle deists and came generally from the upper classes.” (Dillenberger and Welch 132)
      3. “the skeptical enlightenment” and “the revolutionary enlightenment” (Henry F. May’s terms)
         1. “. . . both represent a departure from the easy alliance of church concerns and rational thought toward a more militant spirit which pressed for the victory of reason over the alleged superstitions of the churches. This movement became powerful after the founding of the nation and the publication of Thomas Paine’s *The Age of Reason*.” [132] Paine “had himself participated in the glorious French Revolution, and this was the period of the height of influence of French culture and ideas upon the American scene.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
         2. “Such deism taught individuals to rely upon themselves instead of on the churches. God, it held, is the creator, and the author of the moral law in the universe. Individuals must obey this law: breaking it brings punishment. But the one who follows the moral law will discover the kindness and goodness of God, known directly in nature. The Bible, on the other hand, depicts a God of war and cruelty and caprice; even in the New Testament [132] human dignity is degraded. Truly this was a religion of rational self-confidence.” (Dillenberger and Welch 132-133)
      4. “Deist literature was widely disseminated. Deist societies were founded, the first of which was under the leadership of a former Baptist minister, Elihu Palmer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
      5. It “appealed to self-reliant people who had just created a nation. It appealed to individuals on the frontier who daily had to depend on nothing else but themselves . . . It appealed to college students who were no longer impressed by theological thinking . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
      6. “Lexington, Kentucky, became a center of deistic thinking.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
      7. Ang­li­cans “seemed to have no difficulty combining deism with the Prayer Book. Two-thirds of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Anglican laymen, essentially deist in their outlook.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)
   7. “Quakers and Moravians, traditionally pacifist groups, suffered most since they were distrusted by both sides.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)
   8. “The churches supporting the Revolution had no difficulty accepting the Declaration of Independence. John Witherspoon, the Presbyterian divine who was president of the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University, signed it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)
   9. “To be sure, the churches were concerned with liberty and freedom under God, rather than with “natural equality.” Moreover, their understanding of humanity was not that of the deists. Their arguments for equality took account of sin as well as dignity.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)
3. **after the Revolution**
   1. American Methodism “declared its independence of John Wesley and organized itself as the Methodist Episcopal Church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 130)
   2. “The Anglicans had the problem of obtaining duly consecrated bishops, and when no one would ordain Samuel Seabury in England because he could not take the oath of loyalty to the crown, he was consecrated by three Scottish Anglican bishops. Later, Parliament authorized the consecration of bishops for America through the Church of England, and in 1789 the group in America was formally constituted as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.” (Dillenberger and Welch 130)
   3. “In some of the colonies, one religious group was still favored and supported by taxes, usually either Puritan or Anglican churches. Although other groups could not be kept out, they had to pay taxes for the support of the [established] group . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 130)
   4. In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Rhode Island “There was neither establishment nor the payment of taxes for any religious groups.” (Dillenberger and Welch 130)
   5. “In other areas, similar developments were less a matter of principle than of sheer expediency or necessity. Frequently the religious groups in the areas were diverse and no single group could gain control.” (Dillenberger and Welch 130)
      1. “In New York, for example, establishment did not succeed, and full toleration and freedom did develop eventually.” (Dillenberger and Welch 130)
      2. “In Virginia, a struggle for religious liberty was led by the Baptists, together with the Hanover Presbytery, against the tax-supported Church of England. [For Baptists] separation of church and state was a matter of religious principle. The Hanover Presbytery, a product of the awakenings, was sympathetic to the principle of the church as a voluntary association and thus was also opposed . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 130)
      3. “Most of the Presbyterians favored taxation for all religious groups. Jefferson and Madison agreed with the Baptists and fought against establishment of any kind. The battle was won. . . . now the state of Virginia had . . . ruled out establishment . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
   6. the American Constitution
      1. 1775-83: American Revolutionary War
      2. 1776: the Declaration of Independence (by Thomas Jefferson)
         1. influences
            1. 1215: the *Magna Carta* (protecting the rights of noblemen against the king of England)
            2. John Locke (1632-1704)

“The views in the Declaration . . . derived partly from the writings of John Locke, whose political theories and views of humanity reflected a secularized Calvinistic background. People who held these views were generally religious, but mostly in a general, natural religion, or deist sense . . . Jefferson, the writer of the Declaration, was such a person.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)

1689: Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government*, which says:

Civil society exists “for the protection of property (Latin *proprius*, or that which is one’s own, meaning “life, liberty, and estate”).” (“United States Bill of Rights”)

“. . . each individual is free and equal in the state of nature. Locke expounded on the idea of natural rights that are inherent to all individuals” (inalienable natural rights). (“United States Bill of Rights”)

* + - * 1. Montesquieu (Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, 1689-1755)

“The views in the Declaration showed primarily the influence of French thought upon the more elite in American culture of this period.” (Dillenberger and Welch 129)

Montesquieu “emphasized the need to have balanced forces pushing against each other to prevent tyranny. (This in itself reflects the influence of Polybius’ second-century BC treatise on the checks and balances of the constitution of the Roman Republic.)” (“United States Constitution”)

According to Montesquieu, “The administrative powers were the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary. These should be separate from and dependent upon each other so that the influence of any one power would not be able to exceed that of the other two, either singly or in combination.” (“Charles de Secondat”)

“. . . Montesquieu was the most frequently quoted authority on government and politics in colonial pre-revolutionary British America. And following the American secession, Montesquieu remained a powerful influence on many of the American Founders, most notably James Madison of Virginia, the “Father of the Constitution.”” (“Charles de Secondat”)

* + 1. 17 Sept. 1787: the Federal Convention in Philadelphia completes the Constitution.
    2. 21 June 1788: the ninth state ratifies the Constitution, making it the law of the land.
    3. 4 Mar. 1789: the American Constitution goes into effect.
    4. The original US Constitution has only one statement on religion: “No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.”
    5. the first amendment religion clauses
       1. 1789: James Madison writes the first ten amendments
       2. influences on Madison included
          1. 1776: George Mason’s *Virginia Declaration of Rights* (written with Madison’s input)
          2. state amendment recommendations
          3. 1689: the English *Bill of Rights* (establishing the rights of legislators in Parliament against the power of the sovereign)
    6. “The Virginia enactment [rejecting establishment of religion] became a model for national policy. This was not by accident since James Madison had been so active in the Virginia fight.” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
       1. 25 Sept. 1789: the first Congress promulgates the Bill of Rights for ratification
       2. 15 Dec. 1791: ¾ of the states ratify the Bill of Rights, and they become law
       3. text of the religion clauses of the First Amendment
          1. “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion [establishment clause],
          2. “or prohibiting the free exercise thereof [free-exercise clause] . . .”
  1. “. . . several states continued to have established churches for some time (the constitutional statements, of course, did not refer to *state* actions).” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
  2. “the roots of . . . separation between church and state”” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
     1. “the sheer religious diversity . . ., with no church in a position to effectively assert a claim to establishment.” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
     2. “the Baptists, with their traditional strong opposition to the idea of a state church.” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
     3. “The Quaker experiment in Pennsylvania also provided an important precedent.” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
     4. “The great awakenings [changed] many of the churches in such a way that vol­un­tary association and free decision, rather than community inclusiveness, marked the essence of the church.” [131] “Voluntary association had been a dis­tin­guishing mark of those groups sometimes called “sect-type” churches, in con­trast to the churches which sought to be co-extensive with the community. Now all American chur­ches were sectarian in the broad sense of the term. Reli­gion was now a matter wholly of conscience and decision. . . . one could also freely change denominations . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 131, 135)
     5. “This was a necessary solution in the American scene. But it was [135] also in line with the spirit of the awakenings. There was a stress upon individual decision, an opposition to governmental influence, and a disregard for denominational lines. The individual’s relation to God was the crucial point . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 135-136)
     6. “The deists [thought] most of the difficulties between religious groups were petty . . . they were in favor of a solution which placed none of them in prominence.” (Dillenberger and Welch 131)
  3. “Unlike the Declaration of Independence, [the Constitution’s] checks and balances [presupposed] both baseness and dignity. [Thus it] accords more with the prevailing Protestant concept of humanity’s nature.” Yet “the Protestant influence on America was less than it was at the time of the Declaration of [131] Independence.” Perhaps “the system of checks and balances came [less] chiefly from Montesquieu [and] indirectly from John Calvin . . . through the lineage of John Witherspoon and James Madison.” (Dillenberger and Welch 131-32)
  4. “. . . religious liberty and of the separation of church and state gave the theoretical base for a distinctive kind of Protestantism. It became actual for all the churches during the next half-century.” (Dillenberger and Welch 132)

## The Second Great Awakening

1. **New England**
   1. “While less than ten percent of Americans were church members, piety and evangelical dispositions had not disappeared . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
   2. “Already in the last decade of the eighteenth century revivals were spreading through New England colleges and churches.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
   3. “Timothy Dwight, the new president of Yale, almost single-handedly stemmed the tide of “infidelity” in a university where there was hardly a theological student.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
   4. “. . . Lyman Beecher and Nathaniel Taylor were the most prominent of the new revivalists.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
      1. “Beecher had no fear of emotion as such, provided it was not too prominent and could be tested in terms of commitment toward the future, such as activity in missionary or reform movements.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
      2. “. . . Beecher involved the regular parish clergy along with revivalist preachers in revivals in particular parishes. Hence, revivals were . . . under local control.” (Dillenberger and Welch 133)
      3. “adaptations in the current Calvinist theology” [133]
         1. “While fearful of the disestablishment of the Congregational church in Con­nec­ticut, [133] . . . Beecher and his associates adopted a voluntaristic con­cep­tion of the church . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 133-134)
         2. “. . . without abandoning their conception of God’s sov­er­eignty they stressed that God had provided “means” by which all of us were confronted . . . not easily reconcilable elements were affirmed side by side, such as the sovereignty of God and moral accountability even in matters of faith.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   5. The revivals succeeded “in stemming the rationalist tide [though] they were helped by a reaction to French influences after the excesses of the French Revolution.” But this reaction was in the East, not on the frontier. (Dillenberger and Welch 135)
2. **the frontier**
   1. “The revivals [established] the strength of the churches in a situation where there was neither state support nor interference.” (Dillenberger and Welch 135)
   2. “. . . the influence of the churches was weak on the frontier.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
      1. “Frontier towns were small and isolated. It was impossible to provide either clergy or churches for all of the communities.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   3. “Congregationalists and Presbyterians, who insisted upon an educated clergy, were particularly hard pressed. In an effort to meet the need, they counseled communities where both Congregationalists and Presbyterians had settled, to form a single church and call a minister from either group.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   4. “Methodists were generally more successful, since they organized small groups in “classes” with a lay leader in charge, just as Wesley had done. “Classes” and Methodist communities were then visited by a Methodist minister who traveled an extensive circuit of such groups.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   5. Baptists “were generally in the best position . . . they did not have the burden of a highly educated ministry. A Baptist preacher was one who felt the call. . . . Moreover, such preachers usually were of the same social class as the people to whom they preached.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   6. “Methodist “circuit riders” and traveling Baptist evangelists had gone steadily westward with the frontier, and the success of their work accounts for the numerical preeminence of the Baptist and Methodist churches in the United States.” (Dillenberger and Welch 148)
   7. “The preaching of most of these groups took on a ‘revivalistic” pattern. Individuals were confronted with God’s terrible judgment upon the sins of indifference, infidelity, and immorality. These were painted in graphic pictures which brought fear and dread to the minds of listeners. When this was accomplished, the preacher pointed to the forgiveness of God for those who repented of their sins and were born anew by the spirit.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   8. “But since families sometimes had to come from distances too great to permit them to return home on the same day, a new pattern of “camp meetings” developed in which the families brought provisions and stayed for several days of preaching and meetings.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   9. “The most notable of such meetings were at Gasper River and Cain Ridge in Kentucky, the latter sponsored jointly by Method­ists and Presbyterians. Among the most prominent of the preachers at such revivals was Peter Cartwright, a legendary figure in his own right.” (Dillenberger and Welch 134)
   10. “Revivalism spread from Kentucky and Tennessee into the Northwest Territory. Its peak was reached by 1806.” (Dillenberger and Welch 135)

1. **the East**
   1. But in the 1820s revivalism “sprang up again in the East, primarily in New York State through the preaching of Charles G. Finney.” (Dillenberger and Welch 135)
   2. Finney introduced “new measures” in revival techniques. (Dillenberger and Welch 135)
      1. “Central to Finney’s strategy was unremitting pressure, such as all-night prayer meetings, reference to sinners by name, and the use of the “anxious seat,” namely, a bench at the front of the church where those in distress were the subject of special prayers, exhortations, and convictions of sin and grace.” (Dillenberger and Welch 135)
      2. “Theologically, Finney believed that such measures made people confront themselves . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 135)
   3. Finney “gave the most systematic account of the revival theology in his lectures on revivals of religion.” (Dillenberger and Welch 135)
2. **theology**
   1. “. . . the stress upon individual decision under Christ provided an atmosphere which, connected with other factors, was not conducive to the development of theology. There was, in fact, a suspicion of theology.” (Dillenberger and Welch 136)
3. “**related developments**” (Dillenberger and Welch 136)
   1. “a number of denominational colleges, chiefly west of the Appalachians”;
   2. “formation of Bible societies”;
   3. “Tracts also appeared in increasing numbers, no doubt because they had been put to such good advantage in the propagation of deism.”
   4. “Sunday schools first made their appearance”;
   5. “. . . the separation of church and state had not meant the separation of religion and culture.”

## Revolutionary War Through the Civil War, 1781-1865

1. **introduction**
   1. By 1787 (when delegates at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia adopted the Constitution):
      1. the churches were “molded to a common pattern by the pressures of the American environment . . .” (Hudson 18)
      2. the churches were “molded to a common pattern [by] the Evangelical Revival in eighteenth-century Britain and America.” (Hudson 18)
      3. “. . . American delegates to ecumenical assemblies have frequently found that they stood nearer to one another than any of them did to the respective bodies to which they were related by parentage . . .” (Hudson 2)
   2. the unchurched
      1. The Revolutionary War ended in 1781, but the British did not evacuate New York until 1783. (James Trager, *The People’s Chronology* [Henry Holt: 1996]) “. . . seven years of war [1776-1783] left the former colonists exhausted, impoverished, and disorganized.” (Hudson 49)
      2. The colonies had reached a “low ebb of religious life.” Benjamin Trumbull (*History of Connecticut*, 1818): “A state of war is peculiarly unfriendly to religion. It dissipates the mind, diminishes the degree of instruction, removes great numbers almost wholly from it, connects them with the most dangerous company, and presents them with the worst examples. It hardens and emboldens men in sin; is productive of profaneness, intemperance, disregard to propriety, violence, and licentious living.” (Hudson 50)
      3. Also, “there was a new “freethinking” spirit—French “infidelity,” they were later to call it—abroad in the land. This spirit [rejected] revealed religion . . .” (Hudson 50)
   3. reorganizing after the Revolutionary War
      1. “But before the Protestant churches could launch the powerful counteroffensive to win the new nation to Christian obedience, they had to resolve institutional problems of their own. Church life had been disrupted by the war . . .” (Hudson 50)
      2. “All the churches had been affected by the general impoverishment and disorganization of the war years . . . Ministers had marched off to become chaplains or “fighting parsons.” Synods and associations frequently had been unable to meet. The different denominational groups, to be sure, had survived the Revolution with varying fortunes—Anglicans, Quakers, Mennonites, and Moravians having suffered most; and Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Baptists least.” (Hudson 51)
      3. “After the war, those churches which had been linked to ecclesiastical bodies abroad had to fashion ecclesiastical structures of their own, while those which had been organized on a colonial basis were confronted with the need for a national organization.” (Hudson 51)
2. **Congregationalists**
   1. Some Congregationalists wanted presbyteries. Lyman Beecher: “a presbytery made up of New England men, raised Congregationalists, is the nearest the Bible of anything there is.” (Hudson 53)
   2. Some Congregationalists wanted only state churches. Congregationalism was the established church in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire, and that inhibited those churches “from forming a connectional body . . . across state lines.” (Hudson 53)
   3. Some Congregationalists wanted congregational automony.
      1. “. . . at least a strong minority among the Congregationalists . . . had developed an insistence upon an extreme localism . . .” (Hudson 53)
      2. Nathaniel Emmons (1803): “Association leads to Consociation; Consociation leads to Presbyterianism; Presbyterianism leads to Episcopacy; Episcopacy leads to Roman Catholicism.” (Hudson 53)
      3. “The resistance to any encroachment upon local rights by a higher ecclesiastical authority was especially strong among the generality of the inhabitants of the parishes who were not church members but who controlled much of the outward affairs of the state-established Congregational churches. This jealous defense of local prerogatives was less pronounced among the actual church members until the ejection of the New School synods from the Presbyterian church in 1837 rekindled old fears of ecclesiastical tyranny.” (Hudson 53)
   4. “. . . this spirit of localism was to make it difficult for the Congregationalists to form a national organization long after their churches had been disestablished in New England.” (Hudson 53)
3. **Presbyterians**
   1. “The Presbyterian churches, since the healing of the breach between the Old Side and New Side parties in 1758, had been united in the Synod of New York and Philadelphia . . .” (Hudson 53)
   2. Soon after the end of the war (1781), “a committee of the synod proposed the reorganization of the church into sixteen presbyteries, four [53] synods, and an annual General Assembly. The “book of discipline and government,” which embodied this scheme and preserved the previous right of local presbyteries to control the examination of candidates for the ministry, was approved by the synod in 1787, referred to the presbyteries for consideration, and formally adopted in 1788, with the General Assembly meeting for the first time in 1789.” (Hudson 53-54)
4. **Congregationalists and Presbyterians**
   1. “The Congregationalists and Presbyterians were the two largest colonial denominations, and they emerged from the war with the prestige which came from having given solid support to the Revolutionary cause.” (Hudson 51)
      1. In 1776, the Anglican rector of Trinity Church in New York City reported to Anglicans in England that he had could not “find a single [Presbyterian clergyman] who did not promote the Revolutionary cause.” (Hudson 56)
   2. “These two groups, for the most part, had come to regard themselves as a single phalanx, with a regional allocation of territory.” (Hudson 51)
      1. Prior to the revolution, the Congregationalists of Connecticut had formed an overarching body that linked together the congregations together. “This so reduced the gap which separated them from the Presbyterians (leaving only the original question of where initial jurisdiction resided in debate) that they tended to call themselves Presbyterians. This tendency to adopt the Presbyterian name was also found among the Congregationalists in Rhode Island and New Hampshire.” (Hudson 52)
      2. Prior to the revolution, there was also an “exchange of delegates between the [Prebyterian] Synod of New York and Philadelphia and the [Congregationalist] General Association of Connecticut.” (Hudson 52)
      3. “The Scotch-Irish Presbyterians who settled in the back country of New England were largely absorbed into the Congregational churches . . .” (Hudson 51)
      4. “. . . the Congregationalists who moved southward tended, almost without exception, to [51] become Presbyterians . . .” (Hudson 51-52)
      5. “Following the war, the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1791 voiced its desire “to renew and strengthen every bond of union” between the Presbyterian and Congregational churches . . .” (Hudson 52)
      6. “Somewhat later, when migration into central and western New York from both Pennsylvania and New England brought about an intermingling of Presbyterians and Congregationalists in a territory that had not been covered by the regional allocation, a Plan of Union was devised and adopted in 1801 which permitted the two groups to form single churches in frontier areas.” (Hudson 52)
      7. “For more than a third of a century, the union of the two denominations was remarkably successful.” (Hudson 52)
5. **Dutch Reformed**
   1. “. . . the Dutch Reformed, restricted as they were to the territory that bordered the Hudson River, made their most significant contribution as an appendage to the Congregational-Presbyterian coalition.” (Hudson 59)
6. **Baptists**
   1. 1707: “The largest portion of the Baptists . . . united in an intercolonial body, the Philadelphia Baptist Association . . .” (Hudson 54)
   2. 1750s: major growth begins. “This rapid expansion had made the initial pattern of organization unwieldy, and the process of adjustment through the formation of subsidiary associations had been interrupted by the outbreak of the war.” (Hudson 54)
   3. 1776-1781: “The Baptists were the one major denomination that experienced significant growth during the war years, and—partly as a consequence—they were to have the greatest difficulty of all the denominations in effecting a national organization.” (Hudson 54)
   4. 1781: “By the time the war was over, the continued growth of the Baptists had resulted in the formation of numerous independent local associations. While these local associations maintained correspondence with one another, they had become deeply infected by the hyperindividualistic spirit of “separate” Congregationalists turned Baptist, most of whom resisted the formation of any structure which might conceivably be used to impose any degree of overhead control. As a result, proposals to effect a national organization found little support . . .” (Hudson 54)
   5. 1814: “developing interest in foreign missions [prompts] the establishment of what was intended to be a general convention of the whole denomination.” (Hudson 54)
   6. 1826: “it was decided that this body should not be permitted to become anything more [54] than a voluntary society of individuals and should be restricted in scope to the promotion of foreign missions.” (Hudson 54-55)
   7. “Thus, apart from local associations of churches, the only links which bound Baptists together were to be voluntary societies devoted to a variety of specialized interests. While this solution to their problem of national organization was to exhibit certain defects and was to create serious problems in the future, it had the immediate advantage of combining concerted action with a high degree of flexibility and local initiative.” (Hudson 55)
7. **Quakers**
   1. The Quakers “suffered heavily as a result of the Revolution.” (Hudson 55)
   2. pre-1776: the Quakers “lost much of their earlier dynamic, having entered a period of “quietism” and having adopted the principle of “birth-right” membership.” (Hudson 55)
   3. 1776-1781: “Their refusal to countenance participation in war caused numerous defections, while those who paid war taxes or fines in lieu of military service were “disowned.”” (Hudson 55)
   4. “Henceforth, the Quakers were to be a numerically diminishing element in American religious life, although they remained widely influential as a creative minority devoted to social reform and humanitarian service.” (Hudson 55)
8. **Episcopalians**
   1. “The pessimistic views of Anglican prospects are cited by”: L. W. Bacon, *A History of American Christianity* (1897) 213, 232. (Hudson 184)
   2. “The greatest casualty of the American Revolution was the Church of England . . .” (Hudson 55)
   3. Anglicanism was “the church of the royal officials. This fact alone accounts for the loss of much of its popularity . . .” (Hudson 55)
   4. There was also “the ardent Toryism of most of its clergy.” In 1776, the “rector of Trinity Church in New York City reported [to England] that “all the Society’s missionaries . . . have to the utmost of their power opposed the spirit of disaffection and rebellion” . . .” (Hudson 55)
   5. Anglican churches were dependent on England for ministers. (Hudson 56)
      1. “The limited supervision and co-ordination exercised by the bishop of London was brought to an end . . .” (Hudson 56)
      2. “Not only was it impossible to secure ordination in America, but practically all the ministers north of Maryland were missionaries drawing their support from the SPG [Society for the Propagation of the Gospel] in London. Independence cut off this source of support, since the charter of the Society limited its activities to British colonies.” (Hudson 56)
      3. There “was a large-scale depletion in the ranks of the clergy. . . . [Most] died or departed, and there were no new men to take their place.” After the war,
   6. post-1781:
      1. Pennsylvania had 1 Anglican clergyman,
      2. North Carolina had 1,
      3. Georgia had 1,
      4. New Jersey had 4,
      5. Virginia had 93 parishes before the war and 91 clergymen;

after the war, 23 parishes disappeared, 34 were vacant, and 38 had only 28 clergymen. (Hudson 56)

* 1. After independence, “privileges the Anglicans formerly enjoyed as an established church were abrogated.” (Hudson 56)
  2. 1789: the surviving Anglican clergy hold a convention and “adopt a constitution for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.” (Hudson 56)
     1. “In conformity to the general American pattern, the new constitution provided that the laity should participate in the enactment of all ecclesiastical legislation . . .” (Hudson 56)
     2. “. . . no powers should be delegated to the General Convention save those which could not be exercised by the clergy and laity in a local congregation.” (Hudson 57)
  3. 1801: the bishop of New York “laid down in discouragement his episcopal functions, being convinced that the Protestant Episcopal church would “die out with the old colonial families.” Bishop Madison of Virginia and Chief Justice Marshall were equally certain that the church was too far gone to be revived.” (Hudson 57)
  4. “Not until well toward the middle of the nineteenth century was the Protestant Episcopal church able to make a significant recovery.” (Hudson 57)

1. **Methodists**
   1. in England
      1. 1739: John Wesley founds the first really Methodist “society” in Bristol. (Walker 602)
      2. 1740: Wesley and friends separate from Moravianism and “found a purely Methodist “United Society” at the Foundery” (a former foundry, now the first Methodist chapel in London). (Walker 602)
      3. 1742: “members were divided into “classes” of about twelve persons, each under a “class leader.” This system . . . became one of the characteristic features of Methodism . . .” (Walker 602)
      4. 1744: Wesley wanted preaching done by clerics, [602] but few sympathized with his movement. So Wesley “had the [mostly lay] preachers meet him in London—the first of the “annual conferences.”“ (Walker 602-603)
      5. 1746: “the field was divided into “circuits,” with traveling preachers” and an assistant (later called a superintendent) in charge of each. (Walker 603)
      6. 1791: John Wesley dies.
      7. 1795: “The definite break with the Church of England came . . .” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      8. English Methodism “was reluctant at first to ordain with the laying on of hands.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      9. “Its system centred in the annual Conference (at first of ministers only, later thrown open to laypeople), which controlled all its affairs. The country was divided into districts and the districts into circuits, or groups of congregations. The ministers were appointed to the circuits, and each circuit was led by a superintendent, though much power remained in the hands of the local trustees.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      10. “Because their faith encouraged them to live simply, their economic status tended to rise, with the unintended result that Wesleyan Methodism became a middle-class church that was not immune to the excessive stress on the individual in material and spiritual matters that marked the Victorian age.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      11. schisms: “The Methodist New Connexion broke off in 1797, the Primitive Methodists in 1811, the Bible Christians in 1815, and the United Methodist Free Churches in 1857.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      12. by 1900: English Methodism (including “vigorous outposts in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales”) had 450,000 members. (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      13. reunions: “In 1907 the Methodist New Connexion, the Bible Christians, and the United Methodist Free Churches joined to form the United Methodist Church; and in 1932 the Wesleyan Methodist Church, the Primitive Methodist Church, and the United Methodist Church came together to form the Methodist Church.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
   2. doctrines
      1. Wesley “stood theologically on the common basis of evangelical doctrinal tradition and regarded his societies as part of the Church of England . . .” (Walker 603)
      2. evangelicalism
         1. This description of Methodism is based on: S. E. Mead, “Professor Sweet’s Religion in America,” *Church History* 22 (1953) 42-44; and S. E. Mead, “American Protestantism during the Revolutionary Epoch,” *Church History* 22 (1953) 290-292. (Hudson 185)
         2. Methodism “emphasized the conversion experience and individualistic morals almost to the exclusion of any doctrinal interest, and it tended to think of Christianity as an evangelistic movement which had few implications for any proper church order.” (Hudson 100)
         3. “It was not inclined to make more than the barest minimum doctrinal affirmation a test of fellowship and felt some hesitancy in allowing even basic theological differences to stand in the way of co-operation with those who seemed to be of like heart.” (Hudson 100)
      3. “To the extent that Methodism possessed a theological interest, its most distinctive features were a frank acceptance of the doctrine of free will and the affirmation of a doctrine of Christian “perfection.”” (Hudson 100)
      4. predestination
         1. Wesley “entered a vigorous dissent at the point of predestination, but in most respects he stood fully within the theological tradition that stemmed from Geneva.” (Hudson 30)
         2. “Wesley, like the Church of England generally of his time, was Arminian . . . [Calvinism] seemed to him paralyzing to moral effort. Whitefield was Calvinistic. A hot interchange of letters took place between the two evangelists in 1740 and 1741, though their good personal relations were soon restored . . .” (Walker 603) “. . . Whitefield believed in double predestination; Wesley regarded this as an erroneous doctrine and insisted that the love of God was universal.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         3. 1769: “the predestinarian controversy broke out with renewed intensity. At the conference of 1770, Wesley took a strongly Arminian position . . . The effect of the controversy was to confirm the Arminian character of Wesleyan Methodism.” (Walker 603)
      5. perfection
         1. “Wesley believed it possible for a Christian to attain right ruling motives—love to God and to his neighbor—and that such attainment brought freedom from sin.” (Walker 603)
         2. “To Wesley’s cautious and sober judgment, this was an aim rather than a frequently completed achievement—however it may have appeared to some of his followers. No man was ever more positive than he that salvation evidences itself in a life of active, strenuous obedience to the will of God.” (Walker 603)
         3. Wesley “claimed to have reinstated the biblical doctrines that a man may be assured of his salvation and that, by the power of the Holy Spirit, he is capable of attaining perfect love for God and his fellows in this life.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      6. social justice
         1. From 1800-1850, Methodists gave little attention to “wholesome laws.” (Hudson 101)
            1. They “tended to equate converting the nation with reforming the nation, believing—in the words of a Methodist historian—that “if the man’s soul was saved fundamental social change would inevitably follow.”” (Hudson 101)
            2. “In practical terms, since Methodists as citizens could not avoid adopting some position on political and social issues, this meant that they were apt either to indorse any current reform that seemed to be “good,” or, with equal alacrity, to defend any social order that did not interfere with their evangelistic activities.” (Hudson 101)
         2. Methodists “were at first conservative in politics but in the second half of the 19th century identified themselves more and more with the liberalism of William Gladstone.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         3. “Its strong social interest has expanded from preoccupation with total abstinence to a wide range of national and international issues, especially those connected with race, poverty, and peace.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      7. Methodism and Catholicism
         1. “Official discussion with Roman Catholics on national and world levels has revealed a surprising degree of agreement . . .” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         2. Women were given limited clergy rights in 1924 and were accepted for full ordination in 1956.” “The first woman was ordained to “The Ministry of Word and Sacraments” in 1974.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
   3. in America
      1. 1766-1776: “John Wesley’s lay preachers had been active in the colonies during the decade preceding the Declaration of Independence, and they had succeeded in gathering about four thousand converts into their “classes.”“ (Hudson 57)
         1. 1771: Francis Asbury, a blacksmith, arrives as a preacher and covers vast distances. (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         2. Wesley drafted a “constitution for the “brethren in America,” and [appointed] Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as joint superintendents of the American Methodists. Wesley somehow expected them to remain in some undefined relationship to the Church of England . . .” (Hudson 58)
      2. 1776-1781
         1. disadvantages during the Revolutionary War
            1. “The Methodists “labored under the handicap of being at least nominal adherents of the Church of England . . .” (Hudson 57)
            2. Wesley’s “staunch and articulate Toryism” also hurt them. (Hudson 57)
            3. “Furthermore, with the exception of Francis Asbury, all the lay preachers Wesley had sent to the colonies returned to England when hostilities commenced. Asbury was determined to identify himself with the colonists and to continue his preaching, but it was no easy task.” (Hudson 57)
            4. “When Barratt’s Chapel in Delaware was being built, an observer reflected popular sentiment when he remarked: “It’s no use putting up so large a dwelling for Methodists, for after the war a corncrib will hold them all.” [For “The pessimistic views . . . of Methodism” see: J. M. Buckley, *A History of Methodists in the United States* (1896), p. 186.” Hudson 184] (Hudson 57, 184)
         2. growth during the war
            1. But “Native lay preachers took the place of the departed English itinerants, and the [57] Methodists, like the Baptists, continued to grow, more than tripling in number during the war years.” (Hudson 57-58)
      3. 1784
         1. ordinations
            1. “Anglican church life in America had been so disrupted that the sacraments would no longer be available to most American Methodists unless they had an ordained clergy of their own. Wesley, therefore, responded to their need and as a presbyter consented to ordain men for what was to be the Methodist Episcopal Church.” (Hudson 58)
            2. “In 1784, when there was a shortage of ordained ministers in America after the Revolution, the Bishop of London refused to ordain a Methodist for the United States. Wesley, acting in an emergency and on biblical principles that allow (as he thought) a presbyter to ordain, ordained Thomas Coke as superintendent and two others as presbyters.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         2. the Methodist Episcopal Church
            1. “. . . it was a wholly independent church that emerged by majority vote from the Christmas “conference” of preachers at Baltimore in 1784.” (Hudson 58)
            2. “Asbury and Coke allowed themselves to be called bishops.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      4. “Thus, the American Methodists, formed into a national body and equipped with the highly centralized circuit and conference system devised by John Wesley, were launched on an independent career that was to make them in the course of time the largest single Protestant church in America.” (Hudson 58)
      5. R. E. Thompson (Presbyterian historian): the nineteenth century was “the Methodist age” of American church history.” [33] [The “nineteenth [183] century as the Methodist age in America is the verdict of”: R. E. Thompson, *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States* (1895) 34; and L. W. Bacon, *A History of American Christianity* (1897) 176. 183-184] (Hudson 33, 183-184)
         1. c 1885-c 1835: “The next 50 years saw a remarkable advance led by the circuit riders who preached to the frontiersmen in simple terms.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
      6. schisms and reunions
         1. “The slavery issue split the Methodist Church into two: the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (organized in 1845).” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         2. they came together to form The Methodist Church. The Methodist Protestant Church, a smaller group, joined in the same union.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         3. “The church in the South lost its black members before and during the Civil War. At the time of the union the Central Jurisdiction was formed for all the black members wherever they lived; it existed alongside the other jurisdictions that were determined by geography. The Central Jurisdiction was abolished in 1968; and black Methodists are now integrated in the church.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
         4. “The originally German-speaking Evangelical United Brethren Church, itself a union of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ and the Evangelical Church, was united with The Methodist Church in 1968 to form the United Methodist Church.” (“Methodism,” *Encyclopædia Britannica*)
2. **the “Christian” movement**
   1. “Following the American Revolution, a widespread movement developed that sought to achieve unity among Christians on the basis of the use of Bible names only, the rejection of “human” creeds, and the restriction of church usages to New Testament practice. The platform . . . to unite all denominations was expressed in the slogan: “Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent.”” (Hudson 58)
   2. “A group of Methodists in Virginia, led by James O’Kelley, represented the first expression of this sentiment. In the interest of unity and impressed by the stress of the revivalists upon the name “Christian” as the bond which unites, these Virginia Methodists resolved to be known by that name alone, and to adopt the Bible as their sole guide and discipline.” (Hudson 59)
   3. “A few years later, a Baptist in Vermont, Abner Jones, became convinced that “sectarian names and human creeds should be abandoned and that true piety alone . . . should be made the test of Christian fellowship and communion.”” (Hudson 59)
   4. 1804: “a Presbyterian in Kentucky, Barton W. Stone, rejected all creeds and resolved to be known by no name but “Christian.”” (Hudson 59)
   5. 1809: “The most famous of the “Christians” or “Disciples of Christ” were Thomas and Alexander Campbell. Thomas Campbell, who was later joined by his son, formed the “Christian Association” of Washington, Pennsylvania, in 1809. The *Declaration and Address*, which was issued to announce the formation of the association, was a plea to Christians of every denomination to abandon all unscriptural doctrines and usages and to restore the original unity and purity of New Testament Christianity.” (Hudson 59)
   6. by 1830s: “the “Christian movement” failed in its objective to unite all Christians, and by the 1830’s it had itself become simply another denomination.” (Hudson 59)
3. **the Protestant counteroffensive**
   1. By 1800, “the Protestant churches, having restored a degree of order to their respective denominational houses, were ready to embark upon a powerful counteroffensive to combat the forces of irreligion and to fashion a Protestant America.” (Hudson 60)
   2. “The counteroffensive was spearheaded by Congregationalists and Presbyterians and was strongly supported by Baptists and Dutch Reformed, with some aid from the Evangelical wing of the Protestant Episcopal church.” (Hudson 60)
      1. “Baptist ministers were educated at practically all the colonial colleges, notably those at Philadelphia and Princeton.” (Hudson 60)
      2. 1765: the Baptists establish Brown University. “. . . the Philadelphia group [of Baptists] which took the initiative [chose Rhode Island] because it represented more nearly a mid-point among the fourteen colonies of the Atlantic seaboard.” From 1765-1790, Brown graduated “twice as many Congregational as Baptist ministers . . .” (Hudson 60)
   3. “The Protestant America that the several denominations [60] sought to fashion was defined in what may roughly be described as New England terms.” (Hudson 60-61)
      1. “To suggest this is to acknowledge the obvious intellectual and theological leadership provided by the New England colleges and the closely related institution of the Presbyterians at Princeton.” (Hudson 61)
      2. “It also serves to call attention to the initially subordinate role in the counteroffensive that was played by the Methodists, the “Christians,” and the Baptist farmer-preachers of the southern frontier.” (Hudson 61)
         1. “The “Christians,” with their initial opposition to an educated ministry, to missionary societies, and to Sunday schools, were closely akin—in everything but theology—to the Baptist farmer-preachers.” (Hudson 61)
         2. “The Methodists were also characterized by a lack of education and an undisciplined emotionalism, for which they were viewed askance by more sober churchmen. By 1847, however, [Congregational minister] Horace Bushnell acknowledged that in the long run the Methodists could be counted as allies rather than foes. “If sometimes their demonstrations are rude and their spirit of rivalry violent,” he observed, “still it is good to have such rivals for their labor is still ours; and when they have reached the state of intelligence they are after, they are sure to become effectually, if not [61] formally, one with us. Therefore, let there be, if possible, no controversy with them; but let us rather encourage ourselves in a work so vast by the fact that we have so vast an army of helpers in the field with us.”” [From *Barbarism, the First Danger* (1847).] (Hudson 61-62)
            1. Horace Bushnell **(**1802-1876): “American theologian whose repudiation of traditional Calvinistic austerity had a profound effect on liberal Protestant thought.” (*American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. 3d ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996) “Congregational minister . . . sometimes called “the father of American religious liberalism. . . . *Christian Nurture* (1847) [was] a thorough critique of the prevailing emphasis placed on the conversion experience by revivalists. In *God in Christ* (1849), published in the year of his mystical experience that illumined the gospel for him, Bushnell challenged the traditional, substitutionary view of the atonement (*i.e*., that the death of Christ was the substitute for man’s punishment for sin) and considered problems of language, emphasizing the social, symbolic, and evocative nature of language as related to religious faith and the mysteries of God. *Christ in Theology* (1851) amplified and defended his attitude toward theological language, giving special attention to metaphoric language and to an instrumental view of the Trinity. In *Nature and the Supernatural* (1858) he viewed the twin elements of the title as constituting the one “system of God” and sought to defend from skeptical attack the Christian position on sin, miracles, incarnation, revelation, and Christ’s divinity.” The local Congregational consociation wanted to try Bushnell for heresy, but Bushnell’s church withdrew from the consociation. “Among his numerous works are *The Vicarious Sacrifice* (1866) [and] *Forgiveness and Law* (1874) . . .” (“Horace Bushnell.” *Encyclopædia Britannica 2002*)
         3. Baptists
            1. “The Baptists of the middle colonies and New England as they moved west were largely an educated middle-class group . . . [In] the few urban centers of the seaboard, [Baptists] maintained an intimate relationship with their northern colleagues and shared their interest in education . . .” (Hudson 61)
            2. But “in the rural areas of the South and on the southern frontier there was no middle class and there were few opportunities to secure an education. . . . the Baptists of the South were of low social and economic status. . . . these Baptists developed a pattern of religious life which was disturbing to the leaders of the New England oriented counteroffensive.” (Hudson 61)
4. **the task of the churches**
   1. a society of voluntary obedience
      1. By 1700, “the churches—even in Massachusetts Bay—were no longer in a position to dictate the wholesome laws upon which the Christian [64] character of society in large part depended. As in the other colonies, they were forced . . . to resort more and more to persuasion . . .” (Hudson 64-65)
      2. effects of American independence
         1. “Independence . . . heightened their [the churches’s] belief that the American people had a special destiny under God. The successful outcome of the Revolutionary struggle in the face of what seemed insuperable odds, they firmly believed, was a signal act of God’s providence which could only be interpreted as having some greater end in view.” (Hudson 65)
         2. “. . . with control of the new nation in American hands, the churches had a much more acute sense of direct responsibility for the proper ordering of society than they had had when ultimate control had been located abroad. . . . severing the ties . . . also removed whatever restraining influence an established church at home had had upon government policy. Finally, the churches were compelled to think of their responsibility to the whole nation, and ultimately to the whole continent, rather than in the more restricted and hence more manageable frame of individual colonies.” (Hudson 65)
         3. With independence, “it became a settled constitutional principle that the laws were to be determined by a majority vote of the total citizenry. This changed situation made it politically necessary, as well as spiritually desirable, to win men to voluntary obedience to the laws of God, for now all legislative action was dependent upon individual conviction and personal [65] decision. . . . the public good [would be] advanced only to the extent that a majority of the people could be persuaded to adopt the wholesome laws which God had designed for the well-being of the community. Nor was it possible to relax once these wholesome laws were enacted, for unless voluntary obedience was maintained, a political revolution at the next election could overthrow the laws and wreck all previous efforts. Thus, the churches were forced to embark on a daring venture, operating on the proposition that at least a majority of men could be persuaded to heed the public good rather than their own self-interest . . .” (Hudson 65-66)
      3. “The need of the churches to operate in this fashion is inherent in the very structure of a democratic society. . . . in a democracy the church, if it is to make its influence count, must stand by the side of every citizen, reminding him of his duty to God. In a democracy, it is the single voter in the polling booth who makes and unmakes policy. Thus in a democracy, where neither a Christian prince nor a Christian élite has the power to command, there is no substitute for a voluntary obedience to the laws of God. By no other means can the Christian faith find expression in the total life of the community.” (Hudson 66)
      4. “As a result of the growing role of Parliament, the problem facing British churchmen was much the same as that of their American counterparts.” (Hudson 67)
      5. “. . . William Wilberforce in *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System* (1797) [66] . . . urged the duty of all true Christians “of serving—it may be of saving—their country, not by busy interference in politics . . ., but rather by that sure and radical benefit of restoring the influence of religion.” Wilberforce was not dismissing political activity as unimportant, for he himself was a busy politician directing the affairs of what has been called “the evangelical united front” and was actively engaged in securing the enactment and enforcement of godly legislation. But Wilberforce was emphasizing that, unless political efforts were undergirded by firm convictions in the minds and hearts of men, they would not avail.” (Hudson 66-67)
   2. separation of church and state (the first amendment)
      1. In ad 394, Emperor Theodosius decreed that all people in the empire must be Christian. (Hudson 68)
      2. In the middle ages, “the basic assumption had been that every member of Western society was a member of the church and subject to its discipline.” (Hudson 68)
         1. 1500: Richard Hooker (referring to England): “There is not any member of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any member of the commonwealth which is not also [a member] of the [68] Church of England.”” (Hudson 68-69)
      3. The first amendment says, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” (Hudson 67)
      4. “The churches, on the one hand, were given the right to be completely self-governing, while, on the other hand, it was insisted that they must also be completely self-supporting and self-perpetuating.” (Hudson 67)
      5. The first amendment “referred the establishment of religion to local option. The national government was restrained at this point, but the individual states were not. An emasculated establishment of religion—with each taxpayer assigning his rates to the church of his choice—did linger on for a generation in three of the New England states. But the principle of separation of church and state was incorporated in the constitutions of the other states, and by 1833 guarantees of full and complete religious freedom had become a part of the fundamental law of the three New England states as well. Ultimately these state guarantees were to be reinforced by an interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment which extended the restrictions of the First Amendment to state and local governments.” (Hudson 68)
      6. “The corollary of religious freedom, as has been suggested, is the voluntary church. Theologically the churches might still regard themselves as divinely constituted, but from a legal point of view they were no more than voluntary associations of private citizens.” (Hudson 68)
      7. In the United States, “people had to be persuaded to join [the churches] voluntarily. Furthermore, [they] had to be sufficiently committed to contribute adequate financial support to the churches . . .” (Hudson 69)
      8. “For most of the American churches, the adoption of the principle of the separation of church and state represented no change in their status. Indeed, most of them had both sought and welcomed the establishment of the principle of full religious liberty.” (Hudson 69)
      9. “Only in New England was the withdrawal of ecclesiastical privileges viewed with any great alarm.” (Hudson 69)
         1. “But in the end, even the Congregational ministers in New England who had predicted dire evils to result from disestablishment were forced to acknowledge that the change had turned out to be a blessing in disguise.” (Hudson 69)
         2. “Lyman Beecher was typical of the New England Congregationalists who clung to the conviction that state support of the churches was essential. He first reacted to disestablishment in Connecticut as if the whole church of God were about to be destroyed. [Disestablishment] would mean the triumph of irreligion and immorality . . . But within a short time, Beecher had changed his mind and declared that disestablishment was “the best thing that ever happened in the state of Connecticut.”” (Hudson 69)
         3. “One of the things which struck Beecher most forcibly was the new feeling of solidarity which developed among Christians of all denominations as a consequence of disestablishment. [69] Hitherto, the “minor sects”—Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Strict Congregationalists—had “complained of having to get a certificate to pay their tax where they liked” and had aligned themselves politically with the forces of “infidelity.” Now, he noted with elation, the repeal of the church rates had removed “the occasion of animosity between us and the minor sects,” and, as a result, “the infidels could no more make capital with them against us.” Indeed, the situation was now quite the reverse. The other denominations “began themselves to feel the dangers of infidelity . . .”” (Hudson 69-70)
         4. “Beecher’s other happy discovery was that [disestablishment, i.e., the voluntary status of the churches] had thrown them “wholly on their own resources and God.” . . . they were obliged to discard their lethargy. [Beecher wrote,] “By voluntary efforts, societies, missions, and revivals, they exert a deeper influence than they ever could” when they were accorded the special position in society symbolized by their “shoe buckles and cocked hats and gold-headed canes.”” (Hudson 70)
         5. The churches thus became “well-organized missionary societies.” (Hudson 70)
         6. “Beecher had not shifted his goal, which continued to be the establishment of a godly order in society, but he was forced to shift his strategy. He remained firmly wedded to the notion that God had a special destiny for America, and he remained convinced that the will of God must rule in America if America was to fulfil her destiny.” (Hudson 71)
5. **Protestantism as apolitical**
   1. c 1800: most of the churches “were too firmly rooted in the Puritan tradition to abandon the notion that the “wholesome laws” of God—other than those that dealt with specifically ecclesiastical concerns—needed to be enacted and maintained.” (Hudson 71)
      1. They were needed “to restrain the cupidity of the minority who could not be won to a voluntary obedience . . .” (Hudson 71)
      2. “. . . even the godly did not wholly escape the “old Adam” and, on occasion, needed to be reminded by tangible restraints of their duty to God.” (Hudson 71)
   2. But increasingly Protestants questioned whether ““wholesome laws” were indispensable to a Christian society.” (Hudson 71)
      1. Increasingly Protestants “minimized [71] the staying power of the old Adam, and believed that a sufficient number of good men would automatically create a good society. Thus, this group tended to insist that legislation and political activity were not the necessary concern of Christians as Christians.” (Hudson 71-72)
      2. “The questioning of politics as a necessary concern of the Christian began when John Wesley’s “no politics” rule was introduced into the American scene. “You have nothing to do but save souls,” he told his preachers. Wesley did not regard government as beyond the sphere of God’s concern, but he did regard it as beyond the concern of private men. As a staunch Tory, Wesley was fearful of the chaos that would result if the generality of men sought to exercise political responsibility. He did not intend his followers to be “republicans.” Political decisions, he felt, should be left to those whom God in his wisdom had called to rule the affairs of men. In post-Revolutionary America, however, such counsel did not make much sense, for the governed were themselves the governors. In this situation, Wesley’s followers had to find a new justification for his “no politics” rule and they found it in the thought of such “politicians” as Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.” (Hudson 72)
      3. “Jefferson and Jackson believed in the perfectibility of man [72] and looked forward to the day when the need for laws would have disappeared. The laws would then be replaced within each individual by an “inner check” so that there would be no need of external restraint. . . . The whole thrust of civilization, according to this type of thinking, was to render men more and more capable of governing themselves. The civilized man was the virtuous man, and the virtuous man had no need for the restraint of man-made laws. Thus a natural harmony would ultimately prevail among men, and society would automatically be perfected.” (Hudson 72-73)
         1. 1829: Andrew Jackson said in his inaugural address: “I believe man can be elevated; man can become more and more endowed with divinity; and as he does, he becomes more Godlike in his character and capable of governing himself.” (Hudson 73)
      4. Evangelicals who obeyed Wesley’s “no politics” rule sought to secure this natural harmony [by means of] the regenerated man rather than . . . the civilized man. The “inner check,” they believed, was not the product of the diffusion of knowledge but the consequence of a conversion experience that freed the individual from bondage to sin. Thus “to convert the nation” was “to reform the nation”—a point of view articulated by Bishop McKendree when he said that “God’s design in raising up the preachers called Methodists in America was to reform the continent by spreading Scriptural holiness over the land.” A Christian society was not one of “wholesome laws” designed to conform to the overruling government of God but a nation blessed by the harmony of converted individuals. This [was] “popular romanticism” . . .” (Hudson 73)
      5. “The “Christians” or “Disciples of Christ” . . . were in essential agreement with the Methodist [73] emphasis, for Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone had been deeply influenced both by Wesleyan ideas and by the philosophy of Lockean or Jeffersonian individualism. In the course of time, the constellation of ideas embodied in the formula of the Methodist preachers penetrated to a varying degree the thinking of all Protestant denominations.” (Hudson 73-74)
      6. “. . . the rudiments of the structured thought of a sturdy Calvinism—with its conception of the government of God finding expression in the “wholesome laws” of a Christian society—. . . became further eroded and the hearty optimism of nineteenth-century romanticism became dominant in the churches.” (Hudson 74)
      7. In 1845, “Rufus Anderson, secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions—the old foreign mission bastion of the voluntary society complex—. . . insisted that the responsibility of the churches did not extend beyond an individualistic winning of converts one by one to the cause of Christ. “. . . social renovation will be sure to follow.”” (Hudson 103)
      8. “The difficulty with the formula of “reforming” the nation by “converting” the nation [eventually] became apparent. The formula contained no provision for the guidance of converted individuals in discharging their political responsibilities. Indeed, it was assumed that they would be guided from within and have no need of laws. Since the redemption of all men from vice was long delayed and the promise of a natural harmony remained unrealized, the practical result of the formula in the interim was for Christians, as Christians, to neglect the fashioning of “wholesome laws.” The ultimate consequence was the surrender of the concept of a Christian society. But this was some distance in the future.” (Hudson 74)
   3. objections
      1. During the 1800 election campaign, John M. Mason was “asking rhetorically of his readers: Where did you learn the “maxim” that “religion has nothing to do with politics”?” (Hudson 72)
      2. Horace Bushnell
         1. Bushnell “provides evidence of the redefinition of the churches’ responsibility for society in essentially Methodist terms, for he could speak on occasion of “a nation of free men, self-governed, governed by simple law without soldiers or police.”” (Hudson 103)
         2. But during the 1844 election campaign, Bushnell wrote: “I cannot let politics alone until shown that politics are not under the government of God, beyond the sphere of moral obligation.” (Hudson 72)
6. **freethinking** (**infidelity,** **atheism**)
   1. “Throughout the Revolutionary generation, the natural religion of the English Deists had been gaining adherents among emancipated intellectuals without creating any great stir.” (Hudson 75)
      1. “Indeed, evangelical Christians had even allied themselves with the rationalists in the struggle for religious liberty. This identity of interest and joint labor in a common cause had inhibited any open conflict.” [For the “alliance of rationalists and pietists,” see: S. E. Mead, “American Protestantism during the Revolutionary Epoch,” *Church History* 22 (1953): 278-297.] (Hudson 75)
      2. “Furthermore, the rationalists of the Revolutionary generation tended to frown upon any widespread dissemination of their views. Although they felt personally superior to the “superstitions” of revealed religion, they believed that these foibles of the weak and the ignorant were productive of “good effects” among the masses of the people, serving to promote morality and to preserve peace and order in society. Hence they were quite ready to speak a good word for the churches and to contribute to their support as occasion demanded.” (Hudson 75)
   2. But after the war, the increasing popularity of “freethinking” aroused fear in the churches. (Hudson 75)
      1. “After the Revolution, the tolerant paternalism of rationalistically inclined intellectuals was replaced by the more radical views of popular pamphleteers who saw the existing churches as the great enemy of progress and who sought to win the [75] allegiance of the masses.” (Hudson 75-76)
      2. “The competing claims of “revealed” and “natural” religion were now laid bare, and it became obvious to all that the rationalist attack was directed against the very foundation of the Christian faith.” (Hudson 76)
      3. “. . . the excesses of the later stages of the French Revolution were interpreted as a direct consequence of “infidel” thinking. Events in France, it seemed to them [the churches], had clearly demonstrated that the alternative to godliness was first anarchy and then despotism.” (Hudson 76)
      4. “. . . many earnest churchmen were persuaded that the “deistic societies” which had been founded in several American cities were part of an international conspiracy to overthrow all religion and all government.” (Hudson 76)
      5. “Actually, “infidelity” did not long remain a serious threat, having been almost completely “drowned” during the three decades [1790-1820] in “the great tidal wave of revivalism” that swept the country, so that an English visitor in 1822-23 was able to report that “instances of openly avowed deism are rare,” for “a man’s reputation would be seriously injured if he were to avow himself one.”” (Hudson 85)
7. **the unchurched West**
   1. “The problem of reducing the multiplying communities of the West to Christian obedience . . . became steadily more urgent.” (Hudson 85)
   2. “It was this . . . which precipitated the powerful counteroffensive of the churches.” (Hudson 76)
   3. The churches were worried lest ““barbarism” overwhelm the nation as a result of the removal of vast numbers of people to the frontier territory of the West where they were far removed from the civilizing and Christianizing influences of the more settled communities of the East.” (Hudson 75)
   4. “. . . the balance of political power in the nation would ultimately shift to the West as a result of the westward movement of population.” (Hudson 76)
      1. “The initial reaction to the westward migration in the older communities had been a sense of relief, for it gave promise of solving some of their problems by draining off unwanted elements of the population.” (Hudson 76)
      2. But “it soon became apparent that a vast new empire was being carved out in the American hinterland which would ultimately have a decisive voice in determining the affairs of the nation.” (Hudson 77)
      3. “Lyman Beecher’s *Plea for the West* was an eloquent appeal to the churches to recognize that “the religious and political destiny” of the nation would be decided in the ever multiplying frontier communities and that the urgent necessity, therefore, was to provide them with a religious ministry.” (Hudson 77)
      4. Horace Bushnell (*Barbarism, the First Danger* [1847]): the task is “to fill this great field with Christian churches and a Christian people . . . home missions [are] the chief, the all-important work . . .” (Hudson 77)
      5. Horace Bushnell (*Barbarism, the First Danger* [1847]): “To present mankind the spectacle of . . . a religious nation, blooming in all the Christian virtues; the protector of the poor; the scourge of oppression; the dispenser of light; and the symbol to mankind of the ennobling genial power of righteous laws and a simple Christian faith—this is the charge God lays upon us; this we accept, and this by God’s blessing we mean to perform.” (Hudson 77)
8. **revivalism and voluntary societies**: **overview**
   1. “In responding to [freethinking and the unchurched West], the churches developed what were to become the typical instruments of Protestant Action . . .” (Hudson 78)
   2. “The two-pronged counteroffensive of the churches [by (a) voluntary societies in the Mississippi Valley and (b) circuit riders and farmer-preachers in the South] . . . demonstrated by the middle of the nineteenth century that, with persuasive power alone, the churches “could ‘Christianize’ the nation . . .”” (Hudson 95)
   3. “While the churches of the Protestant coalition were busy seeking to reclaim the West through the activities of the agents and missionaries of the voluntary societies, the churches of the southern frontier—starting from scratch at the close of the Revolutionary War—were making their contribution to the general Protestant counteroffensive by developing an indigenous ministry of their own.” (Hudson 90)
   4. success of the Protestant offensive
      1. 1800-1850: Protestant church membership increases tenfold. (Hudson 95)
      2. membership in Protestant churches (From Cole, C.C. *The Social Ideals of the Northern Evangelists*, *1826-1860*. 1954. 13-14.)
         1. 1800: 1 out of 15 persons
         2. 1835: 1 out of 8
         3. 1850: 1 out of 7
         4. But membership was often only ⅓ of church attendance; and “the constituency of a church was often computed as twice the number of attendants on a given Sunday . . .” (Hudson 96)
      3. “Even though “the flame of religious zeal burned with significant brightness only in the hearts of a minority,” the life of the whole community was deeply penetrated by the basic attitudes inculcated by the churches, and the churches standing beside the courthouse on the village square became symbols of the common conviction that morals and good order rested upon religion.” (Hudson 96)
9. **revivalism**
   1. introduction
      1. “Evangelicalism was a theological emphasis upon the necessity for a conversion experience as the beginning point of a Christian life, while revivalism was a technique developed to induce that experience.” (Hudson 78)
      2. After the 1780s, because the churches were now voluntary, “the great need was for that clearcut commitment to the Christian faith which springs from a thoroughgoing conversion experience.” (Hudson 79)
      3. Lyman Beecher: the churches chiefly looked to the revivals “for their members and pastors, and for that power upon public opinion which retards declension, gives energy to law, and voluntary support to religious institutions.”” (Hudson 81)
      4. 1726-1865 (Great Awakening to Civil War): revivalism is “the major method used to confront people with the claims of Christ and bring them into the life of the churches . . .” (Hudson 118)
      5. c 1795–1835: the Second Great Awakening (“Revivalism.” *Encyclopædia Britannica 2002 Deluxe Edition CD-ROM*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 2002.)
      6. Revivals “swept the urban centers [of America] on the eve of the Civil War.” (Hudson 110)
   2. the southern frontier
      1. “Augustus Longstreet, in his study of the Georgia frontier, has remarked that “the honest Georgian preferred his whiskey straight and his politics and religion red hot.” [On the southern frontier], life was often raw, rough, and uncontrolled. Here physical manifestations of religious excitement, which tended to be frowned upon in Yankee areas, were permitted and sometimes encouraged.” (Hudson 95)
      2. “The settlers moving westward from south [90] of the Potomac, as a result of a differing pattern of settlement during the colonial era, were characterized by less education and culture and by more active frontier “godlessness” than was true of the westering New Englanders around the Great Lakes and in the upper reaches of the Mississippi Valley. Consequently, the Baptist farmer-preacher, the Methodist circuit rider, and the camp meeting were destined to play a much larger role among them than elsewhere.” (Hudson 90-91)
      3. On the southern frontier, the Methodist circuit rider, the Baptist farmer-preacher, and the camp meeting “constituted the second force in the Protestant counteroffensive. Their achievements, measured by the genuine piety awakened and the moral order introduced as well as by the increase in church membership, were more significant than their cultural idiosyncrasies. In balancing the account, it must be remembered that the southern frontier was “crude, turbulent, and godless,” and it is unlikely that anything other than this popular form of Protestant Evangelicalism could have tamed it.” (Hudson 95)
   3. camp meetings
      1. “The camp meetings, great outdoor gatherings for preaching which lasted several days, was the major evangelistic device in the years following 1800.” (Hudson 95)
      2. “Initiated by the Presbyterians when they began to hold sacramental meetings under the trees, they were later repudiated by them because of their noise, confusion, and uninhibited “exercises.”” (Hudson 95)
      3. “Later the camp meeting was domesticated by the Methodists and became a characteristic Methodist technique for enlisting group pressure to induce conversions.” (Hudson 95)
   4. revival theology
      1. evangelicalism: “The initial reaction of ministers to the urgent need for action was a renewed emphasis upon revivalistic preaching. The crisis of decision which they sought to provoke by making their listeners vividly aware that their eternal destiny hung in the balance was now intensified by making the present danger of “infidelity” quite as repulsive and threatening as the future prospect of eternal damnation. And the present danger, as they depicted it, was equally calculated to cause the hearers to make a decision and to make it right.” (Hudson 79)
      2. “God helps those who help themselves.”
         1. “The earliest colonial revivals had been largely unsought, being regarded as the outpouring of God’s spirit upon the people—an outpouring which came in God’s good time as a by-product of the faithful preaching of God’s Word.” Calvin Colton: “Christians waited for them [the early revivals], as men are wont to wait for showers of rain, without even imagining that any duty was incumbent upon them as instruments.”” (Hudson 79)
         2. Later, “revivals came to be regarded as evidence of “the divine blessing upon measures concerted and executed by man.” Confronted by an urgent summons to action, the notion that [79] Christians “must wait God’s time” increasingly came to be considered little more than an apology for indolence. . . . [Lyman Beecher] told the clergy that they were “no longer to trust Providence and expect God will vindicate his cause while we neglect the use of appropriate means.”” (Hudson 79-80)
      3. “disinterested benevolence”
         1. “. . . the revival campaigns that stemmed from the Congregational-Presbyterian orbit stressed a doctrine of “disinterested benevolence” that had a familiar ring to American ears.” (Hudson 80)
         2. Theologians of revivalism included Samuel Hopkins and Nathaniel W. Taylor. “They defined sin as “selfishness,” and holiness or virtue as “disinterested benevolence.” The effect of conversion was to shift “the controlling preference of the mind” from a “preference for self-interest” to a “preference for disinterested benevolence.”” (Hudson 80)
      4. works
         1. True conversion “must express [80] itself in action. The experience of salvation must not be interpreted as the end of the Christian life, but as its beginning. . . . Working, he [Charles G. Finney] insisted, was quite as necessary as believing.” (Hudson 80-81)
         2. “This emphasis upon the need to translate faith into action provided the basis for enlisting the full participation of the laity in the counteroffensive of the churches. Its practical effect was to channel the whole impulse of the religious life into active support of the highly organized system of voluntary societies.” (Hudson 81)
   5. Methodist circuit riders
      1. Peter Cartwright (most famous circuit rider): “A Methodist preacher in those days, when he felt that God had called him to preach, instead of hunting up a college or Biblical institute, hunted up a hardy pony or a horse, and some traveling apparatus, and with his library always at hand, namely, Bible, Hymn Book, and Discipline, he started, and with a text that never wore out nor grew stale, he cried, ‘Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.’”” (Hudson 91)
      2. Cartwright gave a young missionary advice: “I told him to quit reading his old manuscript sermons and learn to speak extemporaneously . . . if he did not adopt this manner of preaching the Methodists would set the whole Western world on fire before he could light his match. [The people of the West wanted a preacher who could mount] “a stump or a block or old log, or can stand in the bed of a wagon, and without note or manuscript, quote, expound, and apply the Word of God to the hearts and consciences of the people.”” (Hudson 91)
      3. Horace Bushnell later came to see “that the Methodist preachers were “admirably adapted, as regards their mode of action, to the new west—a kind of light artillery that God has organized to pursue and overtake the fugitives that flee into the wilderness from his presence.”” (Hudson 92)
   6. Baptist farmer-preachers
      1. northern Baptists
         1. From c 1800-1850, ⅓ of Baptists were in New England and New York. (Hudson 9)
         2. ⅔ of Baptists belonged to the “Protestant coalition” of voluntary societies. (Hudson 92)
         3. The Baptist churches “were multiplying so rapidly that they had to utilize in the ministry many men of limited formal education. Their zeal in founding academies and colleges, however, is ample testimony that they never lost sight of the ideal of an educated ministry.” (Hudson 92)
      2. Separate Baptists
         1. “But there was another current in Baptist life which stemmed from the “Separate” Baptists . . .” (Hudson 92)
         2. The Separate Baptists “established themselves on the early frontier of the Piedmont region of the South, where educational opportunities were sparse and financial resources meager. It was from this area that self-supporting farmer-preachers moved over the mountains with the initial wave of westward migration.” (Hudson 92)
         3. Theodore Roosevelt on the Baptist farmer-preachers (*The Winning of the West*): “They lived and worked exactly as did their flocks . . .; they cleared the ground, split [92] rails, planted corn, and raised hogs on equal terms with their parishioners.” And the churches they formed waited for no help from missionaries sent to them by missionary societies but proceeded to “raise up” additional preachers out of their own number to evangelize neighboring communities.” (Hudson 92-93)
         4. Reliance “on the untutored farmer-preacher . . . initially had been the product of necessity as well as a reflection of their cultural milieu . . .” (Hudson 93)
         5. But “the untutored farmer-preacher . . . hardened into a matter of principle when the two streams of Baptist migration mingled along the Ohio River and its tributaries.” (Hudson 93) For opposition to an educated ministry, see: W. W. Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier* (1931-1939) 1.68-74. (Hudson 184)
            1. John Taylor commented that, according to the farmer-preachers, “there was not one preacher in the whole area who deserved the name until they arrived, but “it is probable that these men think that but few deserve the name of preachers but missionaries.”” (Hudson 93)
            2. Daniel Parker, an early farmer-preacher, said “that God did not send Jonah to Ninevah through a missionary society, nor was he “sent to a seminary of learning to prepare him to preach to these Gentiles; but was under the tuition of a special order of God . . .” These Baptists, with their opposition to an educated ministry and to all forms of organized missionary endeavor, were a strange amalgam of a highly traditional Calvinist theology and a highly uncritical appropriation of an extreme form of Jacksonian individualism. While as an organized group they never were to constitute a majority of the Baptists on the southern frontier, their thinking deeply influenced the whole Baptist ethos of the region.” (Hudson 93)
   7. Presbyterians
      1. “The Presbyterians on the southern frontier did not wholly [93] escape pressure to lower their educational standards for the ministry. For them the pressure arose out of the great “camp meeting” revival that began around 1800. . . . The revival was also to be the occasion for a larger defection of Presbyterians into the ranks of the “Christians.”” (Hudson 93-94)
      2. “Confronted by an acute shortage of ministers, Presbyterians in eastern Kentucky and Tennessee began ordaining men who did not meet the educational standards of the denomination.” (Hudson 94)
      3. “This led to a schism in 1809 which resulted in the formation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.” (Hudson 94)
   8. the Christians (Disciples of Christ)
      1. The Christians “were confined almost entirely to the Ohio Valley and represented what was perhaps the most typical as well as one of the most vigorous and influential forms of Protestantism on the southern frontier. [They were a] “brotherhood” of locally organized churches . . .” (Hudson 94)
      2. The Christians desired “to unite all Christians by dropping all party names and all human creeds and by taking their stance on the Bible alone.” (Hudson 94)
      3. “Theologically, they were strongly Wesleyan, as was made transparently clear when Stone and his colleagues were put on trial by the Presbyterians as a result of their doctrinal and ecclesiastical laxity at the great Cane Ridge camp meeting.” (Hudson 94)
      4. “Philosophically, Campbell had been deeply influenced by the writings of John Locke before he left Scotland and the whole movement exhibited a hyperindividualistic spirit.” (Hudson 94)
      5. “Ecclesiastically, their churches betrayed many affinities with the Baptists with whom Campbell had been associated for a number of years following his break with the Presbyterians. . . . Campbell did more than any other single person to generate an opposition to missionary societies and a theologically educated ministry.” (Hudson 94)
10. **voluntary societies**
    1. introduction
       1. For the voluntary societies, see: C. F. Foster, *An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837* (1960). (Hudson 184)
       2. “A voluntary society was an extra-church agency, formed for a specific purpose by individuals and not related structurally to the churches.” (Hudson 82)
       3. The voluntary society was “a technique for co-operative action devised by British churchmen . . .” (Hudson 82)
       4. “. . . the voluntary society was seized upon by American Protestants as a perfect instrument by which they could pool their efforts to influence public opinion, effect reforms, meet humanitarian needs, establish colleges, provide religious instruction, organize publishing ventures, and carry on extensive and wide-ranging missionary activities.” (Hudson 82)
       5. “As early as 1796, voluntary societies began to be organized . . .” (Hudson 82)
       6. “Lyman Beecher, who was to do more than any other single individual to perfect the technique, stumbled on the usefulness of the voluntary society early in his career when, in a blaze of indignation following the slaying of Alexander Hamilton by Aaron Burr, he decided that dueling was “a great national sin” which must be eradicated. Noting that even on the floor of Congress “powder and ball” had been substituted for “deliberation and argument,” he issued a call for the formation of a society dedicated to putting an end to this national disgrace. The immediate effect of the formation of the society was to arouse [82] interest, awaken attention to the evil involved, and rally all good men to the cause.” (Hudson 82-83)
       7. advantages
          1. “. . . action did not need to be delayed until a majority within a church could be persuaded to act.” (Hudson 83)
          2. Voluntary societies could “marshal the indispensable rank-and-file support behind a specific objective [and] associate “the leading minds of the laity” with the clergy . . .” (Hudson 83)
          3. “. . . as British experience had made clear, [voluntary societies bypassed] denominational differences . . .” The societies were defined “in purposive rather than creedal terms . . .” (Hudson 83)
             1. As the preamble to the constitution of the Philadelphia Sunday and Adult School Union said: “The comparative *fewness* of Christians calls for all practicable and profitable union among themselves. *Divide* and *conquer* is the maxim of their great foe: *Unite* and *triumph* be then the motto of Christians.” (Hudson 83)
       8. Revivalism was not enough.
          1. There were other “channels to the public mind—Sunday schools, cheap tracts, and religious periodicals.” (Hudson 81)
          2. Also, “stable institutions, and a just order in society, . . . presupposed a literate people and a religious leadership that was trained in the liberal arts as well as in the Bible. Schools, academies, and colleges needed to be established . . .” (Huson 81)
          3. Charitable causes and social reforms needed to be fostered. (Hudson 81)
          4. “. . . while the revivals supplied the churches with candidates for membership and volunteers for the ministry, the potential members and the embryo ministers needed to be instructed . . . Bibles, catechisms, and books were necessary in addition to provisions for formal education.” (Hudson 82)
          5. “Above all, ministers or missionaries needed to be sent to those “waste places” of the back country where there were no churches and consequently no leadership to initiate a revival, organize a church, or establish a school.” (Hudson 82)
       9. types: “There were three basic types of societies . . .” (Hudson 84) Their object was:
          1. moral issues: “slavery, temperance, world peace, and Sabbath observance . . .” (Hudson 84)
          2. charitable causes: “the care of orphans, the schooling of the needy, and the reclamation of “females who have deviated from the paths of virtue” . . .” (Hudson 84)
          3. specifically religious needs:
             1. “. . . the primary stress of the earlier Protestant Action was upon [religious formation]. They were all parts of a single enterprise, but a solid foundation of willing obedience to the laws of God was essential to the success of them all.” (Hudson 84)

“. . . at a later time, within the similar structure of Catholic Action, there was an insistence that the first and great task of Catholic Action was the “religious formation” of individuals . . .” (Hudson 84)

* + - * 1. This “third group of societies [had] a thoroughly systematized program of evangelism. The earliest missionaries dispatched by the missionary societies were itinerants. When they found a community able to provide a portion of their support, they settled down and continued their itineracy into neighboring communities as time permitted and opportunity offered.” (Hudson 84)
      1. “. . . the missionary societies were supplying the clergymen and establishing the churches . . .” (Hudson 84)
      2. “. . . the tract and Bible societies provided the necessary literature . . .” (Hudson 84)
      3. “. . . the Sunday School Union busied itself promoting the religious training of the children . . .” (Hudson 84)
      4. “. . . and the education societies maintained the supply of new ministerial personnel by providing funds to aid needy theological students.” (Hudson 84)
  1. the great “Valley campaign” of 1829-1831
     1. “The Mississippi Valley—the vast expanse of open country stretching from the Appalachians to the Rockies—was the great source of anxiety. The smallest of the states being carved out of this midland empire . . . was larger than all five New England states combined, and the population of the valley was multiplying at an astonishing rate. [Ohio in 1800 had 45,000 people; in 1820, 581,000; in 1830, 937,000—more than Massachusetts and Connecticut.] And the election of Andrew Jackson [of Tennessee] in 1828 demonstrated that the valley could even elevate one of its sons to the Presidency.” (Hudson 85)
     2. 1815: “The initial alarm had been raised by Samuel J. Mills when he reported, following his return from a tour of inspection . . ., that some of the valley’s inhabitants had never seen a Bible or heard of Jesus Christ. It was his report more than anything else that gave impetus to the linking of local and state societies into national organizations . . .” (Hudson 85)
     3. 1816: Lyman Beecher, in an address at the founding of the American Education Society, sketched the goal of the Mississippi Valley campaign: “a Bible for every family, a school for every district, and a pastor for every thousand souls . . . The prevalence of pious, intelligent, enterprising ministers through the nation, at the ratio of one for a thousand, would establish schools and academies and colleges, [and these] would produce a sameness of views and feelings and interests which would lay the foundation of our empire upon a rock.” (Hudson 88)
     4. formation of the societies
        1. 1816: the American Education Society is formed. (Hudson 85)
        2. 1816: the American Bible Society is formed. [85] “The American Bible Society proposed to supply a Bible to every family who would either buy or accept one.” [88] (Hudson 85, 88)
        3. 1824: the American Sunday School Union (Hudson 85)
        4. 1825: the American Tract Society [85] (1825: “the Erie Canal had opened a new gateway to the West,” Hudson 85-86)
        5. 1826: the American Home Missionary Society (Hudson 85-86)
     5. “Great care was exercised to preserve [the voluntary societies’] interdenominational character . . .” (Hudson 86)
        1. “The publishing committee of the American Tract Society, for example, was composed of representatives of the Baptists, Congregationalists, Dutch Reformed, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians . . .” (Hudson 86)
        2. “In the field, an equally harmonious spirit tended to prevail. . . . there was a friendly rivalry for the adherence of the converts won in the jointly sponsored revivals . . .” (Hudson 86)
        3. “Baptists and Episcopalians, to be sure, found it difficult to participate directly in the American Home Missionary Society because of its relationship to the establishment of churches. At this point, therefore, they tended to operate more exclusively through supplementary societies of their own.” (Hudson 86)
        4. And for a time, “the Methodists and their “Christian” or “Disciple” colleagues were subjects of reproach because of their undue doctrinal laxity and excessive emotionalism.” (Hudson 86)
        5. But “strictures were largely reserved for such non-Evangelical groups as the Universalists.” (Hudson 86)
     6. “The second feature of these national societies was the close [86] interrelationship among them [i.e., the societies].” (Hudson 86-87)
        1. “The annual meetings were held in May at the same time and at the same place . . .” (Hudson 87)
        2. “. . . a small group of men—through what has been called a series of “interlocking directorates”—largely controlled the policies and activities of them all.” (Hudson 87)
        3. “Indeed, on occasion, they even transferred funds from one society to another to meet an unusually urgent need.” (Hudson 87)
     7. 1826: John Mason Peck
        1. “John Mason Peck, a Baptist missionary operating initially out of St. Louis, was responsible for initiating a great “saturation” campaign by the societies to save the valley and thus save the nation.” (Hudson 87)
        2. “Peck’s was a remarkable vision of what the valley could become with strategically located Sunday schools, churches, colleges, and theological seminaries . . .” (Hudson 87)
        3. “He had returned to the East in 1826 to attend the General Convention of the Baptists, and he remained in New York City to present his plan to the organization meeting of the American Home Missionary Society. His principal suggestion, which received immediate approval, was that the missionaries of any one of the societies could easily act for them all, as he himself had been doing, thus multiplying their effectiveness. Each agent, as opportunity offered, could sell Bibles, distribute tracts, establish Sunday schools, organize churches, promote educational [87] interest, and form local auxiliaries of each of the national societies, and in so doing, augment his income and solve the problem of support.” (Hudson 87-88)
     8. “By 1828 the plans were fully developed, being given added urgency by the shift of political power that was dramatized by the impending election of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency . . .” (Hudson 88)
     9. 1829: “the campaign was launched.” (Hudson 88)
     10. statistics
         1. 1827: the American Tract Society ships “about $700 [88] worth of tracts west of the Alleghenies . . .” (Hudson 88-89)
         2. 1829-1830 fiscal year: the American Tract Society ships $14,927 worth of tracts west of the Alleghenies (Hudson 89)
         3. 1829-1830 fiscal year: the American Bible Society ships
            1. 23,171 Bibles into Ohio
            2. almost as many into Kentucky
            3. 10,000+ into Tennessee
            4. 14,408 into Indiana
            5. total of above: 47,579
         4. “The Sunday School Union proposed to establish a Sunday school in every place in the valley where it was practical to do so, and to do it within two years.” (Hudson 89)
         5. The American Home Missionary Society aimed to supply every locality “with an able and faithful minister.”” (Hudson 89)
         6. “The American Education Society [organized] auxiliaries and sent Lyman Beecher to establish a theological seminary at the strategic center of Cincinnati . . .” (Hudson 89)
         7. “The multiple agency system that had been suggested by Peck was also put into operation.” (Hudson 89)
            1. 1831: the American Home Missionary Society’s 483 missionaries “organized two hundred Bible classes and more than five hundred Sunday schools . . .” (Hudson 89)
            2. The American Sunday School Union “had 112 missionaries of its own (43 Congregationalists and Presbyterians, 24 Baptists, 17 Methodists, 12 Cumberland Presbyterians, 8 Episcopalians, 2 Dutch Reformed, and 6 unidentified) in the valley . . .” (Hudson 89)
            3. The American Sunday School Union “distributed Bibles and tracts in addition to organizing Sunday schools.” (Hudson 89)
         8. Denominational societies supplemented the interdenominational societies. (Hudson 89)
            1. 1828: the Methodist Book Concern distributes “3,500 Bibles, 18,000 Testaments, and 6,000 Scripture Questions.” (Hudson 89)
            2. 1829: the Baptist General Tract Society is publishing 5 million pages a year. (Hudson 89)
     11. the South
         1. “In 1833, encouraged by the success of the valley campaign, [89] the societies turned their attention to the South, where ignorance seemed widespread.” (Hudson 89-90)
         2. “In many sections there was not more than one educated minister for every eight thousand square miles.” (Hudson 90)
         3. “In the South, however, the support enlisted was small and the results meager. There were two major reasons for this.” (Hudson 90)
         4. In the Valley, there was “a population heavily permeated by people of New England or Middle Atlantic background,” who sympathized with the societies’ objectives. (Hudson 90)
         5. But the South was dominated by “the unstructured fervor of popular Evangelicalism . . .” (Hudson 90)
            1. “This had been a minor current at the close of the Revolution, but by 1830 the type of church life it represented was triumphant in the South, and in other parts of the nation it was beginning to outdistance the influence of the older Puritan Evangelicalism.” (Hudson 90)
            2. Of course, “there were enclaves in the South that shared the cultural and religious outlook best typified by New England, and there were enclaves in the upper valley and indeed a scattered few in New England itself that were more” popularly Evangelical. (Hudson 90)

1. **shifting populations among denominations**
   1. “The first half of the nineteenth century witnessed a realignment in the relative numerical strength of the Protestant denominations . . .” (Hudson 96)
   2. problems with statistics
      1. “. . . some churches report the total baptized membership while others include only adult communicants.” (Hudson 97)
      2. “. . . varying requirements for membership [leave] some groups having a much higher proportion of largely nominal members.” (Hudson 97)
      3. “. . . twentieth-century membership statistics . . . are inflated by the practice of including many who have only the most nominal relationship to a church.” (Hudson 98)
   3. 1800: Congregationalists then Presbyterians are the two largest denominations. (Hudson 97)
   4. 1830: Calvinist Baptists then Methodists are the two largest denominations. (Hudson 97)
   5. 1850: Methodists then Baptists are the two largest denominations. (Hudson 97)
      1. Also, Lutherans have experienced a recent surge of immigration.
      2. And Episcopalians have experienced “a vigorous recovery from the low ebb they experienced for more than a generation after independence.” (Hudson 97)
   6. Most say that denominational sizes shifted because of “their relative effectiveness in meeting the religious needs of the western frontier. This would seem to be only partially true . . .” (Hudson 98)
      1. Baptists “made equally striking gains elsewhere . . .” (Hudson 98)
         1. “The Baptists reaped a large harvest from the disaffection created within New England Congregationalism by the “liberalizing” tendencies which were to culminate in the Unitarian explosion of 1815-20 . . .” (Hudson 98)
         2. “. . . and an age which emphasized the supreme and literal authority of the Scriptures [98] found plausibility in the Baptist insistence upon believers’ baptism.” (Hudson 98-99)
      2. Methodists’ “growth was not restricted to the frontier communities. [98] . . . Methodist zeal and enthusiasm . . . was calculated to win a response among many people along the seaboard as well as on the frontier.” (Hudson 98-99)
      3. “The partial truth of the frontier explanation is the fact that in a time when the population is rapidly expanding, those churches profit most which are able to supply enough ministers . . . This both the Methodists and the Baptists were able to do—in the burgeoning mill towns of the East as well as on the frontier.” (Hudson 99)
2. **popular evangelicalism replaces Puritan evangelicalism**
   1. The years 1800-1850 “brought to an end most of the surviving elements of the Puritan age.” (Hudson 96)
   2. “During these years, Puritan [96] Evangelicalism was giving way to popular Evangelicalism, and for the rest of the century American Protestantism was to be defined almost wholly in Methodist terms.” (Hudson 96-97)
   3. “The distinction between two strands of Evangelicalism in American Protestant life has been mentioned repeatedly.” [99] The two strands are “Puritan Evangelicalism” and “popular Evangelicalism.” [101] (Hudson 99, 101)
   4. “The one was characterized by . . . denominations with a relatively strong Puritan or Calvinistic heritage; the other was characterized by . . . the Methodists. During the 1830’s this distinction began to be obliterated, and by 1850 Evangelical Protestantism had become defined almost wholly in Methodist terms.” (Hudson 99)
      1. The “Methodist” groups “included the “Christians” or Disciples, Free Will Baptists, United Brethren, and the Evangelical Church as well as the Methodists themselves . . .” (Hudson 100)
   5. Enthusiasm decreased in popular evangelicalism.
      1. “Popular Evangelicalism, of course, tended to become more sober with the passing of time and tended to lose many of its cultural antipathies.” (Hudson 99)
      2. after 1830: “the Methodists began to establish colleges . . . accompanied by some reservations [about] “a manufactory of which preachers are to be made” . . .” (Hudson 99)
         1. 1834: DePauw University (Greencastle, IN) (Hudson 99)
         2. “. . . what was to become the Boston University School of Theology was specifically established to provide theological education.” (Hudson 100)
      3. “Even Alexander Campbell in 1840 was to found Bethany College and spend the remaining years of his life as a college president.” (Hudson 100)
   6. Enthusiasm increased in Puritan evangelicalism.
      1. Here we see “The shift in the old-line churches from a Puritan Evangelicalism to a popular Evangelicalism . . .” (Hudson 101)
      2. “Much more significant than the tendency of the “Methodist” groups . . . to become more sober and culturally respectable, was the reverse tendency which expressed itself in the rapid shift of other denominations into the Methodist camp.” (Hudson 100)
      3. “. . . the churches which stood most directly within the Calvinist tradition had not forgotten the importance of sound doctrine and—in a subordinate way—of proper church order.” (Hudson 100)
      4. But “Evangelicalism in general stressed the primacy of heart religion manifesting itself in the conversion experience . . .” (Hudson 100)
      5. Charles G. Finney (1792-1875) (first Presbyterian, later [1837] Congregationalist)
         1. Finney was president of Oberlin College in Ohio (1851-1866).
         2. “A lawyer who had received “a retainer from the Lord Jesus Christ to plead his cause,” Finney began his evangelistic activity with the conservative Evangelical views of his theological mentor, George W. Gale . . .” (Hudson 101)
         3. Finney’s revivals “swept central and western New York from 1825 to 1835 . . . in Presbyterian and Congregational pulpits . . .” (Hudson 101)
         4. Finney’s semi-Pelagianism
            1. But “he rapidly moved into the orbit of the New Haven theology of Lyman Beecher and Nathaniel W. Taylor. In the hands of these men, traditional Calvinism had been modified almost beyond recognition on the point of “free will” by an involved restatement designed to provide an effective basis for their revivalistic efforts.” (Hudson 101)
            2. “Finney was much less subtle than his Congregational and Presbyterian colleagues and tended to state bluntly what many of them were thinking. “There is a sense in which conversion is the work of God,” he admitted. But there is also “a sense in which it is the effect of truths” and “a sense in which the [101] preacher does it,” and “it is also the appropriate work of the sinner himself.” The actual turning to God, he explained with an emphasis that suggested that a person saves himself through choice, is the work of the individual. It is what God requires of the individual, and what God requires of him must be something that God cannot do for him. “It must be your voluntary act.”” (Hudson 101-102)
         5. “Nor was Finney one to dwell unduly on theological distinctions.” (Hudson 102)
            1. “It is true that he would tell a Universalist that he had no more religion than his horse . . .” (Hudson 102)
            2. But “When the Presbyterians began to be agitated by theological controversy, Finney said that “their contentions and janglings are so ridiculous . . . that no doubt there is a jubilee in hell every year about the time of the meeting of the General Assembly.”” (Hudson 102)
            3. “. . . he would warn his converts not “to dwell on sectarian distinctions, or to be sticklish about sectarian points.”” (Hudson 102)
            4. “After 1835, when he began dividing his time between a pastorate in New York City and a professorship at Oberlin, Finney adopted the Wesleyan view of “Christian perfection,” becoming largely responsible for the marked emphasis upon “holiness” and “the higher Christian life” in the “prayer meeting” revivals of 1857-59.” (Hudson 102)
      6. “Finney’s work was supplemented by a host of itinerant evangelists, some of whom were imitators with little formal education and some of whom were his own converts who had been trained at the Institute of Practical Education at Whitesboro, New York, or at Oberlin.” (Hudson 102)
      7. “Even the more culturally respectable New Divinity men among the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Baptists tended to move into his camp.” (Hudson 102)
      8. “Lyman Beecher, distressed by Finney’s bluntness and unconventional procedures, had said that if Finney ever entered New England, [102] he would meet him at the border and fight him all the way to Boston, but in the end it was Beecher who invited Finney to come to Boston.” (Hudson 102-103)
      9. “Horace Bushnell, who is often regarded as an enemy of revivals, not only defended them but came to recognize, while deploring “artificial” fireworks, that there was need for some excitement to attract the attention of the unconverted and effect a change in them.” (Hudson 103)
      10. “Even the Lutherans, with their confessionalism undercut by pietism, were brought temporarily into this main current of American Protestantism . . .” (Hudson 104)
      11. Even the Unitarians “made an abortive attempt to hold revivals of their own.” (Hudson 104)
3. **controversies**
   1. Congregationalists: the Unitarians and Universalists separate
      1. Unitarians
         1. pre-1781: “Even before independence had been won, the Congregational ministers of eastern Massachusetts, under the influence of Jonathan Mayhew and Charles Chauncy, had been divided into a liberal and an orthodox party. They lived together in an uneasy truce, with the liberals disguising their unitarian and universalist convictions . . .” (Hudson 104)
         2. 1805-1808: “the election of a liberal to the Hollis Professorship of Divinity at Harvard in 1805 provoked the founding of Andover Theological Seminary in 1808 by the orthodox.” (Hudson 104)
         3. 1815: “the true sentiments of the liberals were revealed in a pamphlet which reprinted some of their correspondence with English Unitarians. A division was immediately precipitated, with about one hundred churches in Massachusetts and a scattered few elsewhere joining the Unitarian faction.” This was “a shattering explosion within Congregationalism . . .” (Hudson 104)
         4. “The Unitarians made little effort to propagate their views, being convinced that cultural advance would ultimately lead others to [104] join them and, in the meantime, being quite content, as someone has said, to maintain their private faith in “the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the neighborhood of Boston.”” (Hudson 104-105)
      2. Universalists
         1. “Views similar to those of the Unitarians were held by the Universalists, a lower-class group stemming from the evangelistic activities of John Murray in eastern Massachusetts during the late eighteenth century.” (Hudson 105)
         2. “Actively propagandist, the Universalists moved into the newer communities of the West, where for a time they were a major religious force and where they exerted a far greater direct influence than the Unitarians—if only by way of reaction—upon the developing theology and institutional patterns of American Protestantism.” (Hudson 105)
         3. “After 1840, however, the Universalists had begun a sharp and steady decline—a decline that was probably hastened by their encounter with Spiritualism.” (Hudson 105)
   2. “Tension within American Protestantism became acute after 1830.” (Hudson 104)
      1. The period 1835-1850 “witnessed the development of severe strains within the several denominations and the temporary collapse of the united efforts of the Protestant coalition.” (Hudson 97)
      2. Presbyterians: the Old School-New School division
         1. 1830s: Presbyterians experinced “tension between the forces of Puritan and popular Evangelicalism . . .” (Hudson 105)
         2. They “were disturbed by the growing influence of the New Divinity of Yale, as formulated by Nathaniel W. Taylor and popularized by Beecher and Finney. It seemed to them to represent not only an undermining of some of the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith but also a developing laxity of ecclesiastical practice that in the end would make impossible any attempt to maintain sound doctrine.” (Hudson 105)
         3. The controversy “transformed such a person as Ashbel Green, who had hitherto been an eager participant in the Protestant [105] coalition, into an earnest advocate of traditional Presbyterian views.” (Hudson 105-106)
         4. “Around 1830 many Presbyterians began to resist the sweeping tide of popular Evangelicalism with a sturdy defense of the traditional standards of doctrine and church order, only to find that they had divided the church and subjected themselves to ridicule and abuse.” (Hudson 104)
         5. 1836: “Among the Presbyterians, the controversy was initiated with charges of heresy lodged against Albert Barnes and Lyman Beecher. Both cases were ultimately brought before the General Assembly in 1836; a New School majority dismissed the charges against Barnes, whereupon the charges against Beecher were withdrawn.” (Hudson 106)
         6. 1837: “Frightened by the “liberal” or “Arminian” tendencies of the New Divinity of Yale,” [108] “the Old School party commanded a clear majority in the General Assembly and proceeded to expel the predominantly New School synods from the church, thus leaving them no alternative but to form a separate New School Presbyterian Church.” [106] (Hudson 106, 108)
         7. c 1865: “the two factions were reunited during and immediately after the Civil War, reintroducing thereby the New School leaven. Furthermore, the fact that Albert Barnes’s eleven-volume commentary on the Bible, published between 1832 and 1853, sold over a million copies was adequate testimony to his continuing influence.” (Hudson 106)
      3. Baptists
         1. “Among the Baptists, the defenders of the traditional standards constituted a large and significant bloc, especially in the back-country areas of both the East and the West. When this group failed to capture the denominational machinery, a defection occurred during the early 1830’s which carried with it many local associations.” (Hudson 106)
         2. “These churches and associations, however, adopted such a rigidly defensive posture that they could do little more than eke out a dwindling existence, and their withdrawal left the other Baptist churches open to what had now become the dominant current of popular Evangelicalism.” (Hudson 106)
      4. minor dissensions (Mormonism, Millerites, and Spiritualism)
         1. “Problems of varying seriousness for the different denominations were created during the 1830’s and 1840’s by the rise of Mormonism, the millenarian excitement generated by the Millerites, the interest in Spiritualism aroused by “the Rochester rappings” of the Fox sisters, and the dissension occasioned by the development of anti-Masonic sentiment.” (Hudson 107)
      5. 1840s-1860s: divisions over slavery
         1. The Old School Presbyterians and the Episcopalians remained aloof to the issue of slavery and so avoided division. (Hudson 107)
         2. The Disciples of Christ “were too loosely associated to be divided.” (Hudson 107)
         3. 1844: the Methodists divide into two bodies over slavery. They only reunite in 1940. (Hudson 107)
         4. 1845: the Baptists divide into two bodies over slavery. They have not reunited. (Hudson 107)
         5. 1857: the New School Presbyterians divide into two bodies over slavery. They have not reunited. (Hudson 107)
         6. 1861: the southern Old School Presbyterians form the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. (Hudson 107)
         7. 1864: the southern New School Presbyterian synod unites with the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. (Hudson 107)
         8. 1869: the northern Old School and New School churches reunite. (Hudson 107)
      6. collapse of the Protestant coalition
         1. “The late 1830’s marked the beginning of the collapse of the complex of voluntary societies . . .” (Hudson 107)
         2. “The major factor in the collapse was undoubtedly the lessening sense of urgency for combined effort . . .” (Hudson 107)
         3. A churchgoing Protestant society allowed the churches “to turn their attention . . . to denominational concerns . . .” (Hudson 108)
         4. Presbyterians and Congregationalists
            1. “The precipitating factor in the collapse of the coalition . . . was the [Presbyterian] Old School-New School controversy.” (Hudson 108)
            2. The Old School Presbyterians abrogated the Plan of Union with the Congregationalists and forbid participation in the American Home Missionary Society, the American Education Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. (Hudson 108)
            3. “These arbitrary actions, in turn, provoked the development of a stiff-necked Congregationalism which viewed the whole Presbyterian system of church government as an instrument of tyranny. This sentiment put an end even to any continued operation of the Plan of Union with the New School Presbyterians . . . it was formally repudiated by the Congregationalists in 1852.” (Hudson 108)
            4. “Henceforth the Congregationalists were to be so overwhelmingly dominant in the three societies from which the Old School Presbyterians had withdrawn that they lost their interdenominational character and became simply agencies of the Congregational churches.” (Hudson 108)
         5. The Episcopalians “had largely limited their direct participation in the Protestant coalition to the activities carried on by the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and the American Sunday School Union. This participation was now to be reduced by the growing influence of the “high church” views of Bishop J. H. Hobart . . .” (Hudson 108)
         6. The Baptists “had largely limited their direct participation in the Protestant coalition to the activities carried on by the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and the American Sunday School Union. “[108] Even this participation was “reduced by the [Presbyterian] Old School defection . . .” (Hudson 108-109)
         7. In 1836, the American Bible Society “abandoned the precedent established in the Burmese translation of the Scriptures and refused to permit Baptist missionaries in India to translate the Greek word *baptizo* clearly to indicate immersion instead of merely transliterating it. The result of this action was a Baptist withdrawal and the establishment by the Baptists of the American and Foreign Bible Society.” (Hudson 109)
      7. renewal of the Protestant coalition
         1. “The collapse of the coalition, however, was only temporary. The triumph of popular Evangelicalism in the major denominations provided a new bond of unity and the pressing problems of the burgeoning cities after the Civil War were to create a new demand for united action. It was within this context that the coalition was to be renewed with the Methodists as full partners.” (Hudson 109)
         2. “In spite of the tensions which had developed during the 1830’s and 1840’s, the churches themselves were surprisingly homogeneous and self-confident. The war was over . . .” (Hudson 111)

## From the Civil War to the First World War, 1865-1914

1. **introduction**
   1. By 1850, most Americans “regarded themselves as “adherents” of one church or another . . .” (Hudson 110)
   2. “. . . during the middle decades of the century, the religious press was growing more rapidly than the secular press both in number of periodicals and circulation. Whitney R. Cross [concluded that] even “laymen read and relished the theological treatises” they contained. (Hudson 110)
   3. When revivals “swept the urban centers on the eve of the Civil War,” there was, R. T. Handy notes, “remarkable unanimity of approval among religious and secular observers alike, with scarcely a critical voice heard anywhere.” [R. T. Handy, “The Protestant Quest for a Christian America, 1830-1930,” *Church History* 22 (1953) 10-12.] (Hudson 110)
   4. Protestantism’s “cultural dominance . . . can also be seen in the ease of transition to a public tax-supported school system—the transition being “palatable [110] to Protestants because the schools were rather clearly Protestant in orientation.”” (Hudson 110-111)
   5. “This was the America the churches sought to maintain as they confronted the new problems of the post-Civil War years.” (Hudson 111)
   6. “. . . while the South was beset with the problems of Reconstruction, the economy of the rest of the country was booming.” (Hudson 111)
   7. In “the sweeping advance of popular Evangelicalism, all the denominations had become remarkably similar in character and outlook.” (Hudson 111)
   8. The “great challenge prior to the Civil War had been to evangelize a westward-moving population . . . the great task during the decades that followed the war was to win and to hold the vast tide of people flowing into the cities.” (Hudson 111)
      1. Immigrants to cities were either from rural areas or from overseas.
      2. “. . . people from hilltop villages and back-country farms moved first to the new mill towns in the valleys and then to the larger commercial and industrial centers . . .” (Hudson 111)
      3. In the larger cities “an increasing number of people from abroad were also to be found.” (Hudson 111-112)
2. **Protestant Action’s urban counteroffensive**
   1. rural immigrants
      1. 1816: city mission societies are organized. At first they distribute tracts and Bibles; later they provide rescue missions, seamen’s institutes, and church extension agencies.
      2. Finney’s revivals more and more aim at city populations.
      3. YMCA (Young Men’s Christian Association)
         1. The Y was “The great instrument of the urban counteroffensive . . .” (Hudson 112)
         2. It became “the most immediately available interdenominational agency at the local level . . .” (Hudson 114)
         3. Young men moving to the city lost the habit and the community pressure of religion. The Y provided them Christian boarding houses, prayer meetings, Bible classes, a reading room, and an employment bureau.
         4. 1844: the Y begins in England.
         5. 1851: the Y comes to the US (Boston’s Y is the earliest).
         6. by 1860: there are 205 local Ys.
         7. The youth of the Y cared for the sick and destitute and schooled poor children.
         8. They were evangelistic: they worked in rescue missions, distributed tracts, and preached on street corners.
         9. They organized revivals.
            1. 1857-1859: prayer meetings at the New York Y evolve into a businessmen’s revival that spreads to the Ys in other cities.
            2. Dwight L. Moody

Through the Chicago Y, a former businessman devotes himself to revivals and becomes the most important person in the Y movement. Moody raised funds for the Y, and the Y organized revivals for him.

He was leader of the Student Christian Movement on college campuses.

But Moody was “the last of the great revivalists”: response to his revivals continually declined. (Hudson 118) Reasons:

changes in the intellectual climate

distractions of city life

an increasingly diverse population

“. . . frenzied efforts were made by some to perpetuate it [revivalism] as a method for reaching the unchurched portions of the population—efforts which ultimately were to bring revivalism into almost complete disrepute.” (Hudson 122)

* + - * 1. 1861-1865 (Civil War): the Y becomes “the wartime instrument of the churches for ministering to the soldiers . . .” (Hudson 114)
    1. Evangelical Alliance
       1. 1867: the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance is organized. Its leader is Josiah Strong.
       2. To reach every home and “keep in touch with people during their frequent moves within the cities, a monthly house-to-house visitation was proposed” to provide a “personal, living, love-convincing touch” between churchgoer and non-churchgoer. (Hudson 115)
       3. by 1889: continuous watch over every part of the community is established in forty cities.
  1. overseas immigrants
     1. Unlike those from rural areas, overseas immigrants were unfamiliar with the American churches and had language and cultural barriers.
     2. The churches provided a native-language ministry as soon as a group arrived in significant numbers.
        1. 1846: Baptists work among Germans.
        2. 1848: Baptists work among Scandinavians.
        3. 1853: Baptists work among French Canadians.
        4. 1888: Baptists work among Poles and Portuguese.
        5. 1894: Baptists work among Italians.
        6. Ultimately: Baptists work among 21 nationalities in 21 languages.
        7. Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodists served the same groups, and also Bohemians, Hungarians, Slovaks, Rumanians, and Russians.
        8. Recruiting a native ministry was difficult. Most seminaries established foreign-language departments for each group. By 1900, native ministers were plentiful.
     3. Local churches did missionary work among immigrants through home visitations and through native-language worship services and Sunday school classes.
     4. Mission centers developed into foreign-language churches. Some merged into a denomination’s other churches; more died after a couple of generations, as their now-assimilated members joined a denomination’s other churches.
  2. the “institutional” church
     1. 1860-1880: many city dwellers move to suburbs, where new churches are built for them.
     2. by 1880: inner-city “institutional churches” arise.
        1. “The objective was to keep the church building open and in use at all hours every day and to draw the people of the neighborhood within its orbit.” (Hudson 118)
        2. They provided gymnasiums, evening classes, employment bureaus, loan associations, medical clinics, public baths, nurseries for working mothers, and various clubs.
     3. 1880-1900: institutional churches rapidly multiply; membership growth is phenomenal.
     4. after 1900: institutional churches become primarily social centers; activities originally intended “to provide a bridge into the life of the church” become “mere humanitarian service . . .” Congregations dwindle and deficits increase, and “many institutional churches became social agencies for which other churches had to find money and leadership . . .” (Hudson 118)

1. **religious education replaces revivalism**
   1. the International Sunday School Association
      1. As revivals declined, the churches had to find another “standardized procedure” for converting people and gaining members. The Sunday school was that method. (Hudson 119)
      2. 1824: missionaries of the American Sunday School Union start to establish Sunday schools.
      3. after 1865: lay people establish Sunday schools “in a new burst of enthusiasm . . .” (Hudson 119)
      4. after 1865: Dwight L. Moody proposes and strongly promotes the International Sunday School Assocation.
      5. B. F. Jacobs, “Chicago real estate man and Baptist Sunday school superintendent,” relentlessly organizes the Association into “city, county, state, and national conventions of Sunday school workers.” He keeps the denominations “working together harmoniously . . .” (Hudson 119)
   2. the convention system
      1. Jacobs “also developed the efficient county convention system of bringing the Sunday school teachers together for periodic rallies, which constituted the real strength of the movement. His objective was to enlist, train, and inspire a vast host of Sunday school workers who would make a culminating “Decision Day” the focal point of their efforts.” (Hudson 120)
      2. ““To attend a convention revealed to the local worker his chosen cause operating on a larger field, broadened his fellowship, inspired him to new effort”; and, at the same time his ardor and zeal were being kindled, he was introduced to new methods and given a measure of training.” (Hudson 120)
   3. the Uniform Lesson plan
      1. “An innovation scarcely less significant than the convention system was the “Uniform Lesson” plan which was adopted, at the insistence of Jacobs, by the National Convention of 1872. Many advantages were claimed for the Uniform Lessons.” (Hudson 120)
      2. “. . . “next Sunday’s lesson” provided a bond between the members of different denominations and contributed to the sense of Protestant solidarity.” (Hudson 120)
      3. The Uniform plan “facilitated lesson-preparation for the teachers. It is reported that in such cities as New York, Boston, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Chicago, as many as eight to twelve hundred teachers would gather every Saturday afternoon to be instructed in the Uniform Lesson for the next day.” (Hudson 120)
   4. the organized class (for adults)
      1. “. . . the Sunday school was well-equipped to replace the older evangelism as a recruiting technique for those entering their teens. It still provided no means for reaching those in their later teens or adults. The “organized” class was a response to the need of the older teen-age and young adult group, and it was designed quite explicitly to serve as an instrument of [120] evangelism. Each member of the class worked to win others for Christ and the church.” (Hudson 120-121)
      2. “The organized class idea, with its slogan “each one win one,” was originated by Marshall A. Hudson, of Syracuse, New York. He had noticed the young men who stood outside the doors of the church each Sunday, waiting for the girls who were teaching in the Sunday school; so he determined to win them by putting them to work for others.” (Hudson 121)
      3. “In 1890 he organized these young men into a Baraca class . . .” (Hudson 121) 2 Chr 20:26, “On the fourth day they [Jehoshaphat and his people] assembled in the Valley of Beracah, for there they blessed the Lord; therefore that place has been called the Valley of Beracah to this day.”
      4. Each Baraca class had its “own officers, and an inner circle—“the secret service”—who were pledged to pray secretly each day for the members of the class who had not as yet made a Christian profession and “at a suitable time to speak to those for whom they [were] praying.” The idea caught on, and soon classes were being organized in other churches.” (Hudson 121)
      5. “In 1895 Philathea (lovers of God) classes for young women were established.” (Hudson 121)
      6. “Within a short time national conventions were being held . . .” (Hudson 121)
      7. By 1913, the World-Wide Baraca-Philathea Union had more than 9000 classes, a membership of almost 1 million, in churches of 32 denominations. (Hudson 121)
      8. Other “nationally organized classes . . . quickly entered the field, among them being the Agoga and Amoma classes, the Drexel Biddle classes, the Bereans, the Gleaners, and the King’s Daughters.” (Hudson 121)
   5. adult classes
      1. “With the impetus provided by organized classes for youth, the Sunday school expanded into the adult field as well. By the turn of the century, most churches had adult Bible classes, which were frequently gathered around a striking personality whose name was given to the class.” (Hudson 121)
      2. “In 1905 the International Sunday School Association established an adult department to [121] promote these classes . . .” (Hudson 121-122)
      3. By 1908, the Association “was issuing certificates of recognition to as many as six thousand new classes each year, and reminding them that “the chief business of this movement is the winning of souls to Jesus Christ.”” (Hudson 122)
   6. conclusion
      1. “Of the specifically urban devices, the Y.M.C.A. alone was still reporting from two thousand to thirty-five hundred “hopeful conversions” each year at the turn of the century . . . [Also, the] foreign-language groups had also displayed evidence of real strength.” (Hudson 122)
      2. “The primary reliance, however, was upon the Sunday school with its “Decision Days” for adolescents, organized classes for older young people, and Bible classes for adults.” (Hudson 122)
2. **the churches discover the world**
   1. “American interest in foreign missions had first been aroused shortly after 1800 by news of English missionary activity and by firsthand reports from distant lands being brought back by the clipper ships. At the very moment when public attention was thus focused upon faraway places, the second Great Awakening was [122] kindling new fervor and devotion among the people of the churches. Given these circumstances, it is not surprising that some of the more ardent and adventuresome of the youthful Christians should have felt an insistent summons to carry the gospel to the ancient lands of the East.” (Hudson 122-123)
   2. “The earliest response was at Andover Theological Seminary, where a group of students banded together with the purpose of going as missionaries to the distant heathen. In 1810 they presented themselves to the Congregational General Association of Massachusetts with the result that the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was formed to undertake their support.” (Hudson 123)
   3. “The American churches, however, remained junior partners to the British until late in the nineteenth century. Then the roles were reversed, and the American churches surged forward.” (Hudson 123)
   4. “During the later decades of the nineteenth century, Americans were becoming world-conscious, and in 1885 Josiah Strong, in a little book entitled *Our Country* sounded a clarion call for Americans to assume their responsibility for the Christianization of the world. The next year a student conference was held at Dwight L. Moody’s base of operation in Northfield, Massachusetts. Before it was over an even one hundred had volunteered for foreign mission service, adopting the slogan: “The evangelization of the world in this generation.” This was the birth of the Student Volunteer Movement, which for the next three decades was to enlist the ablest men and women on the college campuses of the nation and send them to the far corners of the earth.” (Hudson 123)
   5. Providing support for an increasing number of young missionaries became a serious problem. “A Presbyterian [123] layman, John B. Sleman, Jr., . . . attended a Student Volunteer Convention at Nashville in 1906 and was deeply moved by the thousands of students gathered there with one objective in mind.” In fall 1906 he launched the Laymen’s Missionary Movement: “a nationwide campaign was undertaken to challenge laymen to match the devotion of youth with the dedication of their dollars. Until the outbreak of World War I, the Laymen’s Missionary Movement was carried forward with the same surge of enthusiasm that characterized the Student Volunteer Movement.” (Hudson 123-124)
   6. The missionaries also built hospitals and founded schools and colleges. Thus “the culture and institutions of the West [were] transmitted. Quite apart from their evangelistic efforts, the missionaries trained the leaders who were to spark the revolutionary ferment which swept these lands in the twentieth century. It was a daring venture that in some respects yielded a harvest of bitter fruit.” (Hudson 124)
3. **the halcyon years**
   1. “By the end of the century, the final frontier areas had been “churched,” and the American people seemed to be settling down to a stable churchgoing existence defined in Protestant terms. (Hudson 131)
   2. “The decades bridging the turn of the century [“the two decades bridging the turn of the century,” 127] were the halcyon years of American Protestantism.” (Hudson 124, 127)
      1. In part “. . . Protestants shared the general cultural conviction of the time that they were living in the best of all possible worlds . . .” (Hudson 124)
      2. But also “Churches were crowded; costly edifices were being built; programs were proliferating; the moral order, in public esteem if not always in practice, was unquestioned; a broad range of humanitarian concerns elicited widespread interest and generous support.” (Hudson 124)
      3. “Never before had the members of the [124] churches exhibited so contagious an enthusiasm, and never before had they been so busy—serving in social settlements, organizing boys’ clubs, teaching Sunday school classes, attending “open forums,” and conducting campaigns. It was an era of crusades—“movements” they were called—which served to channel the unusual moral idealism and superabundance of zeal generated by the churches into a host of good causes.” (Hudson 124-125)
      4. “Of all the symbols of nineteenth-century America, none was more characteristically Protestant than the Chautauqua Institution on Chautauqua Lake, which Theodore Roosevelt described as the most American thing in America.” [In H. G. McMahon, *Chautauqua County: A History* (1958) 221.] (Hudson 128)
      5. Theodore Roosevelt “declared that he “would rather address a Methodist audience than any other audience in America,” for “the Methodists represent the great middle class and in consequence are the most representative church in America.”” [In C. A. and M. R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (1927) 2.399-400.] (Hudson 128)
   3. “These years were also the great age of the American pulpit.” (Hudson 125)
      1. “Sermons were often front-page news in the daily press, and those of some of the more prominent of the clergy were regularly syndicated nationally in their entirety.” (Hudson 125)
      2. “There was a whole galaxy of stars of national and even international reputation—Phillips Brooks, Russell Conwell, George A. Gordon, Washington Gladden, Lyman Abbott, Newell Dwight Hillis, Charles M. Sheldon, T. DeWitt Talmadge, Charles A. Parkhurst—and a host of others whose fame was regional.” (Hudson 125)
      3. “The preachers in general, James Bryce reported in his classic study of American society, were regarded as “first citizens,” and they exercised “an influence often wider and more powerful than that of any layman.”” (Hudson 125)
   4. “There were, of course, problems to be faced.” (Hudson 125)
      1. “A popular skepticism, stemming from new scientific hypotheses and typified by Robert G. Ingersoll, was manifesting itself . . .” (Hudson 125)
         1. Ingersoll taunted in a newspaper that “the churches are dying out all over the land.” (Hudson 125)
         2. C. C. McCabe of the Methodist Church Extension Society sent him a famous telegram: [125] “Dear Robert: All hail the power of Jesus’ name—we are building more than one Methodist church for every day in the year, and propose to make it two a day!” (Hudson 125-126)
      2. “There was also an array of disturbing new social problems, but it was assumed that these, given time, would not be too difficult to resolve.” (Hudson 126)
         1. Looking back Protestants “could see “human nature growing gradually more refined, institutions better fitted to secure justice, the opportunities for happiness larger and more varied”; and looking ahead they saw “a long vista of years stretching out before them, in which they will have time enough to cure all their faults, to overcome all the obstacles that block their path.”” [Probably a quotation from “James Bryce reported in his classic study of American society . . .” 125] (Hudson 126)
4. **non-Protestant storm clouds**
   1. “Small islands of Roman Catholic population had been incorporated within the nation by successive annexations of territory, and a broadening tide of immigration had brought large Roman Catholic communities into being in the cities.” (Hudson 126)
   2. But the country “seemed so indelibly Protestant that in the end, it was confidently believed, all minority groups would be either assimilated or “Americanized.”” (Hudson 126)
   3. “. . . Leonard W. Bacon was able to report in 1897 that “the Catholic advance in America has not been, comparatively speaking, successful” . . .” (Hudson 126)
   4. “These outward indications of Protestant strength and [126] well-being, however, were deceptive. They represented little more than the high tide of a Protestant advance which had been carried forward by an accumulated momentum from the past, and the momentum was largely spent. In spite of the busyness of the churches the halcyon years of the two decades bridging the turn of the century actually marked the end of an era.” (Hudson 126-127)

## Protestantism in Post-Protestant America, 1914-1960

1. **introduction**
   1. In 1950, “when Arnold S. Nash wrote the introductory chapter to a symposium *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century*, he gave it the title “America at the End of the Protestant Era.” (Hudson 129)
   2. “The post-Protestant era was in large part the product of the flood tide of immigration which poured into the United States” from c 1880-1914. (Hudson 129)
      1. Jews
         1. “Major Jewish communities came into existence in a number of cities . . .” (Hudson 129)
         2. Concentration in a few key cities explains Jews’ disproportionate influence. (Hudson 131)
      2. Eastern Orthodox: “adherents of the several national churches of Eastern Orthodoxy formed significant clusters in some of the industrial centers.” (Hudson 129)
      3. Roman Catholics
         1. 1790 (first census): Roman Catholics are .77% (30,000 out of 3,900,000)
         2. “During the middle decades of the nineteenth century Roman Catholics began arriving in large numbers from Ireland and Germany . . .” (Hudson 129)
         3. From c 1880 on, there was a “great tide of [Roman Catholic] immigration from central and southern Europe which reached its peak in the years immediately prior to 1914.” (Hudson 129)
         4. 1906: Roman Catholics are c 17% (Hudson 129)
         5. Since the language barrier caused isolation from American culture, Catholics’ influence was not “exerted until after World War I. Thereafter Roman Catholicism became an increasingly important factor . . .” (Hudson 130)
         6. Protestantism had to adjust “to a status of coexistence with another major religious tradition.” (Hudson 130)
         7. “The Protestant churches continued to claim almost twice as many members as the Roman Catholic church.” In 1958 ⅔ of Americans thought of themselves as Protestants and ¼ as Roman Catholics (United States Census Bureau). “There are few informed observers, however, who would regard these figures as an accurate indication of the actual balance of influence . . .” (Hudson 130)
         8. Catholic strength “was centered in the cities, whereas the great stronghold of Protestantism had been centered in the small towns and villages of the countryside. . . . the cities were the real power centers of twentieth-century America . . .” (Hudson 131)
      4. The relative weakness of Protestantism [was also due] to internal factors which were the product of its peculiar historical development in the United States.” (Hudson 131)
         1. Protestants “had possessed a near monopoly for so long that it came as a shock to discover that they were henceforth to live in a highly competitive situation in which many of the things they had taken for granted would be sharply challenged.” They were not prepared for a pluralistic society. (Hudson 131)
         2. “. . . Protestantism had become complacent . . . a victim of its own success. . . . the Protestant churches—pleased with the past and confident of the future—tended to relax.” (Hudson 131)
         3. “The deeper malady was the theological erosion which had taken place during the nineteenth century.” (Hudson 131)
      5. theological erosion
         1. “. . . a pluralistic society is a highly competitive society—a society in which various traditions are locked in debate. In such a situation, presuppositions must be clearly defined . . . the adherents of the several traditions must be knowledgeable and informed. They must be able to give . . . a reasoned defense for their faith . . .” (Hudson 132)
         2. why theological erosion had happened
            1. In “the absence of any sharp challenge to the Protestant understanding of the Christian faith, . . . fundamental assumptions tend to be [132] taken for granted. [Protestant] religious affiliation was determined more by accident of birth and persistence of custom than by conscious conviction.” (Hudson 132-133)
            2. Also, every religious movement is subject to attrition. “There is always an alternation between periods of spiritual quickening and vitality and periods of decline and lethargy. Any great surge of religious life and spiritual renewal is always followed by a gradual diminution of zeal and a fading of earlier imperatives.” (Hudson 133)
            3. “While the restless energy released by Evangelicalism succeeded in placing a Christian stamp on much of American culture, Evangelicalism by itself was not an unmixed blessing. Doctrinal definitions tended to be neglected in the stress that was placed upon “heart religion” and the “conversion experience.” The demands of the Christian life, to be sure, continued to be spelled out within the framework of an earlier theological understanding . . . But since the appeal of Evangelicalism was directed more to the emotions than to the intellect, the tendency was for the inherited capital to be lost.” (Hudson 133)
            4. revivalism as a cause of theological decline

For this analysis of revivalism, see: S. E. Mead, “Denominationalism: The Shape of American Protestantism,” *Church History* 23 (1954) 307-310. (Hudson 185)

“The theological erosion was also accelerated by the particular technique—revivalism—which Evangelicalism developed as a means of winning men and women to Christian obedience. The [133] revivalist faced at least two temptations.” (Hudson 133-134)

“First, he was tempted to reduce the ambiguities of human life and the complexities of the Christian faith to simple alternatives so that he could issue a clear-cut call for decision.” (Hudson 134)

“Second, he was tempted to stress results and to justify whatever tended to produce them.” (Hudson 134)

The consequence was to contribute to emptying Protestantism of its content. (Hudson 134)

“. . . the temptations implicit in revivalism were resisted with varying degrees of success by the greater revivalists, for they were men acutely sensitive to the hazards . . .” (Hudson 134)

* + - 1. “The energetic busyness of the churches during the latter part of the century had done little to arrest the erosion. Members were added to the churches. Moral idealism was generated, enthusiasm elicited, and people were put to work. But the basic theological task continued to be neglected. While a cluster of relatively vague and ill-defined folk beliefs survived in most of the churches and were perpetuated by the Uniform Lessons of the Sunday schools, few Protestants were aware of possessing a comprehensive, coherent, and clearly defined intellectual structure which would help to preserve their identity” in a pluralistic society. (Hudson 134)

1. **Protestantism’s loss of identity**
   1. “The theological erosion of earlier decades had dismantled its historic intellectual defenses, and the way was open to a rather complete assimilation of Protestantism to the model of the world. As a result, by the end of the century, American Protestantism had become more the creature of American culture than its creator.” (Hudson 135)
   2. the transition to a culture religion
      1. the “romanticism” of popular Evangelicalism
         1. Assimilation to the culture began with “the “romanticism” of popular Evangelicalism. While Evangelicalism in general, with its stress upon feeling rather than doctrine, tended to undermine the theological foundation of a self-consciously formulated social and cultural ethic, the “romanticism” of popular Evangelicalism denied the necessity for such an ethic. It operated on the assumption that converted individuals would automatically produce a Christian society and a Christian culture.” (Hudson 135)
         2. “As early as 1842, however, Francis Wayland had pointed out that if Christians are not provided with specific instruction on the implications of the Christian faith for the whole of life, . . . they will derive their instruction from the prevailing standards of the market place, the political forum, and society at large.” (Hudson 135)
      2. laissez faire capitalism
         1. The “momentum of old ideas and impulses continued to exert their influence through habit, custom, and lingering sentiment. . . . [But these] provided little guidance for the new type of corporate business activity that began to dominate American economic life after the Civil War. . . . even traditionalist evangelical Protestants embraced the free-wheeling ideas and ideals that were being fostered by a burgeoning industrial society.” (Hudson 136)
         2. Because laissez faire capitalism seemed blessed by “astonishing material prosperity, they concluded that the laissez faire code of the developing industrial society actually represented God’s way of doing things. Thus [they were led] to sanctify the existing economic order and to lend themselves to an uncritical defense of the social status quo. . . . [Thus] the mind of God [was] defined to conform to the practices of the business community . . .” (Hudson 136)
         3. “Even without the surrender to “romanticism,” the folk beliefs which survived the process of theological erosion were too attenuated to have provided an independent ethic.” (Hudson 136)
   3. the “New Theology”
      1. “The New Theology and its more conspicuous exponents are discussed in W. S. Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* (1953) . . .” (Hudson 185)
      2. “The New Theology was essentially a culture religion with a single fundamental theological idea—the doctrine of the Incarnation, interpreted as divine immanence which sanctified the “natural” man and invested the culture itself with intrinsic redemptive tendencies.” (Hudson 137)
      3. “The burst of technological and industrial expansion which followed the Civil War had created an unbridled cheerfulness, confidence, and complacency among the American people. It was the Horatio Alger era of seemingly unlimited opportunity, and middle-class America at least was quite sure that it was living in the best of all possible worlds. [Horatio Alger (1832-1899), “American writer of inspirational adventure books . . . featuring impoverished boys who through hard work and virtue achieve great wealth and respect.” *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. 3d ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.] This temper was reflected and further fortified among Protestants by a growing conviction that the mission of Christianity had been fulfilled in churchgoing [*sic*] America. It was this mood of complacent and self-confident optimism that was expressed in the New Theology.” (Hudson 137)
      4. Henry Ward Beecher
         1. biography (from *Encarta 98 Desk Encyclopedia* [Redmond, WA: Microsoft], 1997)
            1. “Beecher, Henry Ward (1813-1887), American clergyman and abolitionist, one of the most popular preachers of his day. Beecher was born in Litchfield, Connecticut. In 1847 he became the pastor of the Plymouth Church of the Pilgrims in Brooklyn, New York. He held this post for the rest of his life and became one of the most famous pulpit orators and lecturers in American history. . . . he attracted huge audiences in the United States and England with his brilliant speeches . . .”
            2. “His theological views were fairly orthodox . . .”
            3. He espoused “such controversial causes as the biological theory of evolution and scientific historical study of biblical texts. One of the earliest and best-known supporters of the abolitionists, Beecher was also an effective proponent of women’s rights, particularly woman suffrage.”
         2. “Henry Ward Beecher, one of the earliest and most conspicuous exponents of the New Theology, informed the theological students at Yale in 1872 that the great task of the clergy was not to “go back and become apostles of the dead past,” but rather to “make their theological systems conform to the facts as they are.” This had been his own procedure, and it had led him to a blunt and emphatic rejection of any notion of a stern and demanding God. Out of his own experience and observation, he had discovered a benevolent deity who laid upon men no burdens heavier than they could bear. This God, whose nature it was to love men, not “out of compliment to Christ” but “from [137] the fullness of a great heart,” had made man “to start and not to stop, to go on and on, and up and onward, steadily emerging from the controlling power of the physical and animal condition in which he was born and which enthrall him during his struggle upward, but ever touching higher elements of possibility, and ending in the glorious liberty of sons of God.”” (Hudson 137-138)
         3. “Beecher was equally convinced that Christianity should be defined in terms of “disposition and conduct,” since “great-heartedness is more akin to the Gospel spirit than dogma or doctrine.” It was not necessary, he insisted, to ask people what they believed as a condition of church membership, for doctrine is of little consequence if the results are good. And Beecher was confident that the results would quite inevitably be good, being guaranteed by the influence of American culture which had implanted “an ineradicable belief” among Americans that “Christian morality is the safe road from childhood to manhood.”” (Hudson 138)
      5. Phillips Brooks (1835-1893)
         1. “American Episcopal bishop noted for his intelligent and positive sermons. He wrote the Christmas hymn “O Little Town of Bethlehem” (1868).” (*American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. 3d ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.)
         2. “Few were as blunt as Beecher in his break with the past. The more conventional response was quietly to bid the older doctrines good-bye without bothering to refute them. This was true of Phillips Brooks . . .” (Hudson 138)
         3. Brooks, “with never failing charm and power, summoned people to share his simple faith in the spirit of man as the candle of the Lord, revealing God in human life. “Only a person can truly utter a person,” he declared. “Whoever has in him the human quality, whoever has the spirit of man, has the candle of the Lord.” This enthusiasm for humanity was his basic theme. “The ultimate fact of human life is goodness and not sin.” . . . “Utterly swept out of our thought must be any old [138] contradiction between the graces of the gospel and the natural affections. . . . Believe in yourselves and reverence your own human nature; it is the only salvation from brutal vice and every false belief.” (Hudson 138-139)
         4. “Like Beecher, Phillips Brooks found structural support for his faith in his supreme confidence in the power of the culture itself to nurture the natural Christian graces which were resident in every human heart. “I do not know how a man can be an American, even if he is not a Christian, and not catch something with regard to God’s purpose as to this great land.”” (Hudson 139)
         5. “The most impressive feature of American life, to Brooks, was “the effort of men to do outside the churches and outside Christianity that which the churches and Christianity undertake to do.” Thus even “the spirit of the world feels the desire of the things the church means, and tries to do them . . . in another way. . . . What mean the efforts of philanthropy that studiously disown anything except political economy as the impulse from which they work? . . . What do they mean except that that which Christianity intends the human heart desires . . .?”” (Hudson 139)
         6. “This confidence in “the great human impulse, which is the divine impulse,” expressing itself in and in turn being nurtured by “the spirit of the world,” was the secret of Brooks’s broad-churchmanship. Humanity itself, not any organized body of believers, is God’s instrument, and through humanity itself God effects his purposes. This is the true church, embracing the whole of mankind, the entire family of God. It is a church [139] without organization, discipline, or ritual, but it is a church in which “the great human impulses” lead men to do “Christian work in the spirit of Christ” even when they “studiously” or “vehemently” disown him.” (Hudson 139-140)
      6. Washington Gladden
         1. Washington Gladden witnessed “a strike of millhands at North Adams, Massachusetts . . .” (Hudson 140)
         2. He concluded that ““the law of nature” is “the law of brotherhood.” He was convinced that this law was manifesting itself in the pressures of American economic life and subjecting men to a compulsion to co-operate and to live together in a true brotherly relationship of mutual help and service.” (Hudson 141)
      7. “The most striking feature of the New Theology was its lack of normative content, its surrender of any independent basis of judgment. By means of its doctrine of Incarnation, Christ was identified with what were conceived to be the finest cultural ideals and the noblest cultural institutions. Thus it was compatible with every conceivable social attitude, with whatever stream of secular thought one might wish to support and consecrate, with whatever system of values might seem good in the light of one’s own personal predilections. In many ways, because the culture was reasonably Christian, the New Theology was reasonably Christian, but it offered little independent wisdom and guidance to the Christian believer.” (Hudson 140) For example:
         1. Beecher “was convinced that poverty was the product of wilful sin.” (Hudson 140)
         2. But Brooks, a “natural aristocrat,” was “opposed to any leveling of the classes which would prevent men from living together harmoniously in an interesting and enriching inequality.” (Hudson 140)
         3. “Russell H. Conwell—schooled in the marts of trade and instructed by the folklore of Horatio Alger—believed that everyone had an opportunity and a Christian duty to become a millionaire.” (Hudson 140)
      8. “The second striking feature of the New Theology was the way in which its proponents invested the cultural or social process itself with intrinsic redemptive tendencies, thus reflecting the general mood of satisfaction with things as they were or were about to become.” (Hudson 141)
         1. “The basic confidence might be Brooks’s “great human impulses” which lead men to do God’s work even when they disown him . . .” (Hudson 141)
         2. “The basic confidence . . . might be Conwell’s “inspired, sanctified, common sense of enterprising business men” that was operating to make the world more Christlike . . .” (Hudson 141)
         3. “The basic confidence . . . might be Gladden’s conviction that the inexorable march of events was ushering in a day of enlightened self-interest and brotherhood.” (Hudson 141)
         4. But “the fundamental assumption was the same—that somehow the guarantee was “natural” and inherent in the process itself. Thus little room was left for any special redemptive work of Christ.” (Hudson 141)
      9. “A third feature of the New Theology was the fading of any real distinction between the church and the world. [The church embraced] humanity indiscriminately.” (Hudson 141)
         1. “They had emphasized disposition and conduct as the essence of religion in order to ease their departure from the inherited faith and to facilitate the adjustment to a new set of theological convictions.” (Hudson 141)
         2. “But the new convictions did not provide any criteria for ethical discrimination, and consequently even at the point of conduct the possibility of a distinction between the church and the world was ruled out.” (Hudson 141)
         3. “The effect of the New Theology was to cut the nerve of the evangelistic impulse. If men are naturally religious and the culture or society tends to foster the natural Christian graces, the absence of those graces indicates a defect, not in the individual, but in the culture or the society.” (Hudson 142)
            1. “Washington Gladden rejoiced that the “conversion of sinners” was no longer “supposed to be the preacher’s main business” . . .” (Hudson 142)
            2. Edward Judson, “son of the famous missionary to Burma, declared: “The important thing is not the building up of a church but the Christianization of society.”” (Hudson 142)
      10. “There was a difference of opinion . . . on the extent to which society needed to be reformed.” (Hudson 142)
          1. “Phillips Brooks and Russell H. Conwell were content to take their stand with things pretty much as they were.” (Hudson 142)
          2. Washington Gladden “was convinced that a major reconstruction of society was being forced upon the nation.” (Hudson 142)
          3. “Between these two extremes were people interested in particular reforms as universal panaceas for the ills of society—the elimination of poverty, disease, illiteracy, crime, vice, political corruption, and irreligion [a] by the suppression of the liquor traffic, or [b] by giving the vote to women. Others believed that to meet immediate human needs . . . enlightened philanthropy was all that was needed.” (Hudson 142)
      11. “What was most astonishing about the emergence of the New Theology is that its appearance aroused so little dissent. So long as it involved nothing more than the echoing of the current cultural convictions which expressed the general sense of well-being, not even the most conservative Protestants seem to have been alarmed by its implicit repudiation of historic Protestantism. Opposition appeared only when a further step was taken” toward historical criticism of the Bible. (Hudson 143)
   4. modernism vs. fundamentalism
      1. the new intellectual climate
         1. Evolution “posed new problems of biblical interpretation and tended to undermine accepted notions of biblical authority.” (Hudson 145)
         2. “New methods of textual and historical criticism raised similar questions and created further uncertainties.” (Hudson 145)
         3. “The psychology of religion came into its own as a respectable academic discipline which could be utilized to explain religious experience as mere “wish-fulfillment.”” (Hudson 145)
         4. The sociology of religion interpreted “the faith as a social phenomenon and the church as a mere social agency.” (Hudson 145)
      2. the New Theology and the new intellectual climate
         1. “. . . many of the more conspicuous exponents of the New Theology were ultimately to embrace [the new intellectual climate]. This was notably true of Beecher and Gladden.” (Hudson 143)
         2. But Conwell, “for example, was quite content to continue preaching his [143] Gospel of Wealth without giving more than passing notice to biblical texts. (Hudson 143-144)
         3. The New Theology “reflected the general popular climate of opinion, while “liberalism” sought to grapple with the issues being raised in more specifically intellectual currents of thought.” (Hudson 144)
         4. The New Theology “was primarily a preacher’s theology, being fashioned in the pulpit . . .” (Hudson 144)
            1. “Washington Gladden illustrated the earlier process when he reported that his “theology had to be hammered out on the anvil of daily use in the pulpit. The pragmatic test was the only one that could be applied to it: ‘Will it work?’”” (Hudson 144)
            2. “Henry Ward Beecher [wanted] results, and he discovered that they could be secured by finding a truth with which all his hearers agreed and then pressing it home with an intense personal application and appeal. “I gradually formed a theology by practice . . ., by trying it on, and the things that really did God’s work in the hearts of men I set down as good theology, and the things that did not, whether they were true or not, they were not true to me.”” (Hudson 144)
         5. The new intellectual climate “was basically the product of the academic concerns of professors in colleges and theological seminaries and only gradually became incorporated in . . . the pulpit.” (Hudson 144)
            1. Henry Ward Beecher later saw “the danger . . ., as Beecher put it, “of having the intelligent part of society go past us.” “The providence of God is rolling foward in a spirit of investigation that Christian ministers must meet and join.”” (Hudson 144)
      3. modernists vs. fundamentalists
         1. “American Protestants . . . of urban middle-class America whose traditional faith had been eroded by the New Theology found it easy to make the adjustment to the new intellectual climate . . .” (Hudson 145)
         2. But those in the countryside “were ill-prepared to cope with this headlong rush into a new intellectual world. Their whole religious outlook [had] been shaped by the non-intellectual concerns of Evangelicalism . . . those whose memories were stirred by the language and practices of religious life in small-town and rural America tended to adopt an obscurantist stance.” (Hudson 145)
         3. “The protagonists were the “Liberals” or “Modernists,” who sought to adjust the inherited faith to the new intellectual climate, and the “Fundamentalists,” who insisted that the old ways of stating the faith must be preserved unimpaired.” (Hudson 143)
         4. the modernists
            1. “The theologians in the seminaries were the first to deal with the problem systematically. By the very nature of their assignment, they labored under the necessity to restate the Christian faith in terms intellectually defensible and convincing. [145] . . . [But] the inherited doctrinal structure seemed suddenly archaic and out-of-date.” (Hudson 145-146)
            2. The modernists “represented no solid phalanx and at least a half-dozen different solutions to the problem can be identified.” (Hudson 146)
            3. Modernists included “such men as Shailer Mathews and G. B. Foster . . .” (Hudson 146)
         5. authority of the Bible
            1. “The key issue was the authority of the Bible, for Protestantism historically claimed the authority of Scripture for the whole structure of its thought.” (Hudson 146)
            2. Also, “. . . Protestant piety expressed itself most characteristically in daily Bible-reading as the focal point of family devotions and thus it was in the Bible enshrined on the “family altar” that the deepest emotions of Protestants were centered.” (Hudson 146)
            3. “The modernist tendency . . . was to reverence the Bible as a treasury of religious devotion but to reject it as being in any sense normative in religion. It was a suitable subject for historical study and useful for devotional purposes, but the canons of truth were to be found elsewhere.” (Hudson 146)
            4. “Thus the Modernists represented a tendency to forget that the Christian faith had any claim of its own to truth, and many of them came to depend, for their basic affirmations, upon what was often described as the unfolding revelation of God to be found in the scientific study of man, society, and the natural world. For them, the real theologians—the men who served as arbiters of Christian truth and made plain the mind of God—were no longer in the theological seminaries. They [146] were the autonomous scholars in the universities who stood outside the faith in terms of their intellectual inquiries.” (Hudson 146-147)
         6. fundamentalism
            1. “. . . Fundamentalism also represented diverse tendencies.” (Hudson 147)

“. . . the distinction between constructive and radical Fundamentalism is made by”: Norman H. Maring, “Conservative but Progressive,” *What Hath God Wrought*, ed. G. L. Guffin (1960), 17-28. (Hudson 185)

* + - * 1. moderate fundamentalism

A moderately conservative “reaction to the more extreme modernist tendencies . . . had long been present in Protestant seminaries . . .” (Hudson 147)

It “was perhaps best represented by Augustus Hopkins Strong, who had affirmed that “neither evolution nor the higher criticism has any terrors to one who regards them as parts of Christ’s creating and education process,” but who also insisted that to abandon the Bible as the authoritative testimony to Christ and thus in a derivative sense the authoritative ground of faith would be to cut the “taproot” and imperil the very existence of Protestantism.” (Hudson 147)

“Those associated with Curtis Lee Laws, editor of the *Watchman-Examiner*, who first coined the term and applied it to themselves in 1920, probably can best be described as genuine “conservatives,” whose intention was to conserve and defend the integrity and continuity of the Christian faith. They centered their attention on the question of biblical authority and did not wish to make an issue of either evolution or biblical inerrancy.” (Hudson 147)

* + - * 1. belligerant fundamentalism

But during the 1910s “this moderate or conservative Fundamentalism had been largely displaced by a belligerant anti-Modernist reaction . . .” (Hudson 147)

Belligerant fundamentalism stemmed “from the “Prophetic” Bible conferences of the latter part of the nineteenth century.” (Hudson 147)

“The premillennial views enunciated at these conferences presupposed the verbal inspiration of Scripture in every detail as the basis for their whole system . . .” (Hudson 147)

“. . . consequently the itinerant revivalists who found their inspiration at the conferences were [147] quick to assail all forms of biblical liberalism.” (Hudson 147-148)

“The “social gospel” views of Washington Gladden which many of the biblical liberals had adopted constituted a double affront to this group because the “social gospel” represented an explicit and forthright rejection of their premillennial convictions.” (Hudson 148)

“. . . Fundamentalism can probably best be understood as a phase of the rural-urban conflict, representing the tendency of many who were swept into a strange new urban environment to cling to the securities of their childhood in rural America. In this sense, Fundamentalism was much more cultural than religious in its orientation, and frequently exhibited, as H. Richard Niebuhr has observed, “a greater concern for conserving the cosmological and biological notions of older cultures than for the Lordship of Jesus Christ.”” (Hudson 148)

“Equally significant is the fact that Fundamentalism consistently aligned itself with “ultra-conservative political, economic, and social views,” while the mores which were associated with Christ had “at least as little relation to the New Testament and as much connection with social custom” as did those of its opponents.” (Hudson 148)

* + - * 1. *The Fundamentals* (1909-1912)

“The publication of twelve small volumes of *The Fundamentals* [148] between 1909 and 1912 marked the transformation of Fundamentalism from a movement of dissent into a power group intent on seizing control of the various Protestant denominations.” (Hudson 148-149)

“. . . publication of these volumes was financed by two wealthy laymen at a time when the “social gospel” movement was at its height.” (Hudson 149)

“Christian orthodoxy was identified with biblical inerrancy, and was tested by whether or not one accepted literally the Genesis account of creation, the virgin birth of Jesus, his substitutionary atonement, physical resurrection, and imminent bodily return to earth. . . . Actually the five or six “fundamentals” for which the Fundamentalists were ready to do battle were scarcely adequate to spell out a full-orbed understanding of the Christian life and, in the absence of a fully developed theological structure, such a conspicuous representative of Fundamentalism as Billy Sunday tended to equate “salvation with decency, patriotism, and manliness.”” (Hudson 148)

* + - * 1. “The struggle for control of Protestant educational institutions, missionary enterprises, and denominational machinery reached its climax in the 1920’s. Strategies and techniques varied from denomination to denomination, but the obscurantism, violent language, and “smear” tactics of the more vociferous of the Fundamentalists so alienated public opinion generally that Fundamentalism failed to capture a single major Protestant denomination.” (Hudson 149)
        2. “But neither did the Modernists win. Alarmed . . . by the divisive struggle, denominational politicians took charge and, supported by the great mass of church people, succeeded in silencing the controversy. Theological discussion tended to be ruled out of bounds in the interest of united support for denominational programs, and there was a renewed emphasis upon “disposition and conduct” as the only satisfactory test of religious faith.” (Hudson 149)
  1. consent to become “community churches”
     1. “The community church idea had found its earliest expression in the organization of non-denominational churches by residents of new suburban areas who desired only one church for their community. These non-denominational community churches were immensely popular, but they labored under several handicaps.” (Hudson 150)
        1. One was “their inability to draw upon denominational resources to help finance the construction of church buildings . . .” (Hudson 150)
        2. Another was “their inability to command a readily available source of ministers.” (Hudson 150)
           1. “Many ministers were unwilling to give up the security provided [by] denominational pension plans . . .” (Hudson 150)
           2. Many “were fearful lest the absence of established procedures for being transferred from one post to another should leave them stranded when a change might seem desirable.” (Hudson 150)
        3. “As a result of these handicaps, [150] the non-denominational churches were in no position to compete effectively when the denominations, not content to acquiesce in their own demise, adopted the community church idea as an integral part of their church extension programs.” (Hudson 150-151)
     2. “By 1930, with theological issues having been brushed under the carpet, the churches of the major old-line Protestant denominations had settled down to a relatively peaceful and non-controversial existence as “community” churches.” (Hudson 149)
     3. “This transition in status from “gathered” churches to “community” churches [was implicit in] the New Theology.” (Hudson 149)
        1. The “obliteration of any real distinction between the church and the world [149] . . . [made] it difficult to view denominational differences as much more than anachronistic sectarian survivals.” (Hudson 149-150)
        2. “If the church was unable to distinguish itself . . . from the world at large, it could at least bear witness to the essential oneness of humanity. It should therefore be a center of fellowship which would give visible expression to the unity of the community.” (Hudson 150)
     4. “. . . with almost all theological criteria having been ruled out, there was little possibility of defending denominational differences . . .” (Hudson 150)
     5. “. . . “the ‘evangelical’ doctrine that schism is the normal condition of the church” [L. W. Bacon, *A History of American Christianity* 309] in this fallen world had been rejected. Thus there was little reason why the whole community should not be embraced within one church . . .” (Hudson 150)
     6. The major Protestant denominations “devised “comity” agreements whereby a new suburban area would be assigned to a single denomination with the understanding that it would seek to minister to all the religious needs of that community. Other areas, of course, were assigned on a similar basis to other denominations. [Thus] Community Methodist and Community Baptist churches were being organized in the suburbs . . .” (Hudson 151)
     7. “. . . the churches in the older established areas were seeking to embody the community church ideal by announcing that they were “friendly” churches and equally “ecumenical” in their readiness to welcome adherents of other denominations into their membership. The curious phenomenon developed of a member of a Presbyterian church, for example, exclaiming: “I am not really a Presbyterian; I have always been a Methodist.”” (Hudson 151)
     8. “The Congregationalists were the most forthright in defining their churches as community churches.” (Hudson 151)
        1. “A history of Congregationalism, published by that denomination’s press, was to declare that “a Congregational church is a group of Christians associated together for a definite purpose, not because of peculiarities of belief . . .”” (Hudson 151)
        2. The same history said “that members of these churches “are not asked to renounce their previous denominational teachings but are asked to join in a simple covenant pledging cooperation and fellowship.”” (Hudson 151)
        3. “. . . a pamphlet issued by the Commission on Evangelism and Devotional Life of the Congregational Christian Churches . . . asserted that Congregationalists “have seen the need for [151] churches which shall meet the religious requirements of *all* the people in a given community. . . . A Congregational community church is a place of friendly cooperative Christian enterprise that fits the mood and standards of a community. Its membership is open to all.”” (Hudson 151-152)
     9. “The vagueness which surrounded the concept of “friendly cooperative Christian enterprise” can best be seen in the shift of emphasis in the missionary outreach of the churches.” (Hudson 152)
        1. city missions
           1. “City missions [were] established as evangelistic centers for reaching the unchurched portions of the population . . .” (Hudson 152)
           2. A “study sponsored by the influential Institute of Social and Religious Research [recommended]: “A decreasing emphasis upon specific church program and intensification of efforts to help the immigrant worker in the struggle for economic security and social recognition suggest themselves as the most constructive items on the future program of mission work.”” (Hudson 152)
           3. Consequently, by the 1920s city missions “had been largely transformed into social agencies.” (Hudson 152)
        2. foreign missions
           1. In foreign missions increasingly stressed providing “technological, agricultural, medical, and educational knowledge and skills as the primary task of the missionary . . .” (Hudson 152)
           2. “. . . some influential supporters of the mission enterprise were quite explicit in suggesting that the idea of Christian evangelization should be replaced with the concept of intercultural penetration.” (Hudson 152)
     10. “. . . the shift to a community-oriented faith, to be sure, was quite unconscious, and few churches announced that the Christian gospel had been trimmed to fit “the mood and standards” of the community, but it is clear that Protestantism, as represented by the major old-line denominations, was losing its identity and no longer possessed to any great degree [152] . . . an independent theological position . . .” (Hudson 152-153)
     11. “With church life being sustained more by habit and custom than by a conscious commitment to “Christian” truth, the most characteristic response to the competitive situation presented by a pluralistic society was the growing conviction among many Protestants that one religion is as good as another, that it is impertinent to raise divisive issues, that it does not make much difference what one believes so long as he is sincere, and that men of differing faiths by their different routes are all headed for the same place and striving for the same ends. This mood—“religion in general” it has been called—penetrated Roman Catholicism and Judaism as well as Protestantism during these years, and to the extent that it penetrated these communities their influence was emasculated.” (Hudson 153)
     12. homogeneity
         1. “During the decades bridging the turn of the twentieth century, they [“The major old-line Protestant denominations,” 153] had been subjected about equally to the impact of the New Theology and the strains of the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy. . . . the basic adjustment which they effected was much the same.” (Hudson 154)
         2. “. . . a stranger moving from one church to another in the middle decades of the twentieth century would . . . have had difficulty identifying the denominational affiliation of most of them by the sermons that were preached, the hymns that were sung, the architecture of the buildings, the order of worship, and the schedule of weekday activities. . . . This basic similarity was reflected in the ease with which people moved from one of these denominations to another, with their membership and to a degree their ministry becoming quite freely interchangeable.” (Hudson 154)
         3. “The average church member was convinced that the church was something to be supported along with other good causes, but neither the intellectual or ethical implications of the faith he professed extended much beyond the patterns of thought and behavior already current in society.” (Hudson 153)

1. **the new configuration of American Protestantism**
   1. introduction
      1. From 1900-1950, mostly there was “continuing homogeneity . . .” (Hudson 154)
      2. But “Some groups, such as the Lutherans, which hitherto had played only a minor role in Protestant life were becoming much more prominent . . .” (Hudson 154)
      3. “. . . and a few denominations [154] were changing in character.” (Hudson 154-155)
         1. “Southern Baptists had been infiltrated by a group which insisted that Baptists were not Protestants and that Protestant churches were not Christian churches. While this sentiment was not predominant among Southern Baptists, it was sufficiently strong to inhibit Southern Baptist participation in co-operative activities.” (Hudson 155)
         2. Episcopalians
            1. “In similar fashion, a strong party had developed within the Protestant Episcopal Church which insisted that Episcopalians were not Protestants and belonged instead wholly within the “Catholic” tradition. [This insistence] occasionally made it difficult for Episcopalians to participate in Protestant activities . . .” (Hudson 155)
            2. Also, “the Episcopalians had been moving increasingly in the direction of a more “sacramental” conception of church life that was at marked variance with the remaining “evangelical” characteristics of much of Protestantism.” (Hudson 155)
         3. “the emergence of three new sizable groups” (Hudson 155)
         4. “Thus American Protestantism had become much more multiform and diverse than it had ever been before in its history. This, in turn, greatly complicated the problem of self-definition and contributed to Protestantism’s loss of identity.
   2. the shifting denominational pattern of American Protestantism
      1. The *Yearbook of the American Churches for 1960* (1959) “gives the Protestant total as 61,504,699. This figure is inflated by including many who are non-Protestant in the sense that they neither consider themselves Protestants nor look to the Reformation as a decisive recovery and restatement of the Christian faith.” (Hudson 185)
      2. Compared to 1850: (Hudson 156)
         1. Methodists and Baptists traded spots 1 and 2
            1. Baptists advanced from 2 to 1 (“primarily as a result of a surge of growth by Southern Baptists”)
            2. Methodists fell from 1 to 2
         2. Lutherans and Presbyterians traded spots 3 and 5
            1. Presbyterians fell from 3 to 5
            2. Lutherans advanced from 5 to 3 (“Actually Lutheran growth was much greater than this shift in numerical rank would suggest, for they had multiplied their number forty-eight times while the Presbyterians were achieving only a ninefold increase.”)
         3. Congregationalists fell from 4 to 9
         4. Disciples of Christ fell from 6 to 8
         5. Episcopalians advanced from 7 to 6 (“but in the interim they had shifted the basis of reporting their membership from the number of communicants to the number of baptized”)
   3. Lutherans
      1. before World War I
         1. “Although Lutherans had grown rapidly in numbers throughout the nineteenth century as a result of mounting influx of German and Scandinavian immigrants, they had remained isolated from American life . . .” (Hudson 157)
         2. “. . . not a single Lutheran exerted any effective leadership in Protestantism as a whole until after World War I.” (Hudson 157)
            1. The efforts of “Princeton-educated Samuel S. Schmucker . . . were repudiated by most of his fellow Lutherans . . .” (Hudson 157)
         3. “There were several reasons why the Lutherans should have contributed so little . . . to the general character of American Protestantism.” (Hudson 157)
            1. Lutherans often sought to perpetuate the language barrier “as a means of preserving their European cultural heritage . . .” (Hudson 157)
            2. “Furthermore, they were so engrossed in establishing congregations among newly arrived immigrants that they had little time or energy for broader concerns and quite inevitably tended to become self-centered, insular, and provincial in outlook.” (Hudson 157)
            3. “Lastly, they were badly fragmented into many different groups representing differing national backgrounds, differing tides of immigration, differing areas of settlement, and some differences of theological conviction.” (Hudson 157)
      2. after World War I
         1. “. . . Lutherans began to play a more active role in American life.” (Hudson 157) Reasons:
            1. “. . . large-scale immigration had come to an end . . .” (Hudson 157)
            2. “The language barrier was difficult to maintain beyond the first generation in urban centers, and the emotions aroused by the war had hastened the abandonment of the former efforts to perpetuate it.” (Hudson 157)
            3. “Intermarriage with non-Lutherans became more frequent . . .” (Hudson 157)
            4. “. . . the churches began to become aware of their responsibility to unchurched neighbors of other than Lutheran background.” (Hudson 158)
            5. “The period following World War I also witnessed a general rapprochement among the scattered Lutheran groups.” (Hudson 158)

1917: “three Norwegian groups were brought together to form the Evangelical Lutheran Church . . .” (Hudson 158)

1918: “three German bodies united to form the United Lutheran Church . . .” (Hudson 158)

1930: “three other German synods came together to form the American Lutheran Church.” (Hudson 158)

1960: “seven Lutheran groups voted to participate in two further mergers, with the result that almost all Lutherans belonged to one of three major bodies . . .” (Hudson 158)

the Lutheran Church in America: c 3 million

the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod: more than 2.25 million

the American Lutheran Church: slightly less than 2.2 million (Hudson 158)

* 1. “other Protestant groups with a Continental background” (Hudson 158)
     1. “The Church of the Brethren . . . had emerged from its former isolation and had become a fully participating member of the National Council of Churches.” (Hudson 158)
     2. the Evangelical and Reformed Church
        1. 1934: the German Reformed Church and the Evangelical Synod merge. (Hudson 158)
        2. It was “by far, with the exception of the Lutheran churches, the largest and most influential of the Continental bodies.” (Hudson 158)
        3. “The German Reformed had made the adjustment to American life much more rapidly than the Lutherans and by the middle of the nineteenth century they [158] were beginning to produce what was to become a notable succession of distinguished theologians.” (Hudson 158-159)
        4. 1957: “the General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church and the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches voted to unite to form the United Church of Christ.” The group was now fully identified with American Protestant life. (Hudson 159)
     3. the Evangelical United Brethren Church
        1. This “did not represent a non-indigenous Protestant tradition . . .” (Hudson 159)
        2. 1946: “the merger of the two German Methodist groups . . . brought into being a church of [.75] million members [and] made it possible for this formerly German-speaking denomination to assume a much more influential role . . .” (Hudson 159)
     4. Fundamentalist, Holiness, and Adventist groups
        1. “. . . the miscellaneous threefold grouping of Adventist, Fundamentalist, and Holiness churches” Henry Pitt VanDusen (*sic*) called “third force” Protestantism. (Hudson 174)
        2. Together they totaled more than 7 million. (Hudson 159)
        3. The three groups “often can be distinguished only by emphasis.” (Hudson 159)
        4. “The great majority of these groups looked for a triumphant return of Christ . . .” (Hudson 159)
        5. Adventist groups
           1. stem from the Millerite excitement of 1843-44 (Hudson 159)
           2. major stress: Christ’s triumphant return (Hudson 159)
           3. two subgroups: Seventh-day Adventists and Advent Christian Church (Hudson 159)
        6. fundamentalist groups
           1. major stress: “the “fundamentals” as defined during the first two decades of the twentieth century” (Hudson 159)
           2. “divided [159] by differing denominational, theological, and cultural traditions.” (Hudson 159-160)
           3. “. . . there were [160] many “fundamentalist” churches embraced within the old-line denominations, and the co-operative activities of the Fundamentalist movement derived much of their support from members of conventional Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, [and] Presbyterian . . . churches.” (Hudson 160-161)
           4. “The numerical total assigned to the Fundamentalist denominations, therefore, does not represent the full strength of the Fundamentalist movement.” (Hudson 161)
           5. Fundamentalism was “a reaction against Modernism,” but “some phases of the reaction were more culturally oriented and others theologically oriented.” (Hudson 161)

“The Fundamentalist left wing represented by the Churches of Christ and dissident Baptist bodies, perhaps can best be understood as a protest against a culturally respectable urban middle-class Protestantism.” (Hudson 161)

“The right wing, composed of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Christian Reformed Church, was much more theologically oriented.” (Hudson 161)

“Somewhere in the middle would be the Free Methodists and the Wesleyan Methodists who, during the course of the twentieth century, became characterized by a stronger emphasis upon the “fundamentals” than upon the Wesleyan concept of “holiness” or “sanctification.”” (Hudson 161)

* + - 1. holiness groups
         1. origin

“The Holiness groups began to emerge during the 1880’s, but they did not gain real strength until the twentieth century.” (Hudson 160)

“They represented the continuing heritage of the Holiness movement which was basically Methodist in background but which swept through many of the denominations during the years immediately preceding and following the Civil War as a result of the influence of Charles G. Finney.” (Hudson 160)

“They can best be understood, however, as a protest against what they regarded as the growing “worldliness” of the more conventional churches.” (Hudson 160)

“. . . the Holiness churches from the beginning were “people’s” churches, filling the void left when the older denominations became “middle class” and respectable or “worldly.”” (Hudson 160)

* + - * 1. basically fundamentalist in doctrine (Hudson 160)
        2. But “in addition they emphasized most strongly the Wesleyan concept of a second baptism of the Spirit which results in an “entire sanctification.”” (Hudson 160)
        3. two wings

“. . . the purely “perfectionist” bodies . . .” (Hudson 160)

“. . . the Pentecostal groups which insisted that the baptism of the Spirit is also accompanied by the gifts of the Spirit, most notably “speaking in tongues.”” (Hudson 160)

* + 1. conservative but not fundamentalist goups
       1. These were “out of sympathy with tendencies exhibited by most of the old-line churches.” (Hudson 161)
       2. “Neither the nine million Southern Baptists nor the two and one-half million Missouri and Wisconsin Synod Lutherans would wish to be classified as [161] Fundamentalists, but they did represent in their diverse ways a “conservative” Protestantism equally unhappy to be identified with “cooperative Protestantism.”” (Hudson 161-162)
       3. “Even greater theological affinities with Fundamentalism have been displayed by . . . various small Presbyterian churches”: the Baptist General Conference of North America, the North American Baptist General Conference, the Evangelical Covenant Church, and the Salvation Army. Total: 600,000. (Hudson 162)
       4. The “five large Negro Baptist and Methodist bodies would be difficult to distinguish theologically at many points from some of the Fundamentalist and Holiness groups.” Total: 600,000. (Hudson 162)
    2. “. . . this whole Adventist-Holiness-Fundamentalist-“conservative” wing [of] American Protestantism” totals more than 30 million. (Hudson 162)
  1. the shifting pattern of Protestant co-operation
     1. “Another element in the changed configuration of American Protestantism in the twentieth century was the shift in the character of Protestant co-operation.” (Hudson 162)
        1. fundamentalists
           1. “. . . Fundamentalist groups continued to use the voluntary society pattern of co-operation effectively in the twentieth century. Youth for Christ, the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, the Christian Business Men’s Committee—all followed the earlier pattern.” (Hudson 162)
           2. “Even the National Association of Evangelicals, which linked some three or four million “fundamentalists” for purposes of co-operative action, [162] was basically a voluntary society with membership available to individuals, local churches, and a variety of other organizations.” (Hudson 162-163)
        2. mainline denominations
           1. “But among the old-line denominations, this relatively spontaneous form of voluntary co-operation had largely been discarded.” (Hudson 163)
           2. The denominations themselves took over “many of the responsibilities formerly discharged through the interdenominational voluntary societies.” (Hudson 163)

“The Christian Endeavor societies, for example, had been displaced in most of the churches by denominational “youth fellowships.”” (Hudson 163)

“The Student Christian Movement was largely replaced by denominational student groups.” (Hudson 163)

“The Sunday school interest was diverted into denominational channels with denominational lesson materials being assiduously promoted.” (Hudson 163)

“The Student Volunteer Movement continued to exist but only on the periphery of the denominations’ efforts to recruit missionary personnel.” (Hudson 163)

“The political and social concerns, which formerly had produced an array of independent societies each dedicated to a single objective, began to be expressed through official denominational boards of “social service” or “social action.”” (Hudson 163)

* + - 1. new interdenominational agencies
         1. “After 1900 a cluster of official interdenominational agencies was formed . . .” [163] But later Hudson says, “Taken together, these various agencies . . . had been formed just prior to the beginning of the twentieth century . . .” [164] (Hudson 163-164)
         2. “Throughout the nineteenth century, the common convictions of Protestants had been voiced and applied through a closely knit complex of voluntary societies. After 1900 these had been replaced by a cluster of official “councils” which, in turn, have been brought together to form the National Council of Churches.” (Hudson 169)
         3. “. . . what was needed was an “official” means of linking and co-ordinating these denominational activities. [163] . . . The distinguishing feature of these interdenominational bodies was their official character. Hitherto, interdenominational agencies had been voluntary agencies, maintained and supported by interested individuals. These new “councils” were quite different in that they were controlled directly by the participating denominations.” (Hudson 163-164)
         4. “Among these new agencies were the International Council of Religious Education, the Home Missions Council, the United Stewardship Council, and the Council of Church Women.” (Hudson 163)
         5. Federal Council of Churches (most important)

1908: the Federal Council of Churches is organized. (Hudson 163)

The Federal Council “as one of its objectives sought to foster a unified program of [163] evangelism . . .” (Hudson 163-164)

But “its primary purpose was “to secure larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation to human life” . . . the first act of the newly formed council was to draft a Social Creed of the Churches.” (Hudson 164)

* + - * 1. 1950: “these various official agencies were brought together to form the National Council of Churches with divisions of Christian Education, Home Missions, Foreign Missions, and Christian Life and Work, and departments of Evangelism, Broadcasting and Films, Church World Service, United Church Men, and United Church Women.” (Hudson 164)
        2. The “national structure of “co-operative Protestantism” . . . was paralleled on the state and local level by the formation of state and city councils or federations of churches.” (Hudson 164)

These implemented the national council’s concerns. (Hudson 164)

They also carried on “joint programs of weekday religious education, teacher-training institutes, union services, hospital chaplaincies, youth programs, and comity arrangements.” (Hudson 164)

* 1. “patterns of continuing growth and the problem of self-definition” (Hudson 164)
     1. 1940-1954
        1. “. . . numerically the old-line denominations . . . were not keeping pace in their growth with the increase of the population.” (Hudson 165)
           1. Only “The Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and United Lutherans were increasing proportionately somewhat more rapidly than the general population . . .” (Hudson 165)
        2. “The two major bodies that had striking records of growth during the 1940-54 period were the Southern Baptist Convention and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, neither of which belonged to the National Council of Churches.” (Hudson 165)
           1. Southern Baptists: “From 1940 to 1954, the Southern Baptists increased from 4,949,174 to 8,163,562, a gain of 64.9 per cent in comparison with a population increase of 24 per cent.” (Hudson 165)
           2. “The Missouri Synod Lutherans during the same period increased from 1,298,798 to 1,932,000, for a gain of 48.9 per cent.” (Hudson 165)
        3. “. . . smaller “non-co-operative” bodies with records of conspicuous growth”: (Hudson 165)
           1. Christian Reformed Church: up 61.6%
           2. Church of God (Anderson, IN): 59.3%
           3. Church of the Nazarene: 57.4%
           4. Seventh-day Adventists: 53.2%

1. **prospects for recovery**
   1. introduction
      1. By 1950, “the survival of anything resembling classical Protestantism was isolated and meager.” (Hudson 166)
      2. “. . . Alfred North Whitehead’s judgment of Protestantism in 1933: “its dogmas no longer dominate; its divisions no longer interest; its institutions no longer direct the patterns of life.”” (Hudson 166)
   2. Protestantism’s loss of identity
      1. Protestantism “was so devoid of definition and identity in the popular mind that it was assumed that everyone who was not Roman Catholic was automatically Protestant.” (Hudson 167)
         1. When John F. Kennedy announced that he “would enter the West Virginia presidential primary, the political pundits immediately observed that, since 95 per cent of the people of West Virginia were Protestants, this primary would provide a thorough test of the bearing of the religious issue . . . [“95%”] derived from the fact that slightly less than 5 per cent of the population of West Virginia was Roman Catholic. Actually only about 27 per cent of the people of West Virginia belonged to Protestant churches . . .” (Hudson 167)
         2. The armed services had long stamped the identification tags of all who were not Roman Catholics or Jews “with a “P” to indicate that they were Protestants.” (Hudson 167)
      2. This assumption derives from “a lingering heritage from an earlier Protestant America when the whole culture was so thoroughly Protestant in orientation that it could be assumed that almost everyone who was not explicitly something else could be regarded as Protestant in background and unconscious conviction if not in specific affiliation.” (Hudson 167)
      3. This assumption also derives from “the confused image of a Protestantism which had lost much of its [167] unity and cohesiveness and had become diverse and multiform in its expression.” (Hudson 167-168)
      4. “The National Council of Churches reflected this confusion in its most extreme form when it listed the non-theist Ethical Culture Society and the Hindu Vedanta Society in the *Yearbook of the American Churches* among the Protestant denominations.” (Hudson 168)
      5. Many of the mainline Protestant churches rejoiced “in the loss of Protestant identity as evidence of an “ecumenical” spirit.” (Hudson 168)
      6. They allowed “the earlier gathered churches to become community churches which made few demands and extended an indiscriminate welcome to all members of the community into their “fellowship.”” (Hudson 168)
      7. “Not only had Protestantism become difficult to define and to identify theologically; it had lost almost all forms of institutional expression which might have given at least an organizational identity to the Protestant community.” (Hudson 168)
      8. “There were Catholic welfare agencies and Jewish welfare agencies, but the former Protestant agencies had almost universally become community agencies. There were Catholic youth organizations and [168] Jewish youth organizations, but the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. which once had been the instruments of the Protestant churches had ceased to think of themselves as Protestant organizations.” (Hudson 168-169)
      9. The National Council of Churches could not serve as Protestantism’s united voice. (Hudson 169)
         1. “. . . Protestantism was far from united. The homogeneity of Protestantism in the successive Puritan, Puritan-Evangelical, and Methodist eras had long since disappeared.” (Hudson 169)
         2. The National Council of Churches “represented no more than a bare majority of the Protestant population . . .” (Hudson 169)
         3. The National Council of Churches “was weakest in those areas of the country where Protestantism was strongest.” (Hudson 169)
         4. The National Council of Churches “did not conceive of itself as a Protestant instrument.” (Hudson 169)
            1. Even the Federal Council of Chiurches allowed in non-Protestant bodies. (Hudson 170)
            2. The National Council of Churches included:

“the Armenian Church of North America,

“the Polish National Catholic Church, [169]

“and the Greek, Rumanian, Russian, Serbian, Syrian, and Ukrainian Orthodox churches.” (Hudson 169-170)

This permitted ecumenism but “deprived the Protestant community of its one surviving institutionalized symbol.” (Hudson 169-170)

* + 1. Apparently “it was not important for the Protestant community to have an instrument of Protestant action through which it could voice and apply its common convictions.” (Hudson 170)
    2. “. . . the denominations themselves, to say nothing of the Protestant community as a whole, were not conscious of possessing many common convictions. Most of the denominations embraced within themselves such disparate views that the possibility of any extensive denominational consensus was ruled out.” (Hudson 170)
    3. “Even the pronouncements which the clergy found it possible to agree upon from time to time in their denominational assemblies frequently carried little weight because they did not represent the consensus of denominational opinion, lay opinion being sharply divergent from that of the clergy.” (Hudson 170)
    4. There was an “absence of criteria provided by a normative tradition and with the disappearance of disciplinary procedures . . .” (Hudson 170)
       1. “. . . an incident . . . is reported to have occurred in a Baptist assembly. The speaker had been enumerating what Baptists believe and [170] when he asked for discussion from the floor, a man rose to his feet and said, “I don’t believe any of those things, and I am a Baptist.” Whereupon the speaker responded, “You don’t have to believe them to be a Baptist.”” (Hudson 170-171)
  1. the theological revival
     1. The denominations “still carried within themselves—in the form of surviving memories and a lingering identification with the resources of historic Christianity—the possibility of a recovery of a clearer sense of their vocation as Christian churches.” (Hudson 171)
     2. From c 1900-1930, “One of the major obstacles to a Protestant recovery [was] the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy. The effect of this controversy was to force both camps into more and more extreme and untenable positions, to inhibit calm and careful consideration of the issues at stake, and to cause many to regard all theological discussion with apprehension and even distaste.” (Hudson 171)
     3. “By 1930, however, it was apparent that the attempt to place the major denominations in [171] the ill-considered strait jacket of Fundamentalism was not going to be successful. . . . [But] At its best, Fundamentalism had held out for a faith that was something more than insights derived from the contemporary culture.” (Hudson 171-172)
        1. “The most conspicuous illustration of the change that took place was Harry Emerson Fosdick’s confession in 1935 that “the church must go beyond modernism.” . . . The church, he insisted, must cease seeking to accommodate itself to the prevailing culture and must stand out from it and challenge it, for . . . Christ cannot be “harmonized” with any culture. What Christ does to culture is to “challenge” it.” (Hudson 172)
        2. 1932: “The beginning of this change in climate had been signaled by Henry Nelson Wieman’s announcement in 1932 of his intention “to promote a theocentric religion as over against the prevalent anthropocentric one,” although it was left to others to grasp the full meaning of the sickness into which American Protestantism had fallen.” (Hudson 172)
        3. Reinhold Neibuhr and Paul Tillich “symbolized the role that European theological and philosophical thinking was to play in the reconstruction of American Protestantism.” (Hudson 173)
           1. 1932: an “initial landmark . . . in Protestantism’s attempt to recover an independent perspective was the publication . . . of Reinhold Niebuhr’s [172] *Moral Man and Immoral Society* . . .” (Hudson 172-173)
           2. 1933: another “initial landmark [was] the arrival of Paul Tillich . . . to teach at Union Theological Seminary . . .” (Hudson 173)
        4. 1940s: “a theological revival became increasingly evident in Protestant theological seminaries. [But Protestantism’s] theological structure needed to be further clarified, the new theological interest needed to penetrate the laity, and Protestant church life needed to undergo reform and reconstruction in terms of the developing understanding of the Christian faith.” (Hudson 173)
  2. the future
     1. “. . . integrity of church membership . . . will be difficult to achieve in a success-minded era when immediate numbers are prized more highly than depth of commitment, even though it has been demonstrated that lack of commitment—in the long run—results in declining numbers.” (Hudson 173)
     2. Adventist, Fundamentalist, and Holiness churches
        1. The Adventist, Fundamentalist, and Holiness churches “have some sense of continuity with historic Christianity, as well as doctrinal criteria for self-definition and self-identity. Moreover, they have displayed a ready willingness to refuse to conform to many dominant cultural pressures.” (Hudson 174)
        2. But these churches have “been unduly obscurantist and legalistic, often exhibiting a willingness to bypass thinking entirely and frequently dissipating [their] strength in unnecessarily bitter and divisive sectarian struggles and conflicts. Much of [their] intransigence, furthermore, seems to be rooted in a recalcitrant resistance to the modern world that finds much of its motivation in a parochial view of the Christian faith that is no less culture-bound than the understanding of the Christian faith exemplified in [mainline] churches.” (Hudson 174)
        3. Criticism “has begun to be voiced from within [these churches] by those who have been variously described as “neo-Fundamentalists” or “neo-‘Evangelicals’.”” (Hudson 174)
     3. Southern Baptists
        1. “The Southern Baptists represent another “growing edge” of American Protestantism . . .” (Hudson 174)
        2. But the “secret of much of the Southern Baptist growth [is] a highly geared promotional program that is lacking in depth and capitalizes upon [174] the emotions aroused by a regional self-consciousness.” (Hudson 174-175)
     4. mainline denominations
        1. “There is a similar uncertainty of the future for the American Baptists, the Methodists, the Disciples of Christ, and the major Negro denominations. While trends and characteristics vary among them, there are only a few clues to indicate that their church life may be redirected and reconstructed.” (Hudson 175)
        2. “. . . the Presbyterians and the Episcopalians have exhibited most evidence of continuing growth.” (Hudson 175)
           1. “. . . American Protestantism has become increasingly stratified socially during the twentieth century, with the result that the Presbyterians and Episcopalians have been able to profit in suburbia from the prestige that accrued to them as upper- and upper-middle-class denominations.” (Hudson 175)
           2. “The continued adherence of the Presbyterians to their traditional doctrinal symbols and the centering of the liturgical life of the Episcopalians in the Prayer Book also may have protected both denominations from the full corrosive effect of the “acids of modernity.”” (Hudson 175)
           3. “. . . both denominations [show] interest in the theological revival . . . they could draw upon the resources of a tradition that had not been completely forgotten.” (Hudson 175)
        3. “. . . the Evangelical and Reformed Church contributed the most notable initial leadership to the theological revival in the persons of the two Niebuhrs.” (Hudson 175)
        4. The Evangelical and Reformed Church joined with the Congregationalists to become the United Church of Christ. (Hudson 176)
        5. Lutherans
           1. “The final prospect for a vigorous renewal of Protestant life and witness rests with the Lutheran churches which had overcome much of their fragmentation by 1960 and had grouped themselves into three main bodies.” (Hudson 176)
           2. “All had exhibited an ability to grow during the post-World War II years, with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod making the greatest gains.” (Hudson 176)
           3. “The Lutheran churches are in the fortunate position of having been, in varying degrees, insulated from American life for a long period of time. As a result they have been less subject to the theological erosion which so largely stripped other denominations of an awareness of their continuity with a historic Christian tradition. Thus the resources of the Christian past have been more readily available to them . . .” (Hudson 176)
           4. “Among the assets immediately at hand among the Lutherans are a confessional tradition, a surviving liturgical structure, and a sense of community . . .” (Hudson 176)

## Millennialism

1. **definition of** “**millennialism**”: “a belief that Christ will establish a kingdom on earth for a 1,000-year period (Lat. *mille*, thousand; *annus*, year).” (“Millenarianism” 495)
2. **Rev 20**:**1-10**
   1. This concept is based solely on Rev 20:1-10. (“Millenarianism” 495)
   2. Rev 20:1-10, “Then I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain. 2He seized the dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, 3and threw him into the pit, and locked and sealed it over him, so that he would deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years were ended. After that he must be let out for a little while. 4Then I saw thrones, and those seated on them were given authority to judge. I also saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for their testimony to Jesus and for the word of God. They had not worshiped the beast or its image and had not received its mark on their foreheads or their hands. They came to life and reigned with Christ a thousand years. 5(The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended.) This is the first resurrection. 6Blessed and holy are those who share in the first resurrection. Over these the second death has no power, but they will be priests of God and of Christ, and they will reign with him a thousand years. 7When the thousand years are ended, Satan will be released from his prison 8and will come out to deceive the nations at the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, in order to gather them for battle; they are as numerous as the sands of the sea. 9They marched up over the breadth of the earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city. And fire came down from heaven and consumed them. 10And the devil who had deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and sulfur, where the beast and the false prophet were, and they will be tormented day and night forever and ever.”
   3. “Taken in context, the passage probably refers to the time between Christ’s resurrection and the end of the world . . .” (“Millenarianism” 495)
3. **history of interpretation of Rev 20**:**1-10**
   1. Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, among others, took the verses literally.
   2. The Montanists (c. 172-500s) took them literally and “predicted Christ’s return at a particular date to establish his kingdom at Pepuza in Phrygia.” (“Millenarianism” 495)
   3. Opposition by Origen and other Alexandrian theologians ended the literal view in the East. “Augustine (*City of God*, 20.7-9) helped settle the question by identifying the Church with the kingdom of God on earth.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   4. “In the Middle Ages some briefly revived millennial hopes . . .” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   5. “The Anabaptists at Münster (*c*. 1534) expected the return of Christ to establish his king­dom there, and German Pietism in the 17th and 18th cents. supported such ideas, as did the Fifth Monarcy Men in 17th-cent. England.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   6. “The Plymouth Brethren in England (*c*. 1830) were millenarian and developed the basic ideas of dispensationalism that were systematized and popularized by the Scofield Reference Bible.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   7. “Another independent millennial movement began in the U.S. when William Miller worked out an interpretation of Daniel and Revelation, setting a date for Christ’s return in 1843 or 1844. Out of this movement developed the Seventh-day Adventists.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   8. “The Jehovah’s Witnesses also hold millennial views but believe that the millennium has already begun.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
4. **millennialism in the US**
   1. Baker, Nelson B. *What Is the World Coming To*? *A Study for Laymen of the Last Things*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
   2. “There are many millenarians in the United States.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   3. “Some espouse premillenarianism, expecting a sudden return of Christ when certain conditions have been fulfilled.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   4. “Postmillenarianism is the view that Christ’s return, after the gospel has gradually permeated the world and after a Christian society has been established, will last 1,000 years, during which the Jews will be converted. Finally there will be an apostasy, a terrible conflict, and Christ will intervene to destroy the world after having raised and judged the dead.” (“Millenarianism” 496)
   5. “There are also amillenarianists, who do not take the idea of a millennium seriously.” (“Millenarianism” 496)

## Origins of Fundamentalism

1. **approaches to fundamentalism**
   1. “. . . sociological and psychological explanations still predominate. The factors that explain the Fundamentalists’ brash behavior, most historians have argued, can be discovered in the economic and intellectual forces which alarmed and agitated the churches so terribly in the last decades of the nineteenth century and in the psychological states of those whose lot it was to live through those days.” (Sandeen 416)
      1. “Fundamentalism was . . . a political controversy within denominationalism . . .” (Sandeen 416)
      2. H. Richard Niebuhr (“Fundamentalism,” *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, V, 527): “fundamentalism was closely related to the conflict between rural and urban cultures in America. . . . Furthermore, fundamentalism in its aggressive forms was most prevalent in those isolated communities in which the traditions of pioneer society had been most effectively preserved and which were least subject to the influence of modern science and industrial civilization.” (Sandeen 427)
   2. religious approach: “Fundamentalism was . . . a religious movement . . .” (Sandeen 416)
      1. Scholars “have all tacitly assumed or flatly asserted that theologically and dogmatically Fundamentalism was indistinguishable from nineteenth-century Christianity.” (Sandeen 416)
         1. “The Fundamentalists themselves always proclaimed the same theme.” (Sandeen 416)
         2. James M. Gray (“The Deadline of Doctrine around the Church.” *Moody Monthly* [Nov. 1922]: 2): “there is nothing new in Fundamentalism except it may be its name. It is the same old ‘offense of the cross’.” (Sandeen 428)
      2. “. . . historians have not found it necessary to study this group within its religious and theological context.” (Sandeen 416) Exceptions:
         1. Hudson, Winthrop S. *Religion in America*. New York: Scribner’s, 1965.
         2. Smith, H. Shelton, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher. *American Christianity*. Vol. II. New York: Scribner’s, 1963.
         3. “The aura of intellectual disrepute surrounding the Scopes trial has discouraged serious consideration of the faith of the Fundamentalists. [416] . . . we ought to stop referring to Fundamentalism as an agrarian protest movement centered in the South. Only by uncritically accepting the setting and conduct of the Scopes trial as the model of all other Fundamentalist activity can such a parody of history be sustained. If one turns to Fundamentalist periodicals and conference platforms, he does not find them dominated by ill-taught stump preachers or demagogues. In the nineteenth century, especially, the proto-Fundamentalists were frequently men in high esteem in their own denominations and communities. Only in the later twentieth century (if then) did Fundamentalism become particularly a phenomenon of the South. Fundamentalism was not a sectional controversy but a national one, and most of its champions came from the same states as their Modernist opponents. Fundamentalism originated in the northeastern part of this continent in metropolitan areas and should not be explained as a part of the populist movement, agrarian protest or the Southern mentality.” [427] (Sandeen 416, 427)
         4. “Most American historians have felt that the Fundamentalists were mistaken and seem to have concluded that they cannot have been serious—that their theology must have been only a cloak to hide their socio-economic or psychological nakedness.” (Sandeen 416)
         5. Fundamentalists’ “theological affirmations . . . gave structure and identity to Fundamentalism and . . . only through the understanding of this aspect of American intellectual history can we lay the foundation for a historical interpretation of Fundamentalism.” (Sandeen 416)
         6. “. . . the Fundamentalist’s assertion of his own orthodoxy and conservatism cannot be accepted uncritically. Both dispensationalism and the Princeton Theology were marked by doctrinal innovations and emphases which it is mistaken to confuse with apostolic [426] belief, Reformation theology or nineteenth-century evangelism. It is almost incredible that a dispute over the nature of orthodox Christianity could be discussed by a generation of historians without any of them analyzing the validity of Fundamentalist claims. This is especially significant in view of the fact that the Fundamentalist arguments—before, during, and after the controversy of the 1920’s—rested entirely upon their claim to be defending the truths of an historic faith. Some Fundamentalists were only attempting to conserve their traditional faith, that is true. But the assumption that only the Modernists reconstructed their theological position during the intellectual crisis of the late nineteenth century cannot be maintained.” (Sandeen 426-27)
      3. Sandeen’s thesis
         1. “My thesis is that Fundamentalism was comprised of an alliance between two newly-formulated nineteenth-century theologies, dispensationalism and the Princeton Theology which, though not wholly compatible, managed to maintain a united front against modernism until about 1918.” (Sandeen 416)
         2. “. . . the thesis [is that] Fundament­alism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was comprised of an alliance between dispensationalists and Princeton-oriented Calvinists, who were not wholly compatible, but managed to maintain a united front against Modernism until about 1918.” (Sandeen 426)
2. **dispensationalism**
   1. 1820s: the Plymouth Brethren, “a small British sect,” springs up in Ireland and England (Sandeen 416)
      1. bibliography
         1. Neatby, W. Blair. *The History of the Plymouth Brethren*. London: 1901.
         2. Turner, W.G. *John Nelson Darby*. London: 1944.
         3. Kraus, C. Norman. *Dispensationalism in America*. Richmond: 1958.
      2. characteristics
         1. They were “Dissatisfied with what they felt to be the dead hand of tradition and legalism in the Church of England . . .” (Sandeen 416)
         2. In all things they “attempted to recreate the New Testament pattern of church government and worship.” (Sandeen 417)
         3. They “admitted any professing Christian to their informal weekly communion services . . .” (Sandeen 416)
         4. They “refused to acknowledge or create any [416] special caste of clergy . . .” (Sandeen 416-17)
         5. They “conducted their meetings without order of service in order to allow the Holy Spirit to lead their worship . . .” (Sandeen 417)
      3. The member of the Plymouth Brethren chiefly responsible for dispensationalism was John Nelson Darby. (Sandeen 416)
      4. “The *Scofield Reference Bible* [was] the most influential dispenser of dispensationalism in America . . .” (Sandeen 417)
   2. “Dispensationalism refers primarily to the division of history into periods of time, dispensations, seven of which are usually named. The *Scofield Reference Bible* named them
      1. “Innocence (the Garden of Eden),
      2. “Conscience (Adam to Noah),
      3. “Human Government (Noah to Abraham),
      4. “Promise (Abraham to Moses),
      5. “Law (Moses to Christ),
      6. “Grace (Christ through the present to the judgment of the world),
      7. “and the Kingdom or Millennium.” (Sandeen 417)
   3. “Proponents argued that God judged man not on an absolute and unchanging standard but according to ground rules especially devised for each dispensation.” (Sandeen 417) For example:
      1. “. . . under Moses [men] were commanded to obey the law.” (Sandeen 417)
      2. “. . . under the dispensation of Grace, men are required to repent and turn in faith to Christ . . .” (Sandeen 417)
   4. Dispensationalists sharply distinguish Israel and the Church.
      1. “The one is entered by natural birth, the other by conversion—the “new birth.”” (Sandeen 417)
      2. “Both have promises and prophecies given to them which must be distinguished and separated.” (Sandeen 417)
         1. “In the millennium, . . . Israel will be restored to its ancestral land and inherit the earthly kingdom forecast by the prophets. This . . . accounts for the enthusiastic Zionism manifested by many Fundamentalists.” (E.g.: Ryrie, Charles C. *Dispensationalism Today*. Chicago: Moody, 1965. 44ff.) (Sandeen 417)
         2. “In the millennium, the Church will reign as the “bride of Christ” . . .” (Sandeen 417)
   5. the pattern of disobedience, punishment, and saved remnant
      1. “God has established covenants which have always been broken by virtually all those involved in them. God has waited, restraining judgment, but eventually punished the disobedient while saving out of the destruction a little band, a remnant of just men such as Noah, Joshua, or Ezra.” (Sandeen 417)
      2. “In their view the religious leadership has always been the chief center of apostasy (as in the case of Israel and the golden calf) while the righteous remnant has been neglected, overlooked and even despised. In nineteenth-century America as in Europe, the apostates were quickly identified as liberal theologians.” (Sandeen 417)
   6. premillenialism
      1. Many “nineteenth century religious groups—Millerites, Irvingites, Mormons, Campbellites, or Shakers—[were] concerned with prophetic interpretation . . . Millennial expectations are woven into the fabric of early nineteenth century life in both Europe and America.” (See: Smith, David E. “Millenarian Scholarship in America.” *American Quarterly* 17 (Fall 1965): 535 ff.) (Sandeen 418)
      2. “. . . the interpretation of biblical prophecy played a large role in dispensationalism.” (Sandeen 418)
      3. “This pattern [of disobedience, punishment, and saved remnant] of past events was projected into the future through the interpretation of prophecy.” (Sandeen 417)
      4. “The dispensationalist accepted an intensely pessimistic view of the world’s future combined with a hope in God’s imminent and direct intervention in his own life.” (Sandeen 417)
      5. “Dispensationalists became prophets themselves, predicting the speedy end of their own era in an act of God’s cataclysmic judgment. They looked for a literal, imminent second coming of Christ as the next event before God judged the world and brought in the next dispensation, the millennium, and, therefore, referred to their eschatology as premillennialism.” (Sandeen 417)
      6. “Not all premillennialists were dispensationalists, but every dispensationalist was a premillennialist. Some of the best-known works of dispensationalists have been tracts on the premillennial return of Christ. Three of the most influential were”: (Sandeen 428)
         1. Blackstone, William E. *Jesus is Coming*. 2nd ed. New York: 1886.
         2. Brookes, James H. *Maranatha*. 5th ed. New York: 1878.
         3. Gordon, Adoniram J. *Ecce Venit*. New York: 1889.
   7. ecclesiology
      1. “Thus a doctrine of the Church emerged from a philosophy of history: The church was made up of God’s elect who were always only a handful, seldom if ever the possessors of power. The true church could not possibly be identified with any of the large denominations, which were riddled with heresy, but could only be formed by individual Christians who could expect [417] to be saved from the impending destruction.” (Sandeen 417-18)
      2. “It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this ecclesiology for the history of Fundamentalism. Most protest groups within American Protestantism turn into denominations themselves. Yet Fundamentalism has not so solidified, and one of the unappreciated factors in this anomalous situation is certainly the retarding influence of dispensationalism. According to their teaching, the true Church can never be an organization but must remain a spiritual fellowship of individual Christians.” (Sandeen 418)
   8. literalism
      1. “Dispensational theology was based upon hermeneutical principles which required, in fact presupposed, a frozen biblical text in which every word was supported by the same weight of divine authority.” (Sandeen 418)
         1. “For an early reference to the connection between inspiration and literalism, see”: “Inspired Literality of Scripture.” *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy* 2 (1850): 297-307. (Sandeen 428)
         2. See, “for a contemporary reference to the same point”: Ryrie, Charles C. *Dispensationalism Today*. Chicago: Moody, 1965. 86 ff. (Sandeen 428)
      2. “One factor which differentiates the dispensationalists [from other groups—Millerites, Mormons, etc.—interested in biblical prophecy] is their concern for biblical literalism. . . . Literalism, in the early nineteenth century, usually refers quite specifically to the interpretation of prophecy and contrasts with the figurative or symbolic manner of interpretation.” (Sandeen 418)
      3. An American (“Modern Millenarianism.” *The Princeton Review* 25 [Jan. 1853]: 68): “Millenarianism has grown out of a new “school of Scripture interpretation” and its laws of interpretation are so different from the old, that the Bible may almost be said to wear a new visage and speak with a new tongue . . . The central law by which millenarians profess always to be guided, is that of giving the literal sense.” (Sandeen 418)
      4. “It is not difficult to see how some of the characteristic doctrines of dispensationalism arose from this hermeneutic. The second coming of Christ, the restoration of the Jews to the land of Israel, the Great Tribulation, and the 1000 years of peace and justice—dispensationalists believed these prophecies would be fulfilled quite as literally as Christ had fulfilled prophecy during his first advent.” (Sandeen 418)
      5. “When the verbal inspiration of the Bible became a matter of theological dispute later in the century, the dispensationalists were able to win many converts to their cause by arguing that only dispensationalism really took the Bible seriously.” (Sandeen 418)
   9. history of dispensationalism
      1. 1840s: “Dispensationalism was being taught in the United States and Canada as early as the 1840’s . . .” (Sandeen 419)
      2. 1862-77 (a sixteen-year period)
         1. John Nelson Darby “travelled to North America on seven occasions . . ., frequently . . . for as long as a year. . . . Darby resided in North America at least forty percent of the time. The great bulk of his time was spent working in large cities, mostly on the eastern seaboard.” (Sandeen 419)
         2. “Other advocates of [dispensationalism] visited North America, dispensational publications found their way to the U.S., and a few were published in the U.S. as well.” (Sandeen 419)
         3. Darby’s “main aim” was to persuade Christians to leave their denominations. Darby (*Letters* [London: Stow Hill Tract Depot] 2.228): “our real work . . . is to get Christians clear practically of a great corrupt baptized body.” (Sandeen 419)
         4. “Many converts to dispensationalism were won during these years, but few of these would take the step of leaving their denominations. . . . most converts to dispensational theology refused to abandon their denominations and pastoral posts.” (Sandeen 419)
         5. Darby (*Letters* [London: Stow Hill Tract Depot] 2.304): “There is a great effort to keep souls in the various systems while taking advantage of the light which brethren have and preaching their doctrines. They do not even conceal it. One of the most active who has visited Europe told ministers that they could not keep up with the brethren unless they read their books, but he was doing everthing [*sic*] he could to prevent souls leaving their various systems called churches.” (Sandeen 419)
      3. dispensationalism infiltrates the denominations
         1. “Thus the instrument of propagation for the dispensational system in the U.S. became the clergy and religious periodicals of American denominations and voluntary societies, who, without announcing their conversion to anything new or different, began to influence the evangelical churches.” (Sandeen 419)
         2. Dispensationalism appealed particularly to Calvinists.
            1. “Very few Methodists were ever caught up in dispensationalism . . .” [419] Exception: “German-speaking Methodists seem to have been attracted to dispensationalism in undue proportion to their numbers within Methodism . . .” [428] (Sandeen 419, 428)
            2. Not many U.S. Episcopalians “were ever caught up in dispensationalism . . .” [419] Exceptions:

“. . . many British and Canadian Anglicans became converts.” (Sandeen 419)

December 1873: the Reformed Episcopal Church (evangelical in orientation) secedes from the Protestant Episcopal Church (c. 1995 the REC had c. 6,000 members). The REC “also seems to have been especially susceptible to dispensationalist penetration.” (Sandeen 428)

* + - * 1. “Most of the converts seem to be Presbyterians or Calvinistic Baptists. . . . This alignment is significant for the later composition of Fundamentalism, for the Presbyterian and Baptist denominations were the two most racked by the Fundamentalist controversy in the 1920’s.” (Sandeen 419)

Darby (*Letters* [London: Stow Hill Tract Depot] 2.193): “one had to insist on the first principles of grace. No one will have it as a rule in the American churches. Old school Presbyterians, or some of them, have the most of it.” (Sandeen 428)

See: Kraus, C. Norman. *Dispensationalism in America*. Richmond: 1958. 57 ff.

* + 1. the Niagara Conferences
       1. bibliography
          1. “Sources for this conference are extremely varied.” (Sandeen 428)
          2. “An account of the origin of the conference can be found in”: Needham, George C. *The Spiritual Life*. Philadelphia: 1895. 18 ff. (Sandeen 428)
          3. “Addresses from the conferences were published occasionally . . .” (Sandeen 428)

Brookes, James H. *Bible Reading on the Second Coming of Christ*. Springfield, IL: 1877.

*Lakeside Studies*, *Proceedings of the 1892 Niagara Conference*. Toronto: n.d.

*The Second Coming of Our Lord*: *Papers Read at a Conference Held at Niagara*, *July 14-17*, *1885*. Toronto: n.d.

* + - * 1. “James H. Brookes edited a periodical which made cryptic references to the conference regularly from 1876 on, and it is in this source that the Niagara creed was first published *(The Truth*, IV [1878], 452-8).” (Sandeen 428)
        2. “The best place to catch a glimpse of the workings of the conference is the July, 1897, number of *The Watchword*, where narrative statements concerning the progress of the conference are combined with virtually a complete list of the sessions and sermons.” (Sandeen 428)
      1. “After dispensationalism had become an American movement, the institution most influential in its spread was the summer Bible conference . . .” (Sandeen 419)
         1. 1868-1900: “a relatively small but stable group of pastors and laymen met for one or two weeks at a summer resort . . . for concentrated Bible study.” (Sandeen 419)
         2. 1883-97: they met at Niagara Falls. (Sandeen 419)
    1. “The men who led these conferences during the 1870’s deserve to be known as the founding fathers of Fundamentalism . . .” (Sandeen 419)
       1. “James H. Brookes, a Presbyterian and alumnus of Princeton Seminary, [was] for [419] many years pastor of the Walnut Street (now Memorial) Presbyterian Church in St. Louis and editor of his own periodical, *The Truth* . . .” (Sandeen 419-20)
       2. “. . . William J. Erdman [was] at various times pastor of Presbyterian and Congregational churches as well as Moody’s Chicago Avenue Church, one of the founders of the Moody Bible Institute, an editor of the *Scofield Bible* and father of Charles R. Erdman, Professor of Practical Theology at Princeton Seminary . . .” (Sandeen 420)
       3. “. . . Adoniram Judson Gordon, a Baptist, [was] pastor for most of his life of the Clarendon Street Church, Boston, founder of the Boston Missionary Training School (now Gordon College and Seminary), editor of the periodical *Watchword*, a close associate of Moody in the management of the Northfield Conferences . . .” (Sandeen 420)
       4. “. . . William G. Moorehead, a Presbyterian, [was] Professor of New Testament and President of Xenia Seminary, and editor of the *Scofield Bible*.” (Sandeen 420)
    2. 1878: First International Prophetic Conference
       1. “The series of prophetic and premillennial conferences which began in 1878 were the direct outgrowth and offspring of this Niagara Group.” (Sandeen 420)
       2. “But not only dispensationalists collaborated in the calling and direction of the First International Prophetic Conference in 1878. A group of conservative Calvinists closely related to Princeton Theological Seminary were drawn into this conference movement through their concern with the premillennial return of Christ and other prophetic themes. The 1878 Premillennial Conference marks the beginning of a long period of dispensationalist cooperation with Princeton-oriented Calvinists.” (Sandeen 420)
       3. “The unstable and incomplete synthesis which is now known as Fundamentalism at this point first becomes visible to the historian.” (Sandeen 420)

1. **Princeton theology**
   1. Loetscher, Lefferts A. *The Broadening Church*. Philadelphia: 1957. (“The best general treatment of this subject . . .”) (Sandeen 429)
   2. 1812: Princeton Seminary is founded
   3. “The Princeton Theology was born with the founding of Princeton Seminary . . .” (Sandeen 420)
   4. It “endured as a living force for about 100 years.” (Sandeen 420)
      1. It was “Inspired by its first professor, Archibald Alexander . . .” (Sandeen 420)
      2. It was “given its most complete formulation by Charles Hodge in his *Systematic Theology* . . .” (Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. New York: 1874.) (Sandeen 420)
      3. It was “defended and modified throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by competent scholars such as A. A. Hodge, Benjamin B. Warfield and J. G. Machen.” (Sandeen 420)
   5. “The Princeton faculty never admitted that they were teaching a unique theology, but staunchly insisted that they only intended to defend the system of John Calvin. In this belief they were deceived, both the methodology and the conclusions of their theology differing clearly from the work of Calvin himself and the standard of the Westminster Confession.” (“I have analyzed the accuracy of their assertion in my article, “The Princeton Theology,” *Church History*, XXXI (September, 1962).” Sandeen 420 n. 18) (Sandeen 420)
   6. rationalism
      1. “. . . epistemology for Princeton seemed to be divided between reason and mysticism, fact and inner light. Though they criticized their early deist rivals for mistreating right reason, they reserved their hardest words for mystics, hewing a rationalist line in their own theology.” (Sandeen 421)
      2. “The methodology of the Princeton Theology laid down by Archibald Alexander and Charles Hodge remains the most characteristic aspect of the school’s teaching. Insisting that theology must be pursued scientifically, the Princeton professors, completely ignoring the criticism of Hume and Kant, constructed a rationalistic method which was compared by Charles Hodge himself to Newtonian physics.” (Sandeen 420)
         1. “Princeton thus took the position of the scientist who observes, arranges, and systematizes but does not participate in his experiment.” (Sandeen 421)
         2. Charles Hodge (*Systematic Theology* 1.14 ff.): “As natural science was a chaos until the principle of induction was admitted and faithfully carried out, so theology is a jumble of human speculations, not [420] worth a straw, when men refuse to apply the same principle to the study of *the* *Word of God*.” (Sandeen 420-21, emphasis added)
      3. “J.Gresham Machen (qtd. in: Stonehouse, Ned. B. *J*. *Gresham Machen*. Grand Rapids: 1957. 376): “Christian doctrine, I hold, is not merely connected with the Gospel, but it is identical with the Gospel.” This illustrates “the state to which this kind of rationalism was finally carried . . .” (Sandeen 429 n. 20)
   7. inerrancy of scripture
      1. The Princeton theology’s rationalism created its doctrine of the absolute inerrancy of scripture.
         1. “. . . the Lutheran and Reformed dogmatic tradition of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. [The Princeton theology] began as the offspring of that tradition . . .” (Sandeen, Ernest R. “The Princeton Theology.” *Church History* 31 [Sept. 1962].) (Sandeen 429 n. 21)
         2. But “in the course of the nineteenth century [the Princeton theology was] creating something unique.” (Sandeen 429 n. 21)
      2. “Their doctrine of inspiration, as it developed during the century, never wavered from this fundamental tenet—that if the Bible was to be proven to be God’s inspired word, the demonstration must be made on the basis of reason through the use of external marks of authenticity—not inner convictions.” (Sandeen 421)
      3. Charles Hodge (*Systematic Theology* 1.14 ff.): “The Bible gives us not only the facts concerning God, and Christ, ourselves, and our relations to our Maker and Redeemer, but also records the legitimate effects of those truths on the minds of believers. So that we cannot appeal to our own feelings or inward experience, as a ground or guide, unless we can show that it agrees with the experience of holy men as recorded in the Scriptures.” (Sandeen 421)
      4. “Building upon this methodology, Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, and B. B. Warfield constructed what they considered a shock-proof doctrine of Biblical authority.” (Sandeen 421)
         1. “Their fundamental assumption seems to have been that God would not reveal his truths through a fallible book.” (Sandeen 421)
         2. “They tried to prove that God had so inspired the Biblical authors that their every word as recorded on the original autographs was inerrant . . .” (Sandeen 421)
            1. “Inerrant is “a term more specifically rationalistic than the word infallible.” (Sandeen 421)
            2. “The first reference to the original autographs in the Princeton Theology occurs in 1879 . . .” (Hodge, A. A. *Outlines of Theology*. New York: 1879. 66, 75.) (Sandeen 429 n. 22)
         3. “This doctrine did not exist either in Europe or America prior to its formulation in the last half of the nineteenth century.” (Sandeen 421)
      5. “Princeton Seminary was very inbred, but its outreach was extensive, passing far beyond the bounds of Presbyterians into Episcopal, Congregational, Baptist and other denominations.” (Sandeen 420)
         1. “. . . the Princeton doctrine of inspiration has become the common property of dispensationalists and Calvinists alike.” (Sandeen 429 n. 21)
         2. “It has become an essential ingredient in the theology of Fundamentalism.” (Sandeen 421)
         3. “The frequency with which these aspects of the doctrine of inspiration occur in the Fundamentalist controversy seems largely due to the influence of the Princeton Theology. That the Bible was 1) verbally inspired, 2) inerrant in its every reference, statistic, and quotation, 3) when first written down on the original autographs—these phrases have become the shibboleth of the Fundamentalist doctrine of the Scriptures.” (Sandeen 421)
2. **alliance of dispensationalism and the Princeton Theology**
   1. “Both groups insisted upon an inerrant scripture . . .” (Sandeen 421)
   2. “. . . whether by accident or design, [both] began at about the same time to defend their views by recourse to the “original autographs.”” (Sandeen 421)
   3. “Both groups thought in . . . rationalistic terms.” (Sandeen 421)
   4. “Over against the new theologies of immanence . . ., both stressed God’s transcendence and supra-historical power . . .” (Sandeen 421)
   5. “Over against the new . . . social gospel, both . . . expressed themselves in very pessimistic terms when discussing social problems.” (Sandeen 421)
   6. “The two movements were by no means completely compatible . . . Attacks upon the [421] dispensationalists were occasionally heard from such a man as B. B. Warfield . . .” (Sandeen 421-22)
   7. “. . . but the common Modernist foe kept them at peace with one another throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. [421] . . . the books of the dispensationalists were being regularly reviewed and recommended in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*.” (Sandeen 421-22)
   8. 1878 October 30: Perhaps to increase its influence, the Niagara Group called a Bible conference, “the first International Prophetic Conference in the Holy Trinity Episcopal Church in New York City . . .” (Sandeen 422)
      1. The religious press called the participants Millerites and Adventists. (Sandeen 422)
         1. “We confess that we look with some anxiety upon the spread of the view represented at the so-called Prophetic Conference held in New York last week.” *Watchman* (7 Nov. 1878): 356.
         2. See also the *Christian Advocate* (31 Oct. 1878) and the *Standard* (7 Nov. 1878). 429 n. 23.
      2. A “Baptist editor, noting that pessimism about the future was a distinguishing mark of the premillennialists, prophesied that only Anglicans and Roman Catholics were likely to be attracted to it.” (*Watchman* [14 Nov. 1878]: 364.) (Sandeen 422)
      3. But “very little dispensationalism, as such, was taught. Instead a considerable body of respected American and European support was rallied behind pre-millennialist [*sic*] beliefs.” (Sandeen 422)
      4. “Although not a dispensationalist, the able Samuel H. Kellogg, a Princeton Seminary graduate and at that time Professor of Theology at Western Seminary, delivered a paper . . . in which he defended premillennialism as an historic doctrine of the Church.” (Sandeen 422)
      5. In premillennialism, “the dispensationalists had apparently hit upon a theme suitable for building an alliance with certain other Biblically-oriented conservatives, particularly those following the path toward Biblical inerrancy laid out by Princeton.” (Sandeen 422)
         1. “No formal alliances were ever drawn up. No official conferences were held in which the two groups publically [*sic*] declared their intention to cooperate.” (Sandeen 422)
         2. “But during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, there were frequent occasions on which representatives of these two groups were found speaking on the same platforms and publishing their articles in the same books, all with an end to defeating the Modernist heresies.” (Sandeen 422)
   9. 1880-1902: Northfield Conferences
      1. Pierson, A.T. “The Story of the Northfield Conferences.” *Northfield Echoes* 1 (June 1894): 1-13.
      2. Dwight L. Moody held the Northfield Conferences every year from 1880-1902. (Sandeen 422)
      3. They were “important because of the size . . . [and] Moody’s presence . . . Few men in American nineteenth-century Protestantism could equal Moody’s influence.” (Sandeen 422)
      4. Though “Moody’s spirit was “broad, perhaps too inclusive . . . his Northfield Conferences were virtually dominated by dispensationalists . . .” (Sandeen 422)
         1. Especially 1880-87 and 1894-1902. (Pierson 1-13)
         2. Moody seems not to have become a dispensationalist. (Sandeen 422)
         3. But he gave “control of the conference, when he himself was absent, to dispensationalist leaders such as A.J. Gordon or A.T. Pierson and invited so many dispensationalist speakers that they were referred to as “the usual war horses” . . .” (Pierson 6) (Sandeen 422
         4. ““Dispensational Truth” was the announced theme of the conference in 1886, the same year that the Student Volunteer Movement [422] was initiated in Northfield. In that famous conference, in which the first 100 volunteers of the S.V.M. were recruited, the leadership was dispensationalist to a man.” (Pierson 1-13) (Sandeen 422-23)
3. **1900-1910**
   1. By 1900 the fundamentalist “movement had not yet become divisive.” (Sandeen 423)
      1. But “The lines of battle were becoming clear by 1900 . . .” (Sandeen 423)
   2. Most Christians “had not yet been forced—as they later would be—to choose sides between the Fundamentalists and the Modernists, and many Christians felt that they could live peaceably with both camps.” (Sandeen 423)
   3. “. . . the Fundamentalists, though alarmed and dismayed by the teachings of the Modernists, were not ill-informed nor ignorant. Nor were they behaving like obscurantists or retreating from the world. Their movement at this time possessed great vigor, particularly in evangelism and world missions. The leadership was concentrated in urban centers, particularly in the Philadelphia-New York-Boston area with lesser centers in Chicago, St. Louis and Los Angeles. The South was almost unrepresented.” (Sandeen 423)
   4. Fundamentalist leaders held “the editorship of a journal (Charles G. Trumbull or Arno C. Gaebelein), the deanship of a Bible school (James M. Gray or Reuben A. Torrey), a chair in a seminary (Wm. G. Moorehead or Melvin G. Kyle) or the calling of an evangelist (J. Wilbur Chapman or L.W. Munhall).” (Sandeen 423)
4. **1910-1915**: ***The Fundamentals***
   1. *The Fundamentals*: *A Testimony to the Truth*. Chicago: 1910-15.
   2. “This series of twelve pamphlets was published and distributed free, in numbers ranging from 175,000 to 300,000 copies by two brothers who preferred to be known only as “Two Christian Laymen.” [They] were Lyman and Milton Stewart, founders and chief stockholders of the Union Oil Company of Los Angeles . . .” (Sandeen 423)
   3. Lyman “was the real sponsor of the series and Milton a silent partner . . .” (Sandeen 424)
      1. Lyman “was both a Presbyterian and a dispensationalist.” (Sandeen 423)
   4. 1909 summer: Lyman met “Amzi C. Dixon, a dispensationalist Baptist minister at that time pastor of the Moody Memorial Church . . . impressed by Dixon’s militant defense of Christian truth, [Lyman] enlisted him as chairman of an editorial committee to supervise the publication of *The Fundamentals*. This committee, selected by Dixon, was comprised of several laymen who were members of Dixon’s church and three clergymen . . .” (Sandeen 423)
      1. Reuben A. Torrey was dispensationalist “Dean of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (another Lyman Stewart project) . . .” (Sandeen 423)
         1. McLoughlin, W.G., Jr. *Modern Revivalism*. New York, 1959. 366 ff.
      2. Elmore Harris, “possibly a dispensationalist, [was] President of the Toronto Bible Institute and [423] an editor of the *Scofield Reference Bible* . . .” (Sandeen 423-24)
         1. Wallace, W.S. *The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. 3rd ed. London: 1963.
      3. Louis Meyer, “a Jewish convert to Christianity [worked] among Jews under the auspices of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions.” (Sandeen 424)
         1. “Louis Meyer is not known to me outside the Lyman Stewart Correspondence.” (Sandeen 429 n. 30)
   5. purpose
      1. “Some historians have speculated that *The Fundamentals* were part of an elaborate plan or the first shot in the subsequent controversy. There is no evidence that this series had any other intent than its title implied—the reaffirmation of fundamental truths.” (Sandeen 424)
      2. “The tone of the volumes is quite calm, . . . polemical [but not] vituperative.” (Sandeen 424)
      3. That such a heavily dispensationally dominated committee should produce such a balanced series would seem to demonstrate that these early Fundamentalists could still find some grounds for cooperation with other Christian leaders.” (Sandeen 424)
   6. authors
      1. “. . . 64 authors furnished a total of 90 articles to *The Fundamentals*.” (Sandeen 424)
      2. “. . . a great many Calvinist-oriented clergy were recruited to write for *The Fundamentals*.” (Sandeen 424)
      3. But “Only three members of the Princeton Seminary faculty . . . David James Burrell, Charles R. Erdman, and B.B. Warfield . . .” (Sandeen 424)
   7. subjects
      1. biblical authority
         1. “In articles defending specific Christian doctrines, the subject of Biblical authority certainly predominated, 29 separate articles being devoted to it, including five specifically on Biblical inspiration. It is significant that all five were written by dispensationalists . . .” (Sandeen 424)
         2. “. . . the two articles by James M. Gray and L.W. Munhall, which most clearly attempt to structure a theological argument for verbal inspiration, depend upon and quote directly from the works of the Princeton theologians.” (Sandeen 424)
      2. dispensationalism
         1. “Dispensationalism as such was never made the subject of a separate article; when it did occur, it appeared only as the natural mode of expression of a dispensationalist author. Nineteen authors responsible for contributing 31 articles can be identified as dispensationalists.” (Sandeen 424)
   8. structure
      1. “There apparently was no overall plan followed in the publication of *The Fundamentals* . . .” (Sandeen 424)
      2. Some volumes “show a common theme—volume VII, for instance, was devoted almost entirely to biblical problems and volume XII to evangelism and missions.” (Sandeen 424)
      3. Articles in the first half are “adapted to men of the highest culture”; those in the second half are “adapted to the more ordinary preacher and teacher . . .” (LymanStewart to Milton Stewart, 3 Mar. 1911, *Lyman Stewart Papers*.) (Sandeen 424)
   9. five points of fundamentalism?
      1. Some historians and present-day fundamentalists speak “as though there was a kind of Fundamentalist creed of five articles which all [fundamentalists] accepted and [all] Liberals attacked . . .” (E.g., Furniss 13, 16, 50, 72, *et passim*.) (Sandeen 424)
      2. 1910: the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted five points “as essential Christian doctrines.” (Sandeen 424)
         1. Loetscher, Lefferts A. *The Broadening Church*. Philadelphia: 1957. 98.
         2. inerrancy of scripture
         3. virgin birth
         4. substitutionary atonement
         5. physical resurrection
         6. Christ’s “miracle-working power”
         7. “But this was the only [five-point statement] relevant to early Fundamentalism . . .” (Sandeen 425)
      3. Historian Stewart Cole mistakenly said “that the Niagara Group had also adopted such a five-point declaration, but the only creedal statement ever produced by that group (in 1878) contained fourteen points.” (Sandeen 425)
         1. Cole, Stewart G. *History of Fundamentalism*. New York: 1931. 34
         2. See also: “World Conference on Christian Fundamentals Affirmed Nine Points Statement in 1919.” *Sunday School Times* (14 June 1919).
         3. Cole is “probably responsible for the confusion . . .” (Sandeen 425)
      4. “. . . generations of students have been taught to identify the Fundamentalist . . . five points. [But fundamentalists] did not define themselves in relation to any five particular points . . .”
      5. The fundamentalists’ “innovations were more significant than their preservations.” (Sandeen 424-25)
5. **1920s**
   1. In the 1920s “the calm, determined spirit of *The Fundamentals* quickly gave way to the clangor and strife that has turned Fundamentalism into a term of reproach.” (Sandeen 425)
   2. “An analysis of the controversies of the 1920’s is impossible in this paper, but it is essential to note the presence of dispensationalism and Princeton-Calvinism within the contending factions.” (Sandeen 425)
   3. Baptists
      1. The Baptists were “as badly racked by controversy as any.” (Sandeen 425)
      2. In the Northern Baptist Convention, two organizations “led the attack upon Modernism . . .” (Sandeen 425)
         1. The National Federation of Fundamentalists “was determined in its program, but refused to carry the issue to the point of schism.” (Sandeen 425)
            1. The Federation “was controlled largely by . . . [the] more Calvinistic wing of the movement.” (Sandeen 425)
         2. But the Baptist Bible Union militant, “as if it had no real concern for the continuance of the denomination . . .” (Sandeen 425)
            1. The Union “was controlled largely by dispensationalists . . .” (Sandeen 425)

E.g., A.C. Dixon, William B. Riley, T.T. Shields, and W.L. Pettingill. (Sandeen 425)

* + - * 1. “. . . their dispensational doctrine of the church would have made it very much easier for them to countenance schism.” (Sandeen 425)
        2. The Union “did contribute eventually to several small schisms. (Furniss 103ff.) (Sandeen 425)
  1. Presbyterians
     1. “The 1920’s do not mark the beginning of the Fundamentalist controversy within Presbyterianism, but the disputes in the General Assembly, seminaries and mission boards of the church became much more acrimonious . . .” (Sandeen 425)
     2. results (Sandeen 425)
        1. Loetscher, Lefferts A. *The Broadening Church*. Philadelphia: 1957. Esp. ch. 15.
        2. “reorganization of Princeton Seminary”
        3. “simultaneous establishment of the Fundamentalist Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia”
        4. “creation of a Fundamentalist Presbyterian mission board to rival the official denominational board”
        5. 1936: “withdrawal of about 100 ministers and many congregations to form the Orthodox Presbyterian Church”
           1. Loetscher, Lefferts A. *The Broadening Church*. Philadelphia: 1957. Esp. ch. 15.
           2. J. Gresham Machen (“leader of the new denomination”; *Presbyterian Guardian* [22 June 1936]): “On Thursday, June 11, 1936, the hopes of many long years were realized. We became members, at last, of a true Presbyterian Church. . . .” (Sandeen 426)
           3. But “Another schism quickly ensued in which [dispensationalists and Princeton-theology types were] opponents.” (Sandeen 426)

Machen led the Princeton-theology group.

Carl McIntire led the dispensationalist group, which called itself the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

The Princeton-theology group “apologized for not recognizing the dangers of dispensationalism earlier.” (Sandeen 426)

Princeton-theology group (editorial, *Presbyterian Guardian* [13 Mar. 1937] 217): “We cannot offer a very good reason for a failure to raise the issue at an earlier time. Evidently the only reason is that we were absorbed in fighting that great enemy, Modernism.” (Sandeen 426)

## “Evangelicalism”

1. **bibliography**
   1. sociologists
      1. Ammerman, Nancy. *Bible Believers*. 1987.
      2. Hunter, James. *American Evangelicalism*. 1983.
      3. Hunter, James. *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation*. 1987.
      4. Warner, R. Stephen. *New Wine in Old Wineskins*. 1988.
      5. Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restructuring of American Religion*. 1988.
   2. historians
      1. Bratt, James. *Dutch Calvinism in Modern America*. 1984.
      2. *Evangelical Studies Bulletin*
      3. Harrell, David Edwin, Jr. *Oral Roberts*. 1985.
      4. Jones, Charles Edwin. *Guide to the Study of the Pentecostal Movement*. 2 vols. 1983. (“monumental,” xiii)
      5. Marsden, George. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. 1980. (“magisterial,” xiii)
      6. Marsden, George. *Reforming Fundamentalism*. 1987.
      7. Noll, Mark. *Between Faith and Criticism*. 1986.
      8. Sandeen, Ernest. *Roots of Fundamentalism*: *British and American Millenarianism*, *1800-1930*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970.
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2. **etymology**: “Evangelicalism” is derived from Greek εὐαγγέλιον, *euanggelion*, meaning “good news” (English “gospel”). (Carpenter x)
3. **history of usage**
   1. “The first groups to use evangelical as their label . . . were the sixteenth-century followers of Martin Luther. For them, “evangelical” implied that their movement had recovered the gospel, the good news of salvation by grace through faith. So in Europe today, and especi­ally in Germany, evangelical is virtually synonymous with Protestant.” (Carpenter x)
   2. “This was the case in nineteenth-century America also, but for a different reason—because of the domination of revivalism in the Protestant churches. As late as the 1920s, even liberal Protestants such as Harry Emerson Fosdick customarily referred to themselves as evangeli­cals.” (Carpenter x)
   3. “Catholics also use the term evangelical, usually as an adjective, though, not as a noun. By it they refer to the gospel-proclaiming . . . functions in the church, such as a . . . mission.” (Carpenter x)
4. **evangelicalism and fundamentalism**
   1. “Some put conservative Protestants into two categories: the moderates [i.e., evangelicals] and the militants [i.e., fundamentalists]. In this case, an evangelical is a [fundamentalist] with perhaps more education and nicer manners.” (Carpenter x)
   2. “Bob Jones [said,] “an evangelical is . . . someone who says to a liberal, ‘I’ll call you a Christian if you call me a scholar.”” (Carpenter x)
5. **three current meanings of** “**evangelical**”
   1. George Marsden points out three senses. (Carpenter x)
      1. Marsden, George. “Introduction: The Evangelical Denomination.” *Evangelicalism and Modern America*. Ed. George Marsden. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984. vii-xvi.
   2. “. . . all Christians who match up with a few fundamental theological beliefs . . .” (Carpenter x)
      1. Marsden proposes these:
         1. “the divine inspiration, complete trustworthiness and final authority of the Bible . . .
         2. “salvation only through personal trust in Christ . . .
         3. “an emphasis on a distinct and personal experience of saving faith . . .
         4. “the importance of living a morally and spiritually transformed life . . .
         5. “and the importance of evangelism, that is, proclaiming the gospel to all people and calling them to faith in Christ.” (Carpenter x)
      2. “. . . historians refer to this complex cluster of movements and traditions as the American evangelical mosaic.” (Carpenter x)
         1. Smith, Timothy L. “The Evangelical Kaleidoscope and the Call to Christian Unity.” *Christian Scholar*’*s Review* 15 (1986): 125-40.
         2. In part the mosaic results from “this culture’s “free enterprise” religious economy . . .” (Carpenter xi)
         3. Also, “The Amer­i­can religious scene has been particularly puzzling because the formula that has worked so well in analyzing trends in almost every other western nation—modernization equals secularization—does not fit the situation here.” (Carpenter xii)
   3. members of certain groups
      1. “There have been more than a dozen different [evangelical] faith families . . .” (Carpenter xi)
         1. “Black Baptists and Methodists,
         2. “Mennonites and Brethren,
         3. “restorationists of the Disciples of Christ/Chris­tian Church/Churches of Christ tradition,
         4. “German and Scandinavian ethnic pietist-evangelicals,
         5. “pentecostals—both black and white,
         6. “Southern Baptists,
         7. “fundamentalist Baptist and Bible churches,
         8. “holiness Wesleyans such as the Nazarenes,
         9. “Dutch Reformed evangelicals,
         10. “evangelical Friends,
         11. “charismatics—both Catholic and Protestant,
         12. “prolifer­ating Hispanic evangelical and pentecostal communities,
         13. “and the varied Asian-American congregations of the born-again.” (Carpenter xi)
      2. However, “Not all of these groups readily identify themselves as “evangelicals,” much as they might share some basic traits. And as the mosaic image suggests, there is a great deal of fragmentation and isolation among these groups.” (Carpenter xi)
   4. “. . . a movement or coalition that has arisen since World War II.” (Carpenter xi)
      1. “Marsden calls the people in this movement “card-carrying” evangelicals. “Evangelical­ism” in this sense was envisioned and organized by a progressive, reforming party within fundamentalism that sought to bring together all conservative Protestants in America under a common agenda. They never fully succeeded . . .” (Carpenter xi)
      2. “This loose coalition that calls itself “evangelicalism” is in fact less dependent on de­nom­inations than on a network of parachurch agencies such as InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, *Christianity Today* magazine, World Vision, Campus Crusade for Christ, Moody Bible Institute, Seattle Pacific University, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, The 700 Club, and the Bily Graham Evangelistic Association.” (Carpenter xi)
      3. “As Marsden describes it, “evangelicalism” was dominated until about the mid-1970s by post-fundamentalist theologians and ministry leaders, but it also includes some people from all of the other movements and traditions that have embodied evangelical beliefs and emphases. Perhaps the key test for membership in this new evangelical coalition is to find out whether someone identifies more with his or her home denomin­a­tion or with this parachurch network. In this sense, Senator Mark Hatfield is more an evangelical than a Conservative Baptist; former Surgeon [xi] General C. Everett Koop is more an evangelical than a Presbyterian; and both Pat Robertson and Billy Graham identify more as evangelicals than as Southern Baptists.” (Carpenter xi-xii)

## What Are Denominations?

1. **general bibliography**
   1. Hadaway, Kirk. “Denominational Defection: Recent Research on Religious Disaffiliation in America.” *The Mainstream Protestant* “*Decline*”: *The Presbyterian Pattern*, ed. M.J. Coalter, J.M. Mulder, and L.B. Weeks. Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1990.
   2. Hammond, Phillip E. “Religion and the Persistence of Identity.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 27 (1988) 1-11. (“. . . documents the various ways in which religion remains linked to other primary and secondary identities” [such as family and tradition and place], Ammerman 132 n. 31)
   3. Jacquet, Constant H., ed. *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches*, *1989*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1989. (“When scholars or reporters want to know how many denominations there are, they go to this invaluable book and count. In each brief entry are recorded addresses (headquarters), a bit of history (usually detailing when the group organized but also containing some theology), some mention of the group’s agencies (the interconnected organizational structure), and statistics on members, budget, and the like (the standardized units that can be counted).” (Ammerman 118)
   4. Liebman, Robert C., J.R. Sutton, and Robert Wuthnow. “Exploring the Social Sources of Denominationalism: Schisms in American Protestant Denominations, 1890-1980.” *American Sociological Review* 53 (1988) 343-52.
   5. Roof, Wade Clark, and William McKinney. *American Mainline Religion*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1987.
   6. Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restruc­turing of American Religion*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.
2. **introduction**
   1. H. Rich­ard Niebuhr (*The Social Sources of Denominationalism* [New York: World, 1929]) “pointed out [that] American denominations were more a matter of region and ethnicity, race and class, than matters of differences in deeply held beliefs and practices.” (Ammerman 111)
   2. postmodernity
      1. A “broad-ranging retreat from universalism to particularity . . . is part of what we are coming to call “postmodernity.”” [111] (Geertz, Clifford. *Local Knowl­edge*: *Further Essays in Interpretive Anthhropology*. New York: Basic Books, 1983. A “classic source of this argument,” Ammerman 128 n. 2) (Ammerman 111, 128 n. 2)
      2. “For many, the goal is no longer a humanity indistinguishable along ethnic, religious, or gender lines but perhaps a humanity able to honor those distinctions while building a vision of the common good.” (Ammerman 111)
      3. “The honoring of distinctions and particularities is taking place along­side a new valuing of the varieties of our ways of knowing. Description oriented toward the categories defined by academic guilds is giving way [111] to description that follows indigenous categories. . . . Rather than paying attention only to that from which we can generalize, we are paying attention to the particular. Rather than reducing all knowledge to cognitive categories, we are attempting to find a place for affective and experiential learning, as well.” (Ammerman 111-12)
      4. Denominations are “one of the local traditions to be celebrated.” (Ammerman 112)
   3. “. . . how tenuous denominations really are. There is increasing evidence that ordinary Americans are less and less firmly identified with them. People marry across denominational lines, transfer membership when they move, and drop in and out with impunity. The denominations themselves have lost members and money . . .” (Ammerman 112)
   4. “Protestant hegemony has been challenged; the Protestant way of believing, living, and organizing has been de-centered. . . . we are all wonder­ing who we are and if there is a center in our society . . .” (Ammerman 112)
   5. “church,” “denomination,” “sect,” “cult”
      1. There is a “perennial struggle among sociologists to distinguish among church, sect, and denomination (and sometimes cult).” (Ammerman 128 n. 5)
      2. Richey, Russell E. “Institutional Forms of Religion.” *Encyclo­pedia of the American Religious Experience*. Ed. Charles H. Lippy and Peter W Williams. 3 vols. New York: Scribner’s, 1988. 1.31-50. (“. . . a helpful historical overview of the usage of these terms,” Ammerman 128 n. 5)
      3. Stark, Rodney, and William Sims Bainbridge. *The Future of Religion*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985. (“. . . a theoretical overview,” Ammerman 128 n. 5)
      4. Beckford, James. “Religious Orga­nizations.” *The Sacred in a Secular Age*. Ed. Phillip E. Hammond. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985. 125-38. (“. . . argues that sociology of religion’s continued dependence on the Troeltschian formulations has impeded our understanding of the ways in which religious groups organize.” Ammerman 128 n. 5)
      5. “In the “church/sect” tradition, denomination is used to denote religious organizations that do *not* enjoy a monopoly in their culture and accept the pluralism that goes with such a situation . . . such pluralism has as its corollary a high level of individualism and choice. . . . Denominations, then, are relatively accommodated to their culture—at least, to the structural arrangements it imposes on them.” (Martin, David. “The Denomination.” *British Journal of Sociology* 13 (March 1962) 1-14.) (Ammerman 129 n. 5)
      6. “The biggest problem this definition has had is that its empirical referent has often been unclear. It is primarily a conceptual category (an “ideal type”), and the constellation of factors constituting the definition rarely occur so neatly in the real world.” (Ammerman 129 n. 5)
         1. “There are, for instance, bureaucratically organized groups that are strongly at odds with their culture . . .” (Ammerman 129 n. 5)
         2. “There are . . . denominations that have enjoyed quasi-monopolies—at least within subcultures.” (Ammerman 129 n. 5)
         3. “There are also problems in apply­ing the definition thus construed at various levels of analysis. [E.g.,] very accommodated denominations might have very sectar­ian members.” (Demerath, N.J. *Social Class and American Protestantism*. New York: Rand McNally, 1965.) (Ammerman 129 n. 5)
      7. “I have found most convincing Benton Johnson’s strategy of reducing the original constellation of defining factors into one central variable—tension with the culture—defining as more “church-like” organizations that are more accom­modated and as more “sect-like” those that try to maintain distance between themselves and the dominant ways of life around them . . .” (Johnson, Benton. “On Church and Sect.” *American Sociological Review* 28 (1963) 539-49.) (Ammerman 129 n. 5)
         1. “Even that usage requires, however, specificity by region and time—that is, tension with whom?” (Ammerman 129 n. 5)
         2. See: Ammerman, Nancy T. *Baptist Battles*: *Social Change and Religious Conflict in the South­ern Baptist Convention*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1990. 164-66.
   6. “This paper suggests three ways in which scholars have tacitly defined denomination.” (Ammerman 113)
      1. “What all three definitions have in common is their reli­ance on the American experience of voluntarism and pluralism in reli­gious life. All three definitions assume that denominations are translocal clusters of religious identifications and behaviors (and the people and organizations connected to them) that are chosen and developed by their members and exist alongside other, similarly constructed, more or less-distinct [*sic*] religious clusters. Denominations are clusters of language and meaning, practices and habits, that exist so long as there are people willing to claim that the cluster is somehow distinctive. Denominations are something bigger than local congregations, to which most (but not all) congregations are connected and which identify individuals and con­gregations as somehow connected to each other.” (Ammerman 113)
      2. “Just what that “something” is, however, can be quite variously de­fined, and it is that variation we explore below. For each definition, we look for the ways in which definition and data are mutually implicated, and we examine the effects of building on one definition and base of data rather than another. Then we look at the ways the practical and cultural meanings of each of those definitions are shifting under our feet.” (Ammerman 113)
3. **denominations as beliefs and practices**
   1. “Set out to write about denominations, and one can hardly avoid writing about beliefs and practices. That, after all, is what denominations are supposed to be. . . . denominations are supposed to be identifiable by their beliefs and practices. Defining de­nominations by the ideas and rituals that distinguish them from others is the commonsense thing to do.” (Ammerman 113)
   2. “It is also the practical thing for a historian to do.” (Ammerman 114)
      1. *writings*: “Most of the denomi­national “data” that survive to be written about consist of sermons and theological treatises. . . . Many aspects of religious life disappear from our retrospective view, but words usually do not.” (Ammerman 114)
         1. “. . . official theological records are not the historian’s only source. Historians can examine diaries and letters, flyers and everyday artifacts. They can also examine mundane organizational records and the cultural products (literature, art, and the like) that may embody denominational images from earlier periods.” (Ammerman 122)
      2. *statistics*: “Today . . . we also have survey data . . .” (Ammerman 114)
         1. “Unfortunately, . . . While most social scientists define religion in terms of beliefs and practices, they rarely define denomination in those terms. Denomina­tions are defined in terms of some measure of membership or identifica­tion, while the beliefs and practices usually measured are generic, cross-denominational, “orthodox” Christian ideas—belief in God, life after death, and the like.” (Ammerman 114)
            1. Roof, Wade Clark. “Concepts and Indicators of Religious Commitment.” *The Religious Dimension*, ed. Robert Wuthnow. New York: Academic Press, 1979. (“An earlier overview of the literature,” Ammerman 129 n. 7)
            2. “See especially”: Stark, Rodney, and Charles Y. Glock. *American Piety*: *The Nature of Religious Commitment*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1968. (Ammerman 129 n. 7)
            3. “recent studies using “orthodoxy” as a measure of religiosity” (Ammerman 129 n. 7)

Jacobson, C.K., Tim B. Heaton, and Rutledge M. Dennis. “Black-White Differences in Religiosity.” *Sociological Analysis* 51 (1990) 257-70.

Hunsberger, Bruce. “A Short Version of the Christian Orthodoxy Scale.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28 (1989) 360-65.

* + - 1. “On the basis of these blunt instruments, we are then told about which denominations are most orthodox—with the same measure of orthodoxy for every group. The differences measured are differences in degree, not kind. Rarely do we find out whether the people within each denomination believe anything distinctive . . .” (Ammerman 114)
      2. “While national survey data on beliefs may be only marginally useful . . ., denominational survey data can occa­sionally prove more substantially helpful. Many denominations either have their own research offices or commission special studies of their constituents. Those who wish to examine the beliefs and practices of a denomination would do well to seek out such data. They are unlikely to provide a history that extends very far back into the past or yields great theological subtlety.” (Ammerman 114)
    1. congregational studies
       1. “Stephen Warner has argued that American culture has produced a de facto congre­gational polity among all American religions.” (Ammerman 114)
       2. “A similar reality check is provided by denominational studies that begin at the congregational level, rather than in the library. . . . In practice, the expression [114] of denominational life people know most intimately is the lived experi­ence of a congregation. . . . Those who choose to study denominations through the lense [*sic*] of beliefs and practices would do well to seek out empirical windows on congregational life.” (Ammerman 114-15)
    2. “We have begun to realize how our understanding of history has always been shaped by those who had the power to write and to preserve their version of events. In the case of religious history, those who were literate and had access to printing presses were likely to be those who were already in the idea business . . . Whether or not denominational life in the seventeenth century was one endless theological debate, the materials that have survived lead us to see it that way. Today, the official voices of the denominations are still likely to promote a theological definition of denominational studies.” (Ammerman 115)

1. **denominations as organizations**
   1. “If denominations began in the heat of theological battle, definable in terms of distinctive beliefs and practices, what they have gradually become—especially in this century—is modern organizations definable by their bylaws, budgets, and headquarters buildings.” (Ammerman 115)
   2. “During the nineteenth century American denominations began to [115] form and to join a wide variety of voluntary associations. . . . As their world got bigger—through immi­gration, commerce, and wars—they wanted to do bigger things, every­thing from running missions in China to distributing Bibles. Some of these early “societies” were aligned with a particular denomination, but others were not. . . . By the end of the century, American Protestants had discovered just how much they could do, and the pressure was mounting to bring some order out of the organizational chaos that had developed.” (Ammerman 115-16)
   3. “American denomina­tions were pulled toward the models of centralization and efficiency that seemed to be working so well for business.” (Primer, Ben. *Protestants and American Business Methods*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1979.) (Ammerman 116)
   4. “Indeed, DiMaggio and Pow­ell have argued that . . . organizations more and more [are pushed] toward homoge­neity of structure, partly because certain forms have been demonstrated to work, partly because those forms are seen as normal and legitimate, partly because interactions with other organizations (especially a regula­tory state) produce mirror images among departments that must deal with each other.” (Ammerman 116)
      1. DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institu­tional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.” *Ameri­can Sociological Review* 48 (April 1983) 147-60.
      2. “On the role of the state, see”: Wuthnow, Robert. *The Struggle for America’s Soul*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1989. (Ammerman 130 n. 12)
      3. “In addition to Primer’s description of this process, see also Gibson Win­ter’s “Religious Organizations” in vol. 1 of *The Emergent American Society*, ed. W L. Warner (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 408-491. He argues that by the 1950s, Protestant denominations were indistinguishable organizationally, defined primarily as agencies, and that indeed Catholic and Jewish organization was distinguishable but apparently moving in similar directions.
   5. “. . . by the 1920s American denominations of all polities were consolidating their missions, publish­ing enterprises, and other ventures under one organizational roof.” (Ammerman 116)
      1. Primer, Ben. *Protestants and American Business Methods*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1979.
      2. Gibson “argues that by the 1950s, Protestant denominations were indistinguishable organizationally, defined primarily as agencies, and that indeed Catholic and Jewish organization was distinguishable but apparently moving in similar directions.” (Win­ter, Gibson. “Religious Organizations.” *The Emergent American Society*, ed. W L. Warner (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967). 1: 408-91.) (Ammerman 130 n. 13)
   6. “Soon they could draw charts showing the relationship of each part to the whole. Budgets were centralized, and fund-raising was turned over to professionals who advised their constituents that “if the Lord doesn’t provide, systematic finance will.” Gradually, the people who worked for these organizations were expected to have specific educational creden­tials, and everyone had a job description. They worked out long-range plans and proposed integrated programs of study.” (Ammerman 116)
      1. “Mark Chaves . . . has argued that the shift from a “religious authority” structure to an agency structure actually constitutes a struggle between the two for power—I would say for the power to define what constitutes the denomination. Chaves has shown that over time, denominational chief executives have been increasingly likely to come from within the agency system, rather than from parishes, seminaries, and the rest of the ecclesiastical system.” (Chaves, Mark. “The Intra-Denominational Power Struggle: Declining Religious Control of Protestant Denominational Organization.” Paper presented to a meeting of the American Sociological Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1991.) (Ammerman 130 n. 14)
   7. “And they [denominations] began to keep records. . . . In his classic definition of bureaucracy, Max Weber lists paper­work as one of its distinctives.” (Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. 1947. Rpt. ed. New York: Free Press, 1964. 332.) (Ammerman 116)
   8. “All of this centralizing and standardizing has created denominations with much clearer organizational boundaries than had existed before. There are now bylaws and organizational charters setting out lines of authority and ownership. . . . The denomination now is de­fined by the administrative structure that takes in the dollars and carries out the mission of the collective churches it represents. Denomina­tional agencies claim the legitimate authority to embody the religious ideas contained in the theological traditions of the group. They are con­cerned both with external relations (missions and the like) and with the internal life of the body.” (Ammerman 117)
   9. “In their heyday, denominational agencies were able to formulate policies and programs that permeated the lives of local churches. Even without any coercive power, they could exercise persuasive power based on the religious legitimacy granted to them. Even in polities where there was not a bishop to place every pastor, the official seminary (with courses designed around official denominational programs) trained the pastors and helped them get jobs. Even where there was no official creed, the Bible study materials and the teacher training manuals all came from the same source. Even where there was no official prayer book to shape the liturgy, the ubiquitous denominational hymnal and the standardized liturgical planning resources created enough worship uniformity that visitors always knew where they were. This was certainly the Southern [117] Baptist experience, a fact that may strike some as ironic, given Baptist traditions of local autonomy. However, as Mark Chaves points out, it is, ironically, the very absence of strong regional ecclesiastical hierarchies that left congregationally based denominations susceptible to such strong national control. While the strength of the relationship between de­nomination and congregation has been considerably eroded (as we shall see in more detail), denominations as agencies still operate as if they have a primary role in shaping the religious lives of local churches. Denomina­tional agencies claim the legitimate right to be the keepers of religious identity.” (Ammerman 117-18)
   10. “Once these tightly defined organizational structures came into being, they gained the legitimacy that the modern world grants on the basis of such rational and legal criteria. . . . Legitimacy implies the ability to create and to tell one’s history. . . . it is largely these organizations that keep the records from which future historians will work.” (Ammerman 118)
   11. “. . . defining denomina­tion as a modern organizational structure affects the work of the histo­rian. We take the official organization’s word about what membership means and what the mission of the church is. The churches create and define the positions occupied by the people we interview. They maintain [118] the archives from days gone by, and they generate the documents that will become the archives of tomorrow. What we know about comes largely through this definitional filter. Developments that seemed to lead inexorably to the denomination of today are preserved and highlighted; beliefs, practices, and other organizational forms that seem to lead in other directions may be ignored.” (Ammerman 118-19)
2. **denominations as cultural identities**
   1. “Every year since 1972, the National Opinion Research Center’s General Social Survey has asked a random sample of the American population about their religious preferences. Interviewers ask first whether the re­spondent is Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else. If the respon­dent says Protestant, he or she is asked which specific denomination is preferred.” (Davis, James A., and Tom W Smith. *General Social Surveys*, *1972-87*: *Cumulative Codebook*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1987. 130-31, 573-75.) (Ammerman 119)
   2. “. . . a 1954 Gallup poll [showed] that 64 percent of American Protestants did not know who delivered the Sermon on the Mount, and 41 percent could not name the first book in the Bible.” (Ammerman 119)
   3. “Still, Presbyterians identified by so tenuous a connection to the de­nomination [as “preference” without attendance] can be shown to be different from Methodists or Baptists or Catholics identified by equally tenuous connections. [119] . . . There is admittedly more difference among denominations if the preference is accompanied by actual organizational membership and attendance, but even the preference alone makes a difference.” (Ammerman 119-20)
   4. “What this seems to imply is that there is out there in American culture something defined as Presbyterianism that is not simply a theo­logical tradition or an organizational membership. After a few hundred years of existence, denominational identities have taken on a cultural life of their own.” (Ammerman 120)
      1. “The more established the denomination is, the more perva­sive is its cultural identity . . .” (Ammerman 120)
      2. “. . . the more sectarian and separate the group, the more its cultural identity may be at odds with its actual practices and the less likely it is that someone not actually a participant will claim a prefer­ence for that group.” (Ammerman 120)
   5. “We perhaps recognize the fact of such cultural denominational identi­ties in the jokes we tell. We can tell an “Episcopalian” joke, and people will understand enough to laugh.” (Ammerman 120)
      1. ““How many X does it take to change a light bulb?” Two of my favorites are about Episcopalians, and the answer in both cases is three—either “one to change the bulb and two to serve sherry” or “one to change the bulb and two to reminisce about how good the old bulb was.”
   6. “That we have some preexisting, cultur­ally transmitted sense of a denomination’s identity can also be seen in our surprise when our expectations are violated—shaking our heads, for instance, over incense in a Baptist church. We cannot be surprised if we do not have presuppositions. At least part of the story of a denomination, then, exists in the images and the anecdotes of the larger culture.” (Ammerman 120)
   7. “. . . these cultural images . . . arise from widely reported events, the actions of famous per­sons, the insistent preachments of articulate spokespersons. They are formed by publicly visible buildings and programs and billboards. They come, as well, from everyday observations of ordinary people who claim those identities. They may also be tied—as are the denominations themselves—to an ethnic heritage. Out of all the bits and pieces of knowl­edge that make their way into our cultural consciousness, we and our fellow citizens have constructed what it means to be Lutheran or Method­ist or Catholic.” (Ammerman 120)
   8. “The study of denominations as cultural artifacts is something more likely undertaken by social scientists than by historians. Whenever we use national survey preference data, we are implicitly working with this cultural reality. But it is a reality also found in literature, in the arts, and in other media where ideas about various religious traditions may be com­municated. Attention to this cultural level allows us to look at the way various culturally constructed religious identities fit into the larger social system. We can look at how they are related to the educational systems of the culture, where they fit in the economic order, how they relate to political culture, and so on. These amorphous denominational identities may be among the best indices we have of the relationship between denominations and the various other institutional systems of the culture. Each of those systems is operating with implicit ideas about the place of various denominations within American culture.” (Ammerman 121)
3. **writing denominational history**
   1. “. . . denominational history has to [use] all three. Denominations are sets of beliefs and practices; they are organiza­tions; and they are culturally constructed identities.” (Ammerman 121)
4. **the shifting terrain of denominationalism**
   1. “All three aspects of denominational life are undergoing rapid change.” (Ammerman 122)
   2. Roof and McKinney (*American Mainline Religion* 63-71) “document the ways in which the old . . . bonds that had helped to hold American denominations together, have diminished significantly over the last two generations.” (Ammerman 122)
      1. “In traditional communities, the social fabric contained a thread of religion that was woven alongside the threads of ethnicity and family and place.” (Ammerman 122)
      2. “. . . especially since World War II, . . . education and geographic mobility have conspired to dis­place the forces of family and tradition and place . . .” (Ammerman 122)
      3. “The effects of education and mobility are discussed both by Roof and McKinney in *American Mainline Religion*, and by Robert Wuthnow in *The Re­structuring of American Religion*. Noting these effects seem to imply the classic secularization arguments about the diminishment of religion in the modern situa­tion.” (Ammerman 132 n. 32)
         1. Luckmann, Thomas. *The Invisible Religion*. New York: Macmillan, 1967. (“. . . about the disjuncture be­tween individual belief and institutional religion in the modern period,” Ammerman 132 n. 32)
         2. Berger, Peter. *The Sacred Canopy*. New York: Anchor Books, 1969. Chs. 1-2. (“. . . about the necessary ties between belief and plausibility structure,” Ammerman 132 n. 32)
         3. Bellah, R., et al. *Habits of the Heart*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985. (“In the place of commitments to family and place and religion, a new norm of individual choice now seems to reign.” Ammerman 123)
   3. “. . . we must surely ask ourselves today whether those cultural artifacts [“culturally defined denominational identities”] are about to disappear entirely under the pressure of choice and mobility.” (Ammerman 124)
   4. “We are no longer willing to allow, for instance, the ties of religion, family, or geography to limit our choice of marital partners . . .” (Ammerman 123)
   5. “. . . we are likely to migrate back and forth across denomina­tional lines throughout the adult lifespan as we make other moves—to new places, new jobs, new marriages. As the range of choice has ex­panded in other areas, religious affiliations have taken on the same volun­tary character.” (Ammerman 123)
   6. “And the inevitable result of all that individual, voluntary movement is a blurring of the denominational lines.” (Ammerman 123)
   7. “Such individual choices might be construed as leading us in the direction of diminished “social sources” of our denominations. . . . [But] social forces are [still] at work. People moving to an urban region are faced with a dizzying array of religious communities . . . They may look for tradi­tional ethnic or denominational or liturgical practices, but they are just as likely to look for a congregation that “fits” them in other ways. At the same time that individuals are looking for a fit, the congregation is seek­ing to establish a recognizable identity in this admittedly competitive religious market. The result of both these processes is that most congrega­tions are recognizable in social terms. They seek a certain identity and attract a certain kind of folk. They vary in ways that the social lives of people vary today.” (Ammerman 123)
      1. “Some are more attuned to the verbal and cultural distinctions created by education.” (Ammerman 123)
      2. “Some assume more of the privileges afforded by high income. . . . in others life is paced by time cards and layoffs.” (Ammerman 123)
      3. “Singles find some congregations especially congenial, while in other congrega­tions “intact” families are the norm.” (Ammerman 123)
      4. “In some congregations, technospeak is the language . . .” (Ammerman 123)
      5. “A few congregations are even identifi­able as places where gays and lesbians can feel at home.” (Ammerman 123)
   8. “Stephen Warner has argued that a de facto congregationalism has be­come pervasive in American religion (Catholic, Jewish, and other, as well as Protestant). These robust congregations, creating a place for themselves and for their members at the local level, have arisen alongside the decline of denomina­tionalism.” (Warner, Stephen. “The Place of the Congregation in the Contemporary American Religious Configuration.” *The Congregation in American Life*, ed. James Wind and James Lewis. Chicago: U of Chicago P, forthcoming.) (Ammerman 132 n. 35)
   9. Variations in “social identifiers” (Ammerman 124) between congregations are “as likely to exist within denominations as between them. Within the field of Baptist or Presbyterian or even Pentecostal churches, there may be rich ones and poor ones, professional ones and blue-collar ones, high-church and low-church, pro-life and pro-choice. Denomina­tional traditions may set some boundaries on the range of variation, but they do not create anything like a sufficient uniformity to override the other identifiers from which people are making their choices.” (Ammerman 123)
   10. Robert Wuthnow has argued that the social identifiers “seem increasingly to be clustering around poles labeled “liberal” and “conservative,” more than around denominational traditions. People who think of themselves as “liberal” Methodists may be more likely to choose the “liberal” Lutheran church in their new city than to go to the “conservative” Methodist one that is nearby.” (No citation. Either: Wuthnow, Robert. *The Struggle for America’s Soul*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1989. Or, more probably: Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restruc­turing of American Religion*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.) (Ammerman 124)
   11. “Dan Olson and William McKinney have found in a survey of denomina­tional leaders that Wuthnow is right about the clustering of attitudes around two key factors—the Social Gospel and evangelism—and that these factors are corre­lated with a number of other attitudes.” (Olson, Dan, and William McKinney. “Restructuring among Protestant Denominational Leaders: The Great Divide and the Great Middle.” Paper presented to a meeting of the American Sociological Association, Cincin­nati, Ohio, 1991.) (Ammerman 132 n. 36)
   12. “Increasing numbers of members never make it into a new congregation once educational or occupational mobility has dislodged them from an old one. . . . the “no-preference” segment is the fastest growing sector in the American reli­gious market. . . . younger, well-educated, urban cosmopolitan adults choose to drop out . . .” (Roof, Wade Clark, and William McKinney. *American Mainline Religion*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1987. 99, 236.) (Ammerman 124)
   13. “Over the last two decades, explaining “the decline of the mainline” has [132] become something of a growth industry among academics and church leaders.” (Ammerman 132-33 n. 38)
       1. Kelley, Dean. *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
       2. Hoge, Dean, and David A. Roozen. *Understanding Church Growth and Decline*, *1950-1978*. New York: Pilgrim, 1979.
       3. Michaelsen, Robert S., and Wade Clark Roof. *Liberal Protestantism*: *Realities and Possibilities*. New York: Pilgrim, 1986.
       4. Coalter, M.J., J.M. Mulder, and L.B. Weeks, eds. *The Mainstream Protestant* “*Decline*”: *The Presbyterian Pattern*. Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1990.
   14. “What has now become apparent at denomina­tional headquarters is that the organizational apparatus once sustained by 10 million members cannot be sustained by 8 million members, espe­cially with today’s high cost of institutional maintenance. Programs and staff are being cut . . .” (Ammerman 124)
   15. “At the same time that the denominational bureaucracies are being weakened from within, they are also facing unprecedented organizational competition from without. Part of the “restructuring” that Wuthnow documents is the growth of “special-purpose” groups within the religious economy. [Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restruc­turing of American Religion*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988. Ch. 6.] Taking on all sorts of religious tasks—from publishing to running missions to lobbying—these groups exist outside the official denominational umbrella. As denominations are less able to provide ser­vices, special-purpose groups are thriving, ready to fill the gap. The strength of one and the weakness of the other are mutually reinforcing.” (Ammerman 124)
   16. “. . . special-purpose groups . . . [are] part of the erosion of our definition of denomination. Their customers may be pre­dominantly Baptist or Methodist, but nothing prevents them from seek­ing sales orders from Presbyterians or Lutherans or even Catholics.” (Ammerman 124)
   17. “At the local congregational level, a parallel organizational variety may be present. The name on the door may be Disciples of Christ, but the Sunday School material may be Kerygma, the missions budget may in­clude Habitat for Humanity and Bread for the World, and the liturgy may borrow heavily from a newsletter published by a group of feminist Bap­tists. The congregation remains connected to its denomination in all the ways it officially must, but it looks to the larger religious community for its full identity, the support of its own sense of mission.” (Ammerman 125)
   18. “Even the official requirements may be renegotiated as ordinations are increasingly recognized across denominational lines.” (Ammerman 125)
   19. “What may remain as the sole de facto link between local congregation and denomination is money. In the most concrete of terms, if the congregation refuses to give (or, less likely, if the denomination refuses to accept the congregation’s gifts), the con­gregation has left the denominational fold. Short of that, it may deviate and have alternative allegiances on a host of other matters of policy and practice.” (Ammerman 125)
   20. “. . . these transdenominational elements in the prac­tice of a local congregation [may include] liturgical and Christian Education and missions programs . . . [from] nondenominational sources . . .” (Ammerman 125)
   21. “Similar links to nondenominational education and mis­sion agencies have held the fundamentalist network together for most of this century. [Ammerman, Nancy. *Bible Believers*: *Fundamentalists in the Modern World*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1987. 114-19.] When fundamentalists moved from one town to another, they were able to find another “Bible believing” church, without the aid of denominational labels, mostly by looking for programmatic and liturgi­cal clues. I have argued that this loosely linked, entrepreneurial organiza­tional strategy was part of the fundamentalist refusal to accept the rational/legal, bureaucratic terms dictated by “modernity” Ironically, other groups that long ago accepted modern organizational imperatives are now moving in postmodern fashion toward structures that look rather like what fundamentalists have been using all along.” (Ammerman 125)
       1. “The irony of this is particularly uncomfortable for Southern Baptist mod­erates who worshipped their centralized “Cooperative Program” for most of this century. As they now establish special-purpose groups, they are visibly eating crow. Meanwhile, fundamentalists who always condemned bureaucracy are hav­ing to develop rationales for running one.” (Ammerman 133 n. 42)
       2. “This latter tension is explored in” Norsworthy, David Ray. “Rationalization and Reaction Among Southern Baptists.” In Ammerman, Nancy T., ed. *Southern Baptists Observed*: *Multiple Perspectives on a Changing Denomina­tion*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1993. (Ammerman 133 n. 42)
   22. “The nondenominational market is too far-flung (and by definition too decentralized) to ever achieve the kind of local predictability once achieved in centralized, denomination-based programming. But, as Wuth­now warns, there is enough clustering around the liberal and conserva­tive poles to make it unlikely that congregations will mix elements from those two clusters. You would be surprised to hear, for instance, that a church used David C. Cook literature and took its liturgical inspiration [125] from feminists; it is possible, but surprising. I am not so convinced that the clustering is as rigid as Wuthnow fears. There is simply too much ground in the middle and too many hard-to-classify organizations.” (Ammerman 125-26)
   23. “I am convinced, however, that the restructuring now under way will see new relationships evolve among denominations, their state and local constituent units, and the special-purpose groups to which each may be tied. We may find in coming years that denominational headquarters have become (if they have not always been) merely one location on a complex organizational map that includes other affiliated associations, formal and informal networks of communication, links to various suppliers of ideas and services, and even the interpersonal environment in which denomina­tional identity is defined and passed along. [Stewart Clegg devel­oped this “model of the organizational environment”: Clegg, Stewart. *Modern Organizations*: *Organization Studies in the Postmodern World*. London: Sage, 1990. Ammerman 133 n. 43] We may discover again, for instance, just how important families and friendships have been all along in creating and sustaining religious identities. It is probably no accident that “mental members” still seem to seek out churches for significant rites of passage in their lives. [Hadaway, Kirk. “Denominational Defection: Recent Research on Religious Disaffiliation in America.” *The Mainstream Protestant* “*Decline*”: *The Presbyterian Pattern*, ed. M.J. Coalter, J.M. Mulder, and L.B. Weeks. Louisville: Westminster-John Knox, 1990.] Cultural identity, beliefs and practices, and organizational forms are intertwined in complex ways among these occa­sional participants.” (Ammerman 126)
   24. “The Southern Baptists may be merely the most visible and dramatic case of the re-creation of the denominational organizational environ­ment.” (Ammerman 126)
       1. “Marcia Hood-Brown and Robert Liebman have demonstrated that the kind of religious diversity that has always characterized Protestantism results in a variety of organizational innovations that only sometimes become true schisms. Without enough centralization in the SBC to enforce conformity and so long as the CBF does not insist on an exclusive counterorthodoxy, no schism is likely. They see the CBF remaining a special purpose group within the SBC. See their “Paths to Schism: Orthodoxy, Polity, and Dissent in American Protestantism” (Pa­per presented to a meeting of the American Sociological Association, Cincinnati Ohio, 1991). Given greater exercise of central control (which the new fundamen­talist SBC leaders seem inclined toward) and their own concern for orthodoxy, the CBF may yet, however, be forced out (the pattern they term “purge”).” (Ammerman 133 n. 45)
       2. “As those of us in the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship (one of the alternative groups being formed by moderates in the sbc) seek to create new ways of cooperating, we will also be creating new ways to answer the question, “Are you a denomination?” I have begun to describe our organizational model as more like a spider web than like a pyramid: composed of complex linkages, functional, fragile, but easy to recon­struct in ever-changing ways. [“Share My Dreams for Cooperative Fellowship,” *Baptists Today* 10 (23 April 1992) 2.] We can be linked on some sides with the Southern Baptist Convention, but also linked with other Baptist bodies and with a variety of institutions not necessarily linked only to us.” (Ammerman 126)
   25. “The question of denominational identity, then, is a live one at both the cultural and the organizational levels. It is also alive as a theological ques­tion. On one hand, seminaries have never stopped teaching aspiring pas­tors the essential dogmas of their particular tradition. Methodists know about the quadrilateral, and Presbyterians know about Calvin. But on the other hand, a profound distrust of denomination-based theology has pre­vailed in the academy for most of this century. While Tillich may be the favorite among many Methodists and Barth among many Presbyterians and Baptists, neither of those theologians did his work from within those tradi­tions. As we have pushed toward the goal of a universalized Christian theology, we have consciously left behind the particular denominational traditions that were seen as unnecessary divisions among us.” (Ammerman 126)
       1. “Some, indeed are calling for a renewal of theological bases for identity-core beliefs and practices that can shape an enduring denominational community.” (Ammerman 133 n. 47)
       2. Farley, Edward. “The Presbyterian Heritage as Modernism: Reaffirming a Forgotten Past in Hard Times.” *The Presbyte­rian Predicament*: *Six Perspectives*, ed. M.J. Coalter, J.M. Mulder, and L.B. Weeks. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
       3. Johnson, Benton. “On Dropping the Subject: Presbyterians and Sabbath Observance in the Twentieth Century.” *The Presbyte­rian Predicament*: *Six Perspectives*, ed. M.J. Coalter, J.M. Mulder, and L.B. Weeks. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
   26. “That leaves the historian of ideas, the person searching for the theo­logical or intellectual thread that runs through a denomination’s history, with an unclear task. As theologians themselves have increasingly shed their denominational identity, how does one trace out an ideological picture with any distinct boundaries? When does the story of one denomi­nation’s [126] evolving ideas and practices simply merge with some larger whole? If we have depended on theologians and preachers as our primary reporters of a denomination’s beliefs and practices, we may have rather unreliable reports for much of this century. On any given Sunday, it might be very difficult to tell the sermons of a Presbyterian from those of a Baptist or a Methodist or a Lutheran. If theologians have written and preachers have preached as if their audience were a church universal, then their accounts give us little insight into the particularistic worlds of congregations and denominations. We may have to look elsewhere for insights into those particular traditions—perhaps to more popular reli­gious literature or to the reports of laity and clergy who do claim their traditions.” (Ammerman 126-27)
5. **conclusions**
   1. “It seems such a commonsense task, this writing of denominational histo­ries. But”: (Ammerman 127)
      1. denominational boundaries “become less clear as denominations’ theo­logical traditions shift and merge”
      2. “organiza­tional structures give way to loose networks of denominational and nondenominational agencies”
      3. “cultural identities blur under the pressure of increasing mobility”
   2. If we decide “an agency or congregation or idea or person is Presbyterian, on what are we basing that assumption?” (Ammerman 127)
      1. “organizational criteria”?
      2. “theological criteria”?
      3. cultural elements?
   3. Our “assumptions are historically lo­cated and currently under stress.” (Ammerman 127)
   4. “When do changes in theology affect the organizational structure or the way the denomination is identified in the [127] culture? Or when do changes in organizational program affect real changes in practice and identity? If theologians or bureaucrats proclaim a change, does that really mean that practices and perceptions change? While we can make no assumptions about connections between levels, we can also ill afford to ignore those possibilities.” (Ammerman 127-28)
   5. “As the meanings of each of these aspects of denominational life shift, it may be a very opportune moment for reassessing just what denomina­tional labels have meant for these last five centuries. Whenever we are entering a new era, we always seek guidance from a fresh reading of our history. A new look at distinct denominational beliefs and practices, par­ticular denominational organizations, and recognizable denominational identities may help us now to see our way forward.” (Ammerman 128)

## Morphology of American Denominations

Richey, Russell E. “Denominations and Denominationalism: An American Morphology.” In Mullin, Robert Bruce, and Russell E. Richey, eds. *Reimagining Denominationalism*: *Interpretative Essays*. New York: OUP, 1994. 74-98.

Of late, both denominational leaders and the academics who study the religious landscape have pondered the poor health of and the future prospects for mainline denominations and denominationalism. The leaders, desperate for antidotes to staunch membership losses and financial reversals, grasp for diagnoses and cures.1 For their part, scholars wonder whether American denominations and denominationalism are actually breaking up.2 They see signs thereof in the massive losses suffered by mainstream Protestantism; the alienation of members and congregations from national leadership; resultant diversion of resources away from denominational coffers into local and regional projects; the growing division within denominations between liberals and evangelicals (and the persisting division between white and black); the emergence of quasi-independent caucuses and struggle groups, each bent on pressing its agenda and capturing power; and the muting of mainstream Protestant denominations’ public voice and/or its eclipse in American society by evangelical and non-Protestant voices. Denominations, at least in their mainsteam [*sic*] Protestant form, seem to have lost their directions.3 Such disorientation and cataclysmic change have sufficiently worried the Lilly Endowment that it has invested millions in projects such as the conference from which these papers issue in an effort to understand and to describe mainstream American religion. The resultant enquiries, including particularly the major studies of the Disciples of Christ and of Presbyterianism,4 help us appreciate the nature and the extent of the change in mainstream Protestantism.

This essay suggests that radical change is not a new experience, [74] either for denominations or for the collectivity that we call denominationalism. Both the form (denomination) and the family (denominationalism) have changed, evolved over time, metamorphosed.5 That individual confessions have changed dramatically over the years the serious student of history should concede. Less obvious, perhaps, is the equally drastic change in the ecology within which denominations functioned, both the larger organizational ecology of American society and the more immediate ecology comprising other denominations and religious institutions. The change in the latter has gone unremarked, perhaps because the topic itself is disdained; indeed, of late the term denominationalism has been such slur that the serious scholar has been above treating it or has found a less opprobrious rubric under which to attend to the dynamics of American religious institutions. For such analyses, scholars prefer religious freedom, voluntarism, pluralism,6 and, recently, the independent sector.7

Definitions

Such terms, however, do not readily indicate that the American denominational world has possessed, in any given epoch, fairly clear boundaries; that certain groups belonged and others really did not; that denominationalism functioned as the form of the current religious mainstream; that denominations had, again for each period, a recognizable shape such that individual denominations of quite different polities and theologies resembled one another; in short, that the denominational definition was period-specific. Within and in relation to this larger denominational universe, the individual denomination defined itself and functioned, as also in their respective realms did both political party and business enterprise. And denominations of a given period resembled one another more than they did their own confessional ancestors or progeny. Hence the constellation of denominations, no less than the individual denomination, has taken different forms, redefined what denomination means, renegotiated boundaries. For want of a better term we will call that constellation *denominationalism* and will here attempt to sketch its development. Whether such division of Christians is, in ethical or eternal perspective, a good thing will not concern us here. That is quite a legitimate concern but not one that should prevent us also from giving serious attention to the history of Protestant institutions.8

Denominationalism presents the denomination as a voluntaristic ecclesial body.9 It is *voluntary* and therefore presupposes a condition of legal or de facto toleration and religious freedom—an environment within which it is possible, in fact, willingly to join or not join and that provides “space” to exist alongside or outside of any religious establishment. The denomination exists in a situation of religious pluralism, typically a pluralism of denominations. It is *ecclesial*, a movement or body understanding itself to be legitimate and self-sufficient, a proper “church” [75] (or religious movement. [*sic*])10 It is *a* voluntary church, a body that concedes the authenticity of other churches even as it claims its own.11 It need not, however, concede that authenticity indiscriminately; it need not, and typically does not, regard all other denominations as orthodox. And it is an ecclesial *body* or *form*, an organized religious movement, with intentions and the capacity for self-perpetuation, with a sense of itself as located within time and with awareness of its relation to the longer Christian tradition.12 It knows itself as denominated, as named, as recognized and recognizable, as having boundaries, as possessing adherents, as having a history In these several regards, the denomination differentiates itself from reform impulses that may take similar structural form but construe themselves as belonging within;13 from the church that does not regard itself as voluntary or as sharing societal space with other legitimate religious bodies; from the sect, which, although also voluntary, does not locate itself easily in time or recognize boundaries or tolerate other bodies or concede their authenticity.

The term *denomination* and, if Winthrop Hudson is correct, the theory antedate the phenomenon itself.14 The term was used initially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to identify religious postures that could be identified and hence named, such as Arminians. The theory derived from the ecclesiology of the Congregationalists or Independents, a view of the church as institutionalizing itself plurally (and locally) but not in separation or schism, as distinct but not schismatic.

Denominationalism, on the other hand, is a term of more recent vintage, considerably postdating the phenomenon itself. It now functions to describe both denominational theory and the resultant condition or situation of institutionalized division. The accent, particularly in theological and ecumenical hands, tends to fall on the latter part of the definition—“institutionalized division”—and seemingly requires no further comment. While not ignoring division, we will attend here to the condition or situation and its (often implicit) theory. Our argument is that, like democracy or capitalism, denominationalism persists as a complex of theory and practice, of process and form, and has taken very different complexions over its life. Indeed, one feature of denominational complexion has been its relationship with society, commerce, and the state, the “face” that the denominations presented to the culture within which they functioned.

Denominations as we know them may well be breaking up. If so, it need not mean the end to the religious movements now denominated, many of which (for example, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Mennonites, Baptists, Congregationalists) had a predenominational ecclesial existence and have no reason to confuse their essence with its current denominational expression. Denomination­alism is a relatively recent phenomenon and may have outlived its usefulness. It may, on the other hand, be simply going through another of its metamorphoses. [76]

The Stages of American Denominationalism

Five American denominational styles or stages can be discerned, each representing something of an ideal type, a predominant trend in the rich texture of American institutionalism, an expressive style of organization.15 The first, ethnic voluntarism or provincial voluntarism, characterized movements in the religiously pluralistic middle colonies of the eighteenth century, with Presbyterians serving as the best example. The second, purposive missionary association, emerged in the early national period, the form fabricated by Methodists and Baptists and the theory worked out by the Reformed. The third, “churchly” style qualified the second, rather than transforming it fully. It flourished after the Civil War, drew some inspiration from Romantic currents, derived impetus from massive immigration and resulting competition, and took expressive form in both high-church and primitivist movements (Episcopal, Lutheran, Landmark Baptist, Christian).

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, corporate or managerial organization, the fourth stage, swept virtually the entire Protestant mainstream, producing the structures of denominational organization familiar today. The fifth style, perhaps like the third qualifying rather than displacing its immediate predecessor, emerged in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. Dyk­stra compares it with its secular counterpart, the regulatory agency. We prefer to see it as combining a number of contemporary cultural forms—the franchise, the regulatory agency, the caucus, the mall, the media.

As the last example should suggest, each style partook of organizational materials of its day. The denomination did not simply derive itself from secular institutions.16 In several of the periods, religious groups took organizational initiative; Protestants experimented with methods, principles of order, and organizational forms that would find their uses also in political or economic life. This typology, then, does call attention to social origin and social uses of organization. Indeed, it posits that denominationalism served primarily to define the relation of religious movement to the social order. Each type or style functioned with a distinctive vision of American society and of Protestant responsibility therein. Implicitly, the styles delineated rules for, if not a genuine theory of, denominational collaboration or relation. The differences in denominational relations in the several periods are, in part, responsible for the quite contrary judgments that interpreters have rendered about denominationalism—some viewing it as inherently competitive and combative, others noting unitive and cooperative features.

The typology also focuses on the adhesive principle, the commitments, ideals, or purposes that held each religious movement together. This adhesive, too, has differed markedly in different periods. The typology does, however, exaggerate the differences. It isolates the new [77] adhesive principle for each period and, in so doing, obscures the inertia of styles from earlier period(s); as a result, the typology needs to be qualified with the recognition that earlier styles and their adhesive principles continue to live on in later periods; ethnic voluntarism resurfaces to haunt the Presbyterians, and Methodists revert jeremiadically to purposive missionary association. In the present, then, all five types or styles can be detected, in some instances all within a single denomination.

The typology functions, as do typologies generally, to isolate features for purposes of analysis and interpretation. This one serves especially to highlight the dynamic principles internal to the individual denominations, the rules of interdenominational interaction, and the goals they shared vis-à-vis the social order. It is designed for historical uses, to identify for each period the new or predominant denominational style. It does not pretend to embrace the full range of religious institutions, as do sociological typologies. Outside or beyond its purview lie church, sect, and cult structures.17 Nor is it intended to array churches in terms of their own ecclesial self-understanding.18 Rather, this typology focusses on “life and work,” not “faith and order.” It should, however, serve to indicate that both denominations and denominationalism change.

Ethnic Voluntarism and Its Background

Behind the emergence of the first denominational style lie several centuries of European and especially Anglo-Saxon struggles over church order and its uniformity. In the immediate foreground, the Glorious Revolution and the Toleration Act loom especially large as creating actual legal and societal space for loyal but dissenting religious bodies. In England, this space was occupied by the “three old denominations,” Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist, with Quakers eventually also finding room. By occupying that space, even under what seemed imperfect indulgence, these groups participated in turning the concession of toleration into an ideal, a principle, a theory or theology of the church, a view of ecclesial legitimacy. They borrowed the ideas and metaphors for what would become a denominational theory from various parties, including, as Hudson has suggested, the Independents but surely also the Whigs or liberals and probably also that inchoate population that called itself “catholic” Protestants19 and certainly also the Quakers. At any rate, tolerated denominations, and they called themselves that, found greater toleration in England than did their counterparts in the colonies. Law, practice, and advocacy would eventually extend the right of toleration to the colonies; Quaker toleration extended over much of the area where denominationalism first succeeded.

In the deeper background belong the Puritan movements, which contributed in a variety of ways to the emerging American denominational pattern. First, the efforts to purify the Church of England generated the several aforementioned movements that would imprint themselves [78] deliberately, fully, successfully on the American landscape. Both Congregationalists and Baptists functioned with ecclesiologies that made every local body, every institutionalization, in principle authentic and self-sufficient, a legitimation that would over time have infectious power. So, first, Puritanism contributed to the actual plurality of groups and generated principles of ecclesial legitimacy under colonial conditions.20 Second, the Puritan movements functioned, as did other impulses with Reformed origins, with an imperative for godly order and the eschatological urgency to get the form of the church right.21 In its initial expression, this passion for order was quite intolerant and the very antithesis of the denominational tolerant, branch theory of the church. But the premium put on structure and order would, like so much of Puritanism, have value in transmuted, noneschatological form, in this case as preoccupation with constitution and polity. So, second, Puritanism contributed to American denominationalism the Reformed concern for order, law, and structure. A third, related indebtedness to Puritanism was just this sense of the larger, even eschatological context within which the church undertook its ordering. Polity, important though it was, served larger ends—the renovation of society and world and service for the true church, which remained invisible. Fourth and again related were covenantal views, Puritan public theology and its penchant for careful attention to the relation of civil and ecclesiastical realms, a contribution that would loom larger in the second stage of denominationalism than in the first.

The process by which the ideal of toleration, the several principles of order, and the various notions of ecclesial legitimacy were turned into the fabric of denominationalism (the first stage) was the religious turmoil historians know as the First Great Awakening. This process carried itself through most completely in the Middle Colonies, where Dutch Reformed, Quaker, Scots Presbyterian, Baptists, Anglicans, transplanted New England Congregationalists, and German-speaking peoples of various persuasions (Dunkers, Lutherans, Reformed, Moravians, Schwenckfelders, Mennonites) sought space, identity, and community.22 Many found their fulfillment in processes that would be known as revivals—spiritual struggles through which strangers became “brothers” and “sisters” (religious family), moral anarchy became discipline, social cacophony became congregation.23 Its methods of conversion, the testing of one another’s religious experience and commitment to a common walk and each other, produced both revival and religious community. And once emergent, the individual communities of Presbyterians or Lutherans sought support from one another and from appropriate European authorities. Out of those relatively spontaneous struggles came modest denominational structures, associations of congregations and of leaders. Typically understanding themselves as under the authority of some home country judicatory, these associations nevertheless found themselves to be quasi-independent and forced by the sheer distance to resolve problems, adjudicate moral and theological disputes, and identify, train, and authenticate leadership. [79]

Such communities delineated themselves sociologically in one way and theologically in quite another. These denominations and the communities that made them up typically drew together persons on some basis of affinity—national origin, language, prior involvement with that religious group, theological posture. Ethnicity defined actual community.24 However, denominations affirmed their new unity and proclaimed their purposes in eschatological terms, viewing the conversions and revivals that had brought them into being as putting them center stage in God’s dramatic work for the redemption of humanity.25

In this first stage, denominations talked about themselves in grandiose terms but actually focused inward. Cohesion depended upon consent, the acceptance of the authority exercised, the support of laity. These were voluntary communities that might mete out discipline roughly or establish rigid clerical patterns but that required communal assent even in such coercion.26 Associations concerned themselves with problem solving—ministerial supply and credentials, hymnals and service books, catechism, discipline, and the like. Mission or evangelization typically honored ethnic boundaries. And most bodies, even including the Presbyterians at this point, operated with little in the way of a public theology or policy. The notable exceptions to this rule were the established bodies, Congregationalists in New England and Anglicans particularly in the South, neither of whom, in areas where they were established, functioned in this denominational fashion.27 Indeed, insofar as the denominational pattern evidenced itself in New England and the South, it did so in dissenters against these establishments—Separates and Baptists in New England, Presbyterians and Baptists in the South. Denominationalism at this period was an ethnic voluntarism. Since virtually all of the denominations understood themselves to be ultimately under European authority,28 this denominationalism was provincial and, in a sense, provisional, bound confessionally to Halle, Amsterdam, London, Berlin, or Edinburgh and to those colonial peoples who accepted that confession. Denominations initially adhered as ethnic communities; denominationalism was ethnic voluntarism.

Purposive Missionary Association

The second stage of denominationalism is the one most frequently described and is presented as its norm.29 It emerged in the national period as the several denominations, recently themselves independent, established new joint purposes in and specifically in relation to the new American society. The new style and theory of denominationalism derived from many hands; indeed, the various religious bodies all played their part. Of special note, however, were the Reformed traditions,30 particularly the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians, who drew on Scottish moral philosophy, the rubrics of republicanism, and the deeper Reformed tradition, including especially the elements outlined above, to elaborate a public theology and to define collective denominational purposes in [80] terms thereof. Speaking in providential, at times eschatological, language, the Reformed applied covenantal imagery to the nation, tied both civil and religious well-being to a society appropriately ordered, began the invention of societies and structures through which order might be established, and summoned their constituencies to action with notes of concern, alarm, even paranoia.31

Such histrionics have, at times, been credited with motivating the Second Great Awakening. A more plausible influence, and one that indeed motivated both revivals and denominationalism, came in the evangelistic efforts of Baptists, Methodists, and Christians (Restorationists).32 Drawing on diverse strands of Pietism, these popular movements pursued adherents, requiring only, as the Methodists put it, “a desire to flee the wrath to come.” This missionary impulse and self-understanding, initially illustrated in the efforts of Shubal Stearns in my area of North Carolina, broke denominations free of the ethnic constraints of voluntarism and offered them, in principle, the entire American society and all its peoples. To be sure, denominations proved, in practice, to be more selective, and they, in fact, employed various class, ethnic, regional, language, and racial screens. Race-specific (African Methodist and Baptist) and language-specific (German and Scandinavian Lutheran particularly) denominations, in fact, emerged very early in this period. But denominations nevertheless saw the nation and eventually the world as their horizon and their domain. The older boundaries of parish, of ethnicity, of confession, they ignored, indeed, violated. The presumption in such attitudes and behavior, the intrusion on one an-other’s turf, the audacity to think one authorized to Christianize the already Christian, offended religious bodies with traditional notions of parish and ministerial authority, particularly offending the established Congregationalists and Anglicans. The popular movements responded by pressing for greater religious freedom, collaborating in that cause with other enemies to establishments. And they persisted in the expansive, aggressive, competitive, entrepreneurial, expressive boosterism that thereafter would be the business of religion and, for that matter, of America. This style accented initiative, risk taking, mobility, openness, experimentation, vernacular idioms, popular expression—traits that Baptists, Methodists, and Christians both espoused and institutionalized.

These denominations functioned, as Nathan Hatch has observed, as a powerful democratizing and creative force.33 The creativity and the obvious results in such missionary enterprise captivated the more established denominational bodies, notably Presbyterians and Congregationalists, who embraced but redirected this institutionally creative energy. They oriented purposive association towards the building of a Christian America. This coalescence of mission and covenant produced purposive missionary denominationalism. Reformed public theology and missionary pietism unleashed an incredible institution-building effort. Some of that effort channeled itself into the denominations themselves, which adapted [81] the modest associational structures for national ministerial deployment and governance. Much of it went into voluntary societies, which could be erected for whatever the urgent cause, which drew together supporters and workers from various traditions, and which collaborated loosely with one another and with the denominations. Eventually, much of the agenda of the voluntary societies, and some of their structure, would be internalized by the denominations, creating within agencies devoted to missions Sunday schools, tracts, Bible, temperance, colonization—a process not without much trauma and ecclesiastical soul-searching. Purposive missionary association created new institutions and new procedures faster than formal theologies and ecclesiastical polities could adjust. The adjustment crisis would yield the third style of denominationalism.

Churchly Denominationalism

Purposive missionary association did indeed pose crises for movements that, for whatever reason, objected to or were objected to by this increasingly dominant denominational style. R. Laurence Moore calls our attention to the religious outsiders in American history, the self-consciousness with which groups claimed that status, the creativity such self-consciousness elicited, and the ironic way in which outsider status functioned to establish both group and American identity.34 While the popular movements—Methodists, Baptists, and Christians—initially viewed themselves and were viewed as outsiders, they did participate in expanding and defining what would be the new norm of missionary denominationalism. That new norm turned old insiders, some of the established churches of Europe, into outsiders. It created great difficulty for Episcopalians, Lutherans, and some of the Reformed who valued their churchly, sacramental, and catechetical traditions, and even greater difficulty for what Robert Baird termed “non-evangelical bodies,” including Catholics, Jews, Unitarians, and Mormons.35 Such groups found themselves repelled by missionary denominationalism and at the same time impelled to adopt some of its measures for sheer survival.36 This accommodation produced unease among leadership conscious of the normative expressions and forms of their faith. Such unease took eloquent expression in the Mercersburg theology; the two major theologians of the German Reformed seminary at Mercersburg, Philip Schaff and John W. Nevin, issued trenchant criticisms of revivalism, the anxious bench, and the whole “methodistical” scheme—in short, purposive denominationalism—and called the Reformed back to the hallmarks of their tradition. Charles Philip Krauth performed similar service for Lutherans and John Henry Hobart and Calvin Colton for Episcopalians. Inspired by Romanticism, an appreciation for the richness of tradition, the nuances of the confession, the value of the catechism, and the importance of one’s own ecclesial identity, such criticisms, voiced in the 1840s and 1850s, heralded a new denominational style.37 Nonliturgical movements [82] reclaimed a more exclusive sense of church by appeal to non-Romantic versions of tradition. Important and illustrative was the Landmark movement led by J.R. Graves. It also discerned its own apostolic succession that distinguished it from all other religious bodies and warranted critical distance from the expansive, open, cooperative missionary association of the early nineteenth century It opted instead for localism and close communion.

Paralleling this self-conscious confessionalism and producing a revived quasi-confessionalism across American religion were divisive developments within the purposive missionary denominations, specifically, the reemergence of the issue of slavery. Abolition proved the most explosive of a series of “ultraisms” that exposed the fault line in purposive association, namely, that, like another invention of that day, the railroads, denominations and voluntary societies could gather great momentum along their tracks, but a new direction, a new issue, particularly one that exposed profound differences among the travelers (that is, within the membership), could derail and crash the whole train. That, in fact, occurred, beginning with the division of the Presbyterians in 1837, followed by divisions of Baptists and Methodists in the 1840s.38 Each of these controversies exposed vital unresolved issues in purposive missionary organization—its underlying quasi-Arminian theology; the power conveyed to voluntary, often cooperative organizations, which acted on denominational behalf but not under formal, judicatory authority; the appropriateness of cooperative or interdenominational ventures; the theological accountability of parts of the church to one another; the level or office within which ultimate authority was to be vested; the relation of missions and missionary efforts to regular judicatories; the right of denominational officials and media to suppress controversy and dissent. Whether such ecclesiastical issues or slavery divided the churches, historians debate and will doubtless continue to debate. What needs to be affirmed here is that slavery exposed important ecclesiastical issues and that after the divisions, if not before, each of the sectional churches found it important to construe its purposes in theological and ecclesiastical terms. So Old and New Schools, the Wesleyans, and both northern and southern Baptists and Methodists emerged from their respective division intensely committed to and defining themselves in terms of certain ecclesiological principles. A new quasi-confessionalism, then, derived from the slavery and sectional crises, from the divisions, and intensified itself greatly during and after the Civil War, especially in the border states and in other places of overlap, as the churches fought each other altar to altar, laid blame on one another for the war, waved the bloody flag, and proclaimed themselves the true sons of the founder (Wesley, Calvin).

In the northern churches, this heightened churchly emphasis embraced the covenantal, providential, and millennial Christian American themes, actually accenting them. The northern churches typically made loyalty to the Union almost a creedal test. The southern churches [83] reworked their civil religion into a religion of the lost cause, espoused the spirituality of the church, repudiated northern political activism, and so put denominationalism into a cultural rather than a political or a national context.39 Eventually, northern denominationalism also gathered stronger cultural accents as, toward the end of the century, a trans-Atlantic Anglo-Saxonism swept over both regions. The denominations increasingly construed the furthering of a Christian culture as their evangelical and shared mission,40 a purpose readily embraced as well by churches not divided by slavery and less embroiled by sectional factors. Culture, then, served to unite denominations in common cause but also reinforced the churchly emphasis or quasi-confessional­ism by inviting attention to roots, to the tradition.

Also reinforcing theological and cultural impulses to heightened inward-facing denominationalism were the trans-Atlantic initiatives in forming denominational fellowships—Lambeth Conference (1867), World Presbyterian Alliance (1877), Methodist Ecumenical Conference (1881), and International Congregational Council (1891). A Baptist World Conference was mooted earlier but not held until 1905.41 These too encouraged denominations to think about themselves. And so the latter half of the century witnessed an increased denominational consciousness, as each denomination attended to itself. The churches focused on issues of polity, of improved governance, of the structures for mission. They elaborated new youth and men’s organizations, worried over the relation of women’s missionary structures to those of the denomination, improved Sunday schools and Sunday school literature, packaged model plans for church buildings, erected new buildings at a frenzied pace, put up elaborate congregational educational wings, and refined the grammer [*sic*] of denominational life. Culture in denominations and denominational culture prospered. Such efforts would pave the way for the development of the fourth style of denominationalism, corporate organization, but in this third stage the accent fell on denominational culture, rather than on business culture. So denominations put renewed efforts into making their colleges more explicitly Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Congregational.42 New systematic theologies appeared, and denominational and seminary journals flourished. The churches endeavored to get their own houses in order presuming, to be sure, that their efforts served the building of a Christian civilization. And the evangelical or mainstream denominations continued to collaborate, participating in the Evangelical Alliance and in various common educational and missional projects. But the emphasis fell on caring for internal matters.

Corporate Organization

In the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, the denominations continued to work on matters of internal structure. Indeed, they [84] intensified those efforts, but did so as a way of gearing up for even more intensified expansion, mission (abroad), reform of American society, and cooperation. Churches shouldered “the white man’s burden” and transformed ongoing missions into imperial enterprise, albeit in the name of ideals—the gospel, civilization, democracy, health, decency, free enterprise.43 Denominationalism became once again instrumental; denominational attention focused outward. The effective building of this Christian civilization required, so realized the leaders (and especially lay leaders, who increasingly played national roles), the application to themselves and to their work of the procedures, techniques, and structures of the then emerging corporate world. “A managerial revolution”44 in consequence swept the major denominations.

It was undertaken in solution of vexing and important problems, a point now lost on the many critics of denominational bureaucracy. Purposive voluntarism and confessionalism had generated within denominations a complex of essentially voluntary societies, typically run rather independently by an executive secretary. This single person, perhaps with a very small staff, might oversee, as in the case of denominational and women’s missions, an army of employees across the world. Counterparts supervised publications, education, Freedman’s aid, Sunday schools and Sunday school literature, church extension, home missions, and temperance activities. Each agency secretary pushed his or her own agenda, developed this agency’s particular constituency, raised money by separate appeals to congregations, negotiated relations with regional judicatories, and dealt with the formal authority structure of the denomination. Seemingly uncooperative, unchecked, competitive, free enterprise ruled within denominations, as, of course, between and among them. And the embarrassment and chaos at home was magnified in the mission field, where a denomination competed with itself and, of course, with other Christian bodies.

Out of such embarrassment and an appreciation of needed cooperation would emerge the modern ecumenical movement. Some of the same dynamics fed progressivism and the Social Gospel and also professionalization. These larger currents informed the bureaucratization of Protestant denominations, which addressed the duplication, competition, and inefficiency of effort but did so in the interest of ideals—missions, reform, order, unity—and in the recognition that the existing system posed knotty theological, particularly ecclesiological, issues. One of the most vexing ones, appreciated by the Old School Presbyterians earlier in the century, actually at the threshold of the third stage, had to do with the society’s or the agency’s relation and accountability to formal denominational authority. Enunciated by the cry “The denomination is itself a missionary society” and in protest against Presbyterian investment in interdenominational societies, this concern had eventuated in the establishment of missionary and benevolent societies within denominations, thus achieving a level of accountability.

By the end of the century, the growth and multiplication of these [85] intradenominational structures made the once external problem an internal one.45 Were the agencies really accountable to the denomination’s national assembly, council, convention, or conference? Were these powerful societies through which the denomination did much of its business subject to the denomination’s formal authority structure? If so, through what mechanisms? And did such accountability involve coordination between and among the various agencies? And could it also bring into some order the then disparate appeals that agencies made to individual congregations for money, purchase, sponsorship, or whatever?

Denominations answered such questions with the managerial revolution—staffing agencies with professionals; encouraging specialization and relying on expertise; increasing staff; resorting to systematic finance; appointing denominational boards to govern the agencies; elaborating procedures and structures for coordination and collaboration among the agencies and between agencies and local churches; prescribing an organizational grammar so that every level of the church, from congregation to state to regional to national, structured itself with the same bodies, with the same names; consequently centering the denomination nationally through bureaucracy. The efficiency transformation did not happen overnight;46 it built on developments from earlier periods and continued throughout the twentieth century, indeed, continues today, drawing on current business fads.

Simultaneous with their corporate restructuring, denominations addressed other partially related developments—professionalization of the clergy, allowance for significant lay participation, (partial) desegregation, and admission of women into governing and clergy roles. These developments interplayed in very complex fashion. For instance, the initial phases of bureaucratization and lay empowerment were clearly taken at the expense (among others) of women, who saw their own organizations brought under (male) denominational control, a control now to include lay participation (but not initially of women). Similarly, the centering of denominational business in national boards seems to have permitted the regional judicatory—presbytery, conference, diocese—to assume much of the role of a professional organization for clergy.47 At a later stage, integration brought significant numbers of blacks and other minorities to board and agency positions but, in so doing, apparently drained much needed leadership from local churches and regional judicatories.

Each of these developments, like bureaucratization, represented an effort on the part of the churches to reform, and each brought the churches into engagement with the larger societal dynamics of differentiation, secularization, and modernization. The embrace of such trends constituted an aspect of the liberal Protestant agenda.48 This modernization, through self-conscious appropriation of culture, elicited vehement protests, denominational divisions, and the elaboration of a counterdenominational style and culture, one initially normed against modernism and modernization.49 Beginning in protest against the ideas and the [86] institutions of modernity, fundamentalism and evangelicalism elaborated a vast new array of institutions, some patterned on older Protestant forms, some borrowing the most recent technology.50 By the end of the twentieth century, this new denominational culture had begun in significant ways to enter the public forum and was doing so just as the older denominationalism was showing clear signs of fatigue.

Postdenominational Confessionalism

The four denominational styles described thus far have been named for their adhesive and dynamic principles. So, appearances to the contrary, has this stage. The name “Postdenominational Confessionalism” is intended to suggest that denominations have lost or are losing long-familiar adhesive and dynamic principles and are groping, often desperately, for tactics that work and unite.

The most profound factor in explaining both present-day so-called mainstream Protestantism and the emergence in the public sphere51 of the conservative denominations is what Robert Handy terms “the second disestablishment,” which he locates between the world wars.52 That displacement of Protestant denominations from cultural hegemony has, in fact, robbed them of what had been the larger end or purpose that denominationalism served, namely, the building of a Christian society, and made adhesion itself problematic. To put the matter bluntly (and with perhaps some exaggeration), mainstream denominationalism now lacks a credible adhesive and dynamic principle.

Its once-constitutive Christianizing purpose now has been grasped by the evangelical denominations and the transdenominational conservative para-organizations. They contend with or sidestep one of the disestablishing forces—pluralism—by transforming “Christian America” into a set of specific moral campaigns—abortion, school prayer, homosexuality—on which they can make common cause with Roman Catholic, Mormon, and even, at times, Jewish groups. Their denominationalism prospered within a cold war ethos, the shooting cold war that made a conservative moral vision an antidote to communism and the shouting cold war that put conservative rhetoric to use against what they considered the bleeding-heart liberals in church and state. Within that ethos, conservatives and evangelicals erected seminaries, effective publishing enterprises, radio and television ministries, large missionary forces, Christian schools and colleges, megacongregations, and various formal and informal associations—in short, a new denominationalism and a new voluntarism clearly serviceable to a cold war and increasingly appreciated for that service. With the Carter and Reagan presidencies, evangelical denominationalism came into respectability and responsibility. What this new respectability and the end of the cold war will mean for politically conservative denominations we do not yet know.53

At any rate, the campaigns of conservative Protestantism are being [87] fought also within the old mainstream and constitute one of several factors that have altered corporate denominationalism.54 In most denominations, conservative groups lead often vitriolic attacks against the bureaucratic structures and the “liberals” within them. The corporate structure suffers—from erosion of respect, loss of resources, consequent diminished power and smaller staffs, relocation of function to regional judicatories, competition with other national structures, and resurging claims over it by national president, assembly, or conference.55 The latter prove most newsworthy and certainly take expressive form—for instance, in the Southern Baptist conflict.56 Less effective and sometimes more symbolic victories occur in decisions to relocate headquarters so as to punish agency staff and to extricate leadership from locations, such as New York, that are perceived to be ideologically liberal.57

Such warfare frequently comes from conservative groupings and points to one important reality of contemporary denominationalism, mentioned here initially and documented by Robert Wuthnow, that denominations split badly and fairly cleanly into theologically conservative and liberal camps.58 An evangelical-liberal cleavage runs both between and through denominations. Liberals tend to have access to denominational power. In reaction, conservative groups have created alternative structures, some of them operating as caucuses in behalf of one or another cause, others functioning as a shadow denominational structure dedicated to publishing more orthodox literature, sending missionaries, training persons of the right complexion for the ministry, holding rallies, and creating “orthodox” quasi-conventions or -conferences.

The temptation is strong, for the academics who interpret such patterns as for the corporate leadership under attack, to locate the problem in contemporary denominational life in the attackers, in this warfare, and in the division of the denomination into liberal and evangelical camps. Might the cleavage and the warfare be more symptom than problem, more effect than cause?

Might the problem, the cause, lie in the collapse of denominational purpose and in the loss of real reason for hanging together? Conservatives after all do not hold the license on the caucus or political action form. Liberal, women’s, gay, and ethnic organizations also function like political action groups. The caucuses have, individually and collectively, a divisive effect—the denomination divides itself into caucuses. These movements have also a unitive function—they constitute alternatives to the corporate structure in uniting the denominations nationally, albeit along these particular “struggle” lines. In some instances, they gain agency status, as has the United Methodist Commissions on Religion and Race and on the Status and Role of Women. Or they may function under denominational blessing, as did Presbyterian groups until recently in what that body recognized as Chapter IX organizations. But whether incorporated within, sanctioned, or merely tolerated, caucuses and caucus-like groups press themselves on (other) denominational agencies, demanding, in effect, agency adherence [88] to the caucus norm or cause. Thus they behave like the monitoring or regulatory agency so common now in American political life.

That regulatory behavior also increasingly characterizes all denominational agencies, which find themselves resorting to a variety of new mechanisms to achieve the results that used to come easier—to effect policy, to implement program, to disseminate resolutions. So agencies function at times like regulatory agencies, controlling through expectation or rule. In so behaving, denominations internalize one prevalent mechanism for continuing the rule from the top down. As Dykstra has effectively demonstrated, denominations here borrow from the repertoire of national and state regulatory agencies. Regulation—rule making, monitoring, on-site visiting, indicting, exposing, forcing adherence—reaches for the cooperation, unity, and coordination that used to link congregation to state, to region, to nation in denominational life. Regulatory behavior substitutes for the older dynamic and adhesive principles. Regulation, often adversarial in premise or tone, suggests a collapse of denominational cohesion and purpose.

Regulation, however, is only one of an array of mechanisms to which denominations now resort in quest of once-easier unity and purpose. Denominations seek also to behave like foundations, influencing through grants. This is a friendlier style, giving rather than demanding, but it is no less coercive. And it is prevalent and spontaneous. Boards seek funding from outside or sequester funds and immediately set up their own rules for awarding these funds. By making their own grants, they advertise purpose, communicate with regional judicatories or congregations, and achieve cooperation. Agencies also behave at times like consulting firms, generating within some marketable expertise, then hiring themselves out for a project; at times like franchisers, marketing specific product lines in spirituality or stewardship for congregational or judicatory use; at times like educational systems, credentialing through training.59 Regulating, granting, consulting, franchising, marketing, training—these tactics do not energize, do not adhere, do not unite the denominations in the way that the grand cause of a Christian America once did. Indeed, these new board and agency mechanisms further fragment denominational life. But absent some lofty purposes, the agencies struggle on.

The same problems and struggles, the same regulatory, grant-making, consulting, franchising, and training mechanisms, the same quest for unity and purpose can be seen on other levels and in other sectors of denominational life. Regional judicatories, for instance, have begun claiming more of the resources and producing more of the program for congregations. In doing so, they create more regionalized patterns of denominational life, effectively competing with their national counterparts and inevitably disrupting the once-uniform denominational style. The top-down, imposed, common denominational grammar begins to erode.

Congregations also increasingly chart their own courses. Less preoccupied with denominational identity and less impressed with denominational [89] delivery systems, congregations, particularly those with sufficient resources to function independently, buy program modules or curricula from various places.60 They behave like consumers, influenced by and influencing consumerist religious mentality among the people. The ultimate in that style emerges in the megachurches and family life centers, mall-like congregations offering both superstore and boutique religion. Some replicate the entire set of services once rendered by denominations, setting up their own publishing operations, significant television and radio ministries, community service programs, missions, and theological education programs. Such congregations boast of their family atmosphere, their family-like unity. Other congregations evidence the family discord characteristic of other levels of denominational life and “adhere” through the array of regulating, grant-making, franchising, caucusing, consulting, and training functions. In either case, as quasi-family or as a local arena for organizational experimentation, the congregation drifts from denomination and so contributes to the diffuseness of denominational identity.

At the other extreme, and partly in response to denominational consumerism or indifference, can be found an exaggerated denominationalism. Bishops and their counterpart judicatory officials struggle to regain direction, to maintain program momentum, to keep the ship financially afloat. At times, they put high premiums on denominational identity and loyalty, virtually shouting denominationalism. Adherence to denominational practice and structure attests or tests denominational integrity Polity rather than creed or confession becomes the denominational norm. Exaggerated denominationalism also characterizes institutions dependent upon denominational personnel, resources, or support. Seminaries, for instance, can preach high denominational doctrine.61 So in areas having to do with ministerial recruitment, training, and credentialing, hyperdenominationalism surfaces, while amid laity and congregations consumerism and indifference prosper.

All of this—the damaged corporate structure, the caucuses, the regional initiatives and variety, the congregational independence, the hyperdenominationalism—shows mainline denominations groping for a new order and for new purposes to replace those once given by a Christian America. In the meanwhile, they focus attention within, as though their purposes were to be discovered there. And the conservative denominations, until recently seemingly impervious to modernity, now begin to show some of the same strains. They face their own disestablishment and a similar struggle as they cope with the end of the cold war. The two styles of denominationalism may well mark a transition to a yet unclear style, or perhaps to another form of the church altogether.62

Implications

Denominationalism and denominations have changed. That is the main point. Each of the five stages or styles has had its own complexion—a [90] dynamic and adhesive principle, distinctive goals vis-à-vis American society, rules of interdenominational interaction, and boundaries that marked off mainstream denominationalism from sectarian, churchly, or counterdenominational religious styles. Each stage’s dynamic, rendered in its name, oriented denominations toward society. Of note is the way in which denominationalism has oscillated between relatively introspective and expansive modes. The first, third, and fifth stages have been introspective, with denominations preoccupied with internal order; in the first and third, getting the form of the church right served to build the kingdom, while in the fifth stage, mainstream Protestantism seemed to lack for dynamism and lacked also a clear sense of its role in American society.

The second and fourth styles of denominationalism have been expansive, with instrumental conceptions of denominational order and clear commitments to transforming society and world through effective effort and organization. These stages also saw the most self-conscious unity and collaboration between and among the denominations. In the second stage, denominations collaborated through the evangelical united front, the network of voluntary societies, as well as through revivals and camp meetings, in building a Christian America. In the fourth, denominations found common cause in corporate cooperation through explicitly ecumenical organizations; agencies collaborated to divide missionary turf, and executives struggled towards unity in both faith and order and life and work. The first, third, and fifth stages put less of a premium on cooperation, produced fewer new efforts at unity and sustained existing collaboration with lessened enthusiasm.

The matter of boundaries can only be touched upon here. Adequate treatment would involve discussion of the successively larger boundaries of each period and the ways in which renegotiation of boundaries created each stage. In each instance, outsider groups seem to have provided the creative impulse towards a new dynamic principle, forcing wider the boundary of denominationalism, negotiating their own way in, and effecting by their entry a new denominational order. In the first awakening, Presbyterians, various German groups, Separates, and Baptists forged revivalism into a new principle of ethnic voluntarism, establishing thereby new space for religion in the colonies and forcefully stating their own legitimacy. Baptists, Methodists, and Christians played a similar role in the second awakening, expanding denominationalism with their new expansive principle. Various confessional groups, including perhaps the Old School Presbyterians, added that principle to denominational legitimacy in the Civil War period. Around the turn of the twentieth century, corporate reorganization came from outsiders within, reformers and Social Gospelers, who saw in efficiency and rationalized structure a more effective witness at home and abroad. And the fifth style, perhaps only partially emergent, clearly owes much to critics within, as well as to the whole evangelical impulse both within and without. A new denominational [91] order, we suggested, might well radically redraw boundaries so as to embrace both mainstream and conservative denominationalism.

The fifth style may represent another of these periodic stages of withdrawal. Alternatively, as we have indicated denominationalism as we know it may well be breaking up. g so, it need not mean the end to the religious movements now denominated, many of which (for example, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Mennonites, Baptists, Congregationalists) had a predenominational ecclesial existence and have no reason to confuse their essence with its current denominational expression. Denominationalism is a relatively recent phenomenon and may have outlived its usefulness. It may, on the other hand, be simply going through another of its metamorphoses.

NOTES

1. Denominational publishing houses serve up healthy doses of preventive and curative medicine. For instance, Cokesbury, the distributing and sales arm of the United Methodist Publishing House, features Lyle E. Schaller, a guru of church growth, among its “Bestselling Authors,” markets similar items in a regular “Effective Church Series” and under the rubric of “Church Leadership,” and devotes a section of its catalog to “Evangelism & Church Growth.” From the latter, Bishop Richard B. Wilke’s volumes *And Are We Yet Alive?* and *Signs and Wonders*: *The Mighty Work of God in the Church* can be purchased in either book or video form. Kennon L. Callahan offers *Twelve Keys to An Effective Church*, *a Leader’s Guide* to the same, an additional *Twelve Keys*: *Study Guide*, and *Effective Church Leadership*: *Building on the Twelve Keys*. In all, the catalog makes available some fifty books, each offering “keys” to the church’s survival and recovery.

2. See Wade Clark Roof and William McKinney, *American Mainline Religion* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1987), and Robert Wuthnow, *The Struggle for America’s Soul* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989) and *The Restructuring of American Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

3. The question of how the recent growth and public prominence of evangelical and non-Protestant bodies figure in the denominational saga will be dealt with below.

4. See the multivolume series *The Presbyterian Presence*, ed. Milton J Coalter, John M. Mulder, and Louis B. Weeks (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1990-92). The last volume is a synthetic essay by the editors pulling together the findings from the previous seven and entitled *The Reforming Tradition*: *Presbyterians and Mainstream Protestantism in the Twentieth Century* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1992). See also *A Case Study of Mainstream Protestantism*. *The Disciples’ Relation to American Culture*, ed. D. Newell Williams (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991).

5. This analysis draws on the essay by Craig Dykstra and James HudnutBeumler, “The Ecology of Denominational Organization,” in *The Organizational Revolution*: *Presbyterians and American Denominationalism*, ed. Milton J Coalter, John M. Mulder, and Louis B. Weeks (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John [92] Knox, 1992), and also on my own *Denominationalism* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1977) and “Institutional Forms of Religion,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion in America*, ed. Charles H. Lippy and Peter W. Williams, 3 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1988), 1:31-50. The latter treats the literature on denominationalism in some detail, relieves this essay of that burden, and lays the groundwork for this typology in the distinct disciplinary approaches to denominationalism.

6. See William R. Hutchison’s chapter, “Denominational Studies in the Reshaping of American Religious History” in this volume.

7. See, on the latter, *Religion*, *the Independent Sector*, *and American Culture*, ed. Conrad Cherry and Rowland A. Sherrill (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

8. This essay does not attempt to cover Roman Catholic and Jewish patterns with any care but does assume, as Gibson Winter and others have shown, that with certain qualifications denominational dynamics do apply. See the essays herein by Marc Lee Raphael, Jay Dolan, and Robert A. Orsi; see also Gibson Winter, *Religious Identity*. *A Study of Religious Organization* (New York: Macmillan, 1968).

9. This definition draws on classic statements by Winthrop S. Hudson, “Denominationalism as a Basis for Ecumenicity,” and Sidney E. Mead, “Denominationalism: The Shape of Protestantism in America,” both reprinted in Richey, *Denominationalism.*

10. Or “religious body” Obviously, when Jewish groups assumed denominational form, they did so by claiming their legitimacy and self-sufficiency not as Christian ecclesial but as Jewish bodies.

11. The denomination typically functions with a branch theory of the church, the notion that the church exists and is known in the present as an organism with many branches. That affirmation entails an act of self-recognition, that one is only a branch, and the realization that the church has other legitimate, even vital branches.

12. One of several items of self-consciousness that differentiate the denomination from a sect.

13. Early Puritans (colonial as well as British) who persisted in believing themselves part of the Church of England and British Methodists during Wesley’s life thus would not be termed denominations, whereas American Methodists after 1784 would be. As these examples should suggest, one may have some difficulty in determining the point at which a reform or parachurch movement actually achieves independent status as a denomination.

14. Hudson, “Denominationalism as a Basis for Ecumenicity.”

15. These were not inevitable stages, either for individual movements in adjusting to American society or for the collectivity of denominations. A given movement, indeed, would typically have within it all the prior stages. And certain denominations might resist the style of a period, although even that resistance often picked up certain aspects of that very style.

Compare the qualifications and the three types isolated by Dykstra and Hudnut-Beumler in “The Ecology of Denominational Organization”: confederacy, corporation, and regulatory agency.

16. This point is effectively made by James H. Moorhead in this volume in “Presbyterians and the Mystique of Organizational Efficiency 1870-1936.”

17. It is my own belief, although not one that can be elaborated here, that typologies designed to make sense of the American religious scene do need to put in the center the denominations and denominationalism and to array off-center, [93] perhaps considerably off-center, the church type as well as sect and cult movements, each of which ordinarily defines itself vis-a-vis the denominational mainstream. Such a graphing differs from the traditional European one that places church in the center and views other religious movements as defined against it. Here denomination, rather than church, is the norm. In the American experience, classic European churches, for example, the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic, have found their way into the religious establishment as they have appropriated denominational form and self-understanding.

18. For that point, see Arthur Carl Piepkorn, *Profiles in Belief*: *The Religious Bodies of the United States and Canada*, vol. 2, *Protestant Denominations* (1978). (New York: Harper & Row, 1977-79).

19. See my “ ‘Catholic’ Protestantism and American Denominationalism,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 16, no. 2 (Spring 1979): 213-231.

20. The Middle Colonies would also “benefit” from the presence and immigration there of religious bodies from Holland, Germany and elsewhere in Europe.

21. See John F Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament*: *Puritanism During the English Civil Wars* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969); William Lamont, *Godly Rule*: *Politics and Religion*, *106-1650* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1969); David Little, *Religion*, *Order*, *and Law* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969); Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints* (New York: Atheneum, 1969); and the various works of Christopher Hill.

22. As the subsequent citations of Timothy Smith will indicate, I follow him in assessing the relation between the Awakening and ethnicity, an assessment that differs from the more traditional reading that saw the Awakening as substituting a new and shared, indeed, transcolony identity for the linguistic and national divisions of the Middle Colonies. The argument here is that the Awakening did not destroy but transmuted linguistic and national differentia in terms of which people had previously defined themselves. By lodging identity in the new birth of conversion, the Awakening gave a new “evangelical” face to differences-a specifically theologically ethnic face-such that congregations found themselves less reliant on European norms, less subservient to European authority, more conscious of commitments shared with neighbors, but nonetheless bonded along lines of family, language, and national background.

23. For two very different interpretations of this process, both influential in this reading, see Timothy L. Smith, “Congregation, State and Denomination: The Forming of the American Religious Structure,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd set, 25 (1968): 155-176, reprinted in Richey, *Denominationalism*; and Jon Butler, *Power*, *Authority*, *and the Origins of American Denominational Order*: *The English Churches in the Delaware Valley*, *1680-1730*, American Philosophical Society Transactions, 68, pt. 2 (Philadelphia, 1978), and his more recent *Awash in a Sea of Faith*. *Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), especially pp. 164-193. Smith views the ordering process as an essentially positive popular initiative taken by groups who found congregation and eventually denomination the viable resource for identity, community, order, authority, and direction. Butler reads that same process as coercive, authoritarian, and elitist.

24. It needs to be recognized that ethnicity was itself a fabrication and this process of denomination forming a key element therein. Denominations gave shape and legitimacy to ethnic community. There were, of course, exceptions to [94] this pattern of ethnic voluntarism-individuals who affiliated with a group because of proximity, persuasion, marriage, or religious experience-with the major exception religious movements that gradually gave religious attention to, and in some fashion embraced, Africans. Ethnic voluntarism serves nevertheless as a useful rubric for describing the dynamic in denominational formation for this period.

25. For this paradox of ethnic particularity and universality see Timothy L. Smith, “Religion and Ethnicity in America,” *American Historical Review* 83 (December 1978): 1155-1185.

26. A point that Jon Butler seems to have understated.

27. The prior discussion does not imply that revival and conversion confined itself to the ethnic voluntary denominational communities. It did not. Congregationalists and Anglicans did, of course, participate in various ways in the Awakening. However, the Awakening did encourage patterns of divisiveness in those areas.

28. A point of self-understanding distinguishing the denominations from the established Congregationalists in New England.

29. See Sidney E. Mead, *The Lively Experiment* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963); his essay and those by Elwyn A. Smith, Fred J. Hood, and myself in *Denominationalism*; and Winthrop S. Hudson’s *Religion in America* 3rd. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1981).

30. See especially Fred J. Hood, *Reformed America* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1980), and the considerable literature on voluntarism discussed in my “Institutional Forms of Religion” in *Encyclopedia of Religion in America*.

31. The literature on these developments is immense. A fine collection that engages much of it is Mark A. Noll’s *Religion and American Politics*. *From the Colonial Period to the 1980s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

32. The contribution of the primitivist, restorationist movements to this denominationalism was vital but ironic. They grasped, articulated, and institutionalized what would become a central theme in denominational self-understanding, namely, that the evangelical mandate was to unite Christians, reform the church, and renovate the world through the restoration of primitive Christianity. To that end, they repudiated, explicitly and forcefully, denominationalism and the denomination. That repudiation, ironically, gave expression to what in other movements and in denominationalism generally would be a contradiction, or at best paradox or tension-belief that the labor was in behalf of an undivided kingdom (of God) but through highly competitive denominational action and structure. Eventually, the Disciples of Christ recognized its denominational character, an ironic development, perhaps, but an irony important to denominationalism generally-unity despite division.

33. Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

34. R. Laurence Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

35. Robert Baird, *Religion in America*, abr. and ed. Henry Warner Bowden (1856; reprint ed., New York: Harper & Row, 1970).

36. See, for instance, Jay Dolan, *Catholic Revivalism* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978), and *The Immigrant Church* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975). Dolan stresses the Catholic and European origin [95] to patterns that have been frequently ascribed to Protestant influence. One can concede a measure of truth to that point and still observe that Catholics found it appropriate to accent such patterns to succeed in the American environment.

37. The novelty and over-againstness is widely recognized. For instance, see H. Shelton Smith et al., *American Christianity* 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1960, 1963), vol. 2, specifically the section “Resurgent Churchly Traditions.” Sydney E. Ahlstrom in A *Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972) points to similar dynamics in a large section entitled “Countervailing Religion,” pp. 541-632. For a superb case study of this denominationalism, see Robert Bruce Mullin, *Episcopal Vision/American Reality*. *High Church Theology and Social Thought in Evangelical America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

38. Here I follow H. Shelton Smith, *In His Image*, *But* . . . *Racism in Southern Religion*, *1780-1910*. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972), in accenting the importance of the slavery issue in divisions that generated incredible ecclesiastical and theological posturing and have been, in consequence, often interpreted in polity terms. The latter, as we will suggest, were and would thenceforth prove very important.

39. Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood*: *The Religion of the Lost Cause*, *1865-1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980), and “*God’s Project*”: *The Southern Civil Religion*, *1920-1980*, *Religion and the Life of the Nation*, ed. Rowland A. Sherrill (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), pp. 64-83.

40. On this great inversion, the making of culture rather than kingdom the denominational objective, see Robert T. Handy, A *Christian America*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

41. See Henry R.T. Brandreth, “Approaches of the Churches Towards Each Other in the Nineteenth Century,” in A *History of the Ecumenical Movement*, *1517-1948* ed. Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 263-306.

42. For a case study of such efforts, see David B. Potts, *Wesleyan University*, *1831-1910*. *Collegiate Enterprise in New England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

43. See especially William R. Hutchison, *Errand to the World*: *American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), and Jane Hunter, *The Gospel of Gentility*. *American Women Missionaries in Turn-of-the-Century China* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

44. The term derives from and this discussion is informed by the insights of Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., *The Visible Hand*: *The Managerial Revolution in American Business* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press, 1977). For a superb discussion of these developments within Presbyterianism, see in this volume James H. Moorhead, “Presbyterians and the Mystique of Organizational Efficiency, 1870-1936.” The literature on the managerial revolution and denominationalism is reviewed in my “Institutional Forms of Religion.” As this essay shows, the phrase organizational revolution also is applied to these developments and is employed in a fine collection, a case study thereof: Coalter, Mulder, and Weeks, eds., *The Organizational Revolution*.

45. The classic study of these issues is Paul M. Harrison, *Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959). For extension of this treatment to the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish [96] communities, see Gibson Winter, *Religious Identity*. *A Study of Religious Organization* (New York: Macmillan, 1968).

46. See Rolf Lunden, *Business and Religion in the American 1920s* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), for careful scrutiny of a decade of fairly crass celebration of business technique in religion.

47. This point, if accurate, needs study and particularly study that would look at the regional judicatory in relation to some of these larger patterns. How, for instance, have the particularly professional concerns been balanced with governance and program concerns? And how, given significant lay participation in judicatory affairs, have clergy professional matters and more general issues been related?

48. Adjustment to these aspects of modernity was a goal of what would be liberal Protestantism and was initially a positive good. For the larger agenda, see William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976).

49. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*: *The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

50. George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*: *Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987).

51. On this topic see Richard John Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square*: *Religion and Democracy in America* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984).

52. Robert Handy, *A Christian America* pp. 159-184. A “third disestablishment” has been proposed by Roof and McKinney, *American Mainline Religion*, pp. 33-39, but the developments they describe might be construed as catch-up adjustments or later phases of Handy’s second.

53. Perhaps the result will be some rapprochement with the old mainline, the reinventing of denominationalism, and the redrawing of mainline and denominationalism’s boundaries.

54. Again, see Dykstra and Hudnut-Beumler, “The Ecology of Denominational Organization.”

55. For a case study portrayal of these factors and indeed this phase of denominationalism, see Coalter, Mulder, and Weeks, *The Reforming Tradition.*

56. Among the discerning treatments are two that have decidedly informed my estimation of denominational patterns within Southern Baptist experience: Bill J. Leonard, *God’s Last and Only Hope*. *The Fragmentation of the Southern Baptist Convention* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1990), and Nancy Tatom Ammerman, *Baptist Battles*. *Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention* (New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press, 1990 ).

57. Ironically, these attacks on fourth-phase corporate denominationalism are typically justified by an appeal to its central principle, efficiency and cost-effectiveness (The move out of New York to some more central place will “save money and time.”)

58. *The Struggle for America’s Soul*.

59. Mainstream denominational agencies envy conservative use of the media and would certainly try to behave more like producers or broadcasters if they had the resources. [97]

60. Some of this may well be stimulated by denomination switching, which makes the switchers’ experience in other denominational contexts available to the new congregation and, of course, makes the denominational identity of the switcher an issue for the new congregation.

61. At other times and especially when dealing with constituencies from other denominations, the seminaries sound as ecumenical as ever.

62. In this perspective, the recent events within the Southern Baptist Convention may take on a slightly different aspect. Southern Baptists have at once typified, even magnified, these trends *and* also constituted a special and, one hopes, unique pattern. The postdenominational trends are well documented by Ammerman, Leonard, and others; the pattern unique to Baptists is one also prevalent in American society—the leveraged buyout, the hostile takeover. Leonard, *God’s Last and Only Hope*, shows the complex traditions and impulses brought into denominational coherence through a shared culture, piety, theology, and program. Ammerman, *Baptist Battles*, demonstrates how that cooperative program gradually edged Southern Baptists out of Southern establishment into mainstream Protestantism and corporate-bureaucratic denominationalism: “Each side was seeking out a viable place in the newly pluralistic world in which they found themselves. To accept the modern rules of religious civility and individual choice was indeed to make a home for oneself in the modern situation, even if other aspects of modernity were questioned. This is the world to which moderates sought to adapt themselves. They were willing to leave their Southern church-like status to become a denomination in the larger American religious mosaic. The dissidents within this denomination, however, were responding differently to change. In a newly pluralistic setting, they were seeking to reestablish homogeneity. They would recreate inside the religious world what was no longer viable in the world outside” (p. 166; see also pp. 213-214, 159).

To an outsider, Leonard’s version of denominational identity helps explain why Ammerman’s mainstreaming came as such a crisis. At any rate, to this outsider it appears if Baptists arrived just as the party was breaking up but in time to be caught in the ensuing squabble; Southern Baptist corporate leadership came to the mainstream and ecumenical Protestant party just as mainstream Protestantism was discovering that the party was over—that it could not Christianize America and the world, that a denominationalism so premised and so geared for such evangelization was hollow, that its “missional” structures and programs lacked a plausible energizing principle. Other denominations experienced the consequent revolt against “headquarters” as warfare on many fronts. The effective war against corporate culture within the SBC had one front—the conservatives. All the postdenominational trends we have described—the antibureaucratic, anticentrist mood, the consumerism, the caucusing, the PACs, the regulatory behavior, the parachurch structuring, the hyperdenominationalism—when polarized ideologically produced a leveraged buyout. Other denominations may be breaking up. The SBC went private. [98]

# Shopping for Faith

Cimino, Richard, and Don Lattin. *Shopping for Faith*: *American Religion in the New Millenium*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

## Introduction

1. **introduction**
   1. “Our methods for chronicling religious trends include firsthand reporting and research, as well as a review of recent journalistic accounts and scholarly studies on religion in America. The best way to predict the future is to project current trends.” (Cimino and Lattin x)
   2. predictions
      1. “Our goal is to . . . forecast the future of faith in the coming century . . .” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
      2. “Each chapter contains a series of forecasts about the future shape of religion and spirituality. Each forecast [is] in bold type to make it easier to find . . .” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         1. “consumerism will shape all religious practice—from conservative evangelical worship to the wildest New Age workshop” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         2. “personal spiritual experience will replace religious doctrine as the driving force” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         3. “the baby boomers and Generation X will rediscover traditional faith” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         4. “megachurches and small groups will provide new homes for spiritual seekers” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         5. “secular spirituality will change the way Americans work, play, and express their sexuality” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         6. “science, medicine, and the media will find religion” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         7. “religious groups will play a greater role in social service and community development” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         8. “new religious movements and apocalyptic groups will attract followers” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
   3. “. . . we have changed the names of . . . those we identify with only a first name. . . . the names of some individual congregations have also been changed.” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
   4. organization
      1. “*Shopping for Faith* examines the three major areas of religious life:
         1. “individual spirituality and belief,
         2. “religious institutions,
         3. “and the interaction between religion and society.” (Cimino and Lattin ix)
         4. “Think of the three parts of this book as three concentric circles. Each circle encloses the other and then radiates outward—starting with the individual, moving on to the institution, and concluding with society.” (Cimino and Lattin x)
   5. “Included with each copy of *Shopping for Faith* is a CD-ROM containing an electronic version of the book’s entire text, with links to the Internet . . . maintained by TheLinkLibrary.com.” (Cimino and Lattin x)
   6. the authors
      1. “Our book is the culmination of three decades of work chronicling . . . today’s spiritual scene.” (Cimino and Lattin xi)
      2. “Richard Cimino lives in New York and is the editor of *Religion Watch*, a newsletter monitoring trends and research in contemporary religion. He holds a bachelor’s degree in journalism from New York University and a master’s in sociology from Fordham University.” (Cimino and Lattin xi)
      3. “Don Lattin lives in California. He is the religion writer for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and over the past two decades has interviewed thousands of Americans about their religious heritage and spiritual search. He has won numerous awards for his religion reporting, and was a fellow at the Program in Religious Studies for Journalists at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He has also taught religion reporting at the graduate school of journalism at the University of California at Berkeley, where he earned a degree in sociology.” (Cimino and Lattin xi)
2. **belief in America**
   1. beliefs
      1. “Americans believe in God. Around 95 percent of us, the pollsters say, believe in God or a universal life spirit.” (Greeley, Andrew M. *Religious Change in America*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989.) (Cimino and Lattin 1)
         1. “Americans believe in a personal God who is in control of the world, judges humanity, and performs miracles.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         2. “Far fewer view God as a life force or spirit.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         3. “Those numbers have changed very little over the past fifty years.” (Cimino and Lattin 1)
      2. Pew Research Center report, December 1997 (“Poll Says 71 Percent Believe in God.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (22 Dec. 1997): A7.) (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         1. Americans who “never doubt the existence of God”: 71%. (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         2. That is “up 11 percent from a similar survey in 1987.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
         3. So “Americans are getting more religious.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
      3. 1996 Gallup poll (Gallup, George H., Jr. *Religion in America*: *1996 Report*. Princeton: Princeton Religion Research Center, 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         1. adults who believe in heaven: 90%
         2. adults who believe in hell: 33%
         3. adults who “have had a profound spiritual experience, sudden or gradual, that has transformed their lives”: 33%
   2. religious affiliation
      1. “. . . overall attendance at religious congregations has remained about the same over the last forty years.” (Greeley, Andrew M. *Religious Change in America*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989.) (Cimino and Lattin 1)
      2. “a survey of 113,000 Americans by the City University of New York” (Kosmin, Barry, and Seymour Lachman. *One Nation Under God*. New York: Harmony, 1993.) (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         1. “This study was significant because it allowed people to identify their own religious affiliation. Researchers reasoned that self-identification would provide a better picture of affiliation than denominational membership records, since many members no longer identify with the faith of their birth.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         2. “Americans are, for the most part, Christian. . . . an overwhelming 86 percent consider themselves Christian.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
            1. “. . . Christianity’s predominance in the United States is unlikely to be challenged by any other faith.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
            2. “Many immigrants from the non-Christian nations of Asia or the Islamic world are Christian, either because they converted after immigration or came to the United States for religious freedom.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         3. “Jews represent 2 percent, whereas Muslims, Buddhists, and Hindus have smaller representations.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
         4. “Figures were even smaller for followers of nonconventional religions, such as the New Age movement.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
   3. predictions
      1. “Using the past as our guide, we can predict that the religious convictions of Americans will remain fairly stable well into the next millennium.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
      2. But “everything *except* the basic beliefs of Americans are in flux. There will be major changes in how these beliefs are expressed and interpreted . . . Historic shifts will occur in how these beliefs are blended with other religious perspectives. . . . best-selling books on spiritualism and mysticism show that Americans love to “mix and match” religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 2)
3. **the** “**secularization thesis**” **of the 1960s** (Cimino and Lattin 3)
   1. The secularization thesis predicted “a progressive and irreversible decline in religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
      1. “Social scientists pointed to the emptying cathedrals of Europe . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
         1. “While Europe was increasingly secular, at least on the surface, other parts of the world, such as the Middle East, Latin America, and the Arab world, experienced a religious resurgence by the 1970s.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
         2. “Some argued that this growth in traditional faith was religion’s last gasp—simply a reaction to the inexorable march of secularism. They were wrong.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
      2. They pointed to “the dramatic decline of such mainstream U.S. denominations as the Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
         1. But “Secularists failed to notice that more conservative religious bodies grew while more liberal mainline churches declined. . . . Over the past two decades, conservative and traditional faith has increased its social and political influence.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
   2. “Religious institutions were seen as gradually retreating from their public role, especially in areas such as education, welfare, community standards, and social values. An optimistic view of the growing role of science, technology, and psychology, and their potential for enhancing human progress, seemed to rule out older notions of reality based on the supernatural.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
      1. But “Islamic activism in the Middle East and North Africa, as well as the political activism of American evangelicals, illustrates how religion in the 1990s became far more than a private matter between believers and their God.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
   3. “Secularization has occurred within certain American institutions.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
      1. “Some professions, such as the media, psychiatry, academia, and entertainment, have lower levels of religious commitment and practice than those found among business people or blue-collar workers.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
         1. “In its first issue of 1998, the *New Yorker* magazine published the results of a national poll that divided the U.S. population into three groups. “Main Street” represented the overall adult population. “Easy Street” was the name for individuals making more than $100,000 a year. “High Street” identified the third group, those “cultural elites” who subscribe to the *New Yorker*. Asked, “Do you believe that your religion is ‘true’ in a way that other religions and spiritual traditions are not?” residents of Main Street said yes nearly twice as often as those on Easy Street, and more than three times as often as the people on High Street.” (Hertzberg, Hendrik. “The Narcissus Survey.” *New Yorker* (5 Jan. 1998): 28.) (Cimino and Lattin 4)
         2. “Since “knowledge class” professionals produce much of the culture’s media, someone watching television or reading newspapers can easily think that America is more secular than it really is.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
         3. But “Even those in professions once considered secular show growing interest in spiritual matters.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
            1. “Entertainers are unlikely to be pillars of traditional churches, but many have expressed a wide range of spiritual interests—from Scientology to the mystical Jewish teachings of the Kabbalah.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
            2. “. . . social workers and psychologists show rising personal and professional interest in spirituality and see it as a way to address client needs.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
      2. “Religious bodies that dismantled much of their theological identity, by putting more emphasis on social issues or psychological needs, can also be seen as secularized. This is especially the case in groups that have removed practices that once generated a sense of commitment and identity for their members, such as tithing or a literal view of the Bible.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
   4. “Sociologist Peter Berger has said that America often appears as secular as Sweden at the top, but more like India in the profuse religious expression of the people.” (Cimino and Lattin 3)
   5. “One way to gauge America’s elusive spiritual stirrings is to study the best-seller list.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
      1. “Phyllis Tickle, the former religion editor of *Publishers Weekly*, notes that many individuals are hesitant to express nonconventional religious beliefs and often begin their spiritual search in the private realm of books.” (Tickle, Phyllis A. *Rediscovering the Sacred*. New York: Crossroad, 1996. 17.) (Cimino and Lattin 4)
      2. “And the book market tells us that Americans have an insatiable appetite for religion and spirituality. According to the Association of American Publishers, the sales of books in the Bible, religion, and spirituality category shot up 59 percent between 1992 and 1994.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
   6. Is increased religiosity a “response to social problems”? (Cimino and Lattin 4)
      1. “Many commentators see the American interest in spirituality as stemming from a host of current social problems.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
         1. “The exponential growth of technology and the resulting uncertainty about the future, we’re told, make people search for an anchor of meaning in an unstable world.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
         2. “Some observers see a fragmented society and declining respect for government inspiring the search for another kind of authority.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
         3. “Others point to the possibility of nuclear and biochemical war, or the devastation brought on by AIDS, or the disintegration of families to explain the contemporary search for the sacred.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
      2. “Although these factors may all contribute to a spiritual resurgence, Americans have always faced tragedy and social dislocation.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
      3. “Any upsurge in spirituality is not a unique response to social problems but simply the latest rumblings beneath America’s remarkably stable religious terrain.” (Cimino and Lattin 4)
4. **religion vs**. **spirituality**
   1. “. . . one way to understand American religion and chart its future is to see the world of faith like any other product or service in the U.S. economy. Today’s diverse religious landscape has been compared to a busy marketplace where competition thrives and seekers shop.” (Cimino and Lattin 5)
      1. “. . . much of American religious life functions as a marketplace driven by competition and choice.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
      2. Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. *The Churching of America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1992.
      3. See: Warner, R. Stephen. “Work in Progress toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States.” *American Journal of Sociology* (Mar. 1993): 1044-95. (On *The Churching of America*.)
   2. “Many Americans say they want to become “more spiritual” but have little interest in “organized religion.” Nevertheless, many of today’s spiritual seekers do get involved in religion that is organized; it’s just organized differently . . . We live in a postdenominational era, and the denominations that realize that fact are the ones that will thrive in the new millennium.” (Cimino and Lattin 5)
   3. “Some things do not change. Now, as before, the spiritual quest is often a search for community, a longing for belonging. It can also inspire greater social conscience. Religious individuals of all varieties tend to be more involved in community life. More and more religious congregations find themselves at the forefront of community development, providing charity and social service in an increasingly privatized world.” (Cimino and Lattin 5)
   4. “Religious Americans are also involved in politics, both on the left and the right.” (Cimino and Lattin 5)
   5. “Nevertheless, for many Americans spirituality has become a private affair. Rather than gathering in religious congregations, millions of seekers curl up at home with the latest self-help book or inspirational tome. Instead of coming together Saturday at the synagogue or Sunday at church, they pray and meditate in their own private temples. Private religion and our dizzying array of spiritual choices can put us all in “little boxes,” isolated from one another.” (Cimino and Lattin 5)

## The Divorce Between Spirituality and Religion

1. **introduction**
   1. “Steve and Julie, a young California couple with two small children, looked back six years to the time in their lives when they first decided to go “church shopping.” [9] . . . Julie was the child of Southern Baptists, but the couple felt little loyalty to that denomination. Steve certainly wasn’t going to join the local Methodist church just because his grandfather was a minister in that faith. Their decision on what congregation to join had little to do with doctrine, and lots to do with the kind of music played, child care offered, and the feel of Sunday worship. They shopped for a church like they would shop for a car, looking for something comfortable and practical. They were also looking for someone to marry them.” (Cimino and Lattin 9-10)
   2. “America has always been a spiritual melting pot, a place where believers claim the right to invent new theologies, to grow their own religion. It says so in the first line of the First Amendment of the Constitution . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 11)
   3. “Religious beliefs and spirituality have traditionally been viewed as the province of churches, temples, synagogues, and mosques. Yet spirituality and religious faith are increasingly viewed as individual, private matters with few connections to congregation and community.” (Cimino and Lattin 11)
      1. “Most of the world’s religions began with individuals and their perceived encounter with the sacred. All faiths, no matter how communal and collective they eventually become, are based on revelations that were initially directed toward individuals . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 12)
      2. “For millennia, religious groups fought to keep spiritual energy contained within a community of faith. Mystics and saints have always clashed with religious institutions when their experiences of spiritual ecstasy transcend established rules and regulations.” (Cimino and Lattin 12)
      3. “. . . the breakdown of church authority can be traced back to the Protestant Reformation and the Enlightenment . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 18)
         1. “. . . the Protestant notion that there should be no mediator between the individual and God runs deep in the American soul.” (Cimino and Lattin 12)
      4. “Gallup polls show that seven in ten Americans believe that one can be religious without going to church.” (Cimino and Lattin 11)
      5. “. . . denominational leaders dolefully note rampant individualism even among members of their own congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 11)
      6. “seekers”
         1. “Seekers” are “those who have dropped out or never became institutionally involved, despite a keen personal interest in spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 11)
         2. “As with other baby boomers, these seekers want to provide a faith for their children and find a meaningful support system for themselves.” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
      7. “In the new millennium, there will be a growing gap between personal spirituality and religious institutions.” (Cimino and Lattin 11)
2. **America**’**s** “**religious marketplace**” (Cimino and Lattin 68)
   1. Before the 1960s, “family ties, peer pressure, and social status traditionally impinged on Americans’ religious freedom. [12] . . . Americans [felt] social pressure to stay within the confines of their religious heritage.” [26] (Hammond, Phillip E. (sociologist). *Religion and Personal Autonomy*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1993.) (Cimino and Lattin 12, 26)
   2. “The 1960s, which brought the sexual revolution and the breakdown of millions of American families, were also the turning point in this bitter divorce between religion and spirituality. It was the decade that brought no-fault divorce and no-fault religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 12)
   3. But “The social revolution of “the sixties” elevated the values of free choice and experimentation in the religious marketplace. [12] . . . Brand-name religion is on the wane.” [26] (Hammond, Phillip E. *Religion and Personal Autonomy*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1993.) (Cimino and Lattin 12, 26)
   4. Wade Clark Roof’s survey (Roof, Wade Clark. *A Generation of Seekers*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993. 70.)
      1. In the 1950s, “as children, the baby boom generation was as religiously active as preceding generations.” (Cimino and Lattin 12)
      2. “By their early twenties, however, only around one in four boomers was involved in organized religion. This does not mean that most baby boomers became agnostics or atheists. Rather, . . . boomers view “being alone and meditating” as far more important than “worshiping with others.” They are drawn to experiential spirituality, [12] which “places primacy not on reason, not even on belief systems, but rather on a mystical experiential stance.”” (Cimino and Lattin 12-13)
      3. “. . . American baby boomers show declining church attendance and less adherence to church teachings.” (Cimino and Lattin 12)
   5. “. . . church shoppers . . . face a bewildering number of spiritual teachings, religious denominations, and competing congregations in their faith journey. Like most busy families in the 1990s, they have neither the time nor desire to become professional seekers, trying on every spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 49)
   6. Seekers find “their spiritual interests through social networks of family, friends, and co-workers. As spirituality becomes separated from religious institutions, friends and relatives will swap spiritual teachings and techniques as freely as they trade tips on child-rearing and favorite recipes.” (Cimino and Lattin 49)
   7. “For those belonging to religious congregations, and for seekers who go it alone, the range of spiritual options will be one of the disorienting facts of life in the new millennium.” (Cimino and Lattin 49)
   8. “. . . services peddled in the religious marketplace may change, but the gap between religious institutions and personal spirituality will shape the American search for faith.” (Cimino and Lattin 49)
3. **regional differences in religious individualism**
   1. “This divorce between religion and spirituality will be experienced differently in various parts of the nation.” (Cimino and Lattin 13)
   2. “Regional differences have not been completely flattened out by the mass media and nationwide franchises, especially in American religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 13)
   3. Phillip Hammond studied “the four U.S. regions” (New England, the South, the Midwest, and the Far West) by studying a particular state in each region (Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, and California). (Hammond, Phillip E. *Religion and Personal Autonomy*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1993. 139-66.) (Cimino and Lattin 13)
      1. Massachusetts and California have the most religious individualism. (Cimino and Lattin 13)
      2. Ohio was in the middle.
      3. “North Carolina has the least amount of religious individualism . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 13)
   4. “Gallup polls also show the East and West Coasts as incubators of religious individualism. The West Coast ranks high in unchurched people, but continually shows a higher percentage of individuals pursuing spiritual practices such as meditation.” (Cimino and Lattin 13)

## Mainline Denominations in the Post-Denominational Era

1. **introduction**
   1. “Two words describe the future of religious denominations—downsized and decentralized.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
   2. “In the new millennium, religious denominations will lose influence to local congregations and new coalitions of believers [e.g., megachurches].” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
2. **statistics** (**early 1990s**)
   1. Bellah, Robert. *The Good Society*. New York: Vintage, 1992. 187.
   2. Roman Catholics: 25% of Americans (“the largest American religious group by far”) (Cimino and Lattin 100)
   3. “heartland” Protestants (Methodists, Lutherans, American Baptists, Disciples, and Reformed): 24% of Americans (Cimino and Lattin 100)
   4. “culturally elite” Protestants (Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Unitarians): 9% of Americans (Cimino and Lattin 100)
   5. heartland plus culturally elite: 33% (Cimino and Lattin 100)
   6. “That is still about twice as many members as the combined numbers of the Southern Baptists, Pentecostals, and other white evangelical Protestants.” (Cimino and Lattin 100)
3. **mainline-Protestant decline**
   1. “. . . the old mainline denominations—Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Episcopalians—are losing . . . members.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
   2. “Since the early 1960s, the Episcopal Church has lost more than half its members, while [megachurches] have exploded.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
   3. “There is less agreement among church leaders over how mainline denominations should change, whether they can, or even should.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
4. **history**
   1. Pentecostal churches “have historically invested far less than mainline bodies in creating denominational bureaucracies.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
   2. Before the 1960s, mainline congregations “were organized under a corporate model . . . it enabled congregations to extend their presence to a national level through electing trusted leaders, publishing periodicals and educational curricula, and organizing ecumenical and social relief programs.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
   3. “During the 1960s, the trust between leaders and their constituencies broke down, especially within mainline denominations, as respected leaders were replaced by impersonal bureaucracies.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
   4. “Special interest groups emerged in these growing bureaucracies, often around social concerns involving race, gender, and left-of-center politics. National staffers had little connection with their mainly middle-class constituencies, many of whom saw their church straying from its spiritual mission. Meanwhile, there were important changes in patterns of church giving. Causes favored by local congregations gradually received a greater share of money than national programs.” (Coalter, Milton J., John M. Mulder, and Louis B. Weeks. *Vital Signs*: *The Promise of Mainline Protestantism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 98)
   5. In the 1970s and 1980s, “sweeping national social statements and political activism [provoked] criticism and controversy . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
   6. “Starting in the 1980s, denominations finally began responding by localizing, downsizing, and decentralizing.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
      1. “Many of the mainline denominations moved their corporate headquarters from New York City to smaller cities in the South and Midwest. These moves were based on the sentiment that church leaderships needed to get in touch—at least symbolically—with memberships outside of the New York-Washington axis.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
      2. “Congregations, rather than denominations, are now seen as the primary mission organization of American religious bodies. Rather than seeing themselves as the center of religious life, denominations have begun to channel more resources to congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
      3. “The sweeping national social statements and political activism . . . have been scaled back and the work of congregations and community associations targeting local issues has been emphasized.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
   7. example: the International Pentecostal Holiness Church
      1. Ford, Marcia. “Denomination Revamps Image.” *Charisma* (Nov. 1995).
      2. “. . . the International Pentecostal Holiness Church, one of the largest Pentecostal groups, transformed itself in the mid-1990s from a traditional and strongly hierarchical body to one emphasizing the enabling and empowerment of congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
      3. “The denomination’s headquarters in Oklahoma City was renamed as the Pentecostal Holiness Resource Development Center. B. F. Underwood, the general superintendent of the denomination, said, “We decided that what had been the headquarters was not supposed to be there to dictate. It’s there to provide support and resources to the local church.”” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
      4. “Congregations are now permitted a wider latitude in choosing which of the denomination’s seventy-five ministries are suited to their needs.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
   8. example: the fast-growing International Church of the Foursquare Gospel
      1. Church president John Holland: “We don’t try to make a pastor ‘Foursquare.’ Rather, we encourage pastors to use their gifts and individual strengths to reach those in the community around them. You will not find a ‘typical’ Foursquare congregation.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
      2. “Pentecostal historian Vinson Synan notes that without bureaucratic baggage, the church allows local pastors to implement their own strategies for ministry as long as they remain within doctrinal bounds. Even the Foursquare training of ministers is often tailored more to individual needs.” (Lawson, Steven. “Four Square Church Faces 21st Century.” *Charisma* [Mar. 1993]: 16.) (Cimino and Lattin 99)
      3. “Within this Pentecostal denomination is a movement of younger “seeker” congregations known as Hope Chapel.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
      4. “Other Foursquare congregations are diverse, ranging from the traditional Pentecostal First Foursquare Church in Fresno, California, to a racially mixed urban ministry in Chicago.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
      5. This church is growing fast. (Cimino and Lattin 99)
5. **Christian unity from the bottom up**
   1. “Crowded into pews once warmed by George Washington and Betsy Ross, hundreds of Episcopal Church bishops packed Philadelphia’s historic Christ Church in the summer of 1997. They sat beneath church bells financed by Benjamin Franklin’s lottery. Two hundred years after the American revolution, the purple-shirted members of the House of Bishops faced a revolution of their own.” (Cimino and Lattin 116)
   2. “Confronting them at their church convention were the litany of issues that has divided the nation’s mainline Protestant and Anglican denominations into warring camps. High on the agenda was a historic ecumenical proposal that cut to the very heart of what it means to be an Episcopalian.” (Cimino and Lattin 116)
   3. “For church traditionalists, the changes sweeping through the Episcopal Church were all part of a decades-long capitulation to the sexual revolution, the gay rights crusade, the feminist movement, and other harbingers of cultural decline. Now the House of Bishops was about to approve a proposal calling for “full communion” with the nation’s largest Lutheran denomination. Members of the traditionalist Episcopal Synod of America were drawing a line in the sand. They would not stand by while their House of Bishops compromised their holy office in some desperate move to unite with another declining denomination. “For 2,000 years, we’ve had the sacraments handed down from bishops to priests. It’s that apostolic order that distinguishes us,” said one active member in the traditionalist movement, a housewife who devotes countless hours to the cause. “The church hierarchy is liberal, but the members are not. Our people just leave the church with broken hearts.”” (Cimino and Lattin 116)
   4. “Those supporting the ecumenical plan said the bishops were merely legislating what had already happened in Episcopal parishes across the country. Old-fashioned distinctions between “Episcopal” and “Lutheran” were meaningless to most Americans. And besides, the traditionalists were harking back to a perfect church that never existed. “If you really understand our tradition, you see that right from the beginning our church was confused, innovative, and divided,” said the Reverend Alan Jones, dean of Grace Cathedral in San Francisco. “There was never a pure church.”“ (Cimino and Lattin 117)
   5. “As it turned out, Episcopal Church leaders approved their historic agreement with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, only to have the proposal narrowly rejected at the Lutheran church convention later that summer. Although the Lutherans rejected closer ties with the Episcopal Church, they did authorize a separate proposal calling for “full communion” with three mainline denominations—the United Church of Christ, the Reformed Church in America, and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).” (Cimino and Lattin 117)
   6. “Liberal Episcopalians say they have no choice but to join forces with other denominations. They have been losing members and money for thirty years and are finding it harder and harder to support big national programs from their New York headquarters.” (Cimino and Lattin 117)
   7. “All this denominational maneuvering is part of a major realignment of American Christianity in the post-denominational era. Churches with common views on the ordination of women and abortion rights are coming together in coalitions that blur traditional boundaries among Protestants, Anglicans, and Roman Catholics.” (Cimino and Lattin 117)
   8. one Lutheran pastor: “Churches are cooperating around social issues. Dividing lines are drawn over the role of women, gay rights, and abortion, not around denominational ties.”“ (Cimino and Lattin 117)
6. **switching denominations**
   1. There has been a “long decline of denominational loyalty.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
      1. “In 1958, only one person in twenty-five had left their childhood denomination.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
      2. “By 1984, one out of three had left or switched.” (Roof, Wade Clark, and William McKinney. *American Mainline Religion*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1987. 172-83.) (Cimino and Lattin 96)
   2. entire congregations switching
      1. “In American Protestantism, the loosening of denominational ties creates a free-market environment in which an entire Presbyterian congregation goes Pentecostal, or an Episcopal parish turns Eastern Orthodox.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
      2. “In 1993, the pastor of a Vineyard congregation [Vineyard Christian Fellowship, a megachurch] in San Jose, California, took his entire flock into the Antiochian Evangelical Orthodox Mission, trading in “praise [96] bands” and prophesy [*sic*] for ornate vestments and icons of the Virgin Mary.” (Synan, Vinson. *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997. 294.) (Cimino and Lattin 96-97)
      3. “Examples of these wholesale denominational defections reach well into the hundreds, and church growth specialists say that the pace is quickening.” (Cimino and Lattin 97)
      4. “Switching is easier because the clergy have grown more independent.” (Cimino and Lattin 97)
         1. “Denominational “switching” is common not only among the laity, it is growing among clergy as well.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
         2. “In the past, pastors wanting to change denominations would quietly leave their flock. Now, defecting ministers may tell their parishioners, “This is really not where we belong,” says Lyle Schaller, a specialist on congregational trends.” (Cimino and Lattin 97)
      5. In May 1998 “a group of conservative evangelical pastors in the United Methodist Church in California threatened to leave the denomination and take their flocks with them. On the surface, the defections were in response to increasing conflicts about gay rights in the denomination and disagreements over the nature and authority of scripture. Just as important, however, was conservative frustration over . . . an entrenched liberal bureaucracy . . . “We build up a church, then they put in a pastor who doesn’t match up with the congregation, and it kills the church,” one of the evangelicals complained.” (Lattin, Don. “Twenty-Two Pastors Want to Quit Methodist Church, Take Flocks.” *San Francisco Chronicle* [May 1, 1998]: A6.) (Cimino and Lattin 97)
      6. “New divisions within denominations and growing cooperation between like-minded religionists of different traditions will make such switching common in the future.” (Cimino and Lattin 97)
         1. “In today’s religious scene, a conservative Episcopal priest has more in common with a neighboring Eastern Orthodox priest than with his fellow Episcopalian clergy with a liberal bent.” (Cimino and Lattin 97)
      7. “Denominational ties are so weak that some [denominations] have begun advertising for congregations. Consider a recent ad in *Christianity Today* magazine for the Evangelical Episcopal Church International, a newly formed conservative denomination. . . . It advertised the denomination’s “contemporary liturgical worship” . . . Reverend Michael Owen, presiding bishop of the denomination, which had grown to over 200 parishes since its founding in 1995, said advertising for denominations may have been “unusual until recently, but there’s a need for many leaving mainline churches to know there are alternatives.”” (Cimino, Richard P. “Denominational Switching Grows Among Conservative Congregations.” *Religion Watch* [July-Aug. 1996]: 1-2.) (Cimino and Lattin 97)
7. **parachurches**
   1. “Parachurch or para-denominational groups are organizations that stand outside of congregational and denominational life, such as the evangelical relief organization World Vision. They are specialized agencies that do one thing well, rather than all-purpose religious organizations.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
   2. “Denominations have—often reluctantly—begun to allow “parachurch” groups to provide services for their members and congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
   3. example: moderate Southern Baptists
      1. “Sociologist Nancy Ammerman sees new networks of liberal and moderate Southern Baptists as models of this “postmodern denomination.” They avoid structures that mirror those of the wider Southern Baptist Convention. Rather, they work through coalitions—subcontracting, networking, and taking advantage of new computer technology.” (Cimino and Lattin 98)
      2. Nancy Ammerman on the moderate Alliance of Baptists (“SBC Moderates and the Making of a Postmodern Denomination.” *Christian Century* [22-29 Sept. 1993]): “It has a tiny national staff and meets in an annual convocation for education and worship. There is no thought of becoming a ‘full-service’ denomination. Rather, it is a specialized organization with an identifiable niche, capable of forging alliances for the purpose of pursuing specific short-term goals.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
      3. “Although the alliance publishes alternative literature and has started a seminary, these initiatives have not come under control of the organization, and are offered to those in other liberal and moderate Baptist bodies.” (Cimino and Lattin 99)
8. **contributions**
   1. “John Mulder of the Presbyterian Church’s Louisville Seminary, concedes that there has been cutting back of national staff among Presbyterians and other mainline Protestants, and a funding shift from national causes to local congregations. But even if congregational giving continues to move to the local level, “denominations are sufficiently well-endowed so that they won’t disappear,” he says. This is because endowments—such as individual gifts earmarked for specific causes—and foundation giving have assumed greater importance in mainline denominations. In the Presbyterian Church, Mulder says, only 30 percent of funding comes from local congregations. A major source of money today is donations willed by deceased Presbyterians.” (Cimino and Lattin 100)
   2. “It is estimated that more than $10 trillion will be given away in the wills of older citizens as they die in the next few decades. Independent foundations created for such planned giving have been established for the Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) members. But since these foundations are independent, they may lead to further decentralization. Givers often distrust donating to national church leaderships and prefer founda­tions, where they can earmark gifts to specific causes. They are more likely to give to missions or charity than support programs to rebuild centralized bureaucracies.” (Cimino, Richard P. “The Fuzzy Future of Denominations.” *Religion Watch* [Dec. 1996] 1-2.) (Cimino and Lattin 100)
   3. “Not surprisingly, denominational officials are wary about all this downsizing and decentralizing, and not only for reasons of self-preservation. At the 1996 General Conference of the United Methodist Church, delegates pushed a variety of plans for downsizing and simplifying, proposing “new paradigms” to replace national church bureaucracies. Theologian William Willimon writes that many national church leaders feel threatened by the new mood. “Some women and ethnic-minority delegates [100] feared that without the current complex of quotas, rules, and mandated structures they would lose the ground they had only recently gained.” (Willimon, William. “Reformer and Hand-Wringer.” *Christian Century* [May 15, 1996]: 533-34.) (Cimino and Lattin 100-01)
   4. “Denominations provide a collective voice and public expression for church positions on social and other issues. Critics of decentralization fear religious groups will lose any chance of influencing American society if local expressions of faith overshadow a unified national voice.” (Cimino and Lattin 101)
   5. “Decentralization will also change the way clergy and lay leaders are trained. Though it is still uncertain how seminaries will navigate postdenominational currents, a widespread concern has emerged that today’s seminaries are out of touch with the changing needs of people in the congregations. John Fitzmeyer, associate dean of Vanderbilt Divinity School, says that seminaries are facing problems from all sides. On one hand, denominations expect leaders to meet “pre-ordered” standards. On the other hand, schools have had to lower their expectations of students, since they are often ignorant about doctrine and come to seminary as “seekers or questers.” At the same time, the faculty has become more specialized in their disciplines, showing “no common theological calling.” (Cimino, Richard P. “The Fuzzy Future of Denominations.” *Religion Watch* [Dec. 1996]: 2.) (Cimino and Lattin 101)
   6. “Seminaries have begun to change, sometimes by following the lead of corporate America or other organizations in the nonprofit sector. They have entered into new partnerships with other schools. Three Philadelphia seminaries—Eastern, Westminster, and Lutheran Theological Seminary—formed an alliance to teach urban pastors of African-American churches. Seminaries have also forged new relationships with congregations—even those independent and self-contained megachurches. A federation of evangelical seminaries grants credit for leadership education programs conducted by Willow Creek Church, the pioneer megachurch. In fact, megachurch pastors have been in the forefront of challenging the traditional separation of seminary and congregation. If the purpose of seminaries is to train people to work in congregations, they argue, why not close the gap and incorporate these schools into the parish? These kinds of questions will take on more urgency in the new millennium as denominations lose much of their centralized power and congregations and informal networks gain greater influence.” (Cimino and Lattin 101)
   7. “Another trend is the founding of new “niche” seminaries focusing on specific concerns, such as particular ethnic populations or geographic localities. The Logos Evangelical Seminary in Pasadena, California, targets its ministry training programs to the world’s Chinese people. A decade ago, Charlotte, North Carolina, had no seminary; today there are four. An example of the home-grown quality of these schools is Southern Evangelical Seminary in Charlotte, a niche school that emphasizes apologetics (defense of the faith) and began on the campus of a large church.” (Brubaker, George K.. “Seminary Education: Real Time, Real Life.” *Christianity Today* [7 Oct. 1996]: 99-134.) (Cimino and Lattin 101)

## Women and Ministry

1. **women in leadership positions in non-Christian religions**
   1. Judaism: “There has also been a strong influx of women into the Reform, Conservative, and Reconstructionist rabbinate.” (Cimino and Lattin 90)
   2. “Other religious traditions with exclusive male leadership in other countries have succumbed to egalitarian and feminist influences upon arriving in the United States.” (Cimino and Lattin 90)
      1. “Female leadership and feminist ideas have revolutionized many American Buddhist communities, where women have reworked the liturgy and inspired a more democratic form of practice.” (Graham, Barbara. “The Feminine Face of the Buddha.” *Common Boundary* [Mar.-Apr. 1994]: 28-35.) (Cimino and Lattin 90)
2. **the Roman Catholic Church**
   1. “. . . the Southern Baptists and Roman Catholics [are] the last vestiges of patriarchal ministry.” (Cimino and Lattin 89)
   2. 1995: the “Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith declared that the Catholic Church teaching that women cannot be ordained to the priesthood was “infallible” and closed to further discussion. Nevertheless, both the Catholic Theological Society of America and the College Theology Society, an organization of university theology and religious studies professors, have refused to go along with the Vatican edict, and continue to study and debate the issue.” (Cimino and Lattin 90)
   3. “Despite the Vatican position, rising numbers of women enroll in Catholic seminaries. At the Franciscan School of Theology in Berkeley, for example, 40 percent of the students were women in the spring semester of 1997. One of them, Harriet, gave up a legal career to become a Catholic lay minister, or, she hopes, a priest. “I’m just going to let God take care of what’s going to happen in the end,” she said. “Who knows where we’ll be in ten years?”” (Cimino and Lattin 90)
   4. “In Catholic parishes in the United States, women already outnumber men in most types of nonordained ministry. Though women are not empowered to perform sacraments such as consecrating the bread at Mass, they may assist in the communion service as eucharistic ministers, and serve as lectors, lead adult Bible study, and even run priestless parishes as “pastoral associates.”” (Cimino and Lattin 90)
3. **women in Protestant churches**
   1. women in seminaries
      1. “Women are already flooding into ministry . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 89)
      2. “At six of the nine seminaries of the Graduate Theological Union, for example, women now outnumber men . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 89)
      3. “At the Episcopal Church Divinity School of the Pacific, there are seventy women seminarians and only twenty-five male students.” (Cimino and Lattin 89)
      4. “Women are also found in large numbers at the main Southern Baptist seminary in California, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, despite the fact that few Southern Baptist churches will call women as pastors. Nevertheless, in 1997, nearly a third of the 440 students on that Baptist campus were women.” (Cimino and Lattin 89)
   2. “In mainline Protestant churches, the proportion of women clergy is rapidly approaching that of men.” (Cimino and Lattin 89)
   3. “Women are also gaining a place in the [89] pastorates in evangelical churches, especially in Pentecostal and charismatic congregations. Women may serve as co-pastors with their husbands in these churches . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 89-90)
   4. “Though some evangelical megachurches may limit the pastorate to men, women in these congregations’ small groups and other ministries have assumed leadership positions.” (Cimino and Lattin 90)
4. **example**: **Cheryl Kirk-Duggan**
   1. Cheryl Kirk-Duggan has been, since 1997, “director of the Center for Women and Religion at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, a consortium of nine Protestant and Roman Catholic seminaries . . . Kirk-Duggan, ordained in the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, comes out of an African-American denomination that has ordained women for more than a century. Nevertheless, she said, many black churches don’t want to see a woman behind the pulpit. And women can be as resistant as men to the idea.” (Cimino and Lattin 88)
   2. Kirk-Duggan said many churchgoers, black and white, see the world spinning out of control, and want their churches to be “safe and unchanging.”
   3. Cheryl Kirk-Duggan: “People get so hung up on the maleness of Christ, or the maleness of his apostles. If you go that route, then all the priests in the church should be Jewish and in their thirties.” (Qtd. in Cimino and Lattin 89)
   4. Cheryl Kirk-Duggan: “I’d like to see what would happen if women in one of these churches that doesn’t ordain women would simply not show up for services on Sunday, or stop paying their tithes,” she said. “Just watch how quickly a new revelation would come down from above.” (Qtd. in Cimino and Lattin 89)
   5. Cheryl Kirk-Duggan: “There’s a softening of the office of pastor. It’s not the top-down hierarchical mode, the patriarchal way of saying, ‘I am priest,’ or ‘I am minister.’ Women are more community-based. They give more people voices.” (Qtd. in Cimino and Lattin 89)
5. **example**: **Margaret Miles**
   1. “Margaret Miles, dean of the Graduate Theological Union, first came to San Francisco Theological Seminary back in the 1950s as a “good little minister’s wife.” She typed her husband’s papers, ignored her own intellectual development, and joined a group of seminary wives called “The Parsonettes.”” (Cimino and Lattin 93)
   2. ““There were no women in the ministerial programs,” said Miles, who returned to the Bay Area forty years later—after a divorce and eighteen [93] years as a professor at Harvard Divinity School. “It feels like a very different world today. One thing drawing women to ministry is they are socialized to be caring and nurturing toward other people. So it’s a natural. Many women are also drawn here by deeply felt political commitments to revise social institutions, like churches and synagogues, that have been entirely designed and administered by men, and to wonder what these institutions would look like if women had thought them through.”” (Cimino and Lattin 93-94)
   3. “Miles was asked what kind of Easter sermon she’d deliver if the topic was women and religion. “I’d start by saying Christianity has a shameful past on this issue, as do other world religions, by marginalizing and oppressing women,” she said. “At the same time, women in ministry is a rediscovery of one of the essential tenets of Christianity—Galatians 3:28: ‘There is no male and female, for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.’ Women are bringing new life to an ancient tradition that had come to an impasse. That’s a very hopeful thing.” (Lattin, Don. “Called by Her God.” *San Francisco Chronicle Sunday* [30 Mar. 1997]: 1.) (Cimino and Lattin 94)
6. **unintended effects**
   1. “Many of the denominations that have welcomed women into leadership, such as the Episcopal and United Methodist churches, are the [90] ones that are losing market share and social influence.” (Cimino and Lattin 90-91)
      1. Paula Nesbitt
         1. Nesbitt is “a sociologist of religion at Iliff School of Theology in Denver [and] author of *The Feminization of the Clergy in America* . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
         2. “. . . the status of the clergy was already in decline when large numbers of women began entering the field.” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
         3. Nesbitt: “There has been a common understanding that when women enter an occupation, its prestige and its salaries go down. We started to see those changes back in the 1960s.” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
      2. “. . . the shrinking number of positions in declining mainline churches creates stronger competition and a possible backlash against women clergy.” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
   2. “The influx of women into the pastorate may also hasten the graying of the clergy, since many women are entering the ministry at later stages of life.” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
   3. “Although ordained women found it easier to get jobs in the 1990s, they are not necessarily moving into full-time pastorates. Many men are leaving temporary positions, part-time jobs, and other positions like hospital chaplains, and there is a disproportionate increase of women replacing them. [Cimino, Richard. “Women Religious Leadership Facing Mainline Decline, Conservative Growth.” *Religion Watch* [Nov. 1995]: 1-2.] Though these positions may meet the needs of some women clergy, such as those with young children, they may also “ghettoize” women into marginal positions.” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
      1. “Not everyone sees the tendency for women clergy to move into nonconventional positions, rather than traditional pastorates, as a sign of discrimination, as women hitting the “glass ceiling.”” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
      2. “Other research shows that women often choose positions such as community ministries and hospital and prison chaplaincies, not because of discrimination, but because they want more personal interaction in their ministry.” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
   4. “Some see the growing proportion of women in the clergy as furthering the “feminization” of organized religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
      1. “. . . surveys consistently show women to be much more active in organized religion than men . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
      2. “. . . *Newsweek* religion writer Kenneth Woodward argues that the growing proportion of women in leadership may further discourage participation among men and deprive them of role models and masculine spiritual symbols. Woodward sees a future where woman [*sic*] ministers using female imagery for God preach every Sunday to congregations of mainly women.” (Woodward, Kenneth L. “Gender and Religion.” *Commonweal* [22 Nov. 1996]: 9-14.) (Cimino and Lattin 92)
      3. “Even in evangelical and Catholic churches where men retain leadership positions, there is increasing concern that masculinity and religious practice are seen to be in conflict. This is one reason why religious men’s movements like Promise Keepers and the Million Man March have gotten so much attention.” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
      4. “Some of those opposing the ordination of women argue that maintaining a male presence in the clergy is the best way to provide a balance to the predominantly feminine influence found in most congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
      5. “Proponents of the growing movement toward lay involvement, team ministry, and decentralization of congregational life counter that when leadership is dispersed throughout the congregation, members are provided with a variety of male and female role models.” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
   5. “Eugene McCarraher questions whether authoritarianism and abuse of power is solely the province of male clergy. Noting the growing influence of women in Catholic parishes, the historian asserts that the “vertical authority of male priests will be supplanted by the horizontal authority of female laity as women come to effectively run the church in the twenty-first century.” He adds that the concerns women bring to parishes, such as diversity and nondirective leadership, do not automatically translate into greater democracy in parishes and congregations. He cautions that “horizontal modes of authority have their own forms of authoritarianism, ones that operate through interpersonal relationships rather than top-down dictation.” (McCarraher, Eugene. “Smile When You Say ‘Laity.’” *Commonweal* [12 Sept. 1997]: 23.)
7. **gender and styles of leadership**
   1. Women “want more personal interaction in their ministry. This different style of ministry shows how female clergy will change church life. Women clergy have been found to have ministries based strongly on relationships. Their preaching and style of leadership stresses the sharing of personal information and puts less distance between clergy and laity. Women clergy will accelerate the move from strictly hierarchical forms of leadership to team leadership models.” (Cimino and Lattin 91)
   2. But “Other research suggests that church environments shape ministry style as much as the gender of clergy. A survey of 4,000 pastors conducted by Hartford Seminary found that among conservative congregations such as the Assemblies of God, clergy were more apt to take an authority-based style regardless of whether a man or woman was at the helm. Among liberals, male and female Unitarian clergy were most likely to share power with members of their congregation. (Zikmund, Barbara Brown, Adair T. Lummis, and Patricia Mei Yang Chang. *Clergy Women*: *An Uphill Calling*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.) (Cimino and Lattin 91)
8. **inclusive language**
   1. “. . . the issue of inclusive language carries wide appeal among women religious leaders and will be the most controversial feminist innovation in congregational life.” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
   2. examples
      1. “In the Jewish tradition, the feminist use of inclusive language focuses more on the [92] immanence of the divine, rather than the transcendence of God, referring to God as the “wellspring of life,” rather than “king” or “judge.”” (Cimino and Lattin 92-93)
      2. “Feminist liturgies have reformulated the Christian Trinity from “Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” to “Creator, Redeemer, and Sustainer.”” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
      3. “Maternal symbols for God are juxtaposed alongside masculine imagery.” (Cimino and Lattin 92)
      4. “A United Methodist hymnal that deleted traditional male representations of God and attempted to be inclusive of women and racial minorities sparked controversy when it was released in the late 1980s. Yet a survey conducted by Don Saliers of Candler School of Theology of 112 congregations in 1993 found greater acceptance of the hymnal among the laity. A large majority of the congregations were positive and even enthusiastic about the hymnal. (Goldman, Ari. “Hymnals Welcomed.” *New York Times* [31 July 1993]: 10L.) (Cimino and Lattin 93)
   3. “Inclusive language advocates say these revisions are not substituting female for male imagery of God, but adding the voice of women’s spirituality to worship and theology—a voice long silenced in traditional churches.” (Cimino and Lattin 93)
   4. “Those opposed to inclusive language argue that the tradition’s use of male imagery serves a distinctive purpose—stressing the transcendence of God—and that changing historic symbols and formulas changes the theology.” (Cimino and Lattin 93)
   5. “. . . a study of women clergy in generally liberal New England Congregational churches of the United Church of Christ found that while the laity gradually came to accept and appreciate their woman pastors, they had more problems accepting inclusive language. Sixty-three percent of respondents believed that inclusive language in hymns, prayers, sermons, and scripture is not important, while 83 percent did not like female metaphors for God.” (Cimino and Lattin 93)
   6. Allison Stokes (*Women Pastors*. New York: Crossroad, 1995. 123-59): “Clergywomen understand, as many in congregations often do not, that much is at stake in the use of language that is inclusive. The connection between the role of women representing the Divine and the words we use in speaking of the Divine is inextricable.” (Cimino and Lattin 93)
   7. “The Catholic Church [stresses] the importance of the priest being male in representing Christ at the Mass, a position that many American Catholics oppose, judging by their significant level of support for women’s ordination. Many American laypeople, regardless of their stance on inclusive language, are not convinced that the clergy, through their gender at least, uniquely reflect or represent God.” (Cimino and Lattin 93)

## Megachurches

1. **characteristics**
   1. *marketing techniques*: “What they have in common is that they are fast-growing . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   2. *large size*: “Megachurches may have 10,000 members, or no more than a few hundred.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   3. *contemporary services*: megachurches “use contemporary services to attract spiritual seekers and unchurched Americans.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
      1. Examples include popular music and services at unusual times. (Cimino and Lattin 57)
      2. “The emphasis on choice and being “user-friendly” responds to the consumerism and individualism of the wider society.” (Cimino and Lattin 61)
   4. *numerous programs*: in addition to the usual twelve-step programs and Bible study groups, megachurches tend to have other programs: day-care centers, elementary and secondary schools, programs for teens, singles’ groups, workshops on stress reduction, health clubs, etc. (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   5. *conservative theology*: “Most of the largest [megachurches] are evangelical.” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
   6. *denominational indifference*: “Neither baby boomers nor Generation Xers put great importance on denominational loyalty.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
   7. Sociologist Donald E. Miller researched “three seeker churches—Calvary Chapel, Hope Chapel, and Vineyard Christian Fellowship.” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
      1. “According to Miller, these “new paradigm” churches share many characteristics.” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
         1. “They were started after the mid-1960s . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
         2. “. . . most of their members were born after 1945.” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
         3. “Seminary training of clergy is optional, and lay leadership is highly valued. . . . tolerance of different personal styles is prized.” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
         4. “They have extensive small-group ministries . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
         5. “. . . Bible-centered teaching predominates over topical sermonizing.” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
         6. “Worship is Pentecostal . . . Worship takes bodily, rather than merely cognitive, form. “What struck me was that these people were not singing *about* God, they were singing *to* God,” Miller writes. “Something seemed to be reaching back to them—or stirring deep within their individual psyches.”” (Miller, Donald G. *Reinventing American Protestantism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.) (Cimino and Lattin 63)
      2. “He sees Vineyard, Calvary, and Hope as the new wave of American Protestantism. Miller calls their young, enthusiastic members “post-modern primitives.”” Miller: “They acknowledge and utilize many aspects of postmodern culture, yet they find in the biblical tradition—in particular, the ‘primitive Christianity’ of the first century—an underpinning for a radical spirituality that undermines the cynicism and fragmentation of many postmodern theorists.” (Miller, Donald E. *Reinventing American Protestantism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.) (Cimino and Lattin 63)
2. **history**
   1. “In many ways, Catholic parishes are America’s original megachurches. Like their Protestant counterparts, Catholic parishes are often large, multipurpose structures offering a diversity of activities, such as Masses for [59] specific age and ethnic groups and various social and fraternal organizations. The average parish is still eight times larger than the average Protestant congregation.” (Cimino and Lattin 59-60)
      1. “Catholic journalist Tim Unsworth writes that “non-Catholics are attracted to the Roman church by the colorful liturgy, the large, varied community and lung-filling music, while many of their Protestant cradle churches have turned into clubs that are anti-growth. The large, incense-filled Catholic churches offer a certain anonymity that allows both shoppers and seekers to feel comfortable.”” (Unsworth, Tim. “Status of Protestants Under the Sanctuary Lamp.” *National Catholic Reporter* [4 Oct. 1996]: 18.) (Cimino and Lattin 60)
      2. In historic large Catholic parishes, however (unlike megachurches), “Parish memberships were . . . restricted to geographic neighborhoods . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
   2. *1970s*: “In the early 1970s, [Protestant] “superchurches” emerged that intentionally sought to [56] draw the multitudes into their pews by featuring high-profile preachers and Sunday school campaigns.” (Cimino and Lattin 56-57)
   3. *1980s*: “The megachurches emerged a decade later, targeting larger crowds through more sophisticated forms of marketing. Willow Creek Community Church in suburban Chicago pioneered the development of this market-based approach to outreach and worship.” (Cimino and Lattin 75)
   4. *1990s*: “In the free-wheeling economy of the 1990s, churches began marketing and advertising themselves with as much sophistication as corporations launching new products or politicians selling themselves to voters.” (Cimino and Lattin 59)
3. **example**: **California Christian Center**
   1. “. . . California Christian Center [is] a sprawling megachurch serving the fast-growing bedroom communities of the Central Valley. It [is] just off the busy freeway that connects valley residents to the Home Depot, K-Mart, and other megastores . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 55)
   2. “. . . there’s something happening here every day of the week. For many of its 3,800 members, this is not just a church where they come for Sunday worship. It’s where they recreate, educate, socialize, and spend much of their lives. Its fully accredited high school has 350 students, with another 600 attending its elementary and intermediate school, plus 150 more in its day-care center. Its high school is state-of-the-art, with computer labs, libraries, art studios, a band room, two softball fields, one baseball diamond, and a football stadium where its Christian athletes compete with teams from neighboring secular schools. Its athletic director serves both the school and the church. Adult members use the same facilities for their own sports activities.” (Cimino and Lattin 55)
   3. “Like many megachurches, California Christian Center doesn’t play up its affiliation with its Pentecostal denomination. Instead, it stresses that it’s “Bible-based” and “family oriented.” In some ways, the [Center] is a little denomination unto itself. It has spawned a dozen smaller churches and schools, who view its large complex as a kind of Pentecostal cathedral for special events and celebrations. One of the spin-off congregations, Valley Christian Church, is nearly as large as the mother church, and just opened a new 2,500-seat sanctuary.” (Cimino and Lattin 55)
   4. “Steve and Julie, . . . young “church shoppers” . . ., were very impressed . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 56)
      1. ““Everybody was nice and friendly,” Julie recalled. “Even though I wasn’t Pentecostal, I felt at peace when we walked in. It felt like the place where I should be.” Steve, who never went to church as a child, was a bit put off at first by the lively style of worship, but soon felt comfortable. “We liked the music and the fact that they had a big band with contemporary music,” Steve said. “It was familiar. They’d have concerts with Christian bands you’d hear on the radio. And they had lots of good programs for kids.”” (Cimino and Lattin 56)
      2. “After about three months, however, Steve and Julie became dissatisfied. “It was so big that it was hard to meet the same people on Sunday,” Steve said. “You couldn’t get planted. It was too impersonal. You felt lost in the shuffle.” They eventually settled on a smaller Pentecostal church that was not part of the California Christian network.” (Cimino and Lattin 56)
   5. “Jim, a leading lay member at California Christian Center, said his megachurch has found a way to overcome the impersonal feeling that drove Steve and Julie away. “The secret to large churches like this is not that they’re large; it’s all the small groups we have within the church so people don’t get lost,” he explained. “There are lots of ways for people to identify with the church. We have a singles’ group with 200 to 300 people. We have a seniors’ group. There are groups for people with drug and alcohol problems. They meet at different times throughout the week, then we all come together on Sunday.”” (Cimino and Lattin 56)
   6. “Despite its conservative evangelical doctrine, California Christian Center has a consumer approach to Christianity, a market-based ministry. It is user-friendly. It provides all the life services its members need—a singles’ ministry to meet your mate, a school and day-care center for your kids, a softball team for the whole family, a seniors’ group for your parents, not to mention a place to park your car. In the new millennium, more and more American congregations will take this market-based approach to find new members and keep the ones they have. Megachurches embody the consumerism, eclecticism, and the conservatism shaping the religious future. They are the evangelical answer to Home Depot.” (Cimino and Lattin 56)
4. **example**: **Vineyard Christian Fellowship**
   1. history
      1. “Vineyard Christian Fellowship grew out of the countercultural “Jesus Freak” movement in the 1960s and 1970s . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      2. summer, 1974: in Southern California, “Kenn Gulliksen, a born-again Lutheran, gathered five people together in the living room of a private home.” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      3. “Vineyard Christian Fellowship . . . grew so fast that Gulliksen let it all go in 1982, troubled that his creation was turning into another religious denomination—which was exactly *not* the idea.” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      4. “Gulliksen turned the burgeoning movement over to John Wimber, a Quaker-turned-Pentecostal who saw it grow to more than 400 congregations [95] across the United States and another 200 around the world.” (Cimino and Lattin 95-96)
      5. “In the early 1990s, some of the Vineyard congregations parted ways when the “holy laughter” Pentecostal revival, also known by some as the “Toronto Blessing,” swept through the movement.” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
      6. “John Wimber died in November 1997 . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
      7. “Debate still rages over how “denominational” the movement should become. “We are not policy driven,” Paul said. “The government structure primarily exists to facilitate a relationship and connectedness between the local churches.” Another pastor put it this way: “Vineyard is growing up,” he said. “And there’s a fear that when it becomes a denomination, it dies.”” (McClure, Vicki. Religion Reporting Project, UC Berkeley Graduate School of Journalism [Dec. 1997].) (Cimino and Lattin 96)
   2. a typical service
      1. “In an inner-city warehouse and former discotheque, Vineyard Christian Fellowship begins its Sunday morning worship with a six-piece rock band, complete with drums, keyboard, and electric guitar.” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      2. “This service [is] in San Francisco’s trendy “South of Market” district in the fall of 1997 . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      3. “Two overhead projectors beam lyrics onto a wall. Four hundred congregants of varying ages and ethnicities sing out for the first forty-five minutes of the service, some swaying from side to side with arms held high. Others clap their hands, shouting “Praise Jesus!”” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      4. “Nearly everyone in the service, including the preacher, is informally dressed. There’s an unmistakable intimacy in the room. It feels real. “People are just being people here, not putting on a Christian overcoat,” says Monica, a nurse attending this morning’s worship.” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      5. “After the music dies down, the congregation’s associate pastor offers an informal, self-revealing sermon full of personal stories about his own life struggle. “Every single one of us is dealing with stuff,” he says. “And He’s going to expose it.”” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
      6. “Many people don’t consider us a stable church,” said Paul, one Vineyard pastor. “We’re committed to trying new things, and that sometimes stretches the comfort zone.”” (Cimino and Lattin 95)
5. **marketing techniques**
   1. “Megachurch leaders unashamedly admit the influence of business and management theory. One leader cites management guru Peter Drucker’s formula as his inspiration: “What is our business? Who is our customer? What does the customer consider value?”” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   2. Church-growth consultant Richard Southern recommends ““an essential paradigm shift in the way church is done,” a shift that puts the needs of potential “customers” before the needs of the institutional church. “Who says church has to be at 11:00 a.m. Sunday?” asked Southern. “Baby boomers think of churches like they think of supermarkets. They want options, choices, convenience. Imagine if Safeway was only open one hour a week [and] had only one product . . .”” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
   3. “Southern’s firm provides a detailed demographic study of a church’s neighborhood and suggests ways the church can attract new members—including baby boomers worrying about the religious education of their children or their own midlife crises.” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
   4. “In addition to finding out how many of the church’s neighbors believe in God or embrace “traditional American family values,” [Southern’s demographic] study breaks down the local population into such “lifestyle segments” as “struggling multiethnic” or “new-money professional.” If a congregation realizes that it has a lot of “rising potential professionals” in the parish, Southern said, it may want to offer free workshops on stress reduction or begin some kind of child-care program for overworked, two-income couples. Other changes might be simply providing free parking, using popular music in worship services, or making sure that visitors are “welcomed but not singled out.”” (Cimino and Lattin 59)
   5. “Percept Group, Inc., a church-marketing firm based in Costa Mesa, California, provides congregations with three-ring binders full of maps, charts, and detailed social, racial, economic, religious, and psychological profiles of their target communities. Survey data tell church planners whether the people in their neighborhoods prefer an “emotionally uplifting” worship style or one that is “intellectually challenging.” Public opinion polls tell pastors whether the people in their neighborhood are more concerned with personal and spiritual problems, family problems, or community problems, and what type of media campaign is most likely to reach them.” (Cimino and Lattin 59)
6. **large size**
   1. “. . . seeker-sensitive congregations tailor their message and practice to the sensibilities of the surrounding culture. . . . Megachurches feel familiar to baby boomers who studied in large schools, attended huge rock concerts, and shop in sprawling suburban malls.” (Cimino and Lattin 61)
   2. “Some observers say it may be more accurate to speak of the megachurches as “regional churches.” Greater geographical and social mobility of Americans forces congregations to focus beyond their immediate neighborhood.” (Schaller, Lyle E. *The New Reformation*: *Tomorrow Arrived Yesterday*. Nashville: Abington, 1995.) (Cimino and Lattin 61)
   3. “Megachurches are setting up satellite congregations throughout the nation, in a phenomenon Russell Chandler calls “parameter churches.” [99] . . . Suburban megachurches have also set up “chapels” in the inner-city. Eventually these churches become semi-autonomous congregations, part of a new church network.” (Chandler, Russell. *Racing Toward 2001*. San Francisco: Zondervan-Harper, 1992. 240-45.) (Cimino and Lattin 99-100)
7. **contemporary services**
   1. “Visitors are greeted with contemporary music, often performed by professional bands, rather than traditional hymns accompanied by an organ. Writer Charles Trueheart notes that music is a symbolic issue for megachurch pastors. “Whether a church uses contemporary music or not defines what kind of people it wants. When it uses contemporary music, it’s saying it wants unchurched people—particularly those of childbearing and child-rearing age.”” (Trueheart, Charles. “Welcome to the Next Church.” *Atlantic Monthly* [Aug. 1996]: 37-58.) (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   2. “These congregations are marked by flexibility. Services may have no fixed order, and they can be held in the afternoons or on Saturday.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   3. “The sermons are more a source of teaching than preaching. They focus on practical matters, such as family concerns and personal growth, not doctrine, sometimes mixing psychotherapeutic concepts with biblical teaching. They often emphasize religious experience. They seek to feel God’s love, not understand church theology—a theme that plays well with the decreasing importance of denominational doctrine among baby boomers.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
8. **numerous programs**
   1. “There is an emphasis on forming relationships, often expressed in the kinds of small groups found . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   2. “For example, the 20,000-member Second Baptist Church of Houston, Texas, provides a menu of singles’ groups, day-care centers, elementary and secondary schools, and even a health club.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   3. “Megachurches allow newcomers to become involved at their own pace. Visitors are not buttonholed for special attention. The tight communal embrace of traditional small-town churches, which stresses the formation of primary, long-term relationships and loyal participation, gives way to [57] the suburban megachurch’s looser-fitting, impersonal structure. They let members decide how much they want to be involved. Members may join a twelve-step program and then a small Bible study group before actually attending a worship service.” (Cimino and Lattin 57-58)
9. **conservative theology**
   1. “Megachurches reflect the conservative shift in American religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
      1. “Many megachurches have been influenced by the charismatic and Pentecostal movements.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
   2. “Most of the largest are evangelical.” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
      1. “One survey of mainline Presbyterian churches found that thirty-four of the thirty-nine largest Presbyterian churches were evangelical.” (Stevenson, A. Russell. “Mega­churches Prove That Theology Matters.” *Presbyterian Layman* [Sept.-Oct. 1993]: 6, 8.) (Cimino and Lattin 58)
   3. “Megachurches are adorned with few ecclesiastical trappings. Crucifixes and stained glass windows are rare, and the building itself may be rented. Function is more important than form as they attempt to appear unintimidating and culturally relevant to seekers.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
      1. “Congregations looking to attract “the unchurched” avoid denominational labels. Grace Baptist Church becomes “Grace Church.”” (Cimino and Lattin 96)
   4. “In San Francisco, church-growth consultants Richard Southern and Robert Norton won contracts in the 1990s with some of the most theologically liberal mainline congregations in the nation. “Mainline churches don’t have to die,” said Southern, who left a financial marketing business in Los Angeles to start his church-consulting firm. “Anyone can learn these marketing and outreach techniques. You don’t have to change your theology or your political stance.”” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
   5. “C. Peter Wagner, a professor of church growth at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, . . . disagrees with Southern’s idea that liberal churches can attract a significant number of new members without changing their liberal theology. Citing church growth studies, Wagner said that it has been shown that churches with “a strict conviction that Jesus Christ is the only way are the churches with more growth potential.”” (Lattin, Don. “The Word Is Marketing: Mainline Churches Seek Members.” *San Francisco Chronicle* [10 Aug. 1992]: 1.) (Cimino and Lattin 59)
10. **denominational indifference**
    1. “The underlying concept of “seeker” congregations is that churches should meet the wider consumer culture on its own ground. Ideas and practices—however strongly they may be tied to one’s denominational tradition—may be abandoned if they stand in the way of drawing new members.” (Cimino and Lattin 68)
    2. “Their large size and many functions make them [megachurches] less dependent on denominational support and affiliation. Prominent megachurches such as Willow Creek have formed their own quasi-denominational network of churches.” (Cimino and Lattin 57)
    3. “Most American congregations are not large enough to implement many [programs]. . . . many smaller churches, especially those that are evangelical in orientation, view mega­churches as centers of faith in their communities and often attend programs to learn church-growth strategies.” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
    4. “Neither baby boomers nor Generation Xers put great importance on denominational loyalty.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
       1. “The idea of attending church to maintain tradition has fallen out of favor.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
       2. “. . . many of the values from the 1960s, such as informality and a stress on experience over doctrine, are still present among baby-boomer members.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
       3. “. . . sociologist Donald E. Miller . . . is among many church watchers who see main­line Protestant [62] churches moving to the sidelines.” (Miller, Donald G. *Reinventing American Protestantism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.) (Cimino and Lattin 62-63)
       4. “In their research on mainline Presbyterian baby boomers, three sociologists found that younger church members had little attachment to Presbyterian doctrine or identity and showed little commitment to the church.” (Hoge, Dean, Benton Johnson, and Donald Luidens. *Vanishing Boundaries*: *The Religion of Mainline Baby Boomers*. Louisville: Westminster/­John Knox, 1994.) (Cimino and Lattin 62)
       5. “. . . many baby boomers identify less with theology, more with special church groups devoted to environmentalism, abortion issues, or charismatic Christianity. Church members may have more in common with like-minded believers in other denominations than with those sitting in the next pew. This interplay encourages people to switch from one church or denomination to another. Today, it’s not unusual for someone to attend a Quaker meeting while belonging to a small Episcopal church group, or for a Roman Catholic to frequent a Buddhist meditation center. Roof calls it “mixing and matching.”” (Roof, Wade Clark. *A Generation of Seekers*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993.) (Cimino and Lattin 62)
       6. “. . . church attendance by returned baby boomers appears to be decreasing. A survey by the Barna Research Group found that”: (Cimino and Lattin 62)
          1. 1991: 50% “of all boomers “attended services in a given week.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
          2. 1991-1995: over 40% attended in a given week. (Cimino and Lattin 62)
          3. 1996: 33% “had recently attended church.” (Barna, George. *Barna Research Group* [28 Feb. 1996].) (Cimino and Lattin 62)
       7. “According to recent research, [Gen-Xers] exhibit an even greater degree of alienation from religious institutions.” (Barna, George. *Baby Busters*: *The Disillusioned Generation*. Chicago: Northfield, 1994.) (Cimino and Lattin 61)
11. **mainline megachurches**
    1. “After watching their membership decline for a quarter of a century, some mainline Protestant churches are following the lead of their fundamentalist brethren and using computerized demographic studies of their neighborhoods and other sophisticated marketing techniques to fill their pews.” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
    2. “C. Peter Wagner, a professor of church growth at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, agrees that mainline churches are putting more emphasis on marketing and church growth. “During the 1970s, the mainline denominations were developing theological justifications for their declining membership. They were attempting to show that this was just a purging of deadwood and were very indifferent about it,” said Wagner, who has taught church growth at Fuller since 1975. “In the ´80s, once the decline had gone on for 20 or 25 years, they began to get alarmed.”” (Cimino and Lattin 59)
    3. “Mainline marketing may be working. Denominational statistics from the mid- to late 1990s show a possible flattening of membership declines in mainline churches. Although by no means a reversal of the steep membership losses experienced in the 1960s and 1970s, this evidence may point toward renewed religious commitment in some mainline congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 59)
    4. “Megachurches have inspired mainline and liturgical churches to add contemporary services to their programs to attract people who would not attend traditional services, and to reemphasize programs for children and adolescents. Yet the attempt by mainline denominations to open model megachurches has met with less success than more independent, home-grown efforts.” (Cimino and Lattin 58)
12. **contemporary Catholic** “**megaparishes**” (Cimino and Lattin 71)
    1. “. . . Catholic parishes in revived urban centers . . . are changing to meet the demands of religious consumers. . . . [Some] American Catholic churches directly borrow features of the Protestant mega­churches.” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
    2. “Parish memberships were once restricted to geographic neighborhoods, but the new urban parishes are based on choice, drawing members from across a metropolitan area. These parishes have built up strong preaching and music programs to attract newcomers. They offer numerous programs during the weekdays, such as lecture programs and small group discussions to draw those working or living nearby.” (Marciniak, Edward, and William Droel. “The Future of Catholic Churches in the Inner City.” *Chicago Studies* [Aug. 1995]: 172-86.) (Cimino and Lattin 60)
    3. “For example, the ministry of St. Timothy’s Church in Mesa, Arizona, parallels those of large, growing Protestant megachurches in the Sunbelt.” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
       1. “The parish has grown from 1,500 to 4,500 families in a decade, attracting many through its quality music and 100 active groups—ranging from prayer groups to seminars on unemployment.” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
       2. “The parish also has a strong evangelism program that reaches people through advertisements, radio spots, and other marketing techniques.” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
       3. “Youth leaders use marketing techniques to attract and welcome unchurched and disaffected young people to special Masses. . . . St. Timothy’s founded a liturgical youth ministry program, Life Teen, that now boasts about 300 chapters across the nation.” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
       4. “St. Timothy’s demonstrates that models of megachurch ministry need not always forsake denominational identity, as the parish emphasizes Catholic teachings and loyalty to the pope.” (Montali, Larry. “Catholic Parishes Take Page from Megachurches.” *National Catholic Register* [13 Aug. 1995]: 1.) (Cimino and Lattin 60)
13. **African-American megachurches**
    1. “African-American megachurches are growing fast . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
    2. “. . . like their white counterparts, [they] stress personal spiritual experience. They offer charismatic practices and worship, even in denominations not known for their charismatic focus, such as the African Methodist Episcopal Church.” (Cimino and Lattin 60)
    3. “Social concern and political involvement have been hallmarks of the black church, but writer Beverly Lawrence notes that these returnees have introduced a new emphasis on self-help and [60] networking to use the skills of new members to help the church community.” (Lawrence, Beverly Hall. *Reviving the Spirit*. New York: Grove, 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 60-61)
    4. “These churches also mirror the surrounding culture, adopting Afro-centric worship and customs rather than bringing in a rock band.”” (Cimino and Lattin 61)
14. **Jewish** “**megachurchism**”
    1. “In the Conservative branch of Judaism, “magnet” synagogues have been established and marketed to singles, seniors, and other specific target populations. These synagogues feature “user-friendly” worship and liturgy, which draw on both traditional and contemporary sources.” (Cimino and Lattin 61)
    2. “Jewish Community Centers, once largely based around secular endeavors such as adult education and recreation, are adding religious programs to their menus. Like Christian seeker services, they provide “nonthreatening entry points” for disaffiliated Jews to move into Jewish life.” (Rosenberg, Richard. “JCC’s Soft-Sell Judaism.” *Moment* [Apr. 1997]: 35.) (Cimino and Lattin 61)
15. **Generation-X churches**
    1. Demographers distinguish three post-World-War-II generations.
       1. Baby boomers are those born from 1946-62.
       2. “. . . the smaller generation that followed the baby boomers [is] Generation X or the “baby busters” . . .” They are born from 1962-82. (Cimino and Lattin 61)
       3. “. . . the next demographic group [is] the “Millenials,” those people born after 1982.” (Cimino and Lattin 61)
    2. “In a way, Generation Xers are just like baby boomers—only more so. The social forces of consumerism and pluralism shaping the lives of baby boomers are even stronger for baby busters.” (Cimino and Lattin 61)
    3. “In the 1990s, veteran evangelist Billy Graham used the hottest Christian rock bands to fill his Christian crusades with members of Generation X and [Millenials]. Back in the 1950s, when Graham’s evangelical machine first got moving, rock and roll was condemned as “the devil’s music.” Today Graham has no problem attracting teenagers with popular bands like dc talk and Jars of Clay, which fill stadiums with potential young converts. “It’s Christian rock in the sense that the lyrics are Christian, and we try to see that the people get copies of the lyrics so they can follow the music. And the lyrics are really Gospel,” Graham said . . .” (Lattin, Don. “Superman of the Cloth.” *San Francisco Chronicle* [21 Sept. 1997]: 1.) (Cimino and Lattin 61)
    4. “Churches targeting [Generation Xers] are different from the churches of their older siblings and parents.” (Cimino and Lattin 61)
    5. “Some Christian leaders have found that Generation Xers focus more on relationships and intimacy in ministry, whereas baby boomers emphasize high-quality performance. Small groups are emphasized in baby-buster ministry.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
    6. “Generation X churches allow young people to engage in social service, through voluntarism and discussion groups.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
    7. “Evangelism is seen as a gradual process rather than a sudden conversion.” (Cimino and Lattin 62)
    8. “Baby-buster ministries also emphasize lay leaders, rather than hierarchy or “superstar” leadership. Generation Xers are more likely to see their pastor more as a coach.” (Smith, Brad. “Team Ministry in the 21st Century.” *Next* [Feb. 1996]: 1-4.) (Cimino and Lattin 62)

## “The Turn to Tradition”

(Cimino and Lattin 70)

1. **introduction**
   1. The “search for roots is fueled by a sense of dislocation, of lost heritage, a yearning to go home. Although American religion is often characterized by practicality and innovation, the interest in tradition may reflect the pragmatic view that beliefs and spiritual practices that have stood the test of time may serve one better than the latest fad.” (Cimino and Lattin 23)
   2. “In the new millennium, churches that demand the most from their members will be the ones most likely to grow.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
   3. “This turn to tradition is often explained as an attempt to find spiritual roots and an anchor of authority in a rapidly changing world. Market-driven, seeker-based innovations may introduce the unaffiliated to congregational life, but they don’t always provide the benefits of traditional religions—rituals and wisdom tested by generations of experience. A growing number of evangelicals and charismatics involved in seeker-sensitive and contemporary worship are moving to more tradition-based faiths. Megachurches may have revolving doors, with many seekers arriving and born-again “traditionalists” leaving several years later.” (Cimino and Lattin 70)
   4. “In the new millennium, the paths of tradition and consumerism will converge. Choice and selectivity will play a part in even the most ardent traditionalists’ faith. Sociologist Peter Berger argues that the modern person chooses to follow a traditional religion as one option among a whole range of lifestyle choices. Such believers selectively retrieve elements from their tradition that meet social needs and provide personal benefits. . . . Since traditional religions operate within today’s religious marketplace, they too are thrust into competition for adherents. They must present their faith’s teachings in a language and manner that [70] is understandable and attractive, stressing elements of the tradition that are the most relevant to consumers unschooled in Christian basics.” (Cimino and Lattin 70-71)
   5. “. . . current trends suggest that congregations will adopt a “both-and” rather than an “either-or” stance when it comes to seeker services and traditional worship. Most congregations will not limit themselves exclusively to seekers or traditionalists. They will attempt to keep a grasp on their identities amidst the flux of the religious free market, without losing touch with the seekers to whom they are called to minister. Catholic “megaparishes,” Jewish magnet synagogues for niche markets, the Charismatic Episcopal Church, and myriad other hybrids may be tomorrow’s models for this meeting of traditional religion and consumer spirituality. . . . In the new millennium, even traditional institutions like Roman Catholic convents will bend to the dictates of consumerism and the plethora of spiritualities in the wider culture.” (Cimino and Lattin 71)
   6. “. . . the growth of religious pluralism could paradoxically encourage a re-connection with one’s particular tradition. Congregations and faith traditions may seek to recapture their own identity when the “competition” forces them to realize they cannot be all things to all seekers.” (Cimino and Lattin 75)
   7. “How far can congregations go without losing the religious identity that drew their members in the first place? There is little evidence that congregations built upon the “mixing and matching” of spiritualities can experience stable growth.” (Ellwood, Robert. *The History and Future of Faith*. New York: Crossroad, 1988. 157.) (Cimino and Lattin 75)
   8. A “resurgence of religious commitment goes far beyond the evangelical movement. It can be seen in the increasing use of “spiritual directors” and the rising appeal of strict disciplines and practices in the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and mainline Protestant churches.” (Cimino and Lattin 64)
2. **market-based theories of church growth and decline**
   1. Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. *The Churching of America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1992.
   2. “For more on rational choice theory and its scholarly critics, see”: Young, Lawrence A., ed. *Rational Choice Theory and Religion*. New York: Routledge, 1997. (Cimino and Lattin 195 n. 19)
   3. “Religion can be understood by rational-choice theory, the idea that people weigh the anticipated costs against the expected benefits of joining a congregation. This theory came into national prominence with the book *The Churching of America* by Rodney Stark and Roger Finke, as well as through the work of economist Laurence Inannaccone.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
   4. “Such theorists argue that the American religion scene is a free market, with providers flourishing or declining depending on how much they expect from their members. . . . . . . market-based theories can help explain the growth of conservative evangelical churches and the decline of liberal mainline Protestant congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
      1. “Those with rigorous religious practices and strict membership requirements discourage “free riders,” people who take advantage of religious benefits such as wedding and funeral services without making a commitment to the congregation.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
      2. “At the same time, they provide rewards, such as generating a sense of belonging and community, not to mention eternal salvation.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
      3. three points on a spectrum from lax to strict
         1. “As mainline Presbyterians relaxed their traditional observance of the Sabbath and other time-consuming practices, members were deprived of the benefits of belonging to such a religion—the distinctive sense of identity and communal belonging. This sets in motion a continuing pattern of decline.” (Cimino and Lattin 66)
         2. “Seeker churches often do not appear strict, as they preach few doctrines and seem to make few demands upon consumers. Yet these congregations offer members several avenues for spiritual growth, including Bible studies and prayer meetings that foster the integration of new [65] members into small groups. Eventually, they are expected to make a strong commitment to the church, and receive the benefits of belonging to a tight evangelical community.” (Cimino and Lattin 65-66)
         3. “In the same way, religions that establish or reestablish strict practices, such as the evangelical Assemblies of God, have registered sharp growth.” (Cimino and Lattin 65-66)
      4. “Besides faster growth rates, congregations with a strong identity tend to generate higher levels of giving. In the 1996 book *Money Matters*, researchers found that churches such as the Assemblies of God pressure members to show their devotion to God and church by pledging generously. Mainline churches make fewer demands upon members, which often translates into a more lax approach in supporting a congregation’s ministries.” (Hoge, Dean R., Charles E. Zech, Patrick H. McNamara, and Michael J. Donahue. *Money Matters*: *Personal Giving in American Churches*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 66)
      5. “Stark believes that not only will the evangelicals and other religious conservatives come to dominate the religious stage but that some mainline bodies will also shift toward a more conservative position to “become new players in the religious growth market.”” (Qtd. in: Cimino, Richard P. “Women Religious Leadership Facing Mainline Decline, Conservative Growth.” *Religion Watch* [Nov. 1995]: 2.) (Cimino and Lattin 66)
   5. “These revisionist concepts have produced some criticism among scholars.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
      1. “This approach suggests that religion is not significantly different from other spheres of human activity.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
      2. “. . . many relatively nonstrict megachurches are growing faster than smaller hard-line fundamentalist bodies.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
      3. “Other religious professionals who see their mission in more spiritual terms are uncomfortable viewing their work through an economic framework.” Church historian Martin Marty (qtd. in: Lattin, Don. “Irreverent Book Views U.S. Religion through Economic Lens.” *San Francisco Chronicle* [6 Nov. 1993]: A6.): “Finke and Stark’s world contains no God or religion or spirituality, no issue of truth or beauty or goodness, not faith or hope or love, no justice or mercy; only winning and losing in the churching game matters.” (Cimino and Lattin 65)
3. “**worship wars**”: **traditional versus contemporary worship** (Cimino and Lattin 68)
   1. ““In the future, divisions may sharpen between congregations favoring more traditional forms of ministry and those promoting contemporary worship.” (Cimino and Lattin 68)
   2. “In a religious marketplace based on choice and eclecticism, one congregation can borrow from traditional sources—Gregorian chants and contemplative prayer—as easily as another can draw from psychotherapy and rock music.” (Cimino and Lattin 68)
   3. “Traditionalists counter that members new and old must conform their identities and lifestyles to established practices and teachings even if they disturb modern sensibilities. Innovations in worship, they say, result in the “dumbing down” of believers, producing theologically illiterate congregations.” (Cimino and Lattin 68)
   4. “Lutheran theologian Carl Braaten sums up the traditionalist view: “In America the consumer is always right, and if the consumers want ‘Christianity Lite,’ then get rid of the vintage traditions. . . . We’re told we . . . need to be more user-friendly, to make people feel that the transition from life in the secular world to life in the church is smooth and comfortable.”” (Braaten, Carl E. “Theology for the Third Millennium.” *A Report from the Center*. Center for Catholic and Evangelical Theology, Summer 1996. 4.) (Cimino and Lattin 68)
   5. “In early 1996, evangelicals, mostly from Reformed and Lutheran churches, formed the Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals, a group that sought to return to the theology and confessions of the Protestant Reformation. The new group issued a declaration condemning the “pragmatism and consumerism” of the church growth movement and the [68] contemporary evangelical “dependence upon such modern idols as politics, sociology, marketing, and psychology.”” (Cimino and Lattin 68-69)
   6. “In the Lutheran church, conservatives charge that efforts to replace traditional hymns with contemporary songs from non-Lutheran sources challenges the substance as well as the expression of the faith. Lutheran worship is not only based on its liturgy but also on classical hymns from the past four centuries that teach and elucidate doctrines and themes from the Reformation.” (Cimino and Lattin 69)
   7. “. . . tomorrow’s worship wars will not simply be a battle between young believers in booming megachurches and elderly parishioners holding on to time-worn liturgies. . . . many young and middle-age Jewish and Christian seekers are returning to traditional sources of faith in their personal spirituality. This is also happening in traditional churches and synagogues.” (Cimino and Lattin 69)
4. **resurgent commitment to tradition in Judaism**
   1. “There has been an influx of once-secular Jews to Orthodox Judaism; many young professional converts are trading their independent lifestyles for the observant life of the traditional Jewish communities. Conservative and Reform Judaism have re-introduced traditional rituals and practices into their services and observances.” (Cimino and Lattin 69)
   2. “A Conservative Jewish synagogue in Washington, D.C., has attracted young urban professionals emphasizing lay leadership. But [66] at the same time, the synagogue is quite traditional, stressing a “no-nonsense” approach to observance of Jewish law. The rabbi said of the congregants, “The fact that our service is more demanding does not scare them away; on the contrary, that is what they want. Their attitude is, ‘If I am going to do this, I might as well really do it.’”” (Ruby, Walter. “Reform Versus Conservative: Who’s Winning.” *Moment* [Apr. 1996]: 37-39.) (Cimino and Lattin 66-67)
5. **resurgent commitment to tradition in Catholicism**
   1. In the 1990s, “The publication of the *Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church* was at first considered an [23] unlikely best-seller, particularly since it was first marketed with clergy in mind. The skyrocketing sales of the book point to a desire for American Catholics to measure their own views of their faith against a more ancient and universal standard.” (Cimino and Lattin 23-24)
   2. There is “the popularity of Gregorian chant . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
   3. *medieval spirituality*: “spiritual teachings and writings from the Middle Ages [23] . . . there is a widespread interest in pre-Reformation spirituality . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 23-24)
   4. *monasticism*: “Catholicism preserved its monastic tradition when most Protestants discarded it, and provides a ready-made source of spirituality for many Americans.” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
      1. There are “retreats featuring contemplative prayer . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 23-24)
      2. “Increasingly, however, monasteries and spiritual centers are . . . including Zen teachings and other forms of East-West syncretism.” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
   5. *pilgrimages*: “The retracing of religious history to find spiritual sustenance can also be seen in the popularity of pilgrimages to sacred places and shrines . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
   6. *Celtic Christianity*: “Conservative Christians receive new energy from the early Celt’s simplicity of prayer and harmonious living with creation, as well as the transcendent majesty of their God.” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
   7. *El Dia de los Muertos*: “In San Francisco, there were efforts in the late 1990s to put more of a spiritual and ethnic focus on the Latino celebration of *El Dia de los Muertos*, the Day of the Dead. It had been increasingly mixed up with the partying and commercialism of Halloween. “Partying doesn’t bother me, but the loss of spirit does. Everything has become so commercialized, even in Mexico,” said one Latina organizer of the celebration. “We want to bring together all colors, nationalities, and spiritual persuasions. Death is something we all share.” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
   8. “In Catholicism this interest can be seen in the growing number of parishes serving the pre-Vatican II Latin Mass, often drawing young people . . . by its mystery and transcendence. [69] . . . the Latin Mass and Gregorian chant are a specific tradition representing only one period in the history of Catholicism, but they are retrieved because they provide a measure of mystery and transcendence for modern Americans.” (Cimino and Lattin 69-70)
   9. “Catholic religious orders for women that stress traditional teachings and wearing full habits have been shown to draw twice as many recruits than more liberal, mainstream orders.” (Cimino and Lattin 69)
   10. “In November of 1997, for example, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops began considering a proposal that would once again require meatless Fridays for Roman Catholics.” (Cimino and Lattin 66)
   11. “Strict demands on Roman Catholics have long been placed on members of Opus Dei, a tightly organized lay group that has greatly increased its worldwide influence and American presence under the pontificate of John Paul II. Founded in Spain in 1928, Opus Dei requires an unusual amount of devotion and obedience among its lay members, some of whom agree to live a life of celibacy and devote themselves to proselytizing friends and colleagues. Many live a Spartan life of self-sacrifice, including engaging in “mortifications of the flesh” such as self-flagellation. Even those members who marry, or intend to marry, agree to submit to the authority of Opus Dei priests.” (Lattin, Don. “A Church within the Church.” *San Francisco Examiner* [1 June 1986]: A1.) (Cimino and Lattin 66)
   12. example: Tara
       1. “Sacred soundings from an ancient tongue echo through the sweet incense and marble saints of the Roman Catholic sanctuary as Tara kneels down in prayer: “*Pater noster*, *qui es in caelis* . . .”” (Cimino and Lattin 67)
       2. Tara is “a thirty-year-old dancer from Massachusetts, the child of Unitarian and Congregational parents who rarely took their family to church. As a young girl, Tara would often visit friends’ churches and composed her own prayers and rituals before going to sleep at night.” (Cimino and Lattin 67)
       3. “During her college years, however, she became a “basic heathen, dating and partying a lot, using drugs and drinking.”” (Cimino and Lattin 67)
       4. “After moving to New York to pursue her dance career, Tara got interested in feminist spirituality, and read books on astrology, the New Age, and alternative religions. Tibetan Buddhism soon caught her attention. “I was always drawn to the purest expression of things, even in dance. I always wanted to find the source of things. Tibetan Buddhism had that purity. The faith was handed down from one generation to the next.” She was drawn enough to the faith that she moved into a Tibetan Buddhist center with her boyfriend.” (Cimino and Lattin 67)
       5. “Later, when they married and went to Italy, she was surprised by an “extremely powerful” attraction to the Catholic churches and shrines she visited. Tara started praying the rosary and reading Catholic authors such as Thomas Merton and G. K. Chesterton. “I was beginning to feel more comfortable in Christianity,” she says. “It was not as foreign as Buddhism. As hard as I tried, it was hard to escape the familiarity of Christianity.”” (Cimino and Lattin 67)
       6. “Back in New York, Tara tried to find a church home for her new faith. She attended several Catholic parishes, but she found herself dissatisfied with the modern music and user-friendly liturgies. Then she came across a Latin Mass recently permitted by her diocese. She finally felt at home and [67] eventually was baptized at the parish. “The music, the art, the liturgy, everything comes together in the Latin Mass,” she said. “Something sacred is taking place.”” (Cimino and Lattin 67-68)
6. **resurgent commitment to tradition in Eastern Orthodoxy**
   1. “New life has been injected into the once-ethnic confines of Eastern Orthodoxy by converts won over by its rich liturgy and spirituality. In some cases, congregations—from independent charismatic to Episcopalian—have converted to Eastern Orthodoxy en masse.” (Cimino and Lattin 69)
   2. example: Simeon
      1. “Take the case of Simeon, a twenty-seven-year-old teacher with a long beard, glasses, and an intense expression. Simeon lives in a book-lined apartment in lower Manhattan and is active in an Orthodox church in Brooklyn. Like 40 percent of the members of his parish, he is a convert to Eastern Orthodoxy. He was raised as a lukewarm Catholic, but longed for a faith that burned with prayer and passion.” (Cimino and Lattin 64)
      2. ““All the energy I had invested in the church was not of service to anyone,” he said. “I was at a point where I could not identify anything that was religious in what I did or how I lived.”” (Cimino and Lattin 64)
      3. “In his Orthodox parish, Simeon felt a liturgy that “organically linked private prayer with public prayer. Before when I didn’t pray, I would feel guilty. But now when I forget to pray, I am aware of neglecting my soul.” Orthodox disciplines of regular fasting, formal prayers, and confession provide the sense that “you’re not doing it alone. The people from my own community are doing it, and our devotions become a part of me.” In Orthodoxy he found others who valued the practice of common rituals. He found a “place where I could invest my energy and it wouldn’t be wasted.”” (Cimino and Lattin 64)
7. **resurgent commitment to tradition in Evangelicalism**
   1. 1970s-80s: the shepherding movement
      1. “For Thomas, a young accountant from Pittsburgh, Christianity is serious business, a life-changing commitment. Tom was not looking for an easy church when he became a member of his fast-growing evangelical congregation. Members practiced a strict form of Christian discipleship known as “shepherding.” Each shepherd took a flock of twelve young disciples and marched them down the road to righteousness. Tom’s eyes sparkled when he spoke of his shepherd, whom he called “a living example of following Jesus.” “If all the gospel of Jesus Christ is going to do is change my Sunday schedule, then I’m not interested,” he said. “I want something that is going to change my finances, my sex life, the way I work, the way I keep my house, and the way I fix my yard.”” (Cimino and Lattin 63)
      2. “In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the shepherding movement was one of the quiet controversies within the American evangelical movement. Strident, secretive, and authoritarian, its 100,000 to 250,000 members were organized into a pyramid-shaped church government pointing toward five preachers based in Mobile, Alabama. Spread through secret cells, they planted new churches across the country and infiltrated existing Baptist, Pentecostal, and other evangelical congregations. They became so controversial that even TV evangelist Pat Robertson, the former presidential [63] candidate and founder of the powerful Christian Broadcasting Network, spoke out against the movement, calling it “an unnatural and unscriptural domination of one man by another.”” (Cimino and Lattin 63-64)
      3. “Some of the movement’s leaders confessed to authoritarian excesses, others died, and the shepherding movement dropped off the radar screen by the late 1980s. Many of its members, however, went on to become active in the Promise Keepers . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 64)
   2. 1980s-90s: the Promise Keepers
      1. The Promise Keepers is a Christian men’s movement. (Cimino and Lattin 64)
      2. Many members of the shepherding movement became active in the Promise Keepers. (Cimino and Lattin 64)
      3. It “received national attention when it filled the National Mall in Washington, D.C. in October 1997 with hundreds of thousands of shouting, praying, repenting Christian men.” (Cimino and Lattin 64)
      4. “Promise Keepers founder Bill McCartney has acknowledged being “discipled” by a shepherding movement leader in the 1970s. Speaking before the sea of Christian men stretching from the Capitol to the Washington Mall, McCartney declared, “Nobody can go home without the same plan. Every man connected to a church, every church connected to each other. We propose that every man returns home and submits to the authority of a local shepherd. You have to say to your pastor, ‘How high, how far, how much?’”” (Cimino and Lattin 64)
8. **resurgent commitment to tradition in African-American churches**
   1. “A small but growing movement of African-American Pentecostals is moving from free-form worship to adopt liturgical worship practices. The movement does not signal solely a turn to ancient Catholic tradition among blacks; proponents of the “high-church” movement see their priestly garments as linking them with their African past.” (Cimino and Lattin 70)
   2. “At the 10,000-member Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore, church leaders took a page from the Nation of Islam and started “Mighty Men of God,” a ministry wherein young men are required to follow a strict code of personal behavior.” (Cimino and Lattin 66)
9. **resurgent commitment to tradition in mainline Protestantism**
   1. “Mainline Protestant denominations, such as the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and the United Methodist Church, have adopted liturgies and observances more in keeping with historic Christianity, such as holding frequent communion services and following the historic church calendar.” (Cimino and Lattin 69)
   2. “The nondenominational Center for Evangelical and Catholic Theology, established in 1991 by Lutherans at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota, has spearheaded attempts to reconcile Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox theology and practices with Protestant belief.” (Cimino and Lattin 69)
   3. There is “a “convergence” movement among evangelicals blending traditional and sacramental Christianity with more contemporary strains of the faith. New denominations such as the Charismatic Episcopal [69] Church and the Evangelical Episcopal Church have a unique mixture of contemporary evangelical and traditional Anglican elements. The Evangelical Episcopal Church, which quickly grew after its founding in 1995, allows for both contemporary and liturgical services. Between 1992 and 1996, the Charismatic Episcopal Church grew to include about 200 parishes, with two or three churches joining every month. Many of the pastors are Pentecostals who have adopted liturgical practices such as reciting creeds, celebrating weekly communion, and wearing ornate clerical vestments. A typical service may have a procession of robed clerics dispensing a cloud of incense accompanied by a contemporary Christian “praise band.” At one moment worshipers make the sign of the cross, at another, they speak in tongues.” (Duin, Julia. “Denomination Blends Spirituality with High Church Style.” *Charisma* [Sept. 1996]: 25-27.) (Cimino and Lattin 69-70)
   4. “. . . other examples of this return to the historical sources of one’s faith . . . include a Quaker recovering the simplicity of George Fox’s founding religious vision, or a Presbyterian rediscovering Calvinist theology.” (Cimino and Lattin 70)
10. **spiritualities become institutional**
    1. “In the new millennium, . . . [even] the most esoteric of spiritualities will find institutional expression.” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
    2. “Gnosticism, paganism, and “green” spirituality have all established organizations in which followers can meet, compare notes, and draw sustenance from fellow practitioners.” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
    3. “Proponents of diffuse New Age teachings find the structures and discipline of community life valuable in helping to pass on the faith to future generations.” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
    4. “But the wide appeal of a particular tradition’s spiritual teachings does not guarantee it will flourish in an institutional form.” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
       1. “. . . Buddhism as a personal spirituality may flourish at the expense of the growth and stability of Buddhism as an organized religion. People may learn how to meditate at their local Zen Center but not join the organization or pass this religious practice on to their children. Jan Nattier writes that Buddhism must move from being a private “religious preference” to being grounded in the “everyday practice of families and larger social networks to find a stable future.”” (Nattier, Jan. “Buddhism Comes to Main Street.” *Wilson Quarterly* [Spring 1997]: 72-80.) (Cimino and Lattin 72)
11. **institutions adopt spiritualities**
    1. “There is a complex interplay between congregations and the spiritual marketplace.” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
    2. “Many mainstream congregations will struggle with the new marketplace of religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
    3. “. . . the growth of noninstitutional spirituality shows that congregations are failing to help people come to a knowledge of God . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
    4. Or “the growth of noninstitutional spirituality . . . could mean that people are searching for cosmic affirmation rather than personal salvation. “We are merely searching for assurances that the way of life we are already living is pretty much OK,” writes author Craig Dystra. “We are not seeking anything like the radical care for others and obedience to God that marks authentic religious community.”” (Dykstra, Craig. “Religion and Spirituality.” *Initiatives in Religion* [Summer 1996]: 1-2.) (Cimino and Lattin 72)
    5. “New spiritual currents find their way into a variety of religious institutions, thereby demonstrating the eclectic nature of American religion. There is a growth of inner spirituality—from mystical Judaism to contemplative meditation—in religious groups that previously showed little interest in such practices.” (Cimino and Lattin 73)
    6. “. . . spiritualities that appear very exotic when encountered in a bookstore become domesticated when filtered into congregational life. Congregations tailor the messages and practices of other spiritualities to fit their own vision and sensibility. To do otherwise and import spiritual teachings and techniques directly from other traditions—be it Buddhist meditation, Sufi dancing, or goddess spirituality—may in the long run be more baffling than beneficial to congregants.” (Cimino and Lattin 73)
    7. examples “of incorporating spiritualities from outside one’s tradition” (Cimino and Lattin 73)
       1. A “growing number of Catholic groups [are] using the enneagram, a technique that identifies personality types to foster spiritual and personal growth. The enneagram was originally designed by Oscar Ichazo as a mystical system that he says was not very Catholic at all. Catholics deemphasize the system’s emphasis on sexuality and humanity’s potential for divinity.” (Cimino and Lattin 73)
       2. “It’s unlikely that the Southern Baptist Convention will allow veneration of Elvis anytime soon, but individual Baptist believers will still pray at the altar of “The King.”” (Cimino and Lattin 72)
       3. “United Church of Christ (UCC) congregations have been in the forefront of introducing spirituality techniques and disciplines to mainline Protestantism. These innovations include . . . “journaling,” or keeping spiritual diaries, from the human potential movement. UCC literature attempts to link such practices to its Puritan spiritual heritage, noting that Puritan divines and ordinary members regularly chronicled their spiritual development in diaries.” (Cimino and Lattin 73)

## Present-Day Millennialism

1. **introduction**
   1. “Millennial fever” is “the American obsession with the end of the world and the coming of a new dawn.” (Cimino and Lattin 177)
   2. “Date-setting is such an old problem that the Bible warns against it.” (Cimino and Lattin 179)
      1. Mark 13:22, “False messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce signs and omens, to lead astray, if possible, the elect. . . . 32 But about that day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.”
   3. Doomsayers “have always found a following among poor, marginalized people hoping for better times in the hereafter.” (Cimino and Lattin 179)
   4. “Many of today’s apocalyptic stirrings have their immediate roots in the 1970s, when author Hal Lindsey wrote the best-selling book of the decade, *The Late Great Planet Earth*. It used Biblical prophecy to explain how Israel recaptured Jerusalem in 1967, and predicted a Soviet invasion of the Middle East, leading to the battle of Armageddon.” (Cimino and Lattin 179)
   5. “In the new millennium, two important forces will fuel apocalyptic fervor—the mass media, and the decentralization of religious authority. Many doomsayers alive at the end of Christianity’s first millennium were no doubt silenced by the church, or simply had no way of getting their message beyond their immediate village. Today, no one has a monopoly on spiritual truth. Television and radio evangelists are free to spread instantly the prophecy of any doomsayer who strikes their fancy around the globe via radio, television, satellites, and the Internet.” (Cimino and Lattin 181)
2. **premillennialism**
   1. Christian premillennialists “follow a relatively new strand of Bible prophecy . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
      1. “. . . the Antichrist [is] at work in the world, making things worse and worse. . . . even the churches are corrupt.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
      2. “. . . Jesus will “rapture” true believers up to heaven.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
      3. “. . . the Antichrist [will be] revealed in the flesh . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
      4. The raptured “will escape seven years of intense earthly “tribulation” and disaster that culminate in the end of the world.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
      5. “At the end of the Great Tribulation, the battle of Armageddon breaks out, with Christ fighting the Antichrist.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
      6. “Satan is bound and kept out of the way for 1,000 years.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
         1. But see 2 Pet 3:8, “But do not ignore this one fact, beloved, that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like one day.”
         2. And see Matt 24:14, “And this good news of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the world, as a testimony to all the nations; and then the end will come.”
      7. “After the 1,000 perfect years comes the Last Judgment. People go to heaven or hell, and human history ends.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
   2. example: Harold Camping
      1. Lattin, Don. “The Man Who Prophesied the End of the World.” *San Francisco Chronicle Sunday* (12 Mar. 1995]: 1.
      2. “Harold Camping is a veteran Bible teacher and radio evangelist, a founder of Family Radio, one of the world’s largest Christian radio networks, which broadcasts on dozens of American radio stations and around the world in ten languages via short-wave radio. Since its founding in the 1950s, Family Radio has quietly preached a fairly standard brand of evangelical Christianity, a mix of religious music, Bible commentary, and Christian call-in. That suddenly changed in 1993 when Camping startled his listeners by revealing his own detailed timetable to Judgment Day. On his *Open Forum* radio show and in books entitled *1994?* and *Are You Ready?* Camping predicted that Christ would return between September 15 and 27, 1994.” (Cimino and Lattin 177)
      3. Months after September 1994, “Camping was unfazed by his failure to pinpoint the beginning of the end. “Wonderfully, I was wrong about that,” he said. . . . “This doesn’t bother me in the slightest. For those who are believers, it is a no-lose, win-win situation. A lot of people have looked at their lives and how they stand up before God, and have shaped up their lives. A few people did stupid things—like thinking they didn’t have to go to work because Christ was going to come. But if the Lord doesn’t come, fine. We’ll just keep living our lives for Him.” (Cimino and Lattin 178)
      4. When Christ did not return in September of 1994, Camping predicted Christ’s coming “at two later dates that passed with no apparent Apocalypse.” (Cimino and Lattin 178)
3. **New-Age millennialism**
   1. “Americans of other faiths, as well as those with no apparent religious inclination, are also captivated by “end-times” thinking. There is renewed interest in messianic Judaism, the prophecies of the French mystic Nostradamus, and the apocalyptic stories of the Hopis, Mayans, and other Native American Indians. This vision of a future age of peace, harmony, and higher consciousness—the archetype of a New Eden arising from the ashes of global cataclysm—is found in most cultures and religious faiths.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
   2. “For Christian premillennialists, this New Eden . . . is open only to a select group of true believers. Most New Age spiritualists, however, envision a more universal era of [180] blessedness . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 180-81)
   3. “For Christian apocalyptists, the Battle of Armageddon and the Great Tribulation are predetermined and unavoidable. According to the vision of the New Age Apocalypse, however, humanity has a more active role in determining the future. Through meditation or other action in the world, mankind can influence the unfolding of the Apocalypse. Religion scholar Catherine Lowman Wessinger calls this New Age twist on the millennial vision “progressive messianism,” and traces it back to the teachings of Annie Besant, an early leader of the Theosophy movement.” (Wessinger, Catherine. *Annie Besant and Progressive Messianism*. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellon Press, 1988.) (Cimino and Lattin 181)
   4. example: José Arguelles
      1. Lattin, Don. “New Age Showman Touts New Calendar,” *San Francisco Chronicle* [3 Apr. 1995]: A15.
      2. Arguelles was a “former art historian and popularizer of ancient Mayan prophecies . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 178)
      3. “José Arguelles is an influential New Age theorist, the “galactic messenger” who brought the world the Harmonic Convergence, a 1987 instruction that told 144,000 spiritual seekers and aging hippies to climb [177] mountains, hold hands, and usher in a New Age of peace and harmony.” (Cimino and Lattin 177-78)
      4. 1995
         1. “. . . after years of relative obscurity, [Arguelles] resurfaced to hold a press conference to announce the end of time as we know it. According to Arguelles, the future of the world hinges on whether it gets rid of the exceedingly popular Gregorian calendar, which much of the world has been following since Pope Gregory XIII imposed it in 1592.” (Cimino and Lattin 178)
         2. “After receiving messages from Pascal Votan, a Mayan god-king buried beneath the pyramids and magic mushroom fields of Palenque, Mexico, Arguelles came up with a new calendar with thirteen twenty-eight-day months. His calendar, based on the moon and the female menstrual cycle, was said to be more in tune with the cycles of nature. Since the new year would have 364 days, the entire planet gets an extra holiday—the Day out of Time—to keep things on track with the earth’s rotation around the sun.” (Cimino and Lattin 178)
         3. “This will truly be a New Age, Arguelles said, because the old, unnatural calendar caused humanity to declare war, worship materialism, and pollute the planet. . . . We will all know cosmic consciousness is upon us, he predicted, because money and government will be abolished worldwide by 1997.” (Cimino and Lattin 178)
         4. Arguelles “warned that unless humanity embraces the new calendar, there will be “total planetary collapse” by the year 2000.” (Cimino and Lattin 178)
   5. crossover example: God’s Salvation Church
      1. “In 1998, a small Taiwanese group, God’s Salvation Church, moved to Garland, Texas, and received worldwide attention when its leader, Heng-ming Chen, predicted that God would appear on March 25 on channel 18 of every TV set in the world, and that UFOs would later appear in Gary, Indiana, as Asia was devastated by nuclear war.” (Cimino and Lattin 181)
      2. “. . . James Lewis, an authority on new religious movements and author of *The Gods Have Landed*, was not surprised by Chen’s prophecy. “There have always been millennial themes in UFO circles,” Lewis said, “with technological angels saving modern society and powerful space brothers replacing the redemption of God.” (Lattin, Don. “Apocalypse Meets Millennium in Texas Sect.” *San Francisco Chronicle* [7 Mar. 1998]: 1.) (Cimino and Lattin 182)
4. **non-fundamentalist interpretations of millennialism**
   1. “Robert Smith, a professor of New Testament studies at Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, said growing numbers of mainstream scholars are taking another look at the Book of Revelation, including radical proponents of liberation theology. Whereas “fundamentalists see Revelation as unveiling the precise details of God’s timetable for the last days of planet earth,” Smith writes, liberationists see in the book “an unmasking of the structuring of power in our world.” He writes, “The ruling economic and political systems favor the rich, the powerful, and the well-connected. In New Testament times the system which dominated the cities and countries where Christians lived was the Roman Empire.” According to the liberationists, the beast of the Apocalypse “has its counterpart and continuation today in the international political and financial system of the industrial world.” (Smith, Robert. “The Prophet of Patmos and the Artist of Nuremberg,” forthcoming.) (Cimino and Lattin 182)
   2. Some psychologists and spiritualists “see these stories of the end times as archetypal alerts of the collective unconscious, even as a kind of early-warning system to turn humanity away from the path of destruction. Psychologist Kenneth Ring’s research into “near-death experiences” has documented numerous cases of death-bed visions strikingly similar to the great apocalyptic myths. Citing individual prophecies of a global cataclysm followed by a new era of universal love and world peace, Ring suggests that humanity may be subconsciously preparing for a collective near-death experience.” (Cimino and Lattin 182)
5. **millennialism approaching 2000**
   1. “Prophecies about the end of time and the beginning of a new dawn will flourish around the year 2000 . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 179)
   2. The biblical “millennium,” “the thousand years of blessedness following Armageddon, has little to do with the “millennium” of the calendar, the arrival of the year 2000. Nevertheless, they have become hopelessly mixed up in the popular imagination and the mind of the media.” (Cimino and Lattin 180)
   3. “Apocalyptic thinking in the 1990s . . . is increasingly visible in the nation’s political and economic life.” (Cimino and Lattin 181)
      1. Ronald Reagan (1980-88)
         1. “During his presidency, Ronald Reagan showed a particular fascination with the form of apocalyptic prophecy popularized by Hal Lindsey and many of Reagan’s political supporters on the religious right.” (Cimino and Lattin 181)
         2. “In a television interview with evangelist Jim Bakker during Reagan’s 1980 presidential campaign, the Republican candidate predicted, “We may be the generation that sees Armageddon.”” (Cimino and Lattin 181)
         3. “In his famous “evil empire” speech to the National Association of Evangelicals in 1981, Reagan said, “There is sin and evil in the world, and we’re enjoined by the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might.”” (Cimino and Lattin 181)
      2. George H. W. Bush (1988-92)
         1. 1990: “Before launching the war against Iraq, George Bush invited evangelist Billy Graham into the White House for spiritual guidance. “These events,” Graham warned, “are happening in that part of the world where history began, and, the Bible says, where history as we know it will end. I believe there are some spiritual forces at work—both good and evil that are beyond our comprehension.”” (Cimino and Lattin 181)
   4. *U*.*S*. *News & World Report* polls of Americans
      1. Sheler, Jeffrey. “Dark Prophecies.” *U*.*S*. *News & World Report* (15 Dec. 1997): 62.
      2. 1995: 59% “believe the world will come to an end or be destroyed . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 179)
      3. 1997: 67% believe that—an 8% increase in two years. 66% also believe Jesus will someday return. (Cimino and Lattin 179)
   5. February 1998: “. . . President Clinton’s latest military buildup against Sadam Hussein and Russian warnings against a possible U.S. attack had Christian millennialists sounding the trumpets again.” (Cimino and Lattin 179)
   6. “As U.S. military forces headed toward the Persian Gulf, a New York company known as Prophecy Partners, Inc. issued a new video movie ($29.95) and novel ($19.95) entitled *Apocalypse*, once again telling the story of a final military showdown in the Israeli valley of Armageddon. “The timing of the release of this unprecedented evangelical movie is staggering, with Boris Yeltsin now warning of World War III,” the company’s press release proclaims. “What many people don’t realize is that today one single event, in one day, is all it would take to plunge us into the Apocalypse.” (Cimino and Lattin 179)

## Cults

1. **definition**
   1. critics of new religious movements
      1. “According to the anti-cult movement, the “marks of a destructive cult” include
         1. “charismatic leadership claiming divinity or special power;
         2. “brainwashing through sophisticated techniques of coercive influence and mind control;
         3. “deceptive recruitment and fundraising;
         4. “dramatic changes in diet, sleep patterns, and privacy;
         5. “alienation from friends and family;
         6. “financial, physical, and sexual exploitation;
         7. “totalitarian attitudes promoting an “us versus them” syndrome;
         8. “and isolation from the outside world and relocation to remote areas.” (Singer, Margaret. *Cults in Our Midst*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.) (Cimino and Lattin 174)
      2. “. . . authoritarian styles of leadership can . . . be abusive for the followers. Canadian scholars Irving Hexham and Karla Poewe note that new religions with no connections to major religious traditions establish their own moral system and create their own standard of values “that they see as transcending all previous moralities. In many cases these values may be perfectly reasonable, indeed admirable. But cut loose from historical roots, they can easily become bizarre and socially destructive.” (Hexham, Irving, and Karla Poewe. *New Religions as Global Cultures*. Westview, Boulder, 1997. 160.) (Cimino and Lattin 177)
   2. defenders of new religious movements
      1. “. . . many new religious movements may not be as dangerous as they are portrayed by anti-cult activists and the popular media . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 177)
      2. “Defenders of new religious movements say that the anti-cult movement can be more authoritarian than the groups they profess to monitor.” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
      3. “This more sympathetic approach to new religious movements has won many allies in the academic community.” (Cimino and Lattin 174)
         1. “Before Jonestown, the word ‘cult’ had mildly negative connotations associated with the occult. Now the word is synonymous with sinister, murderous brainwashers.” (“a seasoned observer” of cults, qtd. in Cimino and Lattin 174)
         2. “Cults” are, “in the more neutral parlance of academia, “new religious movements.”” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
         3. “Such scholars point to research showing that actual “brainwashing” does not occur in most new religious movements. The small and often declining memberships and rapid turnovers of followers suggest that such former members were not brainwashed or subjected to long-term, damaging mind-control.” (Cimino and Lattin 174)
         4. “Critics of the anti-cult movement also say the early histories of today’s mainstream religious denominations show that concerns about mind-control could just as easily be leveled against their enthusiastic and devoted founders. Most religions start off in an intense, “cultic” manner and often clash with the rubrics and manners of their surrounding culture.” (Cimino and Lattin 174)
            1. “. . . Seventh-Day Adventists were often ostracized as a cult, but since the nineteenth century have been at the forefront of innovations in medicine and diet.” (Lucas, Phillip Charles. “New Religions Needn’t Be Feared.” *Newsday* [15 Apr. 1997]: A41-42.) (Cimino and Lattin 176)
         5. “Some scholars view new religious movements more as laboratories of social innovation than emerging or influential religious forces. In this view, new religious movements are societies in miniature that generate patterns of new thinking and action. For example, sociologist Susan Palmer studied converts in several new religious movements and found they offer young women rites of passage through difficult periods of transition. In the more insulated environment of a new religion, members gain some distance from their culture and are given the space and time to form their own values.” (Palmer, Susan. *Moon Sisters*, *Krishna Mothers*, *Rajneesh Lovers*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1995.) (Cimino and Lattin 176)
         6. “In December 1997, the entire issue of the *Review of Religious Research* was devoted to analyzing how the media portrays new religious movements, and the contributing scholars were not impressed. “It would seem that, in most cases, the only story sufficiently ‘newsworthy’ about these religious groups must involve some diabolical plot to subvert the innocent, engineered of course by a crazed maniacal ‘cult’ leader who secretly schemes to amass limitless power,” writes sociologist Stuart Wright, a [174] sociologist at Lamar University.” (Wright, Stuart. “Media Coverage of Unconventional Religion: Any ‘Good’ News for Minority Faiths.” *Review of Religious Research* [Dec. 1997]: 100-11.) (Cimino and Lattin 174-75)
      4. “Defenders of new religious movements say groups such as the Unification Church can move in more “benign” directions over time . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
         1. “. . . public pressure by critics may help inspire them to mellow.” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
         2. “. . . the Hare Krishnas have lost much of their isolationist, communal orientation as the second generation of members have opted for more independent lifestyles.” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
         3. Members of “the Worldwide Church of God and the Family (formerly the Children of God) . . . have dismantled much [175] of their authoritarian leaderships and have gravitated toward a more mainstream religious identity in the 1990s.” (Cimino and Lattin 175-76)
   3. cults and religious freedom
      1. Some “argue that . . . paranoia and intolerance toward new religious movements [has prompted] America to turn its back on a long tradition of religious liberty. Show me a cult, they say, and I’ll show you somebody else’s religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 174)
      2. “As the new millennium unfolds, critics and defenders of cults, sects, and new religious movements all need to address the problem of religious violence and abuse. Unlike the situation in much of the world, both sides of the cult controversy in the United States agree that unconventional religious groups should not be restricted by law. Yet a major challenge for all democratic societies will be how to identify the dangerous and violent tendencies within the religious community without jeopardizing religious freedom, or stigmatizing groups just because they are different. Religious groups themselves can act as powerful alternatives to abusive religion by modeling communities that encourage the use of reason and independent thinking, by valuing self-respect rather than unquestioning obedience and conformity.
2. **history**
   1. “Religious cults and spiritual sects have flourished throughout American history . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   2. 1960s: “Once viewed as more curious than dangerous, public opinion about new religious movements had already begun to change in the late 1960s and early 1970s when large numbers of young people joined groups such as the Hare Krishna movement and the “Moonies,” the Unification Church of the messianic Korean sect leader, the Reverend Sun Myung Moon.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   3. November 18, 1978: in Jonestown, Guyana, “more than 900 followers of the Reverend Jim Jones perished in the People’s Temple mass suicide and murder.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   4. “. . . the horrors of Jonestown forever changed the way America looks at cults, sects, and new religious movements. [After Jonestown,] new religious movements were viewed with extreme suspicion and alarm. Everyone, including [173] the news media, seemed to be looking for “another Jonestown.” Leading the crusade against these groups were often former members and the parents of current members. From such a perspective, all cults are bad, since they deceptively seduce members, or “victims,” into their ranks.” (Cimino and Lattin 173-74)
   5. In the 1980s, “Osho International, the group of followers of the late Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh, the Indian guru . . . generated fierce controversy . . . at his communal city in rural Oregon . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 176)
   6. “Throughout the 1990s, waves of violence accompanied the rise of apocalyptic groups in the United States and abroad. [Such cults are an] apocalyptic blend of violence, prophesy [*sic*], and politics . . .” Examples are the Branch Davidians and Aum Shrini Kyo. (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   7. “In 1996, the battle between new religious movements and the Chicago-based Cult Awareness Network (CAN) took a bizarre turn when individuals associated with the Church of Scientology purchased the anti-cult group’s name, logo, and telephone hotline. CAN had been forced into bankruptcy following a series of lawsuits, many of them by members of the Church of Scientology or by lawyers who were Scientologists. CAN and its executive director Cynthia Kisser had been among the nation’s most-quoted critics of abusive and authoritarian cults and sects. Her silencing came a year after the Scientology magazine *Freedom* devoted a special issue to the anti-cult group. The magazine called CAN “the serpent of hatred, intolerance, violence, and death,” and proclaimed that “the time has come to do something about the Cult Awareness Network.” (Goodstein, Laurie. “Plaintiff Shifts Stance on Anti-Cult Group.” *Washington Post* [1 Dec. 1996]: A1.) (Goodstein, Laurie. “Anti-Cult Group Dismembered as Former Foes Buy Its Assets.” *Washington Post* [23 Dec. 1996]: A4.) (Cimino and Lattin 176)
   8. “Judging by their small memberships, it seems unlikely that the new religious movements that have raised controversy in the last three decades will become major religions, at least in the way that the Mormons and Jehovah’s Witnesses have in recent times.” (Cimino and Lattin 176)
   9. audience cults
      1. “Audience cult” is a term coined by “sociologist Rodney Stark and William Bainbridge.” (Cimino and Lattin 176)
      2. “Such groups and teachers have a following of people who may support group teachings but have little connection with followers or leaders.” (Cimino and Lattin 176)
      3. “. . . the decentralization of religious authority and the speed of modern communications will encourage the growth of new movements in the coming century.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
      4. Paula Nesbitt (“Countdown to the Millennium.” *Quarterly Review* [Summer 1997]: 112-27): the “World Wide Web holds important implications for a sizable growth trend in audience cult participation over the next several years.” (Cimino and Lattin 176)
3. **example**: **Heaven’s Gate**
   1. “Marshall Herff Applewhite was the son of a Presbyterian minister, and the musical director at the First Unitarian Church in Houston. Bonnie Lou Nettles was a nurse, astrologer, and spiritualist. They met in a Texas hospital in 1972, and opened a short-lived metaphysical bookstore, the Christian Arts Center, at the church where Applewhite worked.” (Cimino and Lattin 171)
   2. “Within a year, they were referring to themselves as the “two witnesses” mentioned in Revelation 11:3—”And I will grant my two witnesses authority to prophesy for one thousand two hundred and sixty days, wearing sackcloth.”“ (Cimino and Lattin 171)
   3. According to the two, “in the early 1970s, Applewhite and Nettles were “two unsuspecting humans in Houston” who were “incarnated” by space aliens and transformed into “Bo” and “Peep,” two shepherds from the Kingdom of Heaven.” (Cimino and Lattin 172)
   4. “Nettles died in the 1980s, and Applewhite’s message became more paranoid and apocalyptic. “We seem to only be good at attracting those who would mock us, misinterpret us, and want us to go away,” he wrote. “They find fault in everything we did and do. We’re not really the martyr type, but ‘so be it’ if it’s His will.”“ (Cimino and Lattin 172)
   5. “Heaven’s Gate resurfaced in the 1990s with an advertising blitz, a Web page, and a final cross-country tour. In 1993, Applewhite issued his “final offer” to anyone who wanted to join them, but no one seemed to be listening. Earth was doomed, he wrote, because “its inhabitants are refusing to evolve.”“ (Cimino and Lattin 172)
   6. “Those who stayed in the cult spent years undergoing a strict regime of behavioral modification and thought control. “They had their identities stripped away,” said one therapist who counseled two families with Heaven’s Gate members. “They went around for months with hoods on and couldn’t see each other. They had to stay in pairs. They had to engage in self-criticism. There were periods when they couldn’t sleep for more than four hours. There were strange diets. They took on new names.” Members were given rule books, and violations included “trusting my own judgement” or “using my own mind” and “keeping an offense to myself.” Major offenses included “sensuality—permitting arousal in thought or in action.” Some of Applewhite’s male followers were so devoted that they allowed themselves to be castrated in a collective submission to their leader’s own sexual insecurities. After struggling with his own homosexual impulses, Applewhite had already had himself sexually neutered.” (Cimino and Lattin 172)
   7. ““Leaders of these groups have such enormous power that their personal needs and problems become part of the group agenda,” said Richard Ofshe, a professor of social psychology at the University of California at Berkeley, and a leading authority on thought reform. “They get imprisoned by their own ideology. They get depressed and angry and turn that against the group.”“ (Cimino and Lattin 172)
   8. “. . . in the spring of 1997, their story exploded across front pages and television screens around the world in the form of Heaven’s Gate, the Southern California “UFO cult.” Convinced they would rendezvous with a UFO trailing the Hale-Bopp comet, thirty-nine true believers dressed themselves in identical black jeans and Nike shoes, [171] downed a deadly mixture of seconal and vodka, and covered their heads in triangular purple shrouds. Left behind on the Internet were voluminous postings describing the history and the mix-and-match theology of Heaven’s Gate—a blend of Biblical prophesy [*sic*], spiritualism, Star Trek, and *The* *X-Files*.” (Cimino and Lattin 171-72)
4. **example**: **Branch Davidians**
   1. David “Koresh’s sect was an offshoot of the Seventh-Day Adventists, a religious denomination that has stressed “end-times” thinking since its founding during a previous wave of apocalyptic fervor in nineteenth-century America.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   2. “Koresh taught that he was a second Christian messiah destined to unlock the mysterious “seven seals” in the Book of Revelation, the apocalyptic final chapter of the New Testament.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   3. “In 1993, a standoff between federal agents and the Branch Davidians in Waco, Texas, ended when a hellish inferno engulfed David Koresh and seventy-two of his followers.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   4. “On the second anniversary of the federal raid on the Branch Davidians, Timothy McVeigh, a disgruntled Army veteran inspired by antigovernment rhetoric and right-wing Bible prophesy [*sic*] took revenge for the U.S. attack on the Branch Davidians by blowing up the federal building in Oklahoma City, killing 167 men, women, and children.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
5. **example**: **Order of the Solar Temple**
   1. The Order of the Solar Temple was founded in 1984 by Luc Jouret and Joseph Di Mambro.
   2. “According to the Solar Temple, 26,000 years ago, the Blue Star (related to Sirius’s energy) left on the earth ‘Sons of the One’ . . .” (Mayer, Jean-Francois. 1996. “Myths of the Solar Temple.” Presented to the ISAR/CESNUR symposium on “Violence and the New Religions.” Nashville, Tennessee. Qtd. in: Sloan, Jennifer. “Order of the Solar Temple.” The Religious Movements Homepage Project at the University of Virginia. 24 July 2001. 17 June 2007. <http://religiousmovements.lib.virginia.­edu/nrms/solartemp.html>.)
   3. A testament left by a suicide victim of the cult reads: “I, a Lightbearer since the most remote times, the time which was given to me on Planet Earth is completed, and I go back freely and willingly to the place from which I came at the beginning of the times!” (Mayer, Jean-Francois. 1996. “Myths of the Solar Temple.” Presented to the ISAR/CESNUR symposium on “Violence and the New Religions.” Nashville, Tennessee. Qtd. in: Sloan, Jennifer. “Order of the Solar Temple.” The Religious Movements Homepage Project at the University of Virginia. 24 July 2001. 17 June 2007. <http://religiousmovements.lib.virginia.edu/nrms/solartemp.html>.)
   4. 1994: “In Canada and Europe, a series of murder-suicides took the lives of seventy-five members of the Order of the Solar Temple, who believed death would bring them new life in a place called Sirius.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
6. **example**: **Aum Shrini Kyo**
   1. Aum Shrini Kyo is “a cult that mixed Buddhist teachings with an apocalyptic scenario that envisioned the end of the world between 1997 and the year 2000.” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
   2. “In the 1990s, [in] Japan, twelve subway riders died and thousands were injured in a nerve-gas attack unleashed by Aum Shrini Kyo . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 173)
7. **deprogramming example**: **Barbara**
   1. Barbara is “an idealistic twenty-year-old from upstate New York and a devoted member of Reverend Moon’s Unification Church.” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
   2. Barbara was “seen by a “non-coercive counselor,” one who does not believe in kidnaping. He told her parents something they did not want to hear, that their daughter was a “sincere ideological convert.” “Barbara was one of those Moonies who really believe their religious experience is best expressed in the theology of the Unification Church,” he said. “They don’t require constant group reinforcement to get them to stay in the church.”” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
   3. “Two years after joining the Moonies, Barbara was snatched off the street by deprogrammers hired by her parents. Kept against her will, she was subjected to twelve days of intense “exit counseling” by a team of anti-cult activists. “They just kept talking about how the church is phony and how everyone is lying and manipulating people,” she said. “They were just trying to downgrade it, saying that it’s just a money-making organization and that people are kept from the outside world, which I know is not true.”” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
   4. “Barbara was shipped to an anti-cult safe house in the Midwest for more deprogramming, then returned to her parents’ home in New York for the Christmas holidays. Once at home, she called the local Unification Church to arrange for rescuers to drive by her parents’ house. Then she slipped away.” (Cimino and Lattin 175)
   5. Barbara: “It was a hard thing to do, but there was nothing I could say to make my parents understand. What makes me want to invest my life in this church is my understanding of God, spiritual reality, and my quest for an ideal. I was really impressed that there was a group of people actively trying to create a new world and become better people.” (Cimino and Lattin 175)

## Experiential Spirituality

1. **introduction**
   1. “. . . the growing tendency to separate faith from institutional belonging encourages experiential spirituality . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 19)
   2. “In one sense, all spirituality is based on one’s experience. Spirituality, more than any other component of religion, is intuitive, more emotional than intellectual. As denominational doctrine becomes less relevant to many Americans, the experiential elements of religion and spirituality will become more important . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 18)
   3. “In the past, spirituality was tied to a comprehensive belief system that valued intellectual agreement, authority, and tradition, along with personal faith experience. The modern emphasis on choice and the importance of the individual has often been translated into the view that beliefs and doctrine must be in sync with one’s life experiences. An individual moved by experiential religion is not going to take the clergy’s word that a particular belief is true. . . . This tendency to judge spiritual truth by human experience will help us understand the varieties and cacophonies of American spirituality in the new millennium.” (Cimino and Lattin 18)
2. **comparing an Assemblies of God service and a New Age seminar**
   1. “At an Assemblies of God congregation, Pentecostal worshipers stretch their arms heavenward, bodies gently swaying, eyes closed, and lips slightly open. They radiate a sensual, almost contagious religious passion. They lay on hands and say that people are healed. They utter strange sounds and call them miraculous. They offer soulful testimonies of a tortured past and proclaim themselves “born again.”” (Cimino and Lattin 17)
      1. “William has been attending the Assemblies of God church since the Holy Spirit descended on him six months ago at an altar call. “I was being anointed with oil and praying with the pastor when I started feeling light,” he recalled. “Suddenly, I was on the ground. I noticed there were words coming out of my mouth, kind of like babbling out loud. It’s hard to put into words now. I had been really stressed out, and was just washed clean. I went in feeling broken, and came out feeling renewed.”” (Cimino and Lattin 17)
      2. “Pentecostalism and other forms of charismatic Christianity attract both seekers and devoted members. These movements stand out from other forms of Christianity through their emphasis on a direct encounter with the Holy Spirit and their downplaying of creeds.” (Cimino and Lattin 19)
   2. “At a New Age seminar, seventy-five psychospiritual explorers lie flat on their backs on a hotel ballroom floor. Under dim lights they listen to a deafening, three-hour soundtrack of hypnotic drumming, sacred music, and other evocative sounds. After a prolonged session of deep, rapid breathing, many fall into a trance. Some lie quietly on their mats, seemingly asleep. Others let out ecstatic moans as they imagine cosmic realms and wave their arms in blissful, circular motions. Some let out demonic, blood-curdling screams as they relive scenes of childhood abuse or painful “past lives.” Others curl up into a fetal position for a “rebirthing” experience.” (Cimino and Lattin 17)
      1. “Sandra came all the way from the Midwest to Eugene, Oregon, for the rebirthing and past-lives workshop. She had no prior experience with meditation or yoga, but was amazed to find herself “going into ancient yogic postures.” Lying on her mat, listening to the drumming, she felt “wonderful, wild laughter coming out of me. I had this deep, profound joy and felt myself in complete rapport with the drumming. I knew what the drummer was saying.”” (Cimino and Lattin 17)
   3. “At first glance, the conservative Christians at the Pentecostal church and the aging hippies at the New Age happening appear to have little in common. Look a little closer, however, and you may see the same great awakening of experiential spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 17)
   4. “Not surprisingly, Assemblies of God leaders do not encourage comparisons between the spiritual experiences at that New Age workshop and their Sunday morning service. “I guess both groups feel a desire for supernatural intervention,” said one Pentecostal pastor, “but our one authority is the Bible. And the Bible tells us that every spirit is not of Christ. A lot of New Age thinking is a mixture of Eastern religions. In my view, some of it is classic demonic possession. There are many spirits in the world, and some of them are very deceptive.”” (Cimino and Lattin 18)
   5. “Theologian Harvey Cox places the “born-again” Christians and the New Age “rebirthers” on the same spiritual page. “Their psychology is quite similar—a retrieval of primal spirituality,” Cox said in an interview. “There are a lot of similarities in the way they try to tap into the experience of awe and wonder with visions, healing, dreams, and trance. Both encourage you to be in touch with your own experience and talk about it—to offer personal testimony.”” (Cox, Harvey. *Fire from Heaven*. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1995.) (Cimino and Lattin 18)
   6. “Cox sees the turn to experiential spirituality as a worldwide phenomenon, active in all major faiths. All traditions include movements that view the direct encounter with the sacred as a key dimension of faith. Such encounters can be experienced as transcendent, distinct from human experience, pointing to God or another reality. But for many seekers unattached to religious institutions, spiritual states are experienced as immanent, as an indwelling of spirit in humanity, nature, and the world. Since these movements are based on individual experience, they do not usually command the allegiance of more “rationalist” or doctrine-based groups. Cox sees this “experientialism” as a radical personal piety whereby seekers are “constantly compiling his or her own collage of symbols and practices in the light of what coheres with their own changing experiences.”” (Cox, Harvey. *Fire from Heaven*. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1995.) (Cimino and Lattin 19)
   7. “Pentecostal Christianity and meditative traditions like Buddhism will carry experiential spirituality in the opening decades of the next century. Because these faiths and spiritualities are based on individual experience, they are easily “mixed and matched” by spiritual shoppers. But so are more traditional teachings. Americans take traditional practices and beliefs out of their religious context and put them on spiritual shopping lists—whether they are Gregorian chants, Native American vision quests, angels, or the mystical Jewish practices of Kabbalah.” (Cimino and Lattin 50)
3. **experiential spirituality as Gnosticism**
   1. Bloom, Harold. *The American Religion*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.
   2. Tickle, Phyllis A. *God-Talk in America*. New York: Crossroad, 1997.
   3. “Gnosticism was condemned as an ancient Christian heresy because followers claimed spiritual truths based on secret knowledge and experience rather than on creeds and scripture.” (Cimino and Lattin 19)
   4. “Religious commentators Phyllis Tickle and Harold Bloom see echoes of ancient Gnostic controversies in today’s spiritual scene.” (Cimino and Lattin 19)
      1. “There is a growing, if disconnected and unorganized, Gnostic movement in the United States.” (Cimino and Lattin 19)
      2. “More important, these currents have unconsciously influenced the Christian and Jewish faiths. Most Americans have never heard of Gnosticism, yet according to Tickle, “almost all America’s contemporary god-talkers—Jews, Christians and Muslims, Buddhist, Hindus, and Baha’is alike—have some fairly basic Gnostic sympathies and even some outright beliefs.”” (Tickle 117-18) (Cimino and Lattin 19)
   5. “Today’s experiential spirituality shares with Gnosticism a need to know God personally without the intermediaries of church, congregation, priests, and scripture.” (Cimino and Lattin 19)
   6. “The Gnostic factor can be found in the growth of occult and esoteric teachings and movements, where access to supernatural secrets are available through [19] individual initiation and experience rather than through publicly revealed texts or doctrine.” (Cimino and Lattin 19-20)
   7. “This new interest in Gnosticism is also seen in best-selling books . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 20)
      1. Marianne Williamson is “one of many popularizers of *A Course in Miracles*, a voluminous spiritual text and self-help book compiled by two New York psychologists, Helen Schulman and William Thetford, between 1965 and 1972.” (Cimino and Lattin 20)
      2. James Redfield’s 1993 novel *The Celestine Prophesy* sold 20 million copies by 2007.
      3. Dan Brown’s 2003 novel *The Da Vinci Code* sold 60.5 million copies by May 2006.
      4. There is also the public’s fascination with the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Elaine Pagel’s work *The Gnostic Gospels*, and in the search for the historical Jesus.” (Cimino and Lattin 20)

## Experiential Spirituality: Eastern Religions’ Spiritualities

1. **introduction**
   1. “Religions that emphasize their experiential and mystical dimensions rather than their moral, social, or doctrinal sides have growing followings, although they are not necessarily showing institutional growth. For instance, Buddhism attracts a growing number of seekers for its mystical and contemplative spirituality, but it finds far less institutional success. In other words, people are more likely to experiment—read books on Buddhism and meditate at home—than join the local Zen center.” (Cimino and Lattin 19)
   2. “In the new millennium, spiritual seekers . . . will continue to turn to the East for spiritual direction and inspiration, even though relatively few will formally adopt these Eastern religions as monks, nuns, or formal lay practitioners.” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
   3. “Rising interest in Eastern faiths like Buddhism, Taoism, Hinduism, and Sufism is part of the broader move toward experiential spirituality. . . . The practice of Eastern forms of mysticism, such as meditation, does not require the same kind of loyalty to an exclusive belief system as Christianity or Islam often does.” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
   4. “In the new millennium, many practitioners of Eastern meditation techniques will continue to see themselves as Christians . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
2. **history of** “**East-Meets-West**” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
   1. “American intellectuals, artists, and writers, from Henry David Thoreau to Jack Kerouac, have long been drawn to the East for spiritual inspiration.” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
   2. “In the 1960s, the interest took on a wider appeal, especially for the younger generations. A new influx of Eastern religious leaders, partly brought on by the liberalization in the U.S. immigration laws and by the greater number of Asians practicing Buddhism and Hinduism, gave greater visibility to these minority religions.” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
3. **Peter Berger’s four encounters of Christianity**
   1. Berger, Peter L. *A Far Glory*. New York: Free Press, 1992. 147.
   2. “Sociologist Peter Berger points to various encounters that Christianity has had with different cultures, and to how these encounters changed and challenged Western faith and culture.” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
   3. the Greco-Roman world
   4. Islam
   5. modernity
   6. Berger: Christianity is “now on the edge of a fourth weighty constellation, this time with the religious traditions of southern and eastern Asia.” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
4. **Buddhism**
   1. “However one interprets the appeal of Buddhism, there is rising interest in this and other ancient Eastern paths. Book publishing shows many passing fads, from angels to crystals. But the interest in Buddhism and Eastern mysticism has remained relatively consistent among Americans.” (Cimino and Lattin 22)
   2. “Aiding the flowering of Buddhism in the United States are the large number of celebrities and intellectuals, from Richard Gere to Martin Scorcese, taking up Buddhist practices and reflecting that fascination in film and other forms of pop culture.” (Cimino and Lattin 22)
   3. “There is also a strongly experiential and psychotherapeutic thrust to the Buddhist spirituality in the West. This new Americanized and largely Caucasian expression of Buddhism is very different from the more ceremonial, nonmystical religion of Asian Buddhists.” (Cimino and Lattin 22)
   4. Mark and Jennifer
      1. “Mark and Jennifer . . . met in high school in upstate New York. Neither of their parents had given them any formal religious upbringing. Jennifer’s mother was something of a hippie, living for a while in the forest with a group of other families. Mom meditated, practiced a little yoga, but never pushed it on her daughter. Mark’s parents didn’t go to church or synagogue either, although they were interested in the teachings of Rudolf Steiner, the late Austro-German mystic, and sent their son to the local Waldorf School.” (Cimino and Lattin 20)
      2. “Mark and Jennifer were twenty-two years old, eager to see the world, and very much in love . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 20)
      3. “One of Mark’s friends gave him a book by Vietnamese Zen Master Thich Nhat Hanh, entitled *Peace Is Every Step*. He was touched by its simple, yet deep, message, and decided that when he and his girlfriend were in Europe they would visit Plum Village, Thich Nhat Hanh’s Buddhist community in southwestern France. “We wanted to follow a spiritual path,” Jennifer said. “We wanted to go to India, but my Mom didn’t want us to go. France was closer and safer.”” (Cimino and Lattin 20)
      4. “. . . they went off to Europe together in the summer of 1994.” (Cimino and Lattin 20)
      5. “At a one-week introductory meditation retreat, they fell in love with Plum Village, with the old stone buildings, the Vietnamese children playing in the fields, and the calm peaceful feeling radiating from the brown-robed monks and nuns. . . . they started talking about following in the footsteps of the monks and nuns. Jennifer went to live with nuns, and Mark moved in with the monks, about a mile and a half away. They only saw each other a couple of times a week.” (Cimino and Lattin 20)
         1. ““It was a very difficult transition from being in love to developing true love. We went from planning on [20] having a family together to becoming a monk and a nun,” Mark said. “I felt tremendous anxiety, but came to realize that all my resistance was rooted in my attachments and desires. When I saw that my love wasn’t allowing her to be free, or allowing me to be free, we realized we really didn’t have such a healthy relationship.”” (Cimino and Lattin 20-21)
         2. ““Something in my heart just opened, and I saw that the most wonderful thing in the world was to let go of everything in life except the Buddhist teachings,” Jennifer said. “It came from somewhere very deep inside.”” (Cimino and Lattin 21)
      6. “In the summer of 1996, under a full moon, they and three other novices took their vows as Buddhist celibates, becoming Brother Mark and Sister Jennifer.” (Cimino and Lattin 21)

## Experiential Spirituality: Western Religions’ Spiritualities

1. **introduction**
   1. The “tendency to mix elements of different traditions into new hybrid forms will continue in the new millennium, as seekers separated from their religious heritage search out new expressions of faith.” (Cimino and Lattin 26)
   2. “The wide range of spiritual texts and self-help books comprise an endless menu of spiritual teachings that can be selected and combined to suit individual needs. Most people, however, don’t have the time and fortitude to construct their own religion from scratch, so they rely on “prepackaged” expressions . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 26)
2. **kaballah**
   1. introduction
      1. “Kabbalah is an ancient, esoteric form of Jewish worship that has seen other revivals over the centuries. One of the most influential mystical texts in Judaism, the Book of Splendor, was written by Moses de Leon, a thirteenth-century Spanish Kabbalist. Its central image is the Tree of Life, which shows the descent of the divine into the material world. Through righteous living, contemplation, and meditation, Kabbalists mystically ascend the Tree of Life, passing through stages such as Endurance, Loving-kindness, Wisdom, and Humility.” (Cimino and Lattin 23)
   2. Rabbi Josef, former Buddhist
      1. “For Rabbi Josef, the journey back to mainstream Judaism was a long, strange trip. As a dedicated student of Zen meditation, Josef studied with Buddhist masters in Japan and served as the director of a California Zen center before rediscovering his Jewish roots.” (Cimino and Lattin 22)
      2. “Today, as the spiritual leader of a growing Conservative-movement synagogue, Rabbi Josef borrows the techniques of Zen Buddhism, such as increasing awareness in the present moment, but places his teaching in a Jewish context. “I don’t practice Buddhism anymore,” he said. “I don’t bow to Buddha.”” (Cimino and Lattin 22)
      3. ““Authentic Judaism was originally presented as a deep spiritual path,” he said. “But the presentation of Judaism most people in America received was a denatured and despiritualized version. We have to rediscover the sense of spirituality that was lost in Judaism.”” (Cimino and Lattin 22)
      4. “In 1997, hundreds of people of all ages filled his synagogue for a conference on Kabbalah and other forms of experiential Judaism.” (Cimino and Lattin 23)
      5. “Congregations and individual believers who dig deep into their respective traditions find striking commonalities with the spiritual sources of other faiths. A synagogue seeking to make connections with the interest in inner-spirituality will find much common ground between its traditions of Jewish mysticism and the Kabbalah and Buddhist or New Age teachings.” (Cimino and Lattin 75)
   3. women and kabbalah
      1. “Many Jewish women are also rediscovering their faith’s mystical heritage. Claire, a woman attending the Kabbalah conference at Rabbi Josef’s synagogue, recalled how she drifted away from Jewish practice, uncomfortable with the “patriarchy, sexism, and God language in the Orthodox world.” Now, she encourages her women friends to take another look at Judaism. “We have a wonderful mystical tradition in Judaism,” she said. “It’s up to us to take from it what is wonderful and good.”” (Cimino and Lattin 23)
3. **sabbath**
   1. “Another traditional spiritual practice finding new applications is keeping the Sabbath. . . . Today, there is a growing movement toward stricter Sabbath observance among mainline Protestants through revived organizations such as the Lord’s Day Alliance.” (Cimino and Lattin 74)
   2. “The traditional observance of the Sabbath in Jewish and Christian traditions was driven by the weight of law and custom. The interest in the Sabbath today is driven more by the modern concern to convey a sense of spirituality and well-being for the overworked.” (Cimino and Lattin 74)
   3. “Dorothy Bass writes that Sabbath observance helps set limits on materialism and other activities that deplete the earth’s resources. Bass adds that the pattern of rest created by the Sabbath seeks to convince believers of all kinds that their fulfillment comes through a spiritual life rather than one based on material acquisition and frenetic activity.” (Bass, Dorothy, ed. *Practicing Our Faith*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997. 149-62.) (Cimino and Lattin 74)
4. **Eastern Orthodoxy**
   1. “. . . the turn East can also be seen in Christianity . . . Western Christians and others look to Eastern Orthodox and Coptic spirituality for their rich mystical traditions. Many Catholics and Protestants draw upon the spiritual resources of Orthodoxy—such as the use of icons, fasting, elements of the liturgy, and monasticism—but only a minority will fully embrace this faith’s rigorous demands and exclusive claims of religious truth.” (Cimino and Lattin 22)
5. **Sufism**
   1. “Sufism, the mystical branch of Islam, has been strongly divorced from its Muslim matrix in the United States, and is therefore finding a growing following among seekers. As Sufism grows closer to its Muslim foundations, it will be interesting to see whether seekers who may initially have been drawn to this spirituality through new translations of the Sufi poet Rumi find themselves on the road to Islam.” (Patch, Rashid Raymond. “Sufi Symposium Sees More Traditional Islam.” *Gnosis* (Summer 1997): 8-10.) (Cimino and Lattin 22)
6. **spiritual direction**
   1. “United Church of Christ (UCC) congregations have been in the forefront of introducing spirituality techniques and disciplines to mainline Protestantism. These innovations include the use of “spiritual directors,” advisers who guide congregation members in spiritual growth—a practice that has long been associated with Catholic monasteries, not white-steepled Congregational churches.” (Cimino and Lattin 73)
   2. “Spiritual direction may not be so traditional when it blends with the self-help movement and psychotherapeutic concepts and practices. . . . Topics that come up in sessions of spiritual direction include divorce, death of family members, addiction, loss of faith, religious conversion, or confusion about the meaning and direction of life. “It can be very similar to what a therapist does, but we are always focusing on the movement of God in your life,” said [73] Pam Sullivan, the founder of La Casa de la Luz, a personal growth center in Northern California that trains spiritual directors.” (Cimino and Lattin 73-74)
   3. “This overlap between spiritual direction and psychotherapy has led to a debate about the boundaries and differences between these two fields. Confusion may arise, for example, when spiritual mentoring becomes a business relationship between client and therapist. . . . Many spiritual directors have begun to charge fixed fees for their services. Traditionally, those seeking spiritual direction might make a contribution to the church. But today, many clergy and lay people are offering their services outside the institutional church and expect to be paid for it.” (Cimino and Lattin 74)
      1. “Some long-time spiritual directors are distressed by this trend. “It’s not that kind of relationship,” said the Reverend Alan Jones, dean of Grace Cathedral in San Francisco and the author of a book on spiritual direction. [Jones, Alan. *Exploring Spiritual Direction*: *An Essay on Christian Friendship*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1982.] “Why does every American transaction have to revolve around money?” (Lattin, Don. “Churches Offer Therapy for Soul.” *San Francisco Chronicle* [25 Dec. 1991]: 1.) (Cimino and Lattin 74)
   4. Alan Jones, author of *Exploring Spiritual Direction*: “Much of what is called ‘spiritual direction’ today is overpsychologized and very trendy. . . . Psychotherapy is about ego-forming and ego-coping. Spiritual direction is about ego-surrendering.” (Lattin, Don. “Churches Offer Therapy for Soul.” *San Francisco Chronicle* [25 Dec. 1991]: 1.) (Cimino and Lattin 74)
7. **angels**
   1. Lattin, Don. “Hark! Hollywood Angels Take Wing.” *San Francisco Chronicle Sunday Datebook* (15 Dec. 1996): 42.
   2. “. . . angels were the symbol of pop religion in the 1990s . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   3. Angels have often served Hollywood as sentimental icons at Christmastide.
      1. In the 1946 film “*It’s a Wonderful Life*, . . . an angel named Clarence descends to inspire and redeem a suicidal Jimmy Stewart.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
      2. In “the 1947 film *The Bishop’s Wife*, . . . Cary Grant arrives from heaven to soften a clergyman’s heart.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
   4. “In the 1990s, however, [angels] were more than just a seasonal bubble of holiday sentiment.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
      1. “It was Christmas 1996, and angels were everywhere.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
      2. “Holiday offerings from Hollywood included a flock of all-too-human angels—including John Travolta in *Michael* and Denzel Washington in *The Preacher’s Wife* . . . an updated version of . . . *The Bishop’s Wife* . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
      3. “On television, *Touched by an Angel* was one of the most watched programs of the decade.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
      4. “Angel books piled high in bookstores across the country, not to mention angel calendars, angel candles, and crystal angel statues.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
      5. “Newspapers and magazines wrote story after story on the angel craze.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
   5. “Angels had become the safe, all-purpose, nonthreatening symbol of pop religion. It seemed like everyone—Christians, Jews, Muslims, New Agers, even atheists—loved angels.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
8. **Matthew Fox**
   1. Lattin, Don. “Driven (and Drawn) by Different Drums.” *Salt Journal* (Nov.-Dec. 1997): 8-15.
   2. “. . . the Reverend Matthew Fox [is the] high priest of mix-and-match religion . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 25)
   3. As a Catholic priest, “His battles with Rome began a few years after the 1983 publication of his book *Original Blessing*, which attacked the church for its emphasis on redemption and original sin. His theology is called “creation spirituality,” and celebrates the joys of nature, sexuality, music, and dance.” (Cimino and Lattin 25)
   4. 1992: the Dominicans expel Fox from their order. (Cimino and Lattin 25)
   5. 1994: “Fox joined the Episcopal Church . . . but now calls himself a “postdenominational priest.”” (Cimino and Lattin 25)
      1. Fox: “We don’t have a lot of time to fiddle around with whether we’re in this denomination or that one. I challenge you to find any twenty-year-old who can tell the difference between a Presbyterian, a Lutheran, a Methodist, an Episcopalian and a Roman Catholic. And who cares?” (Qtd. in Cimino and Lattin 25)
   6. rave Masses
      1. Fox “has found an eager audience among lapsed Catholics of the baby-boom generation. His rave Masses are a bid to attract a younger crowd to his feel-good theology, to push the liturgical envelope.” (Cimino and Lattin 25)
      2. Fox: “Rituals like the Techno Cosmic Mass are a playing out of myth, putting the myth in our hearts and our bodies. A big part of rave culture is the community thing­—there’s a big yearning for community there. The [25] word *community*, or *communio* in Latin, means sharing a common task working together. It’s not just feeling one with each another. It’s doing something. This yearning for community is very heartfelt, and we’re trying to break through that with multicultural, multireligious events. Learning from each other’s stories.” (Qtd. in Cimino and Lattin 25-26)
      3. “Rap music and pulsing techno-tribal rhythms blast out of a warehouse in the San Francisco Bay Area. . . . It’s the Sunday night Techno Cosmic Mass, a worship service that gives new meaning to the word *eclectic*. There’s African drumming, strobe lights, candles, video monitors, t’ai chi, gospel music, aboriginal prayers, and Celtic blessings. Father Fox sits before a circular flower-bedecked altar in the center of the warehouse with his three co-celebrants, a local rabbi, a black preacher, and a Jungian psychologist. Some 350 souls are here tonight. They’re handed bright yellow church programs that explain what happens in the warehouse of wonder. It’s too dark inside to read the programs, but this is what they say: “The Techno Cosmic Mass is a radical new way of worshiping which blends Western liturgical tradition with ecstatic music and dance, urban shamanism, multimedia imagery, and Eastern and indigenous spiritual elements to create a multicultural, intergenerational, and ecumenical form of worship.”” (Cimino and Lattin 25)
      4. “. . . a rap singer paces back and forth before the altar, belting out a staccato hymn with edge.

“One life, one breath, on Earth, one revelation,

“We all share creation: the common denomination.

“So I bow to the Tao and thank Brahmin.

“We all have creation in common.”” (Dellinger, Drew. “Creation in Common.” 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 26)

* + 1. Matt Fox beams: “. . . Let’s dance our diversity!” Among those dancing to diversity is Cindy, a forty-three-year-old white woman who quit her job in Southern California to study with Fox. Raised in the Roman Catholic Church, she left the church at age eighteen . . . “I don’t think I’m ever going to find a Catholic church where I can dance with reckless abandon in the middle of the Mass.”” (Cimino and Lattin 26)
    2. “Despite heroic efforts, Matthew Fox has had trouble attracting younger worshipers to his creation spirituality raves.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)

1. **paganism**
   1. Celtic religion
      1. “Celtic spirituality has also been popular among liberal Christian and neo-pagan groups hoping to revive an indigenous, earthy spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
      2. “Starhawk, the popular pagan writer, notes that Halloween had its roots in an old Celtic feast marking the onset of winter. It has always been a way to express the fear of death ritually, to get through the long, cold nights of winter. “We celebrate the turn of the wheel of the year into darkness,” said Starhawk . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
   2. “goddess spirituality” (Cimino and Lattin 23
   3. “American Indian shamanism” (Cimino and Lattin 23)
   4. witchcraft
      1. Starhawk marks Halloween “with a dance and trance ceremony sponsored by the Reclaiming Collective, her witch’s coven. “Witches have always gathered at this holy time, to mourn and release the newly dead.” (Lattin, Don. “Witches Staking Claim to Halloween as Sacred Holiday.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (24 Oct. 1996): C1.) (Cimino and Lattin 24)
   5. Santería
      1. “Neo-pagans often gravitate to the gods and goddesses and related spiritual practices of their own ethnic backgrounds.” (Cimino and Lattin 24)
      2. “African Americans and Latinos have shown a similar interest in recovering spiritual insights from their African or Latin heritage, often as supplements to their Christian or Islamic faith.” (Cimino and Lattin 24)

## New Age

1. **introduction**
   1. “. . . the most infamous example of syncretized spirituality is the New Age movement.” (Cimino and Lattin 26)
   2. “. . . few people actually identify their religious affiliation as “New Age,” [but] this reluctance to label themselves goes hand in hand with the diffuse and loose-fitting nature of the movement.” (Cimino and Lattin 26)
   3. “Participants [26] may have a primary religious affiliation, and then draw various practices and teachings from the movement.” (Cimino and Lattin 26-27)
   4. “Even its basic philosophy sends seemingly conflicting messages. While the movement stresses spiritual individualism, calling for individuals to discover their own path, it also proclaims a “world is one” communalism.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
   5. “. . . the diffuse nature of the New Age movement makes it hard to define . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      1. The basic “upbeat New Age message [is] of higher consciousness and global transformation . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      2. “Central to New Age philosophy is the idea of a “wholeness paradigm” emphasizing the interconnectedness of all beings. This worldview [42] is seen as replacing the old model associated with Isaac Newton, who saw the universe as a huge mechanical system that operated according to immutable laws.” (Cimino and Lattin 42-43)
      3. It is a collection of “unconventional spiritual stirrings . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
2. **history**
   1. “. . . these unconventional spiritual stirrings have their roots in Eastern religions, occultism, neo-paganism, feminism, political activism, indigenous faiths, human potential teachings, new forms of psychotherapy, and environmentalism.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
   2. “New Age trends follow the demographic journey of the baby-boom generation.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      1. “Its [New Age’s] predecessor, the human potential movement, was influenced by the use of hallucinogens—a practice that faded as its practitioners settled down to raise a family and pursue a career.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      2. The New Age movement “was discovered by the media in the late 1970s and early 1980s.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      3. Mistakenly, the movement “was judged to be over just a few years after . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      4. “Purists in the New Age vanguard disassociated themselves from crowds of initiates climbing on the bandwagon.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      5. “During the 1980s, the New Age expressed itself in natural mystical experiences from channeling to meditation.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
      6. “When the baby boomers reached middle age in the 1990s, the emphasis again shifted, this time to social concerns, technology, environmentalism, and holistic healing. This intense interest in the spirituality of health, healing, and aging will continue as the baby boomers encounter frailty and death. The fact that the New Age is so closely tied to the baby-boom generation guarantees that it will continue to be a force in the coming decades.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
3. **New Age’s future**
   1. “Although New Age terminology, practices, and personalities may be faddish, its eclectic spirituality will endure in the new millennium.” (Cimino and Lattin 27)
   2. “But will [New Age] find a hearing among younger generations? Critic Carl Raschke . . . calls the New Age movement “a large-scale generational psychodrama that seems unintelligible to those both younger and older. . . . It is a massive working out of issues, as the therapists would say, of issues that never were worked out and perhaps can never be worked out. Yet it is America’s burden for the foreseeable future.”” (Raschke, Carl. In *Spirituality and the Secular Quest*, ed. Peter H. Van Ness. New York: Crossroad, 1996. 220.) (Cimino and Lattin 27)

## Immaculate Heart Hermitage and Esalen Institute

1. **introduction**
   1. “. . . along one stretch of the West Coast, the breath-taking Big Sur coastline in central California, [are] two places that speak volumes about religion and spirituality in the new millennium.” (Cimino and Lattin 13)
2. **Immaculate Heart Hermitage**
   1. See: Lattin, Don. “Far from the Maddening Crowd.” *Common Boundary* (Mar.-Apr. 1992): 34.
   2. “Immaculate Heart Hermitage, a Roman Catholic monastery, chapel, and retreat house, is perched on a bluff a thousand feet above the Pacific Ocean. From here, the sea is an ever-present source of inspiration, its moods changing with the weather and the tides. Sometimes, when the fog rolls in and rests at the cliffs below, the monastery sits above the clouds, nestled celestially in the lap of the Santa Lucia Mountains.” (Cimino and Lattin 13)
   3. “Solitude is the central experience of the laypeople who come here for spiritual retreat, and for the twenty-five Camaldolese monks who live here all year round. The monks live in twenty-five cinder-block cottages, or “cells,” aligned in four rows behind the chapel. Five times a day, starting before sunrise with morning vigils, the monks don white robes and come together in the chapel for praise, prayer, meditation, and Holy Communion.” (Cimino and Lattin 13)
   4. “Several of the monks are true recluses, living in tiny cabins and trailers hidden in the woods behind the compound. Their home is a forest of redwood, oak, and madrone that reaches back into the hills, where all that can be heard are the sounds of streams tumbling to the sea, spraying ferns and gray-green boulders with cool mist.” (Cimino and Lattin 13)
   5. “Anne, one of a dozen guests staying in private rooms in the Immaculate Heart guest house, pauses on her way to evening vespers. She works in San Francisco, a four-hour drive up the coast, as a busy executive with a major clothing company. “My job takes a lot out of me,” she says. “If it [13] weren’t for this, I probably wouldn’t even take a vacation. I live by myself and can find quiet time at home, but there’s something about the collective silence here that is amazingly different. Most of the day, we keep silent, and that’s very freeing. It lets us slow down, to be in a beautiful place and listen to God’s will.”” (Cimino and Lattin 13-14)
   6. “The sun sets and a deep orange glow melts into a distant fog bank. Warning bells sound for evening vespers. Fifteen monks carrying hymn books walk quietly into the monastery’s central chapel. They come together in song—sweet and strong. They and the retreatants file into the chapel rotunda for a half hour of silent contemplation. In the center of the rotunda, beneath a single cross hanging from the ceiling, two small candles illuminate the Blessed Sacrament, which sits atop a plain white table.” (Cimino and Lattin 14)
   7. “After the service, it is dark outside, the sea a silver shield under the moon. It is so quiet that the soft crunch of pebbles under your feet makes soft echoes into the hills. To preserve the stillness, you walk softer, feeling every step.” (Cimino and Lattin 14)
   8. ““Surprising things happen in solitude,” explains the Reverend Robert Hale, who first came to Immaculate Heart in 1959, when he was a senior in college and thinking about becoming a monk. “Some people who come here get terrified and leave after the first night. People lead such distracted lives of job, family, television. Many are not aware of how many problems and conflicts, how much unresolved grief, dwells inside them. Others are delighted when they get here, connecting with the prayer, silence, and meditation. It’s like coming home to their deepest center, to a God who loves them.”” (Cimino and Lattin 14)
3. **Esalen Institute**
   1. “Back in 1962, Michael Murphy and a Stanford University classmate, the late Richard Price, started an experiment at an old hot-springs resort at Big Sur. They called it Esalen, and it became ground zero of the “human potential movement” of the 1960s and 1970s, a blend of spirituality, psychology, massage, and mysticism. “There was an explosion of imitators, many of them right down to the letterhead we used,” Murphy recalls. “About five of them made it through the 1980s. Now, it’s starting all over again. It’s like a second pulse. It’s a social invention that’s here to stay—a new kind of learning center.” At Esalen Institute, today’s offerings range from “mind brainwave training” to t’ai chi with Chungliang Al Huang. To many visitors, the place may seem more like a hedonistic mecca than a spiritual retreat. As they have for nearly four decades, naked retreatants soak in the silky radiance of natural hot springs that pour into [14] stone pools cut into the side of the Big Sur cliffs. Nearby, masseuses offer nude body work under a brilliant California sun.” (Cimino and Lattin 14-15)
4. **Brother David**
   1. See: Lattin, Don. “Big Sur Monk a New Age Pioneer.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (24 Dec. 1993): A1.
   2. “In some ways, Immaculate Heart Hermitage and Esalen Institute seem worlds apart. One is a place of solitude and tradition, the other a center of constant experimentation. If there is anyone who can bring these two worlds together, it’s a monk we know named Brother David.” (Cimino and Lattin 15)
   3. “Monk, mystic, and spiritual teacher, Brother David Steindl-Rast divides his time between Immaculate Heart and Esalen, a modern-day circuit rider along one of the world’s most spectacular stretches of coastline. Interlocutor in the dialogue between Catholicism and the New Age, Brother David’s message blends Christianity, mysticism, and humanistic psychology.” (Cimino and Lattin 15)
   4. ““There is something happening in our time, and one of the most significant shifts is in the realm of religion,” he says. “The emphasis is moving from the institution to personal experience. It is happening in people’s individual lives on a very large scale, and it is absolutely irreversible. After 2,000 years, the institution has become so rigid and ossified it is collapsing under its own weight.”” (Cimino and Lattin 15)
   5. “Brother David is something of an enigma to the Roman Catholic Church. One of the institution’s sharpest critics, he is also a man who has brought thousands of lapsed Catholics back into the fold. Born in Vienna in 1926, he has, through his books and lectures, reenvisioned some of the key elements of Christianity in a way that provides new meaning for many Catholics unable to find a place in the institutional church. Prayerfulness becomes mindfulness, an awareness and gratitude for what life brings. Jesus is seen not as a messianic prophet who will return to judge but as a teacher of wisdom.” (Cimino and Lattin 15)
   6. ““When Jesus used scripture from the Hebrew Bible, it was not like the teachers of his time who laboriously interpreted from the text—like the church does today,” he says. “Jesus talked about experience, about daily life. That was such an enormous change in the history of religion—especially in a culture like that in Israel, where the idea of God was so strongly theistic.”” (Cimino and Lattin 15)
   7. “Brother David is a slim man, with a crew cut, angular features, and a close-cropped graying beard. His expression turns serious, almost dour, when he begins to reflect, then softens and brightens with the flow of conversation. Still, Brother David sees a need for tradition and ritual, and warns that many of today’s spiritual seekers “get so enamored with the search that there is nothing more than finding.”” (Cimino and Lattin 15)
   8. “A rugged simplicity in Brother David’s garb speaks of a backwoods hermit. He walks down the long road leading from Immaculate Heart chapel to the coast. It is the first clear day after a long rain, and despite the chill [15] in the air, he is wearing sandals with no socks. A black and well-worn religious vest, tied at the side of his waist, identifies him as a monk.” (Cimino and Lattin 15-16)
   9. ““When I talk about a shift to ‘personal experience,’ I don’t mean ‘private,’” he says. “‘Personal’ is defined in terms of your relations—it is community-related and community-imbedded. You become a person more deeply through your relations to other persons, your relationship to a community. There is great suffering for people who don’t find this community.”” (Cimino and Lattin 16)
5. **a Catholic retreat in California**
   1. “It was an eight-day spiritual vacation run by Roman Catholic nuns and Roman Catholic priests, convened at a Roman Catholic convent in California. Fifty-two participants, most of them Roman Catholic, signed up for the mostly silent “holistic retreat.” At times, however, it was hard to find the Catholicism at this Roman Catholic event. Retreatants spent their days in sessions of Zen meditation, body work, guided imagery, dream workshops, yoga, prayer, and worship. There was time for swimming, jogging, and walking along the oak-lined trails that traverse these forty acres of land owned by a Roman Catholic religious order.” (Cimino and Lattin 71)
   2. ““Our retreats are not exclusively Catholic, like they used to be,” said Father Harry, a Roman Catholic priest who studied for six years under a Zen master in Japan. “We still have preached retreats, but the accent now is not so much on dogma but on experience. It used to be highly mental—but now we use imagination, body movement, chanting.”” (Cimino and Lattin 71)
   3. “East meets West in the convent’s basement, which houses a traditional Japanese Zendo, a meditation room where a painting of Buddha shares the same wall with a large cross. There’s a small Zen rock garden in one corner, a large open Bible in the other.” (Cimino and Lattin 71)
   4. “Retreatants are assigned a personal spiritual director—a priest, nun, or lay person—with whom they meet every other day for counseling and guidance.” (Cimino and Lattin 71)

## Secular Spirituality

1. **introduction**
   1. “The separation of spirituality from religious institutions and congregations gives the modern spiritual quest a “free-floating” quality that can easily attach itself to a wide range of “secular” activities and social movements.” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
   2. “The imprint of the New Age movement is evident in much of . . . secular spirituality. The New Age tendency to “spiritualize” nature is seen among many of today’s spiritual writers.” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
   3. But “Often, *spiritual* is defined in a sense even more diffuse than in the New Age movement.” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
      1. “. . . baby boomers often view self-expression, such as in “finding one’s true self,” . . . as [a] spiritual value . . . Thus, wherever one finds one’s “true self,” whether it be in sports, work, hobbies, or sexuality, can become a place where sacredness and the “soul” are discovered.” (Roof, Wade Clark. *A Generation of Seekers*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993. 133-48.) (Cimino and Lattin 28)
      2. “. . . baby boomers often view . . . empathy with others as [a] spiritual value . . .” (Roof, Wade Clark. *A Generation of Seekers*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993. 133-48.) (Cimino and Lattin 28)
      3. “. . . baby boomers often view . . . other human values—creativity, love, trust, openness, personal fulfillment—” as spiritual values. (Cimino and Lattin 28)
      4. “If spirituality can be translated into a search for one’s true self and for other human values . . . where does God come into the picture? The answer is not always clear [28] . . . Some fear that if everything is “spiritual,” then nothing really is.” (Cimino and Lattin 28-29)
   4. “In the new millennium, spirituality . . . will continue crossing the border from the religious to the secular side of life.” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
      * 1. “Though most Americans believe in God, a *Newsweek* poll estimated that only 60 percent “think a person needs to believe in God in order to experience the sacred.”” (Kantrowitz, Barbara. “The Search for the Sacred.” *Newsweek* (28 Nov. 1994: 56, 61.) (Cimino and Lattin 28)
   5. “. . . many forms of contemporary spirituality [are] based less on the transcendence of God and more on the nearness of the sacred to human experience.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
   6. “Critics complain that popular culture vulgarizes and trivializes spirituality, marketing it to satisfy consumer tastes. Writer Phyllis Tickle counters that the popular media can “democratize theology” by bringing “god-talk” into everyday life.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      1. Secular spirituality “may have reached a low point when an actor playing the owner of a truck in a TV commercial praised Detroit’s latest four-wheel-drive vehicle, calling the driving experience “a spiritual thing.”” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   7. “Writer Phyllis Tickle [*God-Talk in America* 121] counters that the popular media can “democratize theology” by bringing “god-talk” into everyday life.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   8. “. . . the tendency to apply spiritual principles to secular activity will challenge the separation of the sacred and social spheres of American life. While the attempt to find “spirit” in everything can degenerate into a diffuse and meaningless spirituality, it could also bring a new sense of wholeness to everyday life.” (Cimino and Lattin 50)
2. **origins**
   1. self-help programs
      1. “Self-help and empowerment are central to the formation of secular spiritualities.” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      2. “The first self-help programs were based on a generic religiosity, as seen in Alcoholics Anonymous’s invoking of the “higher power.”” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      3. “The expanding self-help literature has maintained this spiritual dimension.” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      4. Phyllis A. Tickle (*God-Talk in America*. New York: Crossroad, 1997. 47): self-help thinking has “tilted our interest in spirituality toward its practical uses, in itself a substantive shift in paradigms.” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      5. Phyllis A. Tickle (*God-Talk in America*. New York: Crossroad, 1997. 47): “much contemporary American spirituality [29] is a recostumed and refurbished form of self-help that seeks more the well-being of its subject than any contemplation of the sacred.” (Cimino and Lattin 29-30)
   2. psychotherapy
      1. “Psychotherapeutic insights and theories inform much of the new secular spirituality. This is especially the case with Jungian thought, which deals with spirituality and myth in everyday life. There has been a popularization of Jungian thought and anthropological views of religion that attempt to extract the common “myths” embedded in the different religious traditions.” (Cimino and Lattin 30)
      2. “Mythologist Joseph Campbell played a pivotal role through his books and Bill Moyer’s television series “The Power of Myth” in 1988. Campbell’s theories on the universality of religious symbols reached many viewers who felt disconnected from denominations and other traditional forms of religious experience.” (Cimino and Lattin 30)
      3. “. . . other forms of psychotherapy—even traditional Freudian psychoanalysis—have reemphasized their humanistic traditions as they provide guidance in achieving personal growth and meaning. Many such therapies, freed from a medicalized understanding of their work, have taken the next step of fusing personal growth to a spiritual framework, thereby redefining such concepts as “soul” and “spirit.”” (Cimino and Lattin 30)
      4. “The integration of psychology and spiritual development is a trend that is only likely to grow in the future.
      5. “*Common Boundary* magazine produced a 1994 directory of resources and programs integrating spirituality and psychology that provides a dizzying menu of choices: mind-body studies, somatic therapy, polarity therapy, Reiki, psychosynthesis, shamanic counseling, and mythopoetic music therapy.” (Simpkinson, Charles, Douglas Wengell, and Mary Jane Casavant, eds. *Graduate Education Guide*: *Holistic Programs and Resources Integrating Spirituality and Psychology*. Bethesda, MD: Common Boundary, 1994.) (Cimino and Lattin 30)
3. “**soul**” **books**
   1. The 1990s “may go down in the publishing world as “the decade of soul.”” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
   2. Thomas Moore “kicked it off with his 1992 mega-best-seller *Care of the Soul*.” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
   3. “Within four years there were 322 book titles and annotations with “soul” listed in *Books in Print*—nearly four times the number in 1990.” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
   4. “The Florida-based publisher, Health Communications, served up *Chicken Soup for the Soul* and quickly sold five million copies.” (Evenson, Laura. “Soulful Books Give Readers Insight, Make Best-Sellers.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (25 Dec. 1996: A1.) (Cimino and Lattin 28)
4. “**Nourishing the Soul**” **conference**
   1. In the mid-1990s, “Hundreds of . . . therapists [and] spiritual seekers . . . packed [the] ballroom of a Washington, D.C., hotel [for] a weekend conference [27] on “Nourishing the Soul” . . . all 2,500 tickets were sold out. Some 1,500 people were turned away . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 27-28)
   2. The conference “featured two mainstays of the best-seller list: Thomas Moore (*Care of the Soul* and *Soulmates*) and M. Scott Peck (*The Road Less Traveled* and *Denial of the Soul*).” (Cimino and Lattin 28)
   3. “Conference sponsor Anne Simpkinson, publisher of *Common Boundary* magazine, was amazed at the response to her Washington weekend. “People can define ‘soul’ in their own way,” she said. “We are trying to open a space for inner exploration, and soul is a piece of that. There’s an absolute hunger out there for people wanting to nourish their inner life.” (Lattin, Don. “Therapists Turn from Psyche to Soul.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (17 Mar. 1994: A1.) (Cimino and Lattin 28)
5. “**losing oneself**” **in activities**
   1. “Psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi writes that all humans have experiences of “flow,” or profound experiences of human enjoyment and transcendence. Such states are often characterized by the experience of “losing oneself” in an enjoyable activity, whether it is playing a game or listening to music.” (Cited in: Van Ness, Peter H., ed. *Spirituality and the Secular Quest*. New York: Crossroad, 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 29)
   2. “Joe Holland writes that “postmodern” spirituality sees the spiritual as “embodied” within the human body itself, nature, and society. This emphasis on the embodiment of spirituality can be interpreted as either the loss of transcendence or the resurgence of the sacred, but it is nevertheless a major factor behind the new secular spirituality.” (Holland, Joe. In *Spirituality and Society*: *Postmodern Visions*, ed. David Ray Griffin. New York: State UP of New York, 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 29)
   3. examples of activities
      1. *prayer*: “Gallup polls have found that such a high proportion of Americans claim to pray that this activity [28] must also include those who consider themselves atheists and agnostics.” (Cimino and Lattin 28-29)
      2. *art*
         1. *creating art*: “Artists and musicians claim that they experience something sacred in their creative work. . . . creativity is seen as a spiritual value.” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
         2. *enjoying art*: e.g., “listening to music.” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      3. *sex*
         1. In a *Newsweek* poll, 26% “said that they obtained a “sense of the sacred during sex.”” (Kantrowitz, Barbara. “The Search for the Sacred.” *Newsweek* (28 Nov. 1994: 56, 61.) (Cimino and Lattin 28)
         2. “. . . erotic energies are seen as connecting humans to each other and the cosmos . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      4. *drugs*: “Many Americans over the past three decades have experimented with psychedelic drugs such as LSD and “ecstasy,” and many report feeling a profound sense of the sacred in their experience.” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      5. *nature*: “nature is viewed as sacred in and of itself . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      6. *human experiences*: “In one sense, the new secular spirituality is nothing new; mysticism in all faiths has been based on the interior search for contact with the sacred, including connections through human experiences . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      7. *politics*: “Peter Van Ness [*Spirituality and the Secular Quest*] notes that a secular spirituality is found in politics, as activists place a spiritual value on building a sense of community and social justice . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      8. *sports*: sports “fulfill one’s “self-actualization” through training . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 29)
      9. *aging*: “In the new millennium, aging will become a well-traveled path to secular spirituality, especially as baby boomers enter this phase of life. Recent studies show that although religious involvement tends to drop off as individuals age, belief and spirituality take on a new dimension as elders review their lives and seek meaning in the face of suffering and loss. They seek “spiritual reintegration” before death, to transform loneliness into the joy of solitude and a catalyst for renewed spirituality.” (Thomas, L. Eugene, and Susan Eisenhandler, eds. *Aging and the Religious Dimension*. Westport: Auburn House, 1994.) (Cimino and Lattin 29)

## Secular Spirituality in Popular Media

1. **introduction**
   1. “. . . recent themes in music, television, and film reflect the secular supermarket of American spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
   2. “As the entertainment media becomes the primary conveyor of common culture, it will compete with religious groups as the main bearer of spiritual and religious insight . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
   3. “Pop culture generates its own religious icons. Fans of the Grateful Dead rock band, the TV show *Star Trek*, and Elvis Presley often display a religious fervor toward their idols.” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
2. **fiction**
   1. “Story-telling to convey spiritual themes is also popular among spiritual leaders who turn to fiction writing.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   2. “Frank Peretti’s novels depict . . . spiritual warfare . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   3. “. . . fiction by Pat Robertson and Charles Colson, show the new interest among evangelicals.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   4. “Fiction and New Age spirituality are a good fit. Both easily draw on myth, mysticism, and emotion.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      1. “Writers and publishers associated with the New Age movement [include] Starhawk, Natalie Goldberg, and Deepak Chopra . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   5. “Romance novels have also been gradually featuring religious, often evangelical Christian, themes and characters.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
3. **films**
   1. “. . . a 1996 report by the Center for the Study of Social and Political Change . . . analyzed the content of hundreds of popular films from 1946 to 1990 . . .” (Rothman, Stanley. “Is God Really Dead in Beverly Hills?” *American Scholar* (Spring 1996): 272-79.) (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      1. “. . . the film industry has veered away from traditional religious themes . . . the favorable portrayal of traditional religious characters and institutions declined with each decade.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      2. “. . . but [Hollywood] continues to be fascinated by the spiritual and the supernatural. . . . As traditional religious themes waned, there were increasing depictions of alternative sources of spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
   2. traditional religion
      1. “. . . traditional religion still finds its way onto film, if only because its mysterious and colorful rituals provide great visual backdrops.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      2. “. . . the portrayal of the Catholic Church in many films—especially of [39] the horror and thriller genres—features dark churches, nuns and priests in traditional garb, statues, candles, and pre-Vatican II imagery.” (Cimino and Lattin 39-40)
      3. “This may also help explain why the colorful and exotic world of Tibetan Buddhism resonates with Martin Scorcese, Bernardo Bertolucci, and other movie makers.” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
   3. nontraditional religion
      1. “In the 1990s, Hollywood released many films with nontraditional religious stories . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      2. There were “the New Age themes of *Ghost*” (1990). (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      3. “. . . Buddhist-inspired films [included] *Kundun* [1997] and *Seven Years in Tibet* [1997].” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      4. Some films depicted “spirituality in a nonreligious context.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
         1. “*A River Runs Through It* [1992] conveyed the spirituality of fly fishing and the “interconnectedness” of humans with the rest of nature.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
         2. “*Fearless* [1993] revolved around one man’s near-death experience.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
         3. “Even the 1993 movie *Groundhog Day* was reportedly informed by the esoteric philosophy of George Gurdjieff, showing an individual awakening to his “true self.”” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
      5. “Careful watchers of another Travolta film, *Phenomenon* [1996], saw vestiges of Scientology when the actor’s character is hit by a flash of light and suddenly becomes “clear,” assuming supernatural powers and awesome intelligence.” (Cimino and Lattin 39)
4. **popular music**
   1. “Music, especially rock, pulses with secular spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
   2. “Elvis, “The King,” is the ultimate example. Researcher John Strausbaugh found fans who venerate Elvis, pray to Elvis, see Elvis in visions, claim Elvis has effected miraculous cures, revere relics associated with Elvis, and do good works in the name of Elvis. Strausbaugh calls it recreational religion—or “an infusion of religious fervor and faith into the pursuit of an avocation one intensely enjoys.”” (Strausbaugh, John E. *The Birth of the Elvis Faith*. New York: Blast Books, 1995. 13.) (Cimino and Lattin 40)
   3. In “the peace and love era of the 1960s, . . . spiritual transcendence was celebrated by the likes of Bob Dylan, the Beatles, and Joni Mitchell . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
   4. Guy Garcia
      1. “*New York Times* writer Guy Garcia writes that U2, Snoop Doggy Dogg, and Peter Gabriel “express a spiritual yearning that harks back, consciously or not, to rock’s gospel roots and a generational groping for more eternal values. Not since the [1960s] have religious themes been so conspicuously prevalent in pop.” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
      2. Guy Garcia (“Rock Finds Religion.” *New York Times* [2 Jan. 1994]: 1L): “The spiritual slant in today’s music is anything but a Sunday school endorsement of organized religion. Instead of urging people to go back to church, or to pray, the message is resolutely iconoclastic. The songs seem to say that in a godless society the only recourse is to make a personal appeal to the divine.” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
   5. “Even in the world of alternative rock, better known for sacrilege than spirituality, Biblical themes and Christian messages find expression. Sixteen Horsepower, an alternative band from Denver, draws on Biblical imagery in its 1997 debut album *Sackcloth ‘n’ Ashes*. Much more than contemporary Christian music, the religion of alternative rockers . . . raises doubts while longing for renewed faith and hope.” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
   6. raves
      1. “. . . local teenagers and college students blow . . . their minds on “ecstasy” or the latest designer drug, dancing like fools into a sweaty state of altered consciousness. Bodies are swaying and minds are expanding in this space . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 25)

## Gender Spirituality

1. **introduction**
   1. “Social changes around gender are increasingly reflected across the spiritual spectrum. Feminism, gay rights, men’s movements, changes in family structure, and the loss of traditional gender roles all figure into the [32] growth of gender spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 32-33)
   2. “In the new millennium, . . . gender spirituality will [be] integrated into mainstream religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 33)

### The Women’s Movement and Spirituality

1. **introduction**
   1. “Books on women’s spirituality are very popular. *In the Womb of God* by Celeste Schroeder and *Sister to Sister* by Susan Johnson Cook” are examples. (Cimino and Lattin 34)
   2. “Books on women’s spirituality . . . suggest that women’s experiences of the sacred are significantly different from those of men.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      1. Jorstad, Erling. “New Wave of Women’s Spirituality Books Focus on Gender Differences.” *Religion Watch* (Feb. 1996): 3.
      2. “They draw on women’s stages of life—the menstrual cycle and menopause, childbirth, and the role of care giving.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      3. “They see a spiritual element in everyday activities of homemaking, such as decorating interior space, food preparation, and in fostering relationships.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
   3. “Women’s spirituality finds many expressions; it can be deeply conservative or radically innovative.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      1. “The flourishing spirituality surrounding the Virgin Mary views the mother of Christ as a model of receptivity and commitment toward God.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      2. “Feminist spirituality, or the goddess movement, centers on the sacredness of the female experience and the empowerment of women.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
2. **goddess spirituality**
   1. introduction
      1. “Goddess spirituality easily finds its place in the eclectic marketplace of American religion, drawing on Judaism, Christianity, political feminism, psychotherapy, paganism, and the New Age.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      2. Goddess spirituality “actively promot[es] female imagery for God.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      3. “Proponents of goddess spirituality claim to revive deities and culture predating the Judeo-Christian tradition. In the process, they often reconstruct ancient texts and history. Although some historians question the accuracy of these retrievals, goddess movement leaders seek to show that matriarchal culture was displaced by patriarchy and a hardening of spiritual outlook.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      4. “A key question in the new millennium will be what effect these revisionist theories will have upon women in mainstream Christian and Jewish religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      5. Already, “Within mainline churches and synagogues, there is a strong feminist movement inspired by goddess literature . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
   2. the “ReImagining 1993” conference
      1. “Goddess spirituality made headlines following a controversial church-financed conference for Christian feminists in Minneapolis called “ReImagining 1993.” Reports soon emerged about some rather unorthodox prayers and rituals held in the name of “Sophia.” It was an ecumenical gathering that attracted a crowd of two thousand women and eighty-five men, including leading staff members of the mainline Presbyterian and Methodist denominations.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      2. One prayer went: “Our maker Sophia, we are women in your image. With the hot blood of our wombs we give form to new life. . . . With nectar between our thighs we invite a lover . . . with our warm body fluids we remind the world of its pleasures and sensations.” (Cimino and Lattin 34)
      3. “Heresy and paganism, declared the *Presbyterian Layman*, the watchdog newspaper of evangelicals within the relatively liberal Presbyterian [34] Church (U.S.A). “They (Christian feminists) seem determined to take the church back to the period when multiple goddesses were worshiped, where sex outside the covenant of marriage was declared a religious rite of passage, where children were regularly sacrificed, and where everyone did what was right in her own eyes.”” (Anonymous. “Back to the Future.” *Presbyterian Layman* (Jan.-Feb. 1994): 2.) (Cimino and Lattin 34-35)
      4. “*Sophia* is Greek for “wisdom,” and in many Biblical references, such as in the first nine chapters of Proverbs, Sophia is personified as a feminine spirit of wisdom. . . . Her rediscovery by growing numbers of Christian women is part of the flowering of feminist theology in American churches and seminaries today.” (Cimino and Lattin 35)
      5. “When they first heard about Sophia, the folks at United Methodist headquarters in Nashville didn’t know what everyone was so upset about. “I’ve worked for the church all these years, and I’d never heard of Sophia,” said the chief spokesman for the United Methodist Church. “We thought she was the waitress down at the corner diner.”” (Lattin, Don. “Christian Doubters Call Sophia a Pagan Goddess.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (3 Mar. 1994): A1.) (Cimino and Lattin 35)

### The Men’s Movement and Spirituality

1. **Robert Bly’s workshops for men**
   1. 1990: “It’s Sunday night at the Scottish Rite Temple, and 750 men have been at it for nearly seven hours. They’ve chanted, screamed, shaken their fists, pounded on conga drums. They’ve read poetry, told stories, searched for meaning in the myths of the ancients. Huge murals of Zarathustra, Solomon, and King Minos stare down from the temple walls, which shake from the stomping of men. There’s not a single female in this raucous sea of maleness. No one worries about frightening the ladies.” (Cimino and Lattin 31)
   2. “They roar a ballsy African chant with a Latin, back-beat rhythm. Gesturing violently, one half of the mob stomp toward the other, chanting: *Benne’ Benne’ go Blao—Benne’ Benne’ go Blae!* Shifting direction and shaking their fists, the other side answers with equal aggression: *Da Da Da Da mon ado—Da moon Dow!* As the testosterone levels rise, the sounds coming from the Scottish Rite Temple sound more like the Sunday roar of NFL football.” (Cimino and Lattin 31)
   3. “Poet Robert Bly, the inspiration behind this gathering of men, calls out from the stage, trying to calm things down. He asks each of the men to turn to the man next to him, knee touching knee, hand on the other’s heart, and ask him whether there was something he resents about his father. Before long, the packed temple fills with the murmuring sound of 375 pairs of men opening up, a quiet conversation punctuated with an occasional sob or heart-felt roar.” (Cimino and Lattin 31)
   4. “Michael, a graduate student in political science at the University of California, first heard about Bly when a friend gave him an audio tape of one of his lectures on men. After searching his soul and his checking account, Michael decided to pay the $75 admission price and attend the all-day workshop. “There’s been so much focus on the women’s movement and [31] what it means to be a woman in the man’s world. Finally there’s a focus on men,” he said. “I grew up with a serious, no-nonsense father. Bly touches on what has been seen as our feminine side, our caring side.”” (Cimino and Lattin 31-32)
2. **the Million Man March**
   1. 1993: “hundreds of thousands of African-American men gathered in Washington for the Million Man March. . . . the Million Man March showed how spirituality also drives the African-American version of the men’s movement.” (Cimino and Lattin 33)
   2. “. . . the leadership of Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam sparked controversy . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 33)
   3. But “Churches with little sympathy for Farrakhan’s race-based teachings took part because of their growing realization that many black men are alienated from their congregations and communities. They realized that Farrakhan’s unorthodox brand of Islam has successfully reached black males—especially inner-city youth—with its message of self-sufficiency and spiritual self-esteem.” (Cimino and Lattin 33)
   4. “The effort to reconcile masculinity and Christian spirituality has since become a major emphasis in black churches.” (Cimino and Lattin 33)
3. **Promise Keepers**
   1. “Though the men’s movement of the 1990s began with New Age overtones [i.e., Bly’s workshops], it exploded when it hit the evangelical world.” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
   2. Promise Keepers is “the evangelical men’s movement that—depending on whom you choose to believe—is a spirit-filled revival of Christian faith and family, or a sexist, homophobic eruption of the religious right.” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
      1. “Critics of the movement see Promise Keepers as a reaction to feminism, or a clever strategy for recruiting foot soldiers into the religious right.” (Cimino and Lattin 33)
      2. “Yet the movement is not monolithic, nor is it primarily political. In a review of books by evangelical men’s movement leaders, William Lockhart found that the literature does not simply display a return to traditionalism in family and theology; rather, the books are similar to other expressions of the men’s movement. They seek to assert masculinity by using archetypes drawn from psychology and to help men build egalitarian relationships with women. They help men communicate and keep families together. Lockhart writes that the movement provides “room for evangelical men to maintain evangelical distinctives yet also cope with changing social realities.”” (Lockhart, William H. “Defining the New Christian Man.” Unpublished paper presented at Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. Nashville: 8-10 Nov. 1996.) (Cimino and Lattin 33)
   3. Spring 1995: 70,000 men meet in the Los Angeles Coliseum. “This one is one hundred times larger” than Bly’s workshop, “but many of the issues are the same.” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
      1. “Ed Cole, a Dallas pastor and leader of the Christian Men’s Network, touched on the main theme sounded from Promise Keepers’ podiums—the need for disciplined families headed by strong men. “Many of our fathers did not teach us well,” said Cole. “The core issue in America today is fatherlessness.”” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
      2. “Rubbing shoulders at the Coliseum were an eclectic assortment of men—a hat-waving, hand-clapping, hymn-hollering collection of middle-aged businessmen in T-shirts, blue-collar men in baseball caps, and delegations from groups like the Christian Surfing Association and the Soldiers for Jesus motorcycle gang. They paid $55 a ticket, which bought them sixteen hours of lectures, prayer, two box lunches, and upbeat Christian music.” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
      3. “High in the upper deck of the Coliseum, Nick talks about life before he was “born again,” growing up in a broken family of nonbelievers. “My father lived in a different town,” he yells over the crowd. “I didn’t have a father figure, so I had no role model to . . .”” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
      4. “His story is interrupted—not by drunken Raider fans—but by the righteous roar of 72,548 men fueled by dueling doses of testosterone and Christian piety. “We love Jesus! Yes we do!” one side of the stadium chants. “We love Jesus! How about you?” their brethren bark back.” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
      5. “Nick, an expectant father and Southern Baptist, tries to finish his story, yelling over the Coliseum crowd. “You see, I’m the first Christian in my family, so I had no role model to show me how to be a Christian man. Here, I can have fellowship with 70,000 Christian men.”” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
      6. “ “These are exciting days,” said speaker Raul Reis, gazing out over the expanse of Christian masculinity. “These are not days to be wimps. They are days to be strong men.” (Cimino and Lattin 32)
   4. “Promise Keepers [reached] its peak with a 1997 gathering of more than a half million men in Washington, D.C.” (Cimino and Lattin 33)
   5. “Promise Keepers itself may have seen its greatest days. In early 1998, eight years after its founding, leaders of the Denver-based group announced that declining attendance at stadium events had caused a financial crisis, causing the organization to lay off all 345 of its staff members.” (Reuters News Service. “Promise Keepers Sacks All 345 Staff Members.” [20 Feb. 1998].) (Cimino and Lattin 33)

### The LGBT Movement and Spirituality

1. **introduction**
   1. LGBT: lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender.
   2. “Many women in the goddess movement are lesbian or bisexual . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 35)
   3. “. . . the AIDS crisis has sparked a spiritual revival among homosexual men.” (Cimino and Lattin 35)
   4. “Alienated by religious institutions that have long viewed them as immoral deviants, many gays and lesbians are finding spiritual sustenance in their own community, and in their own experience, flocking to gay churches, synagogues, and upbeat New Age congregations where the words *sin* and *judgment* rarely pass the pastor’s lips.” (Cimino and Lattin 35)
2. **popular spiritualities**
   1. “Spiritual teachers popular in the gay community include those following *A Course in Miracles* and other forms of metaphysical Christianity, neopaganism, and the writings of Ram Dass, Stephen Levine, and Elizabeth Kübler-Ross.” (Cimino and Lattin 35)
   2. “Many people with AIDS have worked to reconcile themselves with their Judeo-Christian heritage, reviving interest in faith healing and certain Roman Catholic rites such as anointing the sick and dying with oil.” (Cimino and Lattin 35)
   3. “Countless others have been drawn to an eclectic assortment of meditation and visualization techniques, positive-thinking workshops, and New Age spiritualists.” (Cimino and Lattin 35)

## Spirituality in the Workplace

1. **introduction**
   1. “In the coming century, more corporations will try to address the spiritual and emotional needs of their employees, though concerns about productivity and religious freedom may get in the way.” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   2. “Those promoting workplace spirituality say the goal is to motivate and inspire workers, to help employees balance work with the rest of life.” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   3. “Boston University business professor Laura Nash calls it the “feminization” of the corporation, not to indicate the number of women in management, but to denote a kinder, gentler capitalism that seeks to “empower employees in every aspect of performance.”” (Nash, Laura. “The Nanny Corporation.” *Across the Board* [Fall 1994]: 3.) (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   4. “a 1995 survey of workers by *Personnel Journal*” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
      1. Laabs, Jennifer J. “Balancing Spirituality and Work.” *Personnel Journal* (Sept. 1995): 60.
      2. 70% “think spirituality has a place at work.” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
      3. 27% say “their organizations have private, quiet areas where workers can go for reflection and solitude . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
      4. 56% “say they pray, chant, listen to New Age music, or play meditation tapes at work to help relieve stress.” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
   5. “Most workplace programs avoid explicitly religious or spiritual language, preferring terminology like “empowerment” or “energy” or “stress reduction.”” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
   6. “. . . spirituality and business consultant Judi Neil found that most workers keep their spirituality secret for fear of being seen as impractical or as “New Agers.” But as employees find co-workers with similar interests, they begin to support one another in spiritual growth, and become more outspoken.” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
   7. “As in the wider culture, there are many definitions for “soul” and “spirituality” in the workplace. Some see values like trust, openness, cooperation, environmental awareness, and community responsibility as primary signs of workplace spirituality. In this context, “spirit” refers to human spirit and creativity rather than a supernatural entity. Nash asks how far corporations can go in instilling spirituality in their workers. “Can a company alone provide real meaning to a Generation X employee who is ‘beyond God?’”” (No citation.) (Cimino and Lattin 37)
2. **criticisms**
   1. “In the world of business, spirituality will be seen as a means of increasing productivity and employee satisfaction.” (Cimino and Lattin 51)
   2. “Critics argue that companies are peddling “spirituality lite,” putting Band-Aids on abusive corporate practices and masking the cut-throat downsizing of the 1980s and 1990s. Proponents of the “spirit at work” movement insist they are challenging, rather than affirming, conventional management.” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
   3. “Others worry about companies forcing employees to participate in spiritual workshops.” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
      1. “Whereas consultants and business leaders may not view these programs as religious, employees might. Professionals may see a retreat modeled after Native American council meetings or “vision quests” as a pragmatic way to help participants view their work in more meaningful ways. A devout Mormon, however, may see participation in the retreat as disloyal to his faith. These conflicts are most likely to arise over the contested boundary between spirituality and psychology, especially where meditation, visualization, and relaxation techniques are employed.” (Cimino and Lattin 37)
      2. “Growing numbers of companies and employers are applying faith and spirituality—from evangelical Protestant to American Muslim—to their work. A survey [37] conducted by the National Federation on Independent Business of 800 company owners found that 43 percent identified themselves as evangelical or born-again Christian.” (Gahr, Evan. “Spirited Enterprise.” *American Enterprise* (July-Aug. 1997): 53.) (Cimino and Lattin 37-38)
      3. “Whatever their personal beliefs, employers will find that the most effective and least contentious way to integrate spirituality and business is through programs flexible enough for participants to make room for their own faith traditions and spiritual inclinations . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 38)
3. **types of workplace spirituality**
   1. *massage*: “At one major metropolitan daily, reporters have grown accustomed to computer messages flashing across the top of their screens announcing, “Stress-relieving massages are now being offered in the third-floor conference room.” Moans of ecstasy are soon heard from journalists sitting in high-tech massage chairs, having their neck and shoulders rubbed by a certified masseuse.” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   2. *yoga*: “At one major metropolitan daily, . . . yoga classes [are] offered at noon in the basement meeting room. Tables are pushed aside, lights are dimmed, and a dozen employees sit cross-legged on little mats. “Focus on your breath,” the teacher softly suggests. Judith, who both teaches the class and works at the newspaper, says it can be hard to change gears in the middle of the day. “Everybody has been on the phone, running around here and there, and then we ask them to drop all that and create an atmosphere of calm,” she says. “It’s amazing, but it works. Some have done yoga before. Others are newcomers. One guy asked me about meditation classes and I gave him the number of a local ashram.”” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   3. *mantras*: “Occasionally, one even hears the sounds of quiet chanting drifting from a remodeled basement where mighty presses once roared. “Ommm . . . Ommm . . . Ommm . . .”” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   4. *visualization*: “Seminars incorporating visualization and meditation have become something of a corporate fad.” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   5. *discussion groups*: ““Soul committees,” convened to deal with spiritual issues in work, are now found in several companies, including Lotus Development Corp, AT&T, and Boeing. At the World Bank in Washington, D.C., a “Spiritual Unfoldment Society” meets every Wednesday at lunchtime. Fifty to eighty people meet to discuss a variety of spiritual topics ranging from attaining “soul connection” to reincarnation.” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   6. “There are also regular conferences, Web sites, newsletters, and a growing industry of workplace consultants.” (Cimino and Lattin 36)
   7. “Worker spirituality is also hot in publishing [36] circles. From 1994 to 1997, for instance, approximately fifty books were published on the topic.” (Cimino and Lattin 36-37)

## Science and Alternative Spiritualities

1. **introduction**
   1. “In the new millennium, peace may finally come to science and religion. Battles will continue to flare, especially over bioethics and the brave new world of genetic engineering. But the search for spiritual truth and the quest to understand the cosmos are converging. Science is no longer seen as an obstacle to most spiritual seekers and religious believers, but as another way to explore different philosophies, spiritualities, and worldviews.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
   2. “Philosopher Ken Wilber sees their coming together as one of the most important events in our times. “Science is clearly one of the most profound methods that humans have yet devised for discovering truth,” he writes, “while religion remains the single greatest force for generating meaning.”” (Wilber, Ken. *The Marriage of Sense and Soul*: *Integrating Science and Religion*. New York: Random House, 1998. 3.) (Cimino and Lattin 42)
   3. “Signs of a science-religion truce are everywhere.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
      1. “Colleges and universities across the U.S. and around the world have inaugurated hundreds of new courses, conferences, and workshops on the interplay between science and religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
      2. “Funding by the Templeton Foundation, started by philanthropist and financier John Templeton, has significantly contributed to the dialogue at the college level. The philanthropic foundation gave grants in 1996 to set up 300 college-level courses on science and religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
      3. “New books on the subject come out each year.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
   4. “. . . Kevin Sharpe, editor of the *Science and Spirit News*, says new theories in biology and physics have had a “powerful effect in theology and in breaking down the determinism in science which has opposed religion.”” (Cimino and Lattin 43)
2. **Galileo and Catholicism**
   1. “Back in 1633, Galileo was condemned by the Roman Catholic Church, arrested, and had his books burned for concluding that the Earth moves around the sun.” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
   2. “It took 350 years, but the Vatican finally admitted it was wrong. . . . Pope John Paul II admitted the church was wrong on October 31, 1992, formally lifting the edict of the Inquisition against the brilliant Italian astronomer and physicist.” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
   3. Antonio Zichicihi, Italian nuclear physicist (qtd. in: Tabliabue, John. “Pope Bolsters Church’s Support for Scientific View of Evolution.” *New York Times* [25 Oct. 1996]: 1): “The Holy Father recognizes science as a depository of values on the same plane as those of the faith. The third millennium will set the stage for a grand alliance between faith and Galilean science.” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
   4. “To many, the ruling [was] so long overdue [it was] laughable. To others, [it] marked a turning point in the centuries-old clash between science and religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
3. **evolution**
   1. 1996: Pope John Paul II “gave his blessing to Charles Darwin, proclaiming that “fresh knowledge leads to recognition of the theory of evolution as more than just a hypothesis.”” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
4. **Fritjof Capra**
   1. 1939: “Capra was born in Austria . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
   2. 1966: he “earned his doctorate in theoretical physics from the University of Vienna.” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
   3. 1969: Capra had a “profound mystical experience . . . on a central California beach in 1969, an event that helped inspire the *Tao of Physics*. “As I sat on that beach, my former experiences came to life,” he recalls. “I saw cascades of energy coming down from outer space, in which particles were created and destroyed in rhythmic pulses. I saw the atoms of the elements and those of my body participating in this cosmic dance of energy. I felt its rhythm and I heard its sound.” (Qtd. in: Lattin, Don. “Physics, Mystics and the Essence of Things.” *San Francisco Examiner* [9 Feb. 1986]: B1.) (Cimino and Lattin 41)
   4. 1975: Fritjof Capra wrote his best-seller, the *Tao of Physics*, “and launched a new kind of thinking about science and spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
   5. Capra “stood behind the pulpit at the First Unitarian Church and posed a question to a congregation of 200 scientists, mystics, and assorted truth seekers. “Why do we see objects in the everyday world?” asked Capra, who had just told his audience that, according to both physicists and mystics, what is really out there is “a continuous dance of energy.” “Why do we see this glass of water as separate from this table?”” (Cimino and Lattin 40)
   6. “Both mystics and physicists, he notes, conduct research into “the essential nature of all things.” Although mystics explore this realm through quiet meditation, and physicists conduct their experiments with colossal atom smashers and complex mathematical equations, they sometimes produce remarkably similar findings. One famous example is the nature of light, which has paradoxically been found to consist of both waves and particles, depending on how the experiment is conducted.” (Cimino and Lattin 41)
5. **some publications that use physics to bolster spirituality** (from: Stenger, Victor J. “Quantum Quackery.” *Skeptical Inquirer* [Jan./Feb. 1997]. Committee for Skeptical Inquiry. 10 June 2007. <http://www.­csicop.org/si/9701/quantum-quackery.html>.)
   1. Bohm D., and B.J. Hiley. *The Undivided Universe*: *An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. London: Routledge, 1993.
   2. Capra, Fritjof. *The Tao of Physics*. Boulder: Shambhala, 1975.
   3. Chopra, Deepak. *Quantum Healing*: *Exploring the Frontiers of Mind/Body Medicine*. New York: Bantam, 1989.
   4. Chopra, Deepak. *Ageless Body*, *Timeless Mind*: *The Quantum Alternative to Growing Old*. New York: Random House, 1993.
   5. Eberhard, Phillippe H., and Ronald R. Ross. “Quantum Field Theory Cannot Provide Faster-Than-Light Communication.” *Found*. *Phys*. *Lett*. 2 (1989): 127-149.
   6. Everett III, Hugh. ““Relative State” Formulation of Quantum Mechanics.” *Rev*. *Mod*. *Phys*. 29 (1957): 454-62.
   7. Goswami, Amit. *The Self-Aware Universe*: *How Consciousness Creates the Material World*. New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1993.
   8. Kafatos, Menas, and Robert Nadeau. *The Conscious Universe*: *Part and Whole in Modern Physical Theory*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990.
   9. Squires, Euan. *Conscious Mind in the Physical World*. New York: Adam Hilger, 1990.
   10. Wilber, Ken, ed. *Quantum Questions*: *Mystical Writings of the World’s Great Physicists*. Boulder: Shambhala, 1984.
6. **creation theology**
   1. Creation theology, “which holds that God’s creation of the universe is an ongoing process and that humans are “co-creators,” was developed by both scientists and theologians.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
   2. “This is not the same thing as “creationist” theology, the more fundamentalist view that God set forth about 6,000 years ago to create the Earth in six days.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
   3. “Creation theology, and especially creation spirituality, is a more mystical expression that gives scientists a place at the table.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
7. **an interrelated**, **unpredictable**, **evolving creation**
   1. interrelatedness
      1. “Recent scientific theories around the “new physics” and “chaos theory” . . . argue that the systems of the universe are unpredictable and are open to rapid change.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
      2. This is a ““paradigm shift” [as] outlined by Thomas Kuhn, a historian of science who described how people make models of the universe to direct their interpretation of events. . . . This has led to the idea that we cannot separate the way we look at things from our understanding of “reality.”” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
      3. “These ideas also mesh with the philosophy of the New Age . . . Central to New Age philosophy is the idea of a “wholeness paradigm” emphasizing the interconnectedness of all beings. This worldview [42] is seen as replacing the old model associated with Isaac Newton, who saw the universe as a huge mechanical system that operated according to immutable laws.” (Cimino and Lattin 42-43)
      4. the Gaia theory
         1. “Sometimes, science follows in the tracks of spirituality. Take the Gaia theory . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 43)
         2. “. . . birthed in New Age circles [the] theory originally held that the planet, or “Mother Earth,” is alive and acts with a sense of purpose to maintain the conditions of life.” (Cimino and Lattin 43)
         3. “Eventually scientists trimmed much of the spiritual overlay from the theory, replacing the view that the earth acts with a sense of purpose with a more mechanical explanation, more like “feedback.” Nevertheless, much of the scientific community came around [43] to accept the theory’s main point that life on earth helps regulate the earth itself.” (Cimino and Lattin 43-44)
         4. “James Parker Morton, formerly of New York’s Cathedral of St. John the Divine, says that the “very nature of this hypothesis shows that we are at a new moment when scientific and religious inquiry is directed to the same reality and discussed in common language.”” (Cimino, Richard P. “Scientific Breakthroughs Playing a New Role in Theology.” *Religion Watch* [May 1991]: 1-2.) (Cimino and Lattin 43-44)
   2. unpredictable and evolving
      1. “Recent scientific theories around the “new physics” and “chaos theory” . . . see the various parts of the universe as interrelated and always evolving. God’s work of creation, in other words, continues today.” (Cimino and Lattin 42)
      2. “. . . some biologists point to an “ever-increasing diversity of new life forms” as evidence of an “open-ended universe,” where unpredictability is the rule.” (Cimino and Lattin 43)
      3. “A scientist and Anglican priest, the Reverend Arthur Peacocke, [theorizes] that God may have created the world using chance but “loaded the dice in favor of life.” These concepts, he notes, have a way of filtering down to religious congregations and everyday life. Since creation is still taking place, humans are called to “cooperate with God’s intentions” and serve as “co-creators.” This may lead Christians toward a more “positive assessment of civilization and technology” and inspire greater ecological concern.” (Cimino and Lattin 43)
8. **spirituality and computer science**
   1. “Computer breakthroughs such as the Internet spawn new spiritual concepts. Psychologist Jean Houston sees the Internet as a material expression of spiritual connections already present among humans. “What’s happening here is an electronic neurosphere . . . a global mind field that is spawning a new culture.”” (Qtd. in: Hawes, Peter. “Casting a Wider Net.” *Common Boundary* [Nov.-Dec. 1995]: 32.) (Cimino and Lattin 43)
   2. “Scientist and theologian Philip Clayton writes that the creation of computer intelligence systems, including advanced robotics, will force theologians and believers to redefine the concepts of “soul” and “created in the image of God.” As technology takes on human attributes, Clayton ventures that our image of God may even have to be modified.” (Clayton, Philip. “Computers and the Spirit.” *Common Boundary* [Nov.-Dec. 1995].) (Cimino and Lattin 43)

## Health and Spirituality

1. **beginnings**
   1. “. . . William James, the American psychologist and philosopher, was one of the first to document the blending of psychology and spirituality into a practical, personal, and private religion. Calling it “religion of healthy-mindedness,” James observed how the “New Thought” schools of American spirituality promote “systematic exercise in passive relaxation, concentration, and meditation” . . .” (James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: American Penguin Library—Penguin, 1982. 115.) (Cimino and Lattin 50)
   2. Faith healing was “formerly the province of Pentecostals and the Christian Science church . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 44)
   3. “Holistic health [was] once the darling of the New Age movement . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 44)
   4. Dr. Herbert Benson “studied Transcendental Meditation practitioners during the 1960s and 1970s . . .” (Cimino and Lattin 44)
   5. Faith healing, holistic health, and prayer and meditation “went mainstream in the 1980s and 1990s.” (Cimino and Lattin 44)
2. **spirituality and the healthcare system**
   1. “It’s called “the faith factor,” and if growing numbers of researchers are correct, having it makes you healthy. [44] . . . spirituality and religious belief influence body and mind . . .” [46] (Cimino and Lattin 44, 46)
   2. 1988: “a major study . . . involved a group praying for coronary patients, and a control group that did not receive prayer. Those being prayed for ended up with fewer cases of congestive heart failure during recovery, had to use less medication, and experienced fewer complications.” (Hotz, Robert Lee. “Brain Could Affect Religious Response.” *Los Angeles Times* [1 Nov. 1997]: B4:5.) (Cimino and Lattin 45)
   3. “Since the mid-1990s, [Harvard Medical School’s] Mind-Body Medical Institute has been bringing together doctors, nurses, and religious leaders to compare notes and share experiences on the intersection of spirituality and medicine.” (Cimino and Lattin 44)
      1. “People passing by the vast ballroom of a Boston hotel were puzzled. At one moment, a distinguished doctor was holding forth on the latest research on placebos, neurobiology, and cardiology. A few minutes later, a thousand heads bowed in guided meditation. Then the audience applauded enthusiastically as a Pentecostal preacher gave riveting testimony of a healing he experienced as a youth.” (Cimino and Lattin 44)
   4. “Doctors are sold on the physical benefits of faith. A 1996 survey of members of the American Academy of Family Physicians reports that a remarkable 99 percent think religious faith helps patients respond to treatment. The study, conducted by Yankelovich Partners, found that most of these doctors thought spiritual techniques should be part of formal medical training, and 55 percent report they use these techniques as part of their current practice.” (Thomas, Gary. “Doctors Who Pray.” *Christianity Today* [6 Jan. 1997]: 20.) (Cimino and Lattin 45)
   5. “. . . the spirituality-health connection is finding a place in medical education. The National Institute for HealthCare Research reports in 1997 that nearly one-third of American medical schools offered courses on spirituality and healing.” (Cimino and Lattin 45)
   6. “In the new millennium, greater appreciation for the connection between spirituality and health will inspire and challenge the fields of medicine and religion.” (Cimino and Lattin 44)
      1. “Pollster George Gallup predicts that healing will be the major theme of the religious future.” (No citation.) (Cimino and Lattin 44)
      2. Dr. Herbert Benson “forecasts that the medical establishment will turn to healing techniques that draw on spirituality . . . in no small part because they’re seen as cost effective. Since HMOs force medical providers to cut costs by reducing patient visits, preventive and nonmedical treatments will be favorably received.” (Cimino and Lattin 45)
      3. Psychiatrist Richard Friedman: “In ten years when you go for a check-up, I predict that your doctor will not only ask about your medical history but also about your belief system.” (Cimino and Lattin 45)
   7. “Consider the doctor-patient relationship at the medical offices of Dr. Dale Matthews of Georgetown University Medical School. Along with taking blood pressure and writing prescriptions, Matthews offers a method of treatment his colleagues may still find shocking. He prays with them. After examining the legs of one elderly patient, Matthews encourages the woman to join her church choir. “The best thing you can do for your health is to keep praising God every day,” says Matthews, as he writes out the Bible citation of Colossians 3:17 on a prescription pad and hands it to the patient.” (Cimino and Lattin 45) Col 3:17, “And whatever you do, in word or deed, do everything in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.”
   8. prayer and meditation
      1. “What kinds of spiritual practices benefit health and healing?” (Cimino and Lattin 45)
         1. “Studies find prayer and congregation attendance have beneficial effects.” (Cimino and Lattin 45)
         2. “But meditation, and meditative varieties of prayer, seem to have the greatest effect.” (Cimino and Lattin 45)
      2. the relaxation response
         1. Dr. Herbert Benson “studied Transcendental Meditation practitioners during the 1960s and 1970s and pioneered the “relaxation response.”” (Cimino, Richard P. “Health-Spirituality Connections Grow, Encountering Religious Traditions.” *Religion Watch* [Dec. 1995]: 1-2.) (Cimino and Lattin 44)
         2. “Researchers say the “relaxation response” from repetitive words, chanting, and prayer helps in the treatment of heart disease, chronic pain, and infertility.” (Cimino and Lattin 45)
         3. “And it doesn’t seem to matter if the contemplative practice is a [45] Buddhist meditating, a Muslim reciting the Koran, or a Catholic saying the rosary.” (Cimino and Lattin 45-46)
      3. prayer and belief
         1. “Since these different practices have similar effects on health, Benson notes, it may mean they all share the same underlying reality—some­thing that might lead to greater unity and peace among religions.” (Cimino and Lattin 45-46)
         2. “If Buddhist meditation and Quaker prayer have the same effect on health, how important are the distinctive beliefs that undergird these practices?” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
         3. “Those interested in health could come to value prayer or meditation for their physical effects more than their spiritual significance.” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
         4. “Dr. Matthews draws a distinction between “intrinsic” and “extrinsic” faith and their effect on health. Those whose faith is part of their identity (intrinsic) do experience positive health benefits. Others who might use spirituality as a way to achieve status or health (extrinsic) are less likely to benefit, and may actually experience negative health effects.” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
3. **spirituality and the brain**
   1. “If personal faith promotes human wellness, it is not a huge next step to conclude that we are genetically constituted for mystical experience.” (Cimino and Lattin 47)
   2. Dr Herbert Benson: “Our genetic blueprint has made believing in an Infinite Absolute part of our nature. By the process of natural selection, mutating genes deemed faith important enough to the survival of our forefathers and mothers that we were endowed with the same tendencies. . . . Evolution favors religion, causing our brains to generate the impulses we need to carry on—faith, hope, and love becoming part of the neuromatrix with which we approach living.” (Cimino and Lattin 47)
   3. “. . . religious and mystical experiences are colored by how the brain functions.” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
   4. the temporal lobe and spirituality
      1. “People suffering from temporal lobe seizures have long reported that their attacks were accompanied by intense mystical experiences, and that they were often preoccupied by religious thoughts between seizures.” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
      2. “Researchers at the University of California at San Diego’s brain and perception laboratory studied patients suffering from an unusual form of epilepsy [i.e., temporal lobe seizures] and concluded that parts of the brain’s temporal lobe region may influence how intensely a person responds to religious beliefs.” (Culligan, Kevin. “Are We Wired for God?” *America* [22 Mar. 1997]: 23-24.) (Cimino and Lattin 46)
         1. Researcher V.S. Ramachandran: “there may be neural circuits in the temporal lobe that may be part of the machinery of the brain that is involved in mystical experiences and God.” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
         2. “Researchers stressed that these findings do not negate the validity of God, but merely suggest that humans may be “hard-wired” for mysticism and divine communication.” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
   5. “Venturing further into the future, new discoveries in biology, brain research, and pharmaceuticals point to a whole new market of products and technologies to trigger and intensify mystical experience and spiritual well-being.” (Cimino and Lattin 51)
4. **spirituality and fitness**
   1. “By the mid-1990s, gyms and spas were marketing spirituality to their customers.” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
   2. “. . . Martha Barnette reports that “spirituality-speak” has become a regular part of the program at gyms and spas, “providing a kind of one-stop shopping, where the faithful go to feed their spiritual hunger.”” (Barnette, Martha. “Body and Soul.” *Allure* [Sept. 1996]: 258.) (Cimino and Lattin 46)
   3. “It is hard to know where the beauty and fitness ends and the spirituality begins when programs of “aromafitness” are offered and facials are promoted as helping customers come into “alignment with their finest selves.”” (Cimino and Lattin 46)
   4. Barnette’s conclusion: all this may be “the same old self-indulgence [46] with the shiny new language of spirituality. We suspect they spend a lot less time navel gazing than they do studying their cellulite in the mirror, and that the spiritual enlightenment they claim from exercising is actually just a good old rush of endorphins.” (Cimino and Lattin 46-47)
5. **spirituality and psychotropic drugs**
   1. There is an “increasing use of mind-altering drugs to alleviate psychological ailments, especially character and personality problems. Drugs such as Prozac and newer anti-depressants differ from earlier medications in that they not only relieve serious depression but also seem to work on personality traits, such as self-esteem and anger, and promote a general sense of well-being. These, of course, are states of mind long considered the province of religion and spirituality.” (Cimino and Lattin 47)
   2. “Spiritual groups with a strong therapeutic dimension are more likely to be in conflict with the psychopharmacological revolution, viewing it as unwelcome competition. Witness the Church of Scientology’s anti-Prozac campaign.” (Cimino and Lattin 47)
   3. “Religions that emphasize a transcendent God are less concerned because they have invested less in fostering psychological growth and adjustment.” (Cimino and Lattin 47)
   4. “An analysis of how Buddhist practitioners are affected by the use antidepressants found that most meditators using Prozac did not think it conflicted with their religious practice. Most of those interviewed said Prozac and similar drugs do not deal with the “dark night of the soul” or other existential predicaments that spur people onto a spiritual path. A Zen monk adds, “Taking medication is kind of like sitting in a chair rather than sitting cross-legged on the mat. Whether there’s something wrong with people’s legs or the neurotransmitters in their brains, we need to adjust the practice so they can experience it.”” (Graham, Barbara. “Meditating on Prozac.” *Common Boundary* [Sept.-Oct. 1995]: 24.) (Cimino and Lattin 47)
6. **spirituality and substance addictions**
   1. “Research on substance abusers has questioned the wisdom of viewing excessive drug and alcohol use in purely medical terms, and using new drugs to block the feelings of pleasure created by other drugs.” (Cimino and Lattin 47)
   2. “Steven Hyman of the Brain, Mind, and Behavior Initiative at Harvard University [47] found that these attempts are not very successful because they don’t give anything back to the addict. They lack the “spiritual therapy” component of organizations like Alcoholics Anonymous.” (Cimino and Lattin 47-48)
   3. “Andrew and Thomas Delbanco write that self-help groups that draw on spirituality provide addicts with a “compensatory pleasure.” This may come from spiritual experience, or simply taking responsibility for their actions in a “productive love that goes outward, seeking no reward, to other people and, through them, to God.”” (Delbanco, Andrew, and Thomas Delbanco. “A.A. at the Crossroads.” *New Yorker* [20 Mar. 1995]: 58.) (Cimino and Lattin 48)
7. **massage**
   1. “Borrowing spiritual practices from other faiths can unearth neglected elements in one’s own tradition. When Catholic nuns started offering massage therapy and the anointing with oil to patients, they undoubtedly borrowed much of these practices from holistic health. Yet these sisters’ new ministry of caring for the body as well as the soul also gave them a new way of expressing the Catholic teaching of the sacredness of the bodily and physical world.” (Cimino, Richard P. “Religious Orders Branching Out, Innovating.” *Religion Watch* [Sept. 1997]: 7.) (Cimino and Lattin 74)
8. **conclusion**
   1. “. . . Americans are drawn to practical religion—to spiritual practices that not only connect them with the sacred, but fix things, from problems on the job to persistent arthritis. As spirituality is further detached from traditional religion, it will be viewed as a means of solving problems. In the new millennium, many Americans will be more concerned with therapy than theology.” (Cimino and Lattin 51)
   2. “These forecasts can be applied to other faiths. Events sponsored by Harvard Medical School have explored the relationship between spirituality and health among Muslim, Jewish, Hindu, Christian, Buddhist, and other religious traditions. At a 1995 conference in Boston, Harvey Cox of Harvard Divinity School saw strong connections between Pentecostal teachings on the healing energy of the Holy Spirit and traditional Chinese healing methods.” (Cimino and Lattin 75)
   3. religious healing in the near future
      1. Koenig, John. In *Practicing Our Faith*, ed. Dorothy Bass. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997. 149-62.
      2. “Among all the different spiritual teachings and techniques in religious congregations, healing is likely to be one of the most important ones in the future.” (Cimino and Lattin 74)
      3. “John Koenig writes that there will be a new convergence between belief and contemporary medicine, bringing congregations into closer interaction with medical professionals.” (Cimino and Lattin 74)
      4. “Koenig adds that congregations are likely to become involved in promoting healthy behavior, [74] particularly as their members age.” (Cimino and Lattin 74-75)
      5. “The new presence of “parish nurses” in thousands of congregations also points to this trend.” (Cimino and Lattin 75)
      6. “The emphasis on healing and health will be especially evident in small groups and special healing services. Such services involve intercessory prayer and various kinds of touching or anointing, often including, in the Christian context, an emphasis on the Eucharist, or among charismatics, the gifts of the spirit.” (Cimino and Lattin 74-75)

# Appendices

## Christianity in the United States

Barrett, David B., George T. Kurian, and Todd M. Johnson. *World Christian Encyclopedia: A Comparative Survey of Churches and Religions in the Modern World*. 2d ed. Oxford: OUP, 2001. 772-82.

PROTESTANT CHURCHES. Protestantism continues to constitute the Christian majority in the USA, although its proportional place in the population has steadily diminished during the present century, from 65% in 1900 to about 44% in 1995, due primarily to the growth of Catholicism by immigration.

*Baptists* form the principal Protestant tradition at the present time, a position held by Methodists in 1900. The American Baptist Churches in the USA, the largest of the northern Baptist denominations, look to Roger Williams as the founder of the country’s first Baptist church, in Providence, Rhode Island in 1639. For a century and a half work was confined entirely to local communities, and after the Revolutionary War, associations were formed in several states; but the first national body (the Northern Baptist Convention) was not created until 1907. The name was changed to the American Baptist Convention in 1950 and to its present name in 1972.

The largest Baptist church in America is the Southern Baptist Convention, which came into being in 1845 in reaction to the refusal of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, with headquarters in Boston, to accept slave-owners as missionaries. Southern Baptists immediately established a strong central administration, a factor which has contributed to their extraordinary growth over the past century. Conventions now exist in 35 states, and there are a large number of denominational organizations. Of special note are their impressive Sunday school program in the USA and extensive overseas missionary work, the latter with 4,000 workers in over 120 countries in 1995. Unlike many large Protestant denominations, Southern Baptist numerical growth has shown few signs of decreasing in recent years.

Schisms and the creation of new Baptist denominations have taken place almost since the beginning, these including the National Association of Free Will Baptists in 1701, General Association of General Baptists in 1714, Primitive Baptists about 1830 and Baptist General Conference in 1852; and the present century has witnessed the formation of several large fundamentalist groups: the American Baptist Association in 1905, Conservative Baptist Association of America in 1947, Baptist Missionary Association of America in 1950, and Baptist Bible Fellowship International also in 1950. In addition to these larger bodies, all with communities over 100,000, there are many small Baptist denominations and independent congregations.

*Methodists* constitute the second largest Protestant tradition in the USA; but unlike the Baptists, the overwhelming majority are found in one denomination, the United Methodist Church. A number of other Methodist groups exist but they are for the most part small. Although John and Charles Wesley worked in Georgia as early as 1736, the first Methodist society in the New World was not formed until 1766, with the Methodist Episcopal Church itself being organized in 1784. During the 19th century schisms took their toll, the Methodist Protestant Church seceding in 1830 over the question of episcopal authority and the whole southern branch of the church in 1845 over slavery. Nevertheless these 3 bodies united once again in 1939 to form The Methodist Church, and a further merger with the Evangelical United Brethren Church in 1968 has produced the present United Methodist Church. The Church is organized into 5 jurisdictional and 81 annual conferences (including Puerto Rico) and 45 episcopal areas. The United Methodist Church is about half the size of the Southern Baptist Convention, the difference being that the former has experienced annual decreases in adherents in recent years, while the latter has continued to grow in membership.

Other Methodist denominations exist which have broken with the main denomination in order to re-emphasize the Wesleyan doctrine of sanctification, and which now form part of the 2-million strong American holiness movement, including the Wesleyan Church and the Free Methodist Church, founded respectively in 1843 and 1860.

Other important bodies in the holiness movement include the Church of God (Anderson), Christian and Missionary Alliance, and Church of the Nazarene.

*Lutherans* from Germany first came to New York in 1623 and were known to have organized a congregation there by 1649. Other European immigrants followed; but the first synod, called the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, was not assembled until 1748. A general synod was held in 1820.

Most of these early synods remained independent until 1918 when they merged to form the United Lutheran Church. In 1962 the Lutheran Church of America was created by a merger of the United Lutheran Church with the Swedish-speaking Augustana Lutheran Church (founded in 1860), Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church (1890) and the American Evangelical Lutheran Church (1872), the latter working particularly among Danish immigrants. In 1987, the Lutheran Church in America and the American Lutheran Church merged to form the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, by far the largest Lutheran denomination in the USA.

About half the size of the above is the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod which was founded in Missouri by German immigrants from Saxony who joined with others in 1847 to form the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and Other States. This church has been noted for its doctrinal conservatism but has in recent years been rent by division over alleged liberalism in its principal theological school, Concordia Seminary.

The American Lutheran Church came into being in 1960 through the union of 3 denominations: a church of the same name (American Lutheran Church), which was German in background and traced its history to 1818; the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, founded by Danes in 1896; and the Evangelical Lutheran Church, which consisted mostly of Norwegians. A further merger in 1963 also brought in the Lutheran Free Church, another Norwegian body.

Among a number of other smaller Lutheran denominations, the most important is the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

*Disciples of Christ* form a relatively recent tradition in American Protestantism. In the early part of the 19th century, 2 separate groups concerned for Christian unity arose among Presbyterians in Kentucky and Pennsylvania. The Kentucky group called themselves ‘Disciples’ while the Pennsylvania group were identified simply as ‘Christians’. In 1832 they joined together to form the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). This church, whose supreme body at the national level is a general assembly, is divided into 40 regions. [775]

Two massive schisms have taken place among the Disciples since the founding of their church. The first was a conservative split which took place about 1870 and resulted in the creation of the Churches of Christ, a denomination which is commonly described by the adjective Non-Instrumental for its refusal to allow the use of organs or musical instruments during worship services. This body is completely congregational in structure, with no hierarchical or centralized organization, and maintains an extensive missionary work throughout the world. It is also one of the fastest-growing denominations in the USA at the present time.

The second major schism came about 1935 and produced the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, which is usually described as Instrumental because it permits musical instruments in worship.

*Presbyterians* and *Reformed* constitute another major tradition, the former being the term for those of British origin (Scots and Irish), and the latter for those of Continental origin, mainly Dutch. In North America the Presbyterian wing is by far the most significant.

The United Presbyterian Church in the USA, the largest of all these groups, was formed in 1958 from a union of the Presbyterian Church in the USA and the United Presbyterian Church of North America. The former was first organized in 1706, whereas the latter was itself the result of a merger of the Associate Presbyterian Church and the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church in 1858. The church is today organized into congregations, presbyteries and synods, questions of national significance being handled by the annual general assembly, the general council and the judicial commission.

Presbyterianism, as was true of many American denominations, suffered from the North-South conflict over slavery which ended finally in the Civil War of 1861-65. Out of this period came 2 splits of southern synods and presbyteries within the Presbyterian Church in the USA, the first in 1857 and the second in 1861. These 2 southern groups in turn united in 1865 to form the Presbyterian Church in the US.

The 2 principal Reformed denominations are the Reformed Church in America, founded by Dutch settlers to New York in 1628, and the Christian Reformed Church, a schism from the former which took place in Michigan in 1837 over questions of discipline and doctrine.

*Pentecostals* in the USA form a dynamic tradition which grew out of the 19th-century American holiness movement, adding to its teaching an emphasis on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, faith healing, and the exercise of charismatic gifts. Several bodies including the Pentecostal Holiness Church, founded in 1898, continue to retain both emphases in their titles or in their teaching, and the first Pentecostal body in the USA, the Church of God (Cleveland), was at one point actually the Holiness Church. The latter began as a study and fellowship group in Cleveland, Tennessee in 1886, and a key event in its development took place in 1903 when A. J. Tomlinson, who had previously worked for the American Bible Society, joined its ranks, becoming moderator in 1909. The church has shown great vitality in its growth during the present century. In 1923 Tomlinson was removed from office and withdrew to form a separate Pentecostal body which adopted the name Church of God of Prophecy in 1953.

The largest Pentecostal body in the USA with mainly White members at the present time is the Assemblies of God, which dates its beginnings to 1906, although its founding meeting did not take place until 1914. Its churches, although entirely self-governing, are organized into 47 districts and include every state.

One of the most notable of America’s Pentecostal denominations is the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, which grew out of the revival meetings of Aimee Semple McPherson in Los Angeles, beginning in 1918.

Other important bodies include the United Pentecostal Church (1914) and the Pentecostal Church of God of America (1919).

*Congregationalists* have had a variegated history. They first came to the USA with the pilgrims in 1620 and have always had their strength in New England. In 1959 they entered on a major merger with the Evangelical and Reformed Church, a German Calvinistic body, which was itself the result of a union in 1934 of the Evangelical Synod of North America dating back to 1840, and the Reformed Church in the US begun by Germans in Pennsylvania as early as 1730. The resulting United Church of Christ, which at union was 64% Congregationalists and 36% E & R, represents an attempt to blend Congregationalism and Presbyterianism. Although local churches have full autonomy, there are area associations, regional conferences and the general synod at the national level which play an important role.

A still more ambitious union scheme is the Consultation on Church Union which was begun in 1962 and proposes to unite in one church 9 churches: Disciples, Episcopalian, Methodist (4 groups, including 3 Black Methodist denominations), Presbyterian (2) and the United Church of Christ.

*Other Protestants* exist in a great variety of traditions, many of them with very significant constituencies. Among the more important of these are the Seventh-day Adventist Church, founded in 1844, with 9 unions in the USA; the Salvation Army, which entered in 1880 and now has 38 USA divisions; several Brethren (German Baptist or Dunker) groups; 5 Quaker bodies, the earliest going back to 1656; and a large number of Mennonite groups from as early as 1683.

Lastly, there are over 2,500 single independent congregations unaffiliated with any particular Protestant tradition, some of which have up to 8,000 members each. Altogether they total around 1.3 million adherents.

CATHOLIC CHURCH. Catholic history in the USA dates from the first Spanish missions to Indians in 1526, and the year 1565 when the first permanent Catholic community was established at St Augustine, Florida. Maryland became a Catholic colony in 1634, but it was not until the adoption of the American constitution in 1787 that Catholics received full religious liberty. The first Catholic diocese was erected in Baltimore in 1789, becoming an archdiocese in 1808. The USA had its first cardinal appointed from Rome in 1875. By 1990, there were over 56 million Catholics in 32 archdioceses and 134 dioceses in the USA. Jurisdictions with over 2 million Catholics each include Chicago and Boston, joined in 1975 by Los Angeles; and 6 others had over a million each in 1990.

In addition to English-speaking White Americans, the 2 major ethnic groups within the US Catholic Church are over 10 million Spanish-speaking Catholics and one million Black Catholics, in 1990. These 2 latter groups are beginning to come into their own evidenced by the appointment of a 40-year-old Mexican-American priest as archbishop of Santa Fé, New Mexico, and the continued growth and vitality of the National Office for Black Catholics (NOBC), founded in 1970. The NOBC maintains close ties with the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and is funded by annual collections sponsored by the bishops in their dioceses. The NOBC has sponsored studies and seminars to improve the work of the church among Black Catholics, foster pride in their heritage, promote vocations among Blacks, and to assist those of all races and backgrounds to relate more effectively to the Black community. For the Spanish-speaking community, a similar function is performed by the Mexican American Cultural Centre in San Antonio, Texas. In 1974, the USCC Division for the Spanishspeaking, which was formerly a part of the Department of Social Development and World Peace, was upgraded to the status of a secretariat within the USCC.

Historically, the Catholic community in the USA has lived until recent years in a certain isolation from attitudes and values prevailing in the larger American society. It remained separate and homogeneous so that in a host of different ways, from the trivial to the essential, the distinctiveness of Catholic beliefs, values and practices was affirmed and reinforced.

This state of affairs has changed markedly and with increasing rapidity since the end of Vatican Council II. An important question now is whether Catholics in the USA are more influenced by the church or by secular society. Many would say that for a large number of Catholics, the influence of secular society, for good as well as ill, counts more heavily than the influence of the church.

As a result, the Catholic Church in the USA has many of the same problems as the rest of organized religion. Polarization and ferment are widespread in the church, not least in religious life. The shortage of vocations to the priesthood and religious life remains a serious problem.

On the other hand, there are now many signs that a profound spiritual renewal is taking place among American Catholics. Centers and movements for the study and practice of spirituality among priests, religious and laity are springing up in many places. Over 4 million adult Catholics including large numbers of religious personnel and several bishops are involved and active in the pentecostal Catholic Charismatic Renewal. Spiritually-oriented movements for married couples are attracting increasing numbers. After a period of transition, liturgical reforms are now widely accepted and working well. Parish and diocesan councils have spread extensively and involved more people than ever before in the exercise of shared responsibility. Many priests and religious, after a period of uncertainty and confusion, manifest renewed dedication to the mission of the church.

The Holy See has diplomatic relations with United States of America and in AD 2000 is represented to government and the Catholic hierarchy by a pronuncio residing in Washington, D.C.

BLACK/INDIAN/THIRD-WORLD CHURCHES. Some 34.8 million US Blacks, Ameri­can Indians, Spanish-Americans and immigrants from Third-World countries belong to churches indigenous to their own communities, separate from, unsupported by and uncontrolled by White denominations.

*Black churches*. Although Blacks are found in most of the major USA denominations, with the largest numbers in the Roman Catholic Church (1,000,000) and the United Methodist Church (400,000), the majority of all USA Blacks are members of over 140 separate Blacks denominations which have split either from predominantly White or White-controlled denominations or from other Black groups over the past 2 centuries.

The majority of American Blacks are Baptists. The first independent Black Baptist congregation was formed in 1773, at Silver Bluff near Augusta, Georgia, although it was not until 1836 that an association of Black Baptists was organized, the Providence Baptist Association of Ohio. The first national body established was in 1880, called the Foreign Mission Baptist Convention. Others followed: the American National Baptist Convention in 1886 and the Baptist National Educational Convention in 1893, both of which joined the Foreign Mission Baptist Convention to form the National Baptist Convention of America in 1895. In 1915 a major dissension occurred from which emerged 2 churches, the National Baptist Convention USA, and the National Baptist Convention of [776] America. These remain the largest Black denominations in the USA. A further schism from the NBCUSA produced the Progressive National Baptist Convention in 1961. Another very large denomination is the National Primitive Baptist Convention. In addition, there are many small Black Baptist denominations and independent congregations.

The second largest church tradition claiming the allegiance of Blacks is Methodism. A first group of Black dissidents appeared in Philadelphia in 1787 and in 1816 officially organized the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Another group began in New York City in 1796 and eventually grew to be known as the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. A third important body, the Colored (now Christian) Methodist Episcopal Church, was formed in 1870 as a schism from the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The AME, AME Zion and CME churches are all now involved in church union negotiations among themselves, as well as being members of COCU, the Consultation on Church Union. Many small Black Methodist churches are also active.

[photo caption:] Church of God in Christ. Black pentecostals (in USA denominations) totalled 3.2 million by 1978. Largest of all USA pentecostal churches is the Church of God in Christ, whose Bishop B.R. Stewart (*above*) is seen celebrating a Black rock star’s marriage in New York’s Madison Square before 23,000 fans.

Pentecostalism has had a wide appeal among Blacks. The largest body is the Church of God in Christ, which was begun in 1895 through a Baptist interested in ‘the doctrine of entire sanctification through the outpourings of the Holy Spirit’. A major schism from this body in 1969 produced the Church of God in Christ International. Other important Black pentecostal denominations are the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (1914), United Holy Church of America (1886) and a host of smaller churches and individual congregations.

[photo caption:] Native American Church of North America. Contemporary Navajo peyote ritual session, declared legal by US Supreme Court in 1961 because ‘The NAC is a legitimate church entitled to the protection of the 1st Amendment’. Drummer (*left*) accompanies chanter (*center*), while Road Chief (officiating priest, *right*) guides ceremony. The NAC has 23 Chapters and over 400,000 members.

*American Indian churches*. A small number of churches begun by, and indigenous to, American Indians have come into being during the past century, some 20 separate groups being in existence in 1990. The largest is the Native American Church of North America, dating from 1870, which is now found among almost all American Indian tribes. Because of its incorporation of Indian traditional religious concepts and practices including use of the drug peyote, it is regarded by most other American churches as only marginally Christian. The Navajo Native American Church, formed around the turn of the century has an estimated 60% of all Navajos in the USA. The oldest independent Indian group is the Narraganset Indian Church organized in Charlestown, Rhode Island, in 1741. Another early group was the Yaqui Church which, although now very small, traces its origin to Jesuit work in Arizona during the later half of the 18th century.

*Hispanic churches*. In addition to USA Black and American Indian churches, there are several churches, begun in the USA by, and indigenous to, the Spanish-speaking community of USA nationality, especially among those of Puerto Rican and Mexican origin.

*Third-World indigenous churches*. All of the above bodies are indigenous to the USA. Over and above them, however, there are a large and growing number of Third-World indigenous bodies, i.e. originating in the Third World among Non-White peoples, which have been introduced into the USA by immigrant adherents from Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America and Oceania. The greatest impact thus far has been made by Spanish-speaking groups from Latin America, and Puerto Rico, the largest of these being the Spanish wing of the Assemblies of God and the Apostolic Assembly, both of which have entered the USA from Mexico. New denominations introduced from Africa include the African Apostolic Church of Johane Maranke from Zimbabwe, the Kimbanguist Church from Zaire and the Church of the Lord (Aladura) from West Africa. The Church of the First-Born and the International City have both come from Jamaica, while the True Jesus Church and the Church of Christ (Iglesia ni Cristo) owe their beginnings respectively to China and the Philippines. More than 60 such churches existed in the USA in 1990; and although most are still small, they will undoubtedly grow in numbers over the next decade or two.

[photo caption:] Orthodox Church in America. Metropolitan Ireney (third bishop from left), head of Russian-origin million-member OCA, concelebrates with Bishop Elias of Patriarchate of Antioch (second bishop from left) and 2 other hierarchs during 1974 Orthodox Education Day at St. Vladimir’s Seminary.

ORTHODOX CHURCHES. *Eastern Orthodoxy* in the USA represents a phenomenon of great variety and complexity. Churches of the Byzantine and Slavic traditions consist of more than 20 separate churches, the largest single denomination being the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America. Although a Greek community was founded in New Smyrna, Florida as early as 1767, the first church in New Orleans, was not organized until 1864. The archdiocese itself was established in 1921 with headquarters in New York City. This church, which is part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, suffered 3 or 4 minor schisms by Old Calendrist bodies following the acceptance of the new Gregorian calendar in 1924.

In 1792, 8 Russian Orthodox missionary monks arrived in Kodiak, Alaska, where they built their base and first church; and by 1794 they had baptized 25,000 Eskimos. Alaska remained part of Russia until 1867. Russian Orthodoxy at present is represented by 3 bodies in the USA, of which the Orthodox Church in America (OCA) has the longest history (1792) and the greatest number of adherents. Originally known as the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America, it was granted autocephalous status by the Moscow Patriarchate in 1970 and adopted its new name in the same year. The Romanian Orthodox Episcopate and the Albanian Orthodox Archdiocese, founded respectively in 1904 and 1908, are at present under the canonical jurisdiction of the OCA. Two other smaller denominations which have entered the USA in the present century are the Russian Orthodox Church in the Americas, an exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate, and the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. The latter is strongly opposed to the Moscow Patriarchate because of its collaboration with the Soviet communist regime.

A large number of Orthodox bodies have been formed by other ethnic immigrant groups from Eastern Europe, and these are today often divided into 2 distinct rival bodies (as are each the Albanian, Bulgarian, Romanian, and Serbian) or even 3 (as is the Ukrainian). In addition there are Belorussian, Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian, Macedonian, and Carpatho-Russian bodies. Two rival groups related to the Patriarchate of Antioch in Syria are also active. An attempt in 1932 to unite all Eastern Orthodox in America into one church produced yet another denomination, the American Holy Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church.

The most important organization providing for contacts between the various Eastern Orthodox groups is the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas, with 11 member churches.

*Oriental Orthodoxy* has a following of over 700,000. Of the 5 non-Chalcedonian churches in the USA, the largest are the Armenian Church of North America, and the Armenian Apostolic Church of America. The former, begun in 1889, owes allegiance to the Catholicate of Echmiadzin in Soviet Armenia, while the latter, which split from it in 1933, is now related to the Catholicate of Cilicia (sis) at Antelias in Lebanon.

The Syrian Orthodox Church (Jacobite) was introduced into North America in 1895. Forming part of the Patriarchate of Antioch with headquarters in Damascus, Syria, the archdiocese of the USA and Canada is based in Hackensack, New Jersey. Two other small Monophysite groups are the Ethiopian and Coptic Orthodox churches which entered the USA with immigrants in 1959 and 1960.

*Nestorians*. The Nestorian branch of Christianity, the Ancient Church of the East, has been present in the USA since 1907, and has the name Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church of the East. Its patriarchate was moved from Iraq to San Francisco in 1940; there are 35,000 faithful.

MARGINAL CHURCHES. Several large churches exist on the periphery of American Protestantism which are not properly termed Protestant because they do not accept mainline Protestant christocentric orthodoxy. In this survey they are called, for want of a better term, marginal Protestant bodies.

[photo caption:] Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Mormon Temple and headquarters, Salt Lake City.

*Mormons*. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latterday [*sic*] Saints, better known as Mormonism, traces its history to visions of its founder, Joseph Smith, at Fayette, New York in 1830. Severely persecuted everywhere, the Mormons ultimately settled in Utah where they built up a large religious community under the leadership of Brigham Young. Mormonism has 2 orders of priests, the higher priesthood of Melchizedek and the lesser priesthood of Aaron. Church organization is highly centralized, including the First Presidency, which is the supreme executive and legislative body of the church, and the Council of the Twelve Apostles, which carries out the directives of the First Presidency and ordains ministers. The geographical districts of the church are called stakes and local congregations, wards. Mormons are responsible for an extensive educational and social service program and are heavily involved in missionary work. In addition to full-time missionaries, some 5,000 youth are sent out yearly in pairs to spend a 2-year short-term service in propagating Mormonism throughout the world. The result has been vast expansion on all other continents except Africa, due to, until recently, the Mormon refusal to open its priesthood to Blacks, a problem which has also hindered Mormon work among Blacks in the USA.

Since 1831 at least 89 schismatic offshoots have split from the mother LDS church, while retaining essential Mormon beliefs and practices. The largest is the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; others are known as Temple Lot, Bickertonites and Strangites.

*Jehovah’s Witnesses* came into being through the work of Charles Taze Russell, a Congregationalist who was influenced by Adventism in 1870. Russell organized his first congregation in Pittsburgh in 1872 and registered his first incorporated society in 1884. Until the name Jehovah’s Witnesses was adopted in 1931, adherents were known as Russellites, Millenial Dawnists, and International Bible Students. At present the organization is based on 3 USA corporations, the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, and the International Bible Students Association. Congregations meet in kingdom halls and are grouped into circuits and districts, there being 31 districts in the USA. There is no separate clergy; all members are ministers and are expected to give personal witness and distribute literature from door to door, resulting in a massive voluntary missionary enterprise technically known as publishing, with members being called publishers. As with the Mormons, a sizeable number of schisms have broken from Jehovah’s Witnesses through the years, several in a mainline Protestant direction, including the Laymen’s Home Missionary Movement (1918), Churches of the Kingdom of God, Greek Bible Students, and Converted Jehovah’s Witnesses.

[photo caption:] Jehovah’s Witnesses. One of a series of huge international conventions: 1953 New World Society Assembly, New York.

*Christian Science*. The Church of Christ, Scientist was founded at Boston in 1879, by Mary Baker Eddy, whose own personal experience of healing in 1866 led to the founding of a worldwide movement centered on spiritual healing. The denomination retains its headquarters in Boston, where the First Church of Christ, Scientist is still universally regarded as the Mother Church. The Christian Science Board of Directors in Boston is the supreme administrative body of the church. In addition to Sunday and weekday services, local churches maintain reading rooms and an extensive literature distribution program. Key congregational leaders are known as readers, teachers, and practitioners, the latter bearing special responsibility for healing.

[photo caption:] Unification Church. Alleged messiah Sun Myung Moon (right) and wife (left) performed mass wedding of 2,200 couples, New York 1982.

*Unitarianism*. Universalists organized their first church in 1778, and Unitarians in 1796. In 1961 they joined to form the Unitarian Universalist Association. The strength of the movement has been in New England and Boston remains the national headquarters, but membership is declining.

*Spiritism* or Spiritualism has a wide appeal in the USA and is organized into many separate groups, the largest being the International General Assembly of Spiritualists formed in 1936.

A host of over 300 smaller marginal Protestant bodies of all kinds are also active in the USA. Many of them have expanded overseas during the 20th century.

Schisms in a Protestant, or mainline Christian, direction have taken place over the years from most other major bodies as well as from Mormons and Jehovah’s Witnesses. In 1973, the largest USA congregation of Unity School of Christianity (in Los Angeles, with 5,000 members) became pentecostal and broke from Unity; and there have been numerous other such cases.

ANGLICAN CHURCH. Sir Francis Drake touched the shores of California in 1578, claiming the New World for the British queen and the Church of England, but it was not until the foundation of the Virginia colony in 1607 that Anglicans began evangelistic work in America. Anglicanism nearly came to an end at the time of the Revolutionary War, with many of its clergy fleeing to England or Canada. Nevertheless, the period after 1783 was a time of rebuilding, and the constitution of the newly-created Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA was adopted in 1789. Although the church was spared the divisions which rent many Protestant denominations at the time of the Civil War, it has experienced several minor schisms since the formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church in 1873. The Episcopal Church is now in 1995 organized into 8 ecclesiastical provinces in the USA (with Province IX covering Latin American work) and nearly 100 dioceses.

CATHOLIC (NON-ROMAN) CHURCHES. A large number of at least 60 distinct and separate bodies exist in the USA which claim to be Catholic and which cannot properly be called either Roman Catholic, Protestant, Anglican, or Orthodox. Of these, by far the largest is the Polish National Catholic Church in America. This church was formed in Scranton, Pennsylvania in 1897 after a conflict going back many years between immigrant Polish Catholics and the Irish-dominated hierarchy in parts of the Roman Catholic Church in the USA. The first synod of the church took place in 1904 and in 1907 the first bishop was consecrated by 3 Old Catholic bishops in Utrecht, Holland. Several other smaller denominations are also in the Old Catholic tradition related to Utrecht, but most of the others are not recognized by Utrecht. About 30 of these bodies are miniscule episcopal churches under bishops-at-large with very small followings.

*Indigenous missions*. Until the early part of the 19th century most American Christians were involved in evangelizing within their own borders. After the establishment of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1810, thousands of Americans were sent around the world as missionaries, with a marked increase due first to the Student Volunteer Movement at the beginning of the 19th century, and later, the return of thousands of GIs from overseas posts in World War II. A new phenomenon is the sending of missionaries from postdenominational and ethnic churches in the USA to many countries around the world.

*Renewal movements*. In the 1990s the Pentecostal/Charismatic Renewal continued to spread rapidly across most older churches, and numbered over 75 million adherents (of whom 7% Pentecostals, 26% Charismatics, and 68% Independents).

CHURCH AND STATE

In the early years of settlement most states recognized an official church. In 1609, the Church of England was established by law in Virginia, with a statute of 1610 providing for compulsory church attendance. This Anglican establishment was later extended to other colonies: lower New York in 1693, Maryland in 1702, South Carolina in 1706, North Carolina in 1711, Georgia in 1758, and ultimately Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey as well. On the other hand strong anti-Anglican feelings in New England brought by the Pilgrims contributed to the establishment of the Congregational Church as the official religion in Massachusetts and Connecticut. In 1632 Maryland was created as a home for Catholics, and many of the first Catholic immigrants settled there. However, after 1689 Protestants were in control and succeeded in passing laws discriminating against Catholics. Indeed in this early period a strong anti-Catholic bias existed everywhere except in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania.

The desire for religious freedom, accompanied by resentment against Anglicanism because of its ties to Great Britain, was a dominant factor in the religious situation during 1776-89 and resulted in the disestablishment of the Church of England in the southern and middle colonies from 1776-90 and also of Congregationalism in New England (1818 in Connecticut, 1833 in Massachusetts). An important impulse towards that end came from the first federal constitution of 1789 which gave clear expression to the idea of the separation of church and state which had been growing since before the Revolutionary War. Since the formulation of the US constitution in 1787, therefore, the United States has been clearly defined as a secular state in which church and state are legally separated. The constitution makes no reference to God (except for George Washington’s signature ‘In the Year of our Lord 1787’), nor to the state as believing in God, although in 1954 Congress added the words ‘under God’ to the Pledge of Allegiance.

From a legal standpoint the past 50 years have seen a number of important Supreme Court decisions that have further clarified the nature of the separation of church and state in America. The intent of the 16-word constitutional requirement ‘Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof’ (First Amendment, 1791) has always been ambiguous and has needed clarification as the emotional post-1945 issues of abortion, prayer in public schools, taxation of church-owned property, an appointment to the Vatican by a president, and birth-control issues and devices dispensed by public agencies have been considered.

Important Supreme Court cases treating church-state issues since 1947 include the following fourteen. (1) Everson v. Board of Education (1947) upheld state policies extending auxiliary services (health care, lunches, text-books, bus transportation) for students attending parochial schools under the ‘general welfare’ clause of the constitution. Protestants were generally shocked by this decision believing that it would ultimately lead to full public support of Catholic Parochial education. Thus, a year later Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State (POAU) was founded, supported mainly by Baptist, Unitarian, and independent Protestant groups, to protect the separation of church and state. (2) McCollum v. Board of Education (1948) declared that ‘released time’ programs of religious instruction by church-sponsored teachers on public school property were unconstitutional. (3) Zorach v. Clauson (1952) modified the McCollum decision, allowing school boards to provide for religious instruction if this was done off public school premises. Justice Douglas summarized the matter in an oft-quoted statement:

‘We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being . . . When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.’ (4) Burstyn v. Wilson (1952 declared the censorship of films, in this case ‘The Miracle’ by Roberto Rossellini, under the guise of sacrilege and blasphemy to be both vague and unconstitutional. (5) Torcaso v. Watkins (1961) affirmed that the state of Maryland could not require of public office holders ‘a declaration of belief in the existence of God’ and that even this minimal statement was a religious test invading the appellant’s freedom and was thus unenforceable. (6) Engel v. Vitale (1962) banned the use of official state-sanctioned prayers in public school. The particular case in question was that of the New York State Board of Regent’s prayer: [778] ‘Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country.’ A storm of protest followed this decision, and there is sentiment in both Houses of Congress for a constitutional amendment which would allow prayer in school. (7) Pennsylvania v. Schempp (1963) held that the reading of Bible verses without comment or interpretation was unconstitutional, because for some the exercise had a devotional and religious character. (8) McGowan v. Maryland (1961) invalidated a state’s so-called ‘blue laws’ relating to required closure of certain businesses on Sundays. Other decisions during the past decade have extended civil and religious freedom. Black Muslim prisoners have been given access to religious literature, services and pastoral visitation; Seventh-day Adventists and Orthodox Jews have had their job security protected when they abstain from Saturday work; and Jehovah’s Witnesses have been exempted from securing licenses to sell their literature and may refrain from the public school flag-salute and Pledge of Allegiance. In the latter case (West Virginia School Board of Education v. Barnette, 1943), justice Jackson stated in a widely-quoted passage: ‘To believe that patriotism will not flourish if patriotic ceremonies are voluntary and spontaneous instead of a compulsory routine is to make an unflattering estimate of the appeal of our institutions to free minds. We can have intellectual individualism and the rich cultural diversities that we owe to exceptional minds only at the price of occasional eccentricity and abnormal attitudes . . . If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein.’ (9) Welsh v. United States (1970) liberalized and legalized a new basis for conscientious objection to war and exemption from military service. Hitherto, belief in a supreme being was necessary. Afterwards, a deeply-held and morally-consistent repugnance to war and the taking of life was deemed acceptable. (10) Walz v. Tax Commission of New York (1970) denied that the taxexempt status of church property constituted an ‘establishment of religion’ and continued such exemption as long as such property was for religious use exclusively. Noting that many municipal governments are hard-pressed for revenue, some churches have recently made token gifts for such public services as police and fire protection. (11) Sloan v. Lemon (1973) and Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty v. Nyquist (1973) were 2 significant decisions in the long and continuing controversy over providing significant state aid to parochial schools. In the former judgement, a Pennsylvania statute providing for reimbursement of tuition paid by parents who send their children to non-public schools was declared unconstitutional under the establishment clause. In the latter, a New York case, repair grants and highly-complicated tuition reimbursement arrangements to parents of students in parochial schools in low-income areas were judged contrary to the First Amendment. (12) Miller v. California (1973) in a close 5-4 decision allowed states and/or their local communities to take punitive action against those who produce, sell, exhibit or display works ‘which appeal to the prurient interest in sex, which portray sexual conduct in a patently offensive way and which taken as a whole, do not have serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value’. Chief justice Warren Burger wrote: ‘It is neither realistic nor constitutionally sound to read the First Amendment as requiring that the people of Maine or Mississippi accept the public depiction of conduct found tolerable in Las Vegas or New York City’. The minority opinion claimed that the decision would not relieve the court of ‘the awesome task’ of making case-by-case decisions and thus would be unworkable. Their position seemed to be substantiated in the first test case of the above Miller decision, Jenkins v. Georgia (1974), when the court overturned a state’s decision that the film ‘Carnal Knowledge’ was pornographic and obscene. (13) Wheeler v. Barrera (1974) decided that educationally-deprived non-publicschool children should have equitable treatment regarding the distribution of federal funds in aid of special programs for the disadvantaged. The court affirmed that the federal statute (Title I) did not obligate the state to provide on-the-premises instruction in non-public schools (as prohibited by the Missouri Constitution) and that state and local officials had various other options available in order to comply with the requirement of comparable services to all schools. (14) Roe v. Wade (1973), perhaps the most important decision of the past several decades, found the court in a 7-2 decision drafting national guide lines that broadly liberalized abortion laws. Only during the last 10 weeks of pregnancy, the period during which the fetus is judged to be capable of surviving if born, can a state prohibit abortion. The majority decision rejected the view that a fetus becomes a ‘person’ upon conception, while the dissenting opinion called the decision ‘an exercise of raw judicial power’ that values ‘the convenience of the pregnant mother more than the continued existence and development of the life or potential life which she carries’. The ‘Catholic hierarchy together with some conservative Protestant churches bitterly attacked the decision and have been instrumental in founding politically-powerful Right to Life groups whose aim is the defeat of abortion-on-demand politicians and the passage of a constitutional amendment prohibiting abortion. The issue is a divisive one that will traumatize the body politic for some time into the future and will probably retard the ecumenical movement.

In terms of common practice and general trends regarding the future, there is no governmental ministry of religious affairs, nor are churches obligated to register with the government, nor is this situation likely to change.

The post-World War II trend of American Protestantism may be described as transformationist with regard to church-state relations. This position applies a theocentric principle (the sovereignty of God) to church-state theory and practice, and is committed to a prophetic church, a strong social ethic and a realistic view of sin. Transformationism neither advocates a unity of church and state nor their complete separation, but an intermediate position. It avoids a negative separationism that leads to increased secularization of culture and irresponsibility in politics; yet it guards against preferential privilege for any one church whereby the independent stance necessary for prophetic criticism of the state is lost and injustice is done to non-preferred religious bodies. Thus what is being sought is a new kind of ‘creative co-operation’ or ‘benevolent neutrality’ between church and state.

[photo caption:] March for Jesus: 40,000 in 1995 Nashville, TN. From 1990-2000 annual totals skyrocketed worldwide.

BROADCASTING AND MEDIA

The United States is blanketed with Christian radio, television and satellite programming. Hundreds of local stations broadcast Christian evangelistic and discipleship programs.

Aside from English, there are several stations devoted to broadcasting Christian programs in other languages (i.e. Spanish).

From Christian broadcasting’s humble beginnings in 1921 in Pittsburgh, when KDKA aired the first religious broadcast, it has exploded into one of the most powerful evangelistic forces in the United States today. Many innovations have continued to make it easier to reach ever larger audiences.

Virtually every media outlet in the country carries at least one Christian program each year-typically a holiday special. Many local stations carry weekly Sunday morning devotionals. There are more than 1,200 exclusively Christian radio and television stations. Many of these belong to one of 20 religious networks. LeSEA and TBN are among the largest of these. LeSEA, founded in 1968 by Dr. Lester Sumrall, reaches 8 million households through a network of low-power repeaters, 11 television stations, cable stations and the World Harvest Satellite network on Galaxy-4. Its shortwave service, started in 1985, covers Asia, Latin America, Europe, Russia and Africa with programs in English, Spanish, Russian, Mandarin, and Japanese. Its satellite network covers all the United States, half of Canada, and most of Central America. One of its affiliates, WHMB, is the longest continually operated Christian station in the United States; another, WHME, is the top-rated Christian station in the nation. LeSEA’s Hawaii station, KWHE, also operates a shortwave transmitter which broadcasts programming worldwide, most specifically aimed at East Asia. Programs are in English, Spanish, Russian, Mandarin, and Japanese. Trinity Broadcast Network, founded by Paul Crouch, has cable, satellite and television outlets, reaching several million households. Other networks include the Catholics Eternal Word Television Network and Life Broadcasting Network. CBN’s television programs are aired across the United States on cable (the Family Channel) and several local Christian television stations, as well as occasionally on LeSEA and TBN’s networks.

The USA is a member of UNDA. Some 38 organizations produce Catholic media, including radio and TV programs as well as videos. There are 40 Catholic radio stations. The Catholic Television Network is based out of Washington D.C. and has offices in 11 states.

Many of these stations receive their programs from other organizations. There are 380 such agencies. Programs from *Back to the Bible* air on 850 stations. Promise Keeper’s short ‘Highlights’ airs on over 1,200 radio stations. Mission Network News and the Mission Vision Network provides short mission-oriented radio spots to more that a thousand stations. CBN airs its ‘700 Club’ on cable (the Family channel) and on numerous local Christian television stations.

All of the international broadcasters have offices in the USA. AWR has studios in California and Michigan. KNLS, WORHAR, and WYFR have transmitters based in America that cover most of the world.

These broadcasters associate together through several national organizations. The National Religious Broadcasters is an association of 800 broadcasters, including networks and stations, its annual convention is one of the most important for anyone involved in media. The Hispanic Religious Broadcasters is a spinoff association of UNDA and serves a similar function for Catholic broadcasters.

In addition to television and radio, several media outlets are seeking out a new technology: broadcasting their shows via Real Audio and Real Video servers on the Internet. Through this medium, anyone in the world with the necessary equipment can listen to the broadcasts. Nearly all are in English. There are currently more than 40 Christian broadcasters on the Internet. CIRnet is a live 24-hour Christian Internetonly radio network. Churches.NET is the home of CINN, the Christian Internet News Network. Many churches offer online sermons. LeSEA broadcasts its shortwave programs simultaneously on Real Audio sermons. The Bible Broadcasting Network is a national broadcaster headquartered in South Carolina that also provides its programs on the Internet. The Jesus Fellowship Internet Radio Station is a churchsponsored Internet broadcaster. The listening Room features a library of 7,000 recorded sermons and books. The American Christian Network airs well known Bible teachers live 24 hours a day.

AWR operates 2 studios: California (English, Vietnamese) and Michigan (English). Several stations based in the United States use shortwave to reach other world regions: KNLS (Alaska), WORHAR, and WYFR.

INTERDENOMINATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

*National and local councils of churches*. The major national co-ordinating body is the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA (NCCCUSA), founded in New York City in 1950, growing out of the earlier Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in North America (1908). Member denominations number 32, including most of America’s largest Protestant, Orthodox, and Black churches. Notable by their absence are the Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptist Convention. However, Catholic interest in ecumenism, which is co-ordinated by the Bishop’s Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs of the NCCB, is strong. In 1969 a joint Catholic-NCCC commission was appointed to [779] investigate the possibility of eventual Catholic membership in the council. The work of the NCCC is carried out through 3 divisions (Church and Society, Education and Ministry, Overseas Ministry), 4 commissions, and 3 offices.

With the exception of Alabama and Mississippi, every state in the USA has its own council or conference of churches, interchurch or interfaith association or agency; and several states have more than one. In addition there are a vast number of city-wide councils. The Catholic Church holds membership in 15 state councils of churches and more than 50 metropolitan ecumenical agencies.

Other national inter-denominational co-ordinating bodies include the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), National Black (formerly Negro) Evangelical Association (NBEA, NNEA), Associated Gospel Churches (representing fundamentalist denominations with over 4 million members), Pan-Indian Ecumenical Association, American Council of Christian Church­es, Christian Holiness Association, Council of Japanese American Christian Churches in North America and National Fraternal Council of Churches.

[photo caption:] Intervarsity Urbana Missions convention held every three years in Urbana, llinois.

*International bodies* with headquarters in the USA include: International Association of Women Ministers; International Christian Youth Exchange; International Ministerial Federation; and World’s Christian Endeavor Union.

International ecumenical organizations with branches in the USA include: Ecumenical Satellite Commission (which is concerned for press, cinema, radio and TV), United States Conference for the World Council of Churches, North American Office of the World Student Christian Federation.

*National service agencies* include the American Bible Society, American Tract Society, Associated Church Press, Christian Ministry in the National Parks, Church Women United, Evangelical Press Association, General Commission on Chaplains and Armed Forces Personnel, National Association of Christian Schools, National Association of Ecumenical Staff, National Council of YMCAs, National Interreligious Service Board for Conscientious Objectors, North American Academy of Ecumenists, Religion in American Life (which attempts to reach the American public through advertising), Religion Newswriters Association, Religious Public Relations Council, and YWCA of the USA.

*Confessional councils*. National and international confessional councils and federations with their world’ headquarters in the USA, serving one ecclesiastical confession, include the Baptist World Alliance, Lutheran Council in the USA; Mennonite World Conference, North American Baptist Fellowship, Pentecostal Fellowship of North America, Standing Conference of the Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas, World Convention of Churches of Christ (Disciples) and World Methodist Council.

Other international bodies with branches but not world headquarters in the USA include: Friends World Committee for Consultation, Lutheran World Federation, Pentecostal World Conference and World Alliance of Reformed Churches, the latter serving Presbyterians and Congregationalists.

*Dialogue consultation*. A significant number of other conversations are in progress sponsored by churches and confessional families nationally. These include joint dialogue between Lutherans and Anglicans, Anglicans and Orthodox, Lutherans and Orthodox, and 8 consultations in which Catholics are involved. Concerning these latter, joint dialogue is being carried on between the Catholic episcopal conference (Bishops’ Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs) and the following: American Baptist Convention (Division of Cooperative Christianity; first meeting held in April, 1967); Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) (Council of Christian Unity; March, 1967); Episcopal Church (Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations; begun June, 1965); Lutheran churches (USA National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation; March, 1965); United Methodist Church; June, 1966; Orthodox churches (Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops of America; September, 1969); Presbyterian-Reformed churches (North American Council of the World Alliance of Reformed churches; July, 1965); and Southern Baptists (Department of Interfaith Witness; May 1969). These continuing consultations aim through dialogue to investigate points at issue which have been factors in the separation of churches, with the hope of achieving a deeper and broader agreement among Christians.

*Theological education*. A major future of the current North American ecumenical scene is the growth of clusters and consortia of theological schools, involving Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican institutions. The most important are the Chicago Cluster of Theological Schools, California Graduate Theological Union, Washington Theological Consortium, and Boston Theological Institute. These co-operative enterprises differ greatly in emphasis but involve cross-registration, joint planning, and the development of a common network of library facilities. Some follow a practice of exchanging teaching staff and others conduct joint research programs.

*Study and research*. Many societies and associations dedicated to the scientific study of religion on an ecumenical basis have been formed, the most important of which belong to the Council on the Study of Religion. Members of the council include the following: American Academy of Religion, American Society of Christian Ethics, American Society of Church History, American Society of Missiology, American Thelogical Library Association, Catholic Biblical Association, Catholic Theological Society of America, College Theological Society, Society of Biblical Literature, Society for the Scientific Study of Religions, and Religious Education Association.

Other academic institutions giving special attention to ecumenical study and research are: (1) the Ecumenical Continuing Education Centre, founded at Yale University in 1967, which links the Yale Religious Ministry, United Ministries in Higher Education at Yale, New Haven and Connecticut Councils of Churches, includes on its board of directors Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox, and provides opportunities for pastors and lay persons to engage in study programs in a university setting; (2) the Ecumenical Institute, founded in Chicago in 1954, which is a Division of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago and provides a research, study and training center for religious renewal on an ecumenical basis focusing on the needs of the local congregation; (3) the Ecumenical Institute of Religious Studies, founded in Worcester, Massachusetts in 1967, which is run by Catholic Assumptionists; (4) Graymoor Ecumenical Institute, founded in Garrison, New York in 1967, which is operated by Catholic Friars of the Atonement under an interdenominational board, with its research, study and action center dedicated to the search for a Christian response to social and religious issues facing American life; and to ecumem al and interreligious dialogue; (5) the Institute fof Advanced Religious Studies, founded at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana in 1966, which explores the conveyance of religion with other fields of study and concentrates on the relationship of Christianity to the non-Christian world; (6) the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research, founded at St John’s University in Collegeville, Minnesota in 1967, which though centered in a Catholic university is independently incorporated, having a predominantly Protestant board of directors, and which offers research facilities to individual scholars studying the problems of ecumenism broadly conceived; (7) John XXIII Institute for Eastern Christian Studies, founded at Fordham University in New York City in 1971, which is a Catholic institute emphasizing Orthodox-Catholic relations and the study of the Eastern tradition of Christianity; and (8) Institute for Thomistic and Ecumenical Studies, founded by the Dominican Province of the Holy Name in Berkeley, California in 1966, which provides facilities for competent scholars to pursue post-doctoral studies related to ecumenism.

*Ecumenical action*. Centers and agencies for ecumenical action include: (1) Berkeley Center for Human Interaction, founded in Berkeley, California in 1966, which sponsors intensive small-group conferences and programs; (2) Christians Associated for Relationships with Eastern Europe (CAREE), in Elgin, Illinois, which aims to foster good relations with Christians in Eastern Europe especially through the Christian Peace Conference, to promote Christian-Marxist dialogue and to work for international peace and justice; (3) Cooperation in Development (CODEL), founded in New York City in 1969, an inter-faith consortium which co-ordinates the work of member Christian service and mission groups in the areas of hunger, health, and housing; (4) the Ecumenical Institute, founded at Wake Forest University in Winston Salem, NC, in 1968, which is a Southern Baptist center offering resources for conferences, study, and dialogue; (5) the Ecumenical Institute, founded in Merrimac, Massachusetts in 1964, which emphasizes the renewal of the local congregation; (6) the Gustav Weigel Society, founded at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, DC in 1966, which promotes spiritual ecumenism through retreats for pastors and lay persons; (7) John XXIII Ecumenical Center, founded in Paoli, Pennsylvania in 1969, which is an independent and interdenominational institution seeking to enlist all men in the common worship of God and service of their neighbor; (8) John LaFarge Institute, founded by Jesuits in New York City in 1964, which promotes ecumenical and interracial activities and holds conferences; (9) LAOS, in Washington, DC, which is an ecumenical agency for training and recruiting volunteers with professional skills for work in developing countries and in areas of need in the USA; (10) Laymen’s Academy for Ecumenical Studies, founded in Amherst, Massachusetts in 1961, which emphasizes Catholic-Protestant and Black-White relations, in addition to lay theological education; (11) Packard Manse Ecumenical Center, founded in Stoughton in Massachusetts, 1947, which is dedicated to social ecumenism at the local level; and (12) the World Center for Liturgical Studies, founded in Boyton Beach, Florida in 1965, which sponsors conferences and provides study facilities for the continuing education of church leaders with special emphasis on pastoral and liturgical areas of the ministry.

*Jewish-Christian relations*. The major concern of inter-religious dialogue in the USA is Jewish-Christian relations, and a number of Christian, Jewish, and joint organizations have been formed to improve contacts between Christians and Jews.

Joint organizations include: (1) Interreligious Committee of General Secretaries, founded in 1968, which enables the executive officers of the NCCCUSA, USCC, and the Synagogue Council of America to collaborate in matters of mutual interest; (2) National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ), founded in New York City in 1928, which is a member of the international Council of Christians and Jews in London, and seeks to combat religious and social prejudice through its 70 regional offices, its sponsorship of Religious News Service (RNS), and its promotion of an annual Brotherhood Commitment Week; (3) World Conference of Religion for Peace (WCRP), established as a permanent interreligious body in 1971 following the first world conference on religion and peace in Kyoto, Japan in 1970, which includes members of all the principal world faiths in sharing insights and promoting common action for peace, justice and mutual understanding; (4) US Interreligious Committee on Peace (USICOP), founded in Washington, DC in 1964, which works in close co-operation with WCRP in promoting peace issues and action among the entire spectrum of religious groups in the USA; and (5) Inter-met (Interfaith Association in Metropolitan Theological Education), founded in Washington, DC in 1969, which is an interfaith (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish) organization seeking to develop a metropolitan-wide system of theological training for continuing education and to effect a better structure of education for congregational ministries. [780]

Specifically-Christian institutions and organizations include: (1) Office for Jewish-Christian Relations of the NCCCUSA, organized in New York City in 1974, which disseminates information and encourages meetings and action programs involving the 2 communities; (2) Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs Committee of the NCCB, founded in Washington, DC in 1964, which is concerned for relations among Christians and Christianity and secularism, as well as inter-faith dialogue through its separate Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations; (3) Saint-Meinrad School of Theology, in St Meinrad, Indiana, which stresses Jewish studies and is engaged in co-operative ventures with several Jewish agencies; (4) Boston College, which offers courses in Jewish-Christian relations; (5) Institute of Judeo-Christian Studies, a Catholic institute founded at Seton Hall University, New Jersey, in 1951; (6) Centre for Judaic Studies, founded by the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California; (7) Philo Institute, founded at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago in 1971, which studies Judaism’s influence on early Christianity and publishes *Studia Philonica*; (8) Israel Study Group, attached to the NCCCUSA in New York City; and (9) Christians Concerned about Israel, in Philadelphia.

Jewish institutions and organizations include: (1) Synagogue Council of America, in New York City, which relates mainly to the executives of the NCCCUSA and USCC and has little substantive programming; (2) Jewish Institute of Religion at Hebrew Union College, in Cincinnati, Ohio, which offers doctoral studies in Rabbinic Judaism to Christian ministers; (3) Dropsie University, in Philadelphia, which also provides advanced Jewish studies by Christians; (4) Jewish Theological Seminary, in New York City, which conducts institutes on social studies for Christian and Jewish clergy, seminary students, and academicians; (5) Interreligious Affairs Department of the American Jewish Committee, in New York City, which conducts colloquia, institutes, seminars, and dialogues with Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Evangelical, and Black groups in the USA; (6) Anti-Defamation League of B nai B’rith in New York City, which specializes in studies and programs combatting anti-Semitism, conducts conferences with Christian leaders and publishes materials on Jewish-Christian relations; (7) Jewish Chautauqua Studies of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, in New York City, which produces films and audio-visual aids and provides Jewish lectures to seminaries and college campuses; and (8) Centre of Interreligious Research, in Chicago, which is a small group of university and seminary staff seeking to organize systematic research on an interreligious basis.

FUTURE TRENDS AND PROSPECTS

Church affiliation is projected to decline to 64.8% by 2025. The nonreligious and atheists will likely jointly top 12% by 2025 while most of the other world religions are expected to grow due to immigration.

Christianity is expected to decline steadily throughout the next fifty years, perhaps dropping below 75% by AD 2050. This decline will primarily be the result of the growth of non-Christian immigrant religions, such as Islam and Buddhism, as well as the steady rise of the nonreligious.

## Christianity’s New Center

Jenkins, Philip. “Christianity’s New Center.” (Interview by Katie Bacon.) *TheAtlantic*.*com*. 12 Sept. 2002. 5 May 2005. Web.

Philip Jenkins, the author of “The Next Christianity” in the October Atlantic, argues that most Americans and Europeans are blind to Christianity’s real future.

In the past year, coverage of religious issues has focused tightly on two themes—the present and future dangers of Islamic fundamentalism, and the scandal in the American Catholic Church. There’s an assumption that Christianity’s worldwide influence is waning, as Islam’s influence—especially in the political sphere—grows. And there’s a belief that if Catholicism is to remain a healthy, vibrant religion, it must adjust itself to “modern” mores by revisiting its policies on celibacy, women’s roles in the Church, and the amount of influence accorded to the laity. But Philip Jenkins, a scholar of history and religion at Pennsylvania State University, believes that on these issues the American public can’t see the forest for the trees. In his article in the October Atlantic, “The Next Christianity,” (and in his recent book, The Next Christendom), Jenkins argues that Americans are all but unaware of what is one of the most important shifts of the twentieth century—the explosive growth of Christianity in the Southern Hemisphere.

The Christianity practiced in Africa, Latin America, and Asia tends to be much more rigidly conservative and traditional than that of the North, and its practitioners are often guided by a strong belief in the power of the supernatural to directly shape their lives. As Jenkins writes,

The most successful Southern churches preach a deep personal faith, communal orthodoxy, mysticism, and puritanism, all founded on obedience to spiritual authority.... Whereas Americans imagine a Church freed from hierarchy, superstition, and dogma, Southerners look back to one filled with spiritual power and able to exorcise the demonic forces that cause sickness and poverty.

The places where Christianity is spreading and mutating are also places where the population levels are rising quickly—and, if Jenkins’s predictions hold true—will continue to rise throughout the next century. The center of gravity of the Christian world has shifted from Europe and the United States to the Southern Hemisphere and, Jenkins believes, it will never shift back. So when American Catholics, for instance, talk about the necessity and the inevitability of reforms (reforms that Southern Catholics would most likely not condone), they do so without fully realizing that their views on the subject are becoming increasingly irrelevant, because the demographic future of their Church lies elsewhere.

That demographic future puts Christianity on a collision course with Islam. Though there will continue to be more Christians in the world than Muslims, they will be jostling for converts in the same places, and Jenkins forsees that several countries “might be brought to ruin by the clash of jihad and crusade.” The Northern world is unlikely to be the instigator of future crusades. But it seems inevitable that both Europe and the United States will be shaken by the reverberations of growth and conflict in the new Christian world.

I spoke with Jenkins recently by phone.

For someone who isn’t familiar with Christianity as it’s practiced in the Southern Hemisphere, how would you define it? In general terms, how does it differ from the ways that Christianity tends to be practiced in the North?

There are a number of prime things I would list, but high on the list is the fact of poverty—that very often in the global South you’re dealing with people who are not the world’s fat cats. That means that they tend to relate much more closely to the biblical world and its concerns than do people who are rich and from the First World. Often they’re people without access to the kind of medical care that the First World takes for granted, so the medical, healing, and exorcism elements of the Bible make very good sense to them. The other fact, apart from poverty, is novelty. In many parts of the global South, Christianity is a much newer religion than it is in Europe or North America. That’s particularly true in Africa. Of course, Christianity has been in South America for a long time, but the kind of Pentecostal and Protestant Christianity that’s come in over the last fifty years is obviously a newer kind of experience. So in some cases these are families that are discovering the Bible and Christianity for the first time, and it seems to be a new and rather intoxicating experience.

You write that the “denominations that are triumphing across the global South” are “radical Protestant sects, either evangelical or Pentecostal, and Roman Catholicism of an orthodox kind.” What are the differences between evangelicalism, Pentecostalism, and orthodox Roman Catholicism, as they are practiced in the global South?

Let’s start with Catholicism. In the global South you have almost a pre-Vatican II, old-world kind of Catholicism. Catholics there are more concerned with the traditional, more willing to accept authority and leadership, more prepared to insist on orthodoxy. Whereas in America and Europe we tend to have cafeteria Catholicism, as in, I’ll take a little bit of this, a little bit of that, throw in a bit of Wicca, and see what we come up with. In terms of Protestantism, a lot of the mainstream churches, like Episcopalian and Methodist, have a real presence in the global South. The Anglican Church, for instance, is a real force in Africa and in large parts of Asia. But some of the fastest growth has been in newer denominations, and they’re usually called Pentecostal. The word goes back to the early twentieth century, to a series of revivals in which people believed they were getting direct inspiration from the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was speaking through them. It’s sometimes called Charismatic Christianity, and often involves a belief in trances, visions, and dreams. Pentecostal Christianity also has an impact on the edges of Catholicism—these are ideas that make sense across the denominational boundaries.

What is it about Christianity that makes it so adaptable to new conditions and new places? Is Christianity more adaptable than, say, Islam or Hinduism or Buddhism?

The great competitors are Christianity and Islam—no other religion comes close. That was the great trend of the twentieth century—the proportion of people who have gone to one of those two has increased steadily. I think the appeal of both of them is that they can be taken at lots of different levels but that ultimately you can take them as very simple packages. Both have pretty accessible scriptures with a wide range of messages. Both are very adaptable, very flexible. Over time, both of them have evolved into a lot of different forms, which can adapt to different settings. The biggest single difference between them is probably the matter of translation, and I can see plusses and minuses for each. In Islam, wherever you live, you have to learn one particular language to read the scriptures, and that’s an equalizing, democratic message, because it suggests that all languages in the world are equally inadequate before the holy language. Christianity operates in a different way, which is that it validates all languages as ones in which you can transmit the scriptures. I think that may be why Christianity is ahead, because by translating, by always putting the scriptures into new languages, it encourages literacy, it encourages the vernacular. And when people read for the first time, it probably gives them a great deal more self-confidence, more ability to make their own decisions, and that tends to spill over into political and social matters.

In your book, you talk about how in the coming century Christians and Muslims will each be striving to find more converts—and often in the same places. What parts of the world are still open for conversion?

There are a lot of potential converts in Africa, which has many countries where ten or twenty percent of the population practice traditional African religions. There are also areas of the world that aren’t so much on our religious maps right now, and the biggest by far is China. Religion in China has always been a complicated matter. It’s an area where people often have more than one of what we traditionally think of as religions. It’s possible to be a Confucian and a Daoist and a Buddhist at the same time. It’s easy to imagine a situation where you would find Christians pushing very hard for conversions there. Islam traditionally has not been a big missionary religion in China, but it could be, and you’re talking about twenty percent of the world’s population. The other area where you get a lot of competition for converts is India. For both religions, Hindus are fair game. We don’t have a good idea of how many Christians and Muslims there are in either India or China, but in both cases there’s a good deal of evidence that both Christian and Muslim numbers are being understated. So those are a couple of the areas where we could have... well, let’s say friendly rivalry. Let’s be optimistic.

If the Southern Hemisphere comes to dominate Christianity—and hence becomes the main locus of conflict between Christianity and Islam—what sort of effect will that have on the tensions between Islamic powers and the North?

My main concern in that regard is that conflicts in the South cannot be contained, because although they may take place in countries like the Congo or Nigeria, it’s likely that as time goes by, regional powers and superpowers will become involved. The great example of this is Indonesia together with the Philippines, where you have an ethnic division—an awful lot of Christians in Indonesia are Chinese. It is not too much of a stretch to imagine China saying, You must stop the massacres of our people, or we will become involved. We will not stand idly by. When you have that, how do other regional powers respond? I sometimes say that God has a very grim sense of humor, because so many of the areas on these religious fault-lines are also the key oil-producing regions. So religious politics are oil politics. I’m not sure how much we’ve taken that fact aboard.

Let’s imagine another situation, which is not too hard to contemplate, in which you had a full-scale war break out in Nigeria between Christians and Muslims, with the prospect of millions being killed. The potential there for drawing in regional powers, or powers concerned about oil wealth, is enormous. But people just aren’t paying attention to such possibilities. As time goes by, though, such violence is going to be harder and harder to ignore. I think this will be much more of an issue for the United States, where you could see a significant Christian voting block emerging, than in Europe, where Christianity is largely a dead issue.

You write that “it is Christianity”—not Islam—”that will leave the deepest mark on the twenty-first century.” Why do you think this will be the case?

Primarily I mean that in terms of the numbers. As I try and say in the article, and I certainly said this strongly in the book, the numbers are not fixed. It is possible that there will be wars and persecutions and that things will change so that Islam might in fact surpass Christianity. But as far as we can see from the numbers right now, Christianity is going to continue to be the world’s most numerous religion, at least until the end of the twenty-first century. Christianity is growing most quickly in the areas that are probably going to be the great centers of population, if not centers of power, in the new century. So if we’re looking for the religion that is going to affect the largest number of lives in the twenty-first century, it is almost certainly going to be Christianity, which gets me to another issue: why people in the West can’t see that.

Yes, people in the West seem almost blissfully unaware of the roiling growth of Christianity in the global South. How have most people here managed not to pay attention?

There’s a cynical remark that is none the worse for maybe being true, which is that people in Europe and North America really aren’t very interested in the poorest of the poor. If you are a poor person in Ethiopia or Uganda or Peru, you don’t show up on the radar screen. And we’re dealing here with countries that aren’t even in the Third World economically—we’re dealing with the very very poor. Islam has registered in the last twenty or thirty years only because we see it as politically threatening. Maybe some Christians somewhere would have to take hostages before anyone would really notice they’re there.

I think there’s a prejudice about Christianity—that it is the religion of the rich West, that where you find Christianity in Africa or Asia, it’s an imperial hangover and really doesn’t belong there, it’s just tacked on. Connected with that is the idea that Christianity is interfering with authentic cultures. The Christianity that tends to be practiced in the global South is also the kind of Christianity that people don’t feel any sympathy for, at least in the media. Pentecostal, traditional Christianity is just not what we want.

It’s similar to the type of Christianity that the media in the U.S. don’t like to pay attention to—the John Ashcroft brand.

Exactly. You’d never guess from looking at history that through most of the twentieth century at least half of American Christians were evangelical/Pentecostal fundamentalists. They really got lost to the media between the Scopes trial back in 1925 and the election of Jimmy Carter in 1976. And suddenly people discovered them and thought, My God, there are millions of these people out there, this must be a right-wing explosion. No, they’ve always been there, you’ve just never noticed them. It’s a question of what you see and what’s really there. The famous phrase is, If I hadn’t believed it, I wouldn’t have seen it with my own eyes.

As you just touched on, there’s been a lot of hand-wringing over the past few decades about missionaries having imposed Christianity on people in Africa, Asia, and South America. I got the impression from your book that you feel that maybe it was imposed, but at this point that’s pretty irrelevant because it has taken off and mutated and become its own force.

That’s right, and it’s quite surprising how many Africans, for example, will say something like that. Their view now is that wherever it came from, Christianity is now their religion. In my book I quote Julius Nyerere, who was the president of Tanzania and a great figure in radical African socialism, and he was absolutely lyrical about the missionaries. He said they were good, generous people, and they came to try and help us, and let’s be grateful for them. There are lots of German Christians out there, and I don’t think many Germans are bothered by the fact that it was Irish and English missionaries who brought them Christianity a thousand years ago. These days, it’s German Christianity. So I think religions like this tend to get imported and internalized quite quickly. Islam is just the same. The vast majority of Muslims aren’t Arab, but they regard it now as their religion.

Is there still a role for Northern missionaries who want to spread the word in the South?

Yes, I can see some role, but I think in terms of making converts the bulk of the traffic is going to be the other way round. I think there’s a lot that people can do in terms of helping to build networks and infrastructure, helping to bring food and medical facilities and so on. But the religion is spreading pretty well of its own accord right now. It might be that some of the biggest roles that Northerners can play are political, trying to ensure that Northern governments intervene to prevent too much military pressure against Christian communities in the South. If you have communities that are being destroyed by religious persecution, as has happened in Indonesia, then maybe that should very much be the West’s business.

In terms of the reforms being called for in response to the American Catholic Church’s sexual-abuse scandal, you seem to feel that Northern liberals are missing the point—they are now a small minority in a Catholic world that is essentially conservative and that would not agree to end the celibacy rule, have women priests, or give more power to the laity. What do you think will result from this fundamental disconnect between North and South?

There is obviously enormous pressure for change within the American Catholic Church and within some European Churches, and the sense is that the Church has gotten out of sync with secular standards, particularly over issues like gender and sexuality. But the fact is that the Church is not out of sync with secular societies elsewhere in the world, and particularly in the parts of the world where the Catholic Church is doing quite well. I think I quote this in the article, that Americans make up only six percent of the Catholic Church worldwide, and even that’s a little bit deceptive. Among those six percent a good number are already Latino and Asian, and that’s the growing segment. White Anglos make up quite a small proportion of the Catholic Church. There are reformist groups within the American Catholic Church that have quite radical agendas, including things like the ordination of women. The big issue is whether that sort of change might happen in the American Church and lead to some kind of American schism, some kind of break with the mainstream of the Catholic Church. My guess is no.

Ultimately, all these issues are moot because they entirely depend on the personality of the next Pope. It might be that the next Pope will launch a lot of radical reforms and will very much be somebody who will go down well in Boston or New York, and it’ll be the Africans who are unhappy. That could happen. But maybe it will be the other way round. That’s not something we can predict right now. All you really can say is that the current Pope has pretty much filled the ranks of cardinals with his own people, so the odds of it being a pretty conservative choice are quite high.

And whom do you think the Pope is paying more attention to at this point—his Southern flock or his Northern one?

I think he is listening much more to the Southerners. I think he is feeling much more at home with people from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The Pope has long been horrified at liberal Western Europe and parts of America. But one thing I think a lot of people haven’t noticed is how horrified he’s been by the liberalization of Churches and countries in Eastern Europe since the breakup of communism. Far fewer people go to church in Poland now than they did under communism. I think he’s really very bothered by Europe generally.

If the next Pope is conservative and continues to listen more to the Southern part of the world, do you think the Catholic Church will lose a lot of those who are agitating for liberal reforms?

A lot of people have talked about Catholics leaving the Church, but it’s been interesting how few of them have actually done so. Even the quite liberal people who disagree with the Church on lots and lots of different things still very often turn up to Mass on Sundays—though they complain a lot. I don’t think we’re necessarily talking about a lot of defections, but we’re talking about continuing unhappiness and agitation, maybe contributing to further scandals and further emphasis on scandals. But I get myself in enough hot water trying to predict demographic trends. Trying to predict specifically where the American Catholic Church is going to be in five years would be very tough.

You write that “the first Reformation was a lot less straightforward than some histories suggest.” In what ways is it more complicated than the story that’s typically presented?

The standard idea of the Reformation is that you had heroic figures standing up and making this new statement, launching a revolution, kicking in the door, the door was rotten, and the whole structure fell down. Well, there are a number of things wrong with that picture. First of all, what people were fighting about was nothing like as simple as that—it wasn’t just an issue of liberty and the freedom to marry and fighting a corrupt church. One side was as religious and “superstitious” as the other one—the Protestants were just as anti-Jewish and likely to burn witches as the Catholics, in some cases they were even more so. It wasn’t a case of the revolution triumphing overnight. The revolution triumphed by employing a great deal of persecution. Protestant countries became Protestant by rigidly repressing the old Catholic ways. They had to kill an awful lot of Catholics in order to become Protestant societies. And the other issue is that the old world did not go away gracefully. The Catholic Church did not collapse, it became a reformed institution by becoming more Catholic, and that’s a very successful recipe. Today the Roman Catholic Church is still the largest religious organization on the planet—there are more Catholics on the planet than there are Muslims, for example. We have a kind of simple, heroic vision of the Protestant triumph, which is in terms of Protestant freedom versus Catholic slavery, to put it crudely, and it’s just not like that. It’s much more ambiguous.

How might a twenty-first-century Reformation—and Counter-Reformation—play itself out?

Moving away from the Reformation/Counter-Reformation terms specifically, the main analogy I see is that of a religious revolution and its aftermath. A liberalizing revolution starts off in one area and instead of sweeping the whole Christian world what it actually does is invite a conservative, traditionalist reaction that proves to be even stronger in the rest of the world. When you look at the numbers in the Catholic world, they are pretty overwhelming. The parts of the world that seem to be tempted by a liberalizing “reformation” are relatively small. But the areas that might be tempted to a much more conservative, traditional Christianity are very large.

There are a number of Catholics around today who speak in terms of Martin Luther nailing the theses on the church door at Wittenberg. Some of them talk about a third Vatican council which would bring about the reforms they want. The idea I play with is that they could end up with something they don’t want. Instead of a Vatican council, they could end up with another Council of Trent, which was something that was called to deal with reform and did it by saying, Look, all those things you didn’t like, we’re bringing them back double. So it became an even more conservative, traditional system than what they were trying to get away from.

Your article hints at some scary scenarios—for instance that a religious revolution coupled with a conservative reaction might result in sectarian violence similar to what Europe experienced during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation.

Sectarian violence could flare up in a number of ways. One of them is the Christian/Muslim issue, which we’ve talked about and which is a very pressing danger. Another thing to watch for is Protestant/Catholic conflict or rather Pentecostal/Catholic conflict. Pentecostalism has been growing very fast in Latin America, and most people would say that in Latin America one person out of every nine is a Pentecostal. In some of the areas of fastest growth, notably Peru and Mexico, there have been conflicts between Protestants and Catholics which look exactly like what would have happened in France and Germany around 1580. They even start the same way—the Catholics have a procession of the Virgin, the Protestants gather round and make fun of it, the Catholics go off and burn down the local church. At the moment that’s largely at the level of rioting, except in some areas of southern Mexico where it really does look like civil war. That’s a worrying issue for Latin America. It’s not so much an issue in Africa, where Catholics and Protestants still have lots of space between them, and lots of other people to convert.

I’ve been interested in some of the responses I’ve gotten to my books. People tell me that the things I write about are really scary. You know, I don’t intend them to be scary. People say, Oh, this is a terrifying book, it suggests that we’re going to have all this fundamentalism and all this traditional Christianity. But I don’t think that’s necessarily scary. It’s just a different kind of Christianity. If people are shooting at each other, that frightens me. But if people are just believing differently, that doesn’t.

But some of the implications of your book—the religious clashes we could see in the future—do seem fairly apocalyptic.

Oh, sure. The most worrying areas, as I said, are in the Muslim-Christian interaction. Those do worry me. When U.S. soldiers find themselves in the southern Philippines, for example, I’m not sure how many policy-makers realize that what they’re doing is walking along one of the key religious fault lines in the world.

Some of the tensions in U.S. society—between separation of church and state and Christian fundamentalism, between liberal Protestant denominations and movements such as Pentecostalism, which are reminiscent of a more radical, conservative brand of Christianity—seem to reflect the growing rift between Northern and Southern Christianity. Do you see the U.S. as in some ways an anomaly in the North/South picture you draw?

I almost see three different demographic trends here—you have Europe, which is de-Christianizing at an amazing rate; you have Africa and Latin America, where Christianity is growing very fast; and the U.S., where Christianity is holding on very well. It’s still the default religion for the great majority of Americans. It’s as difficult for Europeans to take American God-talk seriously as it is for them to look at, say, Africa or Latin America. I think that’s one concept that we tend to misunderstand in the United States. We have this idea that America is becoming a very religiously diverse society. For instance, there’s a very interesting book by Diana Eck called A New Religious America, about how America is becoming the world’s most diverse society. In fact I disagree. I think it’s becoming a more Christian society—a society in which Christians are if anything more numerous and more dominant, because the more Latino a country becomes, the more you get those kinds of religious traditions. One figure I always quote is that by 2050 a third of Americans will probably be claiming Latino or Asian roots. The great majority of those are going to be coming from Christian backgrounds. I do think the U.S. is very odd in terms of where it fits into the world’s religious picture. And even odder is the split between the religion of the mainstream and the non-religion of the elite. The sociologist Peter Berger has this famous quote about Indians and Swedes—he says Indians are the most religious people in the world, Swedes are the least religious, and Americans are a nation of Indians governed by Swedes. I wish I’d invented that quote—it’s very accurate.

There really does seem to be a split within the U.S. The “Christmas and Easter” Christians seem to be the ones running the media—and looking at the fundamentalist Christians with amazement.

Or horror. In my book I quoted an article by Brent Staples in *The New York Times* that begins by commenting how churches across America are deserted and if only they would just come to terms with secular norms about issues of gender and sexuality, maybe they’d have a chance. This shows that Brent Staples has probably never looked inside a church outside midtown Manhattan, because when you go anywhere else in the country, the churches are trying to build ever bigger car parks. I sometimes say that if you want to see the symbols of soaring faith in architecture, you can look at the Gothic spires in the Middle Ages or the church car parks in twentieth-century America.

Do you see the U.S. evolving toward the Swede version or the Indian version? Or do you think it will maintain the current dichotomy?

As far as I can see, I think it will continue very much as it is—ideally with Indians and Swedes blissfully unaware of each other’s existence. We leave them alone, they leave us alone.

Do you travel extensively to do the research for your books and articles? If so, are there any personal impressions that jump out at you from having witnessed different versions of Christianity in the Southern Hemisphere?

I’ve traveled a fair amount, but oddly, the best impressions I got were actually in Europe. When you’re in Mexico, for example, you tend to see some things as part of the context. But it’s where you see the two cultures coming together that you’re really struck. One impression that leapt out at me happened was something I observed in Amsterdam a couple of years ago on a Sunday. You realize that you are in a completely different city from an American city, because there is virtually nothing you would call church life anywhere in the downtown. The churches are non-functioning or empty—Amsterdam is as secular a city as you can find. And then you move into the poorer suburbs, and you can see the churches filling up, and they’re entirely made up of Africans. You think of all the lessons this has in terms of stories of colonial empires, and you think of all these Dutch missionaries going out to Africa or Asia to convert. This is an example of the obvious phrase the empire strikes back. Seeing these Africans who are clearly not the world’s richest people, but who are very sober, respectable folk, you think, Well, that’s the future of Christianity. It’s a very powerful visual statement.

Many of the characteristics of Christianity as it’s practiced in the global South—a belief that God will intercede on a personal level, a belief in using prayer to exorcise demons or witches, a certain apocalyptic worldview—seem to hark back to earlier versions of Christianity in the North, as it might have been practiced during the Middle Ages, or perhaps in Colonial America. Do you think what we’re seeing in the South is part of a natural progression, and that in two or three hundred years Southern Christianity may look a lot like Northern Christianity does now?

I’d say two things. Firstly, you’d be amazed how many Americans practice the kind of Christianity you just described. You would not have to go far from where you are now to find a church where people believed those things. They could be Latinos, they could be African-American, or they could be white. Just because religion moves on to a more liberal, more secular approach doesn’t mean that everyone else gives up the older ideas.

But I think it is important to say that African or Asian Christianity will become a lot more diverse. Something like that is already happening. If you look at South Africa, for example, which is probably the most socially advanced country on the continent, you have a very wide range of religious belief—everything from very liberal academic intellectual folk associated with mainstream churches like Anglican and Methodist, over to some of the independent churches, the Pentecostal churches. Will the Christianity of the South liberalize? Yes, I think that’s happening already. But that won’t necessarily shut out some of the older ideas and practices. Built into Christianity, I think, is a kind of cycle, in which the further people move toward secularism and intellectual approaches to religion, the more at least some people will be drawn back to the idea of an original “primitive” religion. Wherever you have a religion based firmly on a scripture, you’ll always get that cycle. That’s why fundamentalism has always been around and always will be, under different names. People will always be trying to get back to the pure ideal, as they imagine it. It’s a very Newtonian system—for every action, there’s a wildly disproportionate reaction.

## The Next Christianity

Jenkins, Philip. “The Next Christianity.” *The Atlantic Monthly* 290.3 (Oct. 2002). 7 May 2003. Web.

We stand at a historical turning point, the author argues—one that is as epochal for the Christian world as the original Reformation. Around the globe Christianity is growing and mutating in ways that observers in the West tend not to see. Tumultuous conflicts within Christianity will leave a mark deeper than Islam’s on the century ahead.

“. . . the twenty-first century will almost certainly be regarded by future historians as a century in which religion replaced ideology as the prime animating and destructive force in human affairs . . .”

“The original Reformation . . . challenged the idea that divine authority should be mediated through institutions or hierarchies, and it denied the value of tradition. Instead it offered radical new notions of the supremacy of written texts (that is, the books of the Bible), interpreted by individual consciences. The Reformation made possible a religion that could be practiced privately, rather than mainly in a vast institutionalized community.”

“The invention of movable type and the printing press, in the fifteenth century, was a technological development that spurred mass literacy in the vernacular languages—and accelerated the forces of religious change. In the near future, many believe, the electronic media will have a comparably powerful impact . . . In the view of liberal Catholics, much of the current crisis derives directly from archaic if not primitive doctrines, including mandatory celibacy among the clergy, intolerance of homosexuality, and the prohibition of women from the priesthood, not to mention a more generalized fear of sexuality.”

“If we look beyond the liberal West, we see that another Christian revolution, quite different from the one being called for in affluent American suburbs and upscale urban parishes, is already in progress. Worldwide, Christianity is actually moving toward supernaturalism and neo-orthodoxy, and in many ways toward the ancient world view expressed in the New Testament: a vision of Jesus as the embodiment of divine power, who overcomes the evil forces that inflict calamity and sickness upon the human race.”

In the Third World, there are “currently 480 million in Latin America, 360 million in Africa, and 313 million in Asia, compared with 260 million in North America . . .” They are “what the Catholic scholar Walbert Buhlmann has called the Third Church, a form of Christianity as distinct as Protestantism or Orthodoxy, and one that is likely to become dominant in the faith.”

“There is increasing tension between what one might call a liberal Northern Reformation and the surging Southern religious revolution, which one might equate with the Counter-Reformation . . . an enormous rift seems inevitable.”

Southern Christianity

“The Reformation led to nothing less than the creation of the modern European states and the international order we recognize today. For more than a century Europe was rent by sectarian wars between Protestants and Catholics, which by the 1680s had ended in stalemate. Out of this impasse, this failure to impose a monolithic religious order across the Continent, there arose such fundamental ideas of modern society as the state’s obligation to tolerate minorities and the need to justify political authority without constantly invoking God and religion. The Enlightenment—and, indeed, Western modernity—could have occurred only as a consequence of the clash, military and ideological, between Protestants and Catholics.

“Today across the global South a rising religious fervor is coinciding with declining autonomy for nation-states, making useful an analogy with the medieval concept of Christendom—the *Res Publica Christiana*—as an overarching source of unity and a focus of loyalty transcending mere kingdoms or empires. . . . The laws of individual nations lasted only as long as the nations themselves; Christendom offered a higher set of standards and mores that could claim to be universal. Christendom was a primary cultural reference, and it may well re-emerge as such in the Christian South—as a new transnational order in which political, social, and personal identities are defined chiefly by religious loyalties.”

“For at least a century after Luther’s Reformation, [the] Catholic states—Spain, Portugal, and France—were launching missionary ventures into Africa, Asia, North and South America. By the 1570s Catholic missionaries were creating a transoceanic Church structure: the see of Manila was an offshoot of the archdiocese of Mexico City. By about 1600 the Catholic Church had become the first religious body—indeed, the first institution of any sort—to operate on a global scale. Even in the Protestant heartlands of Northern and Western Europe—England, Sweden, and the German lands—the heirs of the Reformation had to spend many years discouraging their people from succumbing to the attractions of Catholicism. Conversions to Catholicism were steady throughout the century or so after 1580. It looked as if the Reformation had effectively cut Protestant Europe off from the mainstream of the Christian world. Only in the eighteenth century would Protestantism find a secure and then strategically preponderant place on the global stage, through the success of booming commercial states such as England and the Netherlands . . .”

“. . . Christians are facing a shrinking population in the liberal West and a growing majority of the traditional Rest. During the past half century the critical centers of the Christian world have moved decisively to Africa, to Latin America, and to Asia. The balance will never shift back.”

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Africa | 1900 | total population: 107 million | Christian population: 10 million | 9% |
| Africa | 2003 | total population: 784 million | Christian population: 360 million | 46% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Africa | 1953 |  | Catholic population: 16 million |  |
| Africa | 2003 |  | Catholic population: 120 million |  |
| Africa | 2025 |  | Catholic population: 228 million |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Philippines | 2025 | Catholic population: 90 million |  |  |
| Philippines | 2050 | Catholic population: 130 million |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| world | 2025 | Christian population: 2.6 billion | (Africa+L. Am.: 50 %; Asia: 17%) |  |

Christianity as a whole

“. . . Christian African countries have some of the world’s most dramatic rates of population growth. Meanwhile, the advanced industrial countries are experiencing a dramatic birth dearth.”

“By about 2050 the United States will still have the largest single contingent of Christians, but all the other leading nations will be Southern: Mexico, Brazil, Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, and the Philippines. By then the proportion of non-Latino whites among the world’s Christians will have fallen to perhaps one in five.”

“These figures actually understate the Southern predominance . . . because they fail to take account of Southern emigrants to Europe and North America.”

“. . . established white communities in Europe are declining demographically, and their religious beliefs and practices are moving further away from traditional Christian roots. The result is that skins of other hues are increasingly evident in European churches; half of all London churchgoers are now black. African and West Indian churches in Britain are reaching out to whites, though members complain that their religion is often seen as “a black thing” rather than “a God thing.”

In the United States a growing proportion of Roman Catholics are Latinos, who should represent a quarter of the nation by 2050 or so. Asian communities in the United States have sizable Catholic populations. Current trends suggest that the religious values of Catholics with a Southern ethnic and cultural heritage will long remain quite distinct from those of other U.S. populations. In terms of liturgy and worship Latino Catholics are strikingly different from Anglo believers, not least in maintaining a fervent devotion to the Virgin Mary and the saints.

European and Euro-American Catholics will within a few decades be a smaller and smaller fragment of a worldwide Church. Of the 18 million Catholic baptisms recorded in 1998, eight million took place in Central and South America, three million in Africa, and just under three million in Asia. (In other words, these three regions already account for more than three quarters of all Catholic baptisms.) The annual baptism total for the Philippines is higher than the totals for Italy, France, Spain, and Poland combined. . . .

In “both theology and moral teaching, Southern Christianity is more conservative than the Northern—especially the American—version. Northern reformers, even if otherwise sympathetic to the indigenous cultures of non-Northern peoples, obviously do not like this fact. The liberal Catholic writer James Carroll has complained that “world Christianity [is falling] increasingly under the sway of anti-intellectual fundamentalism.” But the cultural pressures may be hard to resist.

The denominations that are triumphing across the global South—radical Protestant sects, either evangelical or Pentecostal, and Roman Catholicism of an orthodox kind—are stalwartly traditional or even reactionary by the standards of the economically advanced nations. The Catholic faith that is rising rapidly in Africa and Asia looks very much like a pre-Vatican II faith, being more traditional in its respect for the power of bishops and priests and in its preference for older devotions. African Catholicism in particular is far more comfortable with notions of authority and spiritual charisma than with newer ideas of consultation and democracy.

This kind of faith is personified by Nigeria’s Francis Cardinal Arinze, who is sometimes touted as a future Pope. He is sharp and articulate, with an attractively self-deprecating style, and he has served as the president of the Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, which has given him invaluable experience in talking with Muslims, Hindus, Jews, and members of other faiths. By liberal Northern standards, however, Arinze is rigidly conservative, and even repressive on matters such as academic freedom and the need for strict orthodoxy. In his theology as much as his social views he is a loyal follower of Pope John Paul II. Anyone less promising for Northern notions of reform is difficult to imagine.

Meanwhile, a full-scale Reformation is taking place among Pentecostal Christians—whose ideas are shared by many Catholics. Pentecostal believers reject tradition and hierarchy, but they also rely on direct spiritual revelation to supplement or replace biblical authority. And it is Pentecostals who stand in the vanguard of the Southern Counter-Reformation. Though Pentecostalism emerged as a movement only at the start of the twentieth century, chiefly in North America, Pentecostals today are at least 400 million strong, and heavily concentrated in the global South. By 2040 or so there could be as many as a billion, at which point Pentecostal Christians alone will far outnumber the world’s Buddhists and will enjoy rough numerical parity with the world’s Hindus.

The booming Pentecostal churches of Africa, Asia, and Latin America are thoroughly committed to re-creating their version of an idealized early Christianity (often described as the restoration of “primitive” Christianity). The most successful Southern churches preach a deep personal faith, communal orthodoxy, mysticism, and puritanism, all founded on obedience to spiritual authority, from whatever source it is believed to stem. Pentecostals—and their Catholic counterparts—preach messages that may appear simplistically charismatic, visionary, and apocalyptic to a Northern liberal. For them prophecy is an everyday reality, and many independent denominations trace their foundation to direct prophetic authority. Scholars of religion customarily speak of these proliferating congregations simply as the “prophetic churches.”

Of course, American reformers also dream of a restored early Church; but whereas Americans imagine a Church freed from hierarchy, superstition, and dogma, Southerners look back to one filled with spiritual power and able to exorcise the demonic forces that cause sickness and poverty. And yes, “demonic” is the word. The most successful Southern churches today speak openly of spiritual healing and exorcism. One controversial sect in the process of developing an international following is the Brazilian-based Universal Church of the Kingdom of God, which claims to offer “strong prayer to destroy witchcraft, demon possession, bad luck, bad dreams, all spiritual problems,” and promises that members will gain “prosperity and financial breakthrough.” The Cherubim and Seraphim movement of West Africa claims to have “conscious knowledge of the evil spirits which sow the seeds of discomfort, set afloat ill-luck, diseases, induce barrenness, sterility and the like.”

Americans and Europeans usually associate such religious ideas with primitive and rural conditions, and assume that the older world view will disappear with the coming of modernization and urbanization. In the contemporary South, however, the success of highly supernatural churches should rather be seen as a direct by-product of urbanization. (This should come as no surprise to Americans; look at the Pentecostal storefronts in America’s inner cities.) As predominantly rural societies have become more urban over the past thirty or forty years, millions of migrants have been attracted to ever larger urban areas, which lack the resources and the infrastructure to meet the needs of these wanderers. Sometimes people travel to cities within the same nation, but often they find themselves in different countries and cultures, suffering a still greater sense of estrangement. In such settings religious communities emerge to provide health, welfare, and education.

This sort of alternative social system, which played an enormous role in the earliest days of Christianity, has been a potent means of winning mass support for the most committed religious groups and is likely to grow in importance as the gap between people’s needs and government’s capacities to fill them becomes wider. Looking at the success of Christianity in the Roman Empire, the historian Peter Brown has written, “The Christian community suddenly came to appeal to men who felt deserted . . . Plainly, to be a Christian in 250 brought more protection from one’s fellows than to be a *civis Romanus*.” Being a member of an active Christian church today may well bring more tangible benefits than being a mere citizen of Nigeria or Peru.

Often the new churches gain support because of the way they deal with the demons of oppression and want: they interpret the horrors of everyday urban life in supernatural terms. In many cases these churches seek to prove their spiritual powers in struggles against witchcraft. The intensity of belief in witchcraft across much of Africa can be startling. As recently as last year at least 1,000 alleged witches were hacked to death in a single “purge” in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Far from declining with urbanization, fear of witches has intensified. Since the collapse of South Africa’s apartheid regime, in 1994, witchcraft has emerged as a primary social fear in Soweto, with its three million impoverished residents.

The desperate public-health situation in the booming mega-cities of the South goes far toward explaining the emphasis of the new churches on healing mind and body. In Africa in the early twentieth century an explosion of Christian healing movements and new prophets coincided with a dreadful series of epidemics, and the religious upsurge of those years was in part a quest for bodily health. Today African churches stand or fall by their success in healing, and elaborate rituals have formed around healing practices (though church members disagree on whether believers should rely entirely on spiritual assistance). The same interest in spiritual healing is found in what were once the mission churches—bodies such as the Anglicans and the Lutherans. Nowhere in the global South do the various spiritual healers find serious competition from modern scientific medicine: it is simply beyond the reach of most of the poor.

Disease, exploitation, pollution, drink, drugs, and violence, taken together, can account for why people might easily accept that they are under siege from demonic forces, and that only divine intervention can save them. Even radical liberation theologians use apocalyptic language on occasion. When a Northerner asks, in effect, where the Southern churches are getting such ideas, the answer is not hard to find: they’re getting them from the Bible. Southern Christians are reading the New Testament and taking it very seriously; in it they see the power of Jesus fundamentally expressed through his confrontations with demonic powers, particularly those causing sickness and insanity. “Go back and report to John what you hear and see,” Jesus says in the Gospel according to Matthew (11: 4-5). “The blind receive sight, the lame walk, those who have leprosy are cured, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the good news is preached to the poor.” For the past two hundred years Northern liberals have employed various nonliteral interpretations of these healing passages—perhaps Jesus had a good sense of the causes and treatment of psychosomatic ailments? But that is not, of course, how such scenes are understood within the Third Church.

Today, as in the early sixteenth century, a literal interpretation of the Bible can be tremendously appealing. To quote a modern-day follower of the African prophet Johane Masowe, cited in Elizabeth Isichei’s *A History of Christianity in Africa*, “When we were in these synagogues [the European churches], we used to read about the works of Jesus Christ . . . cripples were made to walk and the dead were brought to life . . . evil spirits driven out . . . That was what was being done in Jerusalem. We Africans, however, who were being instructed by white people, never did anything like that . . . We were taught to read the Bible, but we ourselves never did what the people of the Bible used to do.”

Alongside the fast-growing churches have emerged apocalyptic and messianic movements that try to bring in the kingdom of God through armed violence. Some try to establish the thousand-year reign of Jesus Christ on earth, as prophesied in the Book of Revelation. This phenomenon would have been instantly familiar to Europeans 500 years ago, when the Anabaptists and other millenarian groups flourished. Perhaps the most traumatic event of the Reformation occurred in the German city of Münster in 1534-1535, when Anabaptist rebels established a radical social order that abolished property and monogamy; a homicidal king-messiah held dictatorial power until the forces of state authority conquered and annihilated the fanatics. Then as now, it was difficult to set bounds to religious enthusiasm.

Extremist Christian movements have appeared regularly across parts of Africa where the mechanisms of the state are weak. They include groups such as the Lumpa Church, in Zambia, and the terrifying Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA), in Uganda. In 2000 more than a thousand people in another Ugandan sect, the Movement for the Restoration of the Ten Commandments of God, perished in an apparent mass suicide. In each case a group emerged from orthodox roots and then gravitated toward apocalyptic fanaticism. The Ten Commandments sect grew out of orthodox Catholicism. The Lumpa Church began, in the 1950s, with Alice Lenshina, a Presbyterian convert who claimed to receive divine visions urging her to fight witchcraft. She became the *lenshina*, or queen, of her new church, whose name, Lumpa, means “better than all others.” The group attracted a hundred thousand followers, who formed a utopian community in order to await the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. Since it rejected worldly regimes to the point of refusing to pay taxes, the Lumpa became increasingly engaged in confrontations with the Zambian government, leading to open rebellion in the 1960s.

Another prophetic Alice appeared in Uganda during the chaotic civil wars that swept that country in the 1980s. Alice Lakwena was a former Catholic whose visions led her to establish the Holy Spirit Mobile Force, also pledged to fight witches. She refused to accept the national peace settlement established under President Yoweri Museveni, and engaged in a holy war against his regime. Holy Spirit soldiers, many of them children and young teenagers, were ritually anointed with butter on the understanding that it would make them bulletproof. When Lakwena’s army was crushed, in 1991, most of her followers merged with the LRA, which is notorious for filling its ranks by abducting children. Atrocities committed by the group include mass murder, rape, and forced cannibalism. Today as in the sixteenth century, an absolute conviction that one is fighting for God’s cause makes moot the laws of war.

The changing demographic balance between North and South helps to explain the current shape of world Catholicism, including the fact that the Church has been headed by Pope John Paul II. In the papal election of 1978 the Polish candidate won the support of Latin American cardinals, who were not prepared to accept yet another Western European. In turn, John Paul has recognized the growing Southern presence in the Church. Last year he elevated forty-four new cardinals, of whom eleven were Latin American, two Indian, and three African. The next time a papal election takes place, fifty-seven of the 135 cardinals eligible to vote, or more than 40 percent, will be from Southern nations. Early this century they will constitute a majority.

It may be true that from the liberal Northern perspective, pressure for a Reformation-style solution to critical problems in the Church—the crisis in clerical celibacy, the shortage of priests, the sense that the laity’s concerns are ignored—seems overwhelming. Poll after poll in the United States and Europe indicates significant distrust of clerical authority and support for greater lay participation and women’s equality. The obvious question in the parishes of the developed world seems to be how long the aloof hierarchy can stave off the forces of history.

From Rome, however, the picture looks different, as do the “natural” directions that history is going to take. The Roman church operates on a global scale and has done so for centuries. Long before the French and British governments had become aware of global politics—and well before their empires came into being—papal diplomats were thinking through their approaches to China, their policies in Peru, their views on African affairs, their stances on the issues facing Japan and Mexico. To adapt a popular activist slogan, the Catholic Church not only thinks globally, it acts globally. That approach is going to have weighty consequences. On present evidence, a Southern-dominated Catholic Church is likely to react traditionally to the issues that most concern American and European reformers: matters of theology and devotion, sexual ethics and gender roles, and, most fundamentally, issues of authority within the Church.

Neatly illustrating the cultural gulf that separates Northern and Southern churches is an incident involving Moses Tay, the Anglican archbishop of Southeast Asia, whose see is based in Singapore. In the early 1990s Tay traveled to Vancouver, where he encountered the totem poles that are a local tourist attraction. To him, they were idols possessed by evil spirits, and he concluded that they required handling by prayer and exorcism. This horrified the local Anglican Church, which was committed to building good relationships with local Native American communities, and which regarded exorcism as absurd superstition. The Canadians, like other good liberal Christians throughout the North, were long past dismissing alien religions as diabolically inspired. It’s difficult not to feel some sympathy with the archbishop, however. He was quite correct to see the totems as authentic religious symbols, and considering the long history of Christian writing on exorcism and possession, he could also summon many precedents to support his position. On that occasion Tay personified the global Christian confrontation.

The cultural gap between Christians of the North and the South will increase rather than diminish in the coming decades, for reasons that recall Luther’s time. During the early modern period Northern and Southern Europe were divided between the Protestantism of the word and the Catholicism of the senses—between a religious culture of preaching, hymns, and Bible reading, and one of statues, rituals, and processions. Today we might see as a parallel the impact of electronic technologies, which is being felt at very different rates in the Northern and Southern worlds. The new-media revolution is occurring in Europe, North America, and the Pacific Rim while other parts of the globe are focusing on—indeed, still catching up with—the traditional world of book learning. Northern communities will move to ever more decentralized and privatized forms of faith as Southerners maintain older ideals of community and traditional authority.

On moral issues, too, Southern churches are far out of step with liberal Northern churches. African and Latin American churches tend to be very conservative on issues such as homosexuality and abortion. Such disagreement can pose real political difficulties for churches that aspire to a global identity and that try to balance diverse opinions. At present this is scarcely an issue for the Roman Catholic Church, which at least officially preaches the same conservatism for all regions. If, however, Church officials in North America or Europe proclaimed a moral stance more in keeping with progressive secular values, they would be divided from the growing Catholic churches of the South by a de facto schism, if not a formal breach.

For thirty years Northern liberals have dreamed of a Third Vatican Council to complete the revolution launched by Pope John XXIII—one that would usher in a new age of ecclesiastical democracy and lay empowerment. It would be a bitter irony for the liberals if the council were convened but turned out to be a conservative, Southern-dominated affair that imposed moral and theological litmus tests intolerable to North Americans and Europeans—if, in other words, it tried to implement not a new Reformation but a new Counter-Reformation. (In that sense we would be witnessing not a new Wittenberg but, rather, a new Council of Trent—that is, a strongly traditional gathering that would restate the Church’s older ideology and attempt to set it in stone for all future ages.) If a future Southern Pope struggled to impose a new vision of orthodoxy on America’s Catholic bishops, universities, and seminaries, the result could well be an actual rather than a de facto schism.

The experience of the world’s Anglicans and Episcopalians may foretell the direction of conflicts within the Roman Catholic Church. In the Anglican Communion, which is also torn by a global cultural conflict over issues of gender and sexuality, orthodox Southerners seek to re-evangelize a Euro-American world that they view as coming close to open heresy. This uncannily recalls the situation in sixteenth-century Europe, in which Counter-Reformation Catholics sent Jesuits and missionary priests to reconvert those regions that had fallen into Protestantism.

Anglicans in the North tend to be very liberal on homosexuality and the ordination of women. In recent years, however, liberal clerics have been appalled to find themselves outnumbered and regularly outvoted. In these votes the bishops of Africa and Asia have emerged as a rock-solid conservative bloc. The most ferocious battle to date occurred at the Lambeth World Conference in 1998, which adopted, over the objections of the liberal bishops, a forthright traditional statement proclaiming the impossibility of reconciling homosexual conduct with Christian ministry. As in the Roman Catholic Church, the predominance of Southerners at future events of this kind will only increase. Nigeria already has more practicing Anglicans than any other country, far more than Britain itself, and Uganda is not far behind. By mid-century the global total of Anglicans could approach 150 million, of whom only a small minority will be white Europeans or North Americans. The shifting balance within the church could become a critical issue very shortly, since the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, is notably gay-friendly and has already ordained a practicing homosexual as a priest.

The Lambeth debate also initiated a series of events that Catholic reformers should study carefully. Briefly, American conservatives who were disenchanted with the liberal establishment in the U.S. Episcopal Church realized that they had powerful friends overseas, and transferred their religious allegiance to more-conservative authorities in the global South. Since 2000 some conservative American Episcopalians have traveled to Moses Tay’s cathedral in Singapore, where they were consecrated as bishops by Asian and African Anglican prelates, including the Rwandan archbishop Emmanuel Kolini. By tradition an Anglican archbishop is free to ordain whomever he pleases within his province, so although the Americans live and work in South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and other states, they are now technically bishops within the province of Rwanda. They have become missionary bishops, charged with ministering to conservative congregations in the United States, where they support a dissident “virtual province” within the church. They and their conservative colleagues are now part of the Anglican Mission in America, which is intended officially to “lead the Episcopal Church back to its biblical foundations.” The mission aims to restore traditional teachings and combat what it sees as the “manifest heresy” and even open apostasy of the U.S. Church leadership. Just this past summer Archbishop Kolini offered his protection to dissident Anglicans in the Vancouver area, who were rebelling against liberal proposals to allow same-sex couples to receive a formal Church blessing.

Ultimately, the first Christendom—the politicoreligious order that dominated Europe from the sixth century through the sixteenth—collapsed in the face of secular nationalism, under the overwhelming force of what Thomas Carlyle described as “the three great elements of modern civilization, gunpowder, printing, and the Protestant religion.” Nation-states have dominated the world ever since. Today, however, the whole concept of national autonomy is under challenge, partly as a result of new technologies. In the coming decades, according to a recent CIA report, “Governments will have less and less control over flows of information, technology, diseases, migrants, arms, and financial transactions, whether licit or illicit, across their borders. The very concept of ‘belonging’ to a particular state will probably erode.” If a once unquestionable construct like Great Britain is under threat, it is not surprising that people are questioning the existence of newer and more artificial entities in Africa and Asia.

For a quarter of a century social scientists analyzing the decline of the nation-state have drawn parallels between the world today and the politically fragmented yet cosmopolitan world of the Middle Ages. Some scholars have even predicted the emergence of some secular movement or ideology that would command loyalty across nations like the Christendom of old. Yet the more we look at the Southern Hemisphere, the more we see that although supranational ideas are flourishing, they are not in the least secular. The parallels to the Middle Ages may be closer than anyone has guessed.

Across the global South cardinals and bishops have become national moral leaders in a way essentially unseen in the West since the seventeenth century. The struggles of South African churches under apartheid spring to mind, but just as impressive were the pro-democracy campaigns of many churches and denominations elsewhere in Africa during the 1980s and 1990s. Prelates know that they are expected to speak for their people, even though if they speak boldly, they may well pay with their lives. Important and widely revered modern martyrs include Archbishop Luwum, of Uganda; Archbishop Munzihirwa, of Zaire; and Cardinal Biayenda, of Congo-Brazzaville.

As this sense of moral leadership grows, we might reasonably ask whether Christianity will also provide a guiding political ideology for much of the world. We might even imagine a new wave of Christian states, in which political life is inextricably bound up with religious belief. Zambia declared itself a Christian nation in 1991, and similar ideas have been bruited in Zimbabwe, Kenya, and Liberia. If this ideal does gain popularity, the Christian South will soon be dealing with some debates, of long standing in the North, over the proper relationship between Church and State and between rival churches under the law. Other inevitable questions involve tolerance and diversity, the relationship between majority and minority communities, and the extent to which religiously inspired laws can (or should) regulate private morality and behavior. These issues were all at the core of the Reformation.

Across the regions of the world that will be the most populous in the twenty-first century, vast religious contests are already in progress, though so far they have impinged little on Western opinion. The most significant conflict is in Nigeria, a nation that by rights should be a major regional power in this century and perhaps even a global power; but recent violence between Muslims and Christians raises the danger that Nigerian society might be brought to ruin by the clash of jihad and crusade. Muslims and Christians are at each other’s throats in Indonesia, the Philippines, Sudan, and a growing number of other African nations; Hindu extremists persecute Christians in India. Demographic projections suggest that these feuds will simply worsen. Present-day battles in Africa and Asia may anticipate the political outlines to come, and the roots of future great-power alliances. These battles are analogous to the ideological conflicts of the twentieth century, the alternating hot and cold wars between advocates of fascism and of democracy, of socialism and of capitalism. This time, however, the competing ideologies are explicitly religious, promising their followers a literal rather than merely a metaphorical kingdom of God on earth.

Let us imagine Africa in the throes of fiery religious revivals, as Muslim and Christian states jostle for political influence. Demographic change alone could provoke more-aggressive international policies, as countries with swollen populations tried to appropriate living space or natural resources. But religious tensions could make the situation far worse. If mega-cities are not to implode through social unrest and riot, governments have to find some way to mobilize the teeming masses of unemployed teenagers and young adults. Persuading them to fight for God is a proven way of siphoning off internal tension, especially if the religion in question already has a powerful ideal of martyrdom. Liberia, Uganda, and Sierra Leone have given rise to ruthless militias ready to kill or die for whatever warlord directs them, often following some notionally religious imperative. In the 1980s the hard-line Shiite mullahs of Iran secured their authority by sending hundreds of thousands of young men to martyr themselves in human-wave assaults against the Iraqi front lines. In contemporary Indonesia, Islamist militias can readily find thousands of poor recruits to fight against the nation’s Christian minorities.

Some of the likely winners in the religious economy of the new century are precisely those groups with a strongly apocalyptic mindset, in which the triumph of righteousness is associated with the vision of a world devastated by fire and plague. This could be a perilously convenient ideology for certain countries with weapons of mass destruction. (The candidates that come to mind include not only Iraq and Iran but also future regional powers such as Indonesia, Nigeria, the Congo, Uganda, and South Africa.) All this means that our political leaders and diplomats should pay at least as much attention to religions and sectarian frontiers as they ever have to the location of oil fields.

Perhaps the most remarkable point about these potential conflicts is that the trends pointing toward them have registered so little on the consciousness of even well-informed Northern observers. What, after all, do most Americans know about the distribution of Christians worldwide? I suspect that most see Christianity very much as it was a century ago—a predominantly European and North American faith. In discussions of the recent sexual-abuse crisis “the Catholic Church” and “the American Church” have been used more or less synonymously.

As the media have striven in recent years to present Islam in a more sympathetic light, they have tended to suggest that Islam, not Christianity, is the rising faith of Africa and Asia, the authentic or default religion of the world’s huddled masses. But Christianity is not only surviving in the global South, it is enjoying a radical revival, a return to scriptural roots. We are living in revolutionary times.

But we aren’t participating in them. By any reasonable assessment of numbers, the most significant transformation of Christianity in the world today is not the liberal Reformation that is so much desired in the North. It is the Counter-Reformation coming from the global South. And it’s very likely that in a decade or two neither component of global Christianity will recognize its counterpart as fully or authentically Christian.
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   “*Chastity*: . . . being pure or chaste.” “*Chaste*: Not having experienced sexual intercourse; virginal. Abstaining from unlawful sexual intercourse. Abstaining from all sexual intercourse; celibate.” (*American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4th ed., 2006) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The only mention of Christ’s thousand-year reign on earth is Rev 20:1-10: “Then I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain. 2He seized the dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, 3and threw him into the pit, and locked and sealed it over him, so that he would deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years were ended. After that he must be let out for a little while. 4Then I saw thrones, and those seated on them were given authority to judge. I also saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for their testimony to Jesus and for the word of God. . . . They came to life and reigned with Christ a thousand years. . . . 7When the thousand years are ended, Satan will be released from his prison 8and will come out to deceive the nations . . . 10And the devil . . . was thrown into the lake of fire and sulfur, where the beast and the false prophet were, and they will be tormented day and night forever and ever.” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See also Fitzmyer’s comment elsewhere (*Gospel According to Luke* 1.222):

   “Salvation” denotes the deliverance of human beings from evil, physical, moral, poli­ti­cal, or cataclysmic. . . . In most instances, where Paul uses the image, it expresses an element of his futurist eschatology, denoting an effect still to be fully achieved in the future (in contrast to that of justification) [see Phil 2:12, “work out your salvation with fear and trembling,” and Phil 3:20, the Christian awaiting a Savior]. . . . By con­trast, when Luke refers to salvation, it is something already achieved, though Luke 21:28 admits a future aspect of it. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In the Old Testament, God is Israel’s *go*’*ēl*, a kinsman who buys back a captured relative (Exod 6:6-7, Deut 7:6-8, Isa 41:14, 43:1, 43:14, 44:6, 47:4, 51:11, 52:3-9, Pss 18:15, 77:35, 111:9). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)