

## Holiness and Radicalism in Nineteenth-Century America

*Timothy L. Smith*

The year 1835 was the *annus mirabilis* of both liberation theology and the doctrine of sanctification in the United States. Phoebe Palmer professed the experience of perfect love at a weekly ladies' prayer meeting held at her sister's home in New York City that year, and for the next four decades she made the New York Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness the center of Methodist perfectionism and spiritual feminism, and the source of much of its social concern.<sup>1</sup> That year also, Orange Scott, presiding elder in Springfield, Massachusetts, won a majority of the New England Methodist ministers over to abolitionism by sending each a three-month subscription to William Lloyd Garrison's *The Liberator*. Scott's subsequent agitation of this issue, in defiance of the bishops, led to the secession, eight years later, of the Wesleyan Methodists in western New York and, in a move to prevent New England from joining them, to the division of the Methodist Church, north and south, at the General Conference of 1844.<sup>2</sup>

Methodists scarcely dominated the scene, however. Evangelicals of New England Congregationalist backgrounds, when they resided west of the Hudson River and were required by the terms of the plan of union of 1801 to

become Presbyterians, moved in parallel directions in the year 1835. In January of that year, John J. Shipherd and Asa Mahan came to New York City to persuade Arthur Tappan to consider Oberlin, Ohio, as the location of the college he planned to support for the students who had withdrawn from Presbyterian Lane Theological Seminary in Cincinnati when the trustees forbade their antislavery activities the year before. Tappan, who had been a mainstay of Lane and had supported the students during much of the year of feverish antislavery activity that followed their withdrawal, agreed to the plan, and named Mahan, a Cincinnati Presbyterian pastor who had sustained the students against the trustees, to be president at Oberlin. The conditions were, however, that evangelist Charles G. Finney, recently pastor of the congregation of revivalists and reformers that Arthur and his brother Lewis Tappan had helped organize in New York City, should spend half of each year in Oberlin as professor of theology; that the faculty, not the trustees, should be in control of the college; and that it should be committed to "the broad ground of moral reform in all its departments."<sup>3</sup>

Oberlin immediately became the vital center of Christian reflection and action aimed at the liberation of black people from slavery and racism; of women from male oppression that excluded them from the higher professions but exploited them in the oldest; of the poor from ignorance, alcohol, and the greed of merchants and land speculators; and of American society generally from all those forms of institutionalized evil that stood in the way of Christ's coming kingdom.<sup>4</sup> Theodore Dwight Weld, whose perfectionist view of Christian faith underlay his recent emergence as the most prominent evangelical abolitionist in the country, appeared at Oberlin in the fall of 1835 to give a series of lectures on abolition and to train students as antislavery agents, just as Finney completed his first half year as professor there.<sup>5</sup> That autumn, Finney, whose New

Versions of the material in this chapter appeared in the *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, vol. 13 (Spring 1978) [© Timothy L. Smith, 1978], and in the *American Quarterly* (Spring 1979) [© the University of Pennsylvania]. Used by permission.

York congregation meanwhile had erected the Broadway Tabernacle as his church and revival center, began the *Lectures to Professing Christians*, signaling his growing involvement with the doctrine of the sanctification of believers, which he thought crucial to further progress in Christendom's march toward the millennium.<sup>6</sup> The widespread merging of Christian perfection with moral reform, in a theology no longer Calvinist, though professedly Puritan, was too much for the more conservative of the Scotch-Irish preachers in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., and certainly too much for the Princeton Seminary faculty. Within two years, that denomination also had divided, ostensibly over theological, but in fact over social issues as well.<sup>7</sup>

The broader significance of these events has been obscured by the tendency of historians—a tendency now in the process of being reversed—to view perfectionists and abolitionists as representing eccentric, if not lunatic strains in American theology. Another series of events in 1835 suggests instead, that Christian radicalism was for the moment in the mainstream. Nathaniel W. Taylor, professor of theology at Yale and the chief architect with Lyman Beecher of the New Divinity, or the New England theology as it was called, published in his journal, *The Christian Spectator*, four essays which placed him firmly in the camp of those to whom sanctification had become the crucial issue. By grafting onto covenant theology the doctrine of the moral nature of divine government, which required the consent of the human will to all that God provided or demanded; by locating depravity not in our natures, as had Jonathan Edwards, but in our dispositions—our selfish wills; and by adopting Samuel Hopkins' idea that disinterested benevolence, or unselfish love toward God and other humans, was the sum of the Christian's duty, Taylor and Beecher transformed Calvinist dogma into a practical Arminianism, without having to jet-

tison Calvinist verbiage.<sup>8</sup> Meanwhile, Lyman Beecher's son Edward, who joined the famous "Yale band" to become the first president of Illinois College, spoke for many of the young New Englanders sent out by Yale and Andover seminaries as missionaries to the Midwest in the 1830s.<sup>9</sup> In 1825 he called for "the immediate production of an elevated standard of personal holiness throughout the universal church—such a standard . . . as God requires, and the present exigencies of the world demand." With Finney, Edward Beecher believed that on the creation of this standard depended all hopes for the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth.<sup>10</sup>

The ethical seriousness of the New Divinity equaled that of the Methodists on the one hand, or the Unitarians on the other. The title of the first of the four articles Taylor published indicated its content: "The Absolute Necessity of the Divine Influence for Holiness of Heart and Life." The second article began with refreshing directness:

The promised agency of the Holy Spirit, for the conversion of sinners and the sanctification of saints, is the rock of safety to the church, and the hope to the world. All preaching and prayer which dispenses with the necessity of this divine influence . . . tends to drive revivals of religion, and religion itself, from the earth.

This divine influence, however, Taylor went on to say, "never violates the great laws of moral action or contravenes the freedom of the subject." It does not leave the human being "the mere creature of passive impressions or a machine operated upon by compulsory force."<sup>11</sup> As such radical moralism became the central expression of evangelical piety, Boston's Unitarians could no longer claim a monopoly on ethical concern. In the years 1834 and 1835 their most honored leader, William Ellery Channing, brought to a climax his series of twelve sermons on *The Perfect Life*, which closely paralleled the radical ethics of

the New Divinity. In each, he insisted that absolute personal righteousness, attained by obedience to the commands of Jesus and by the imitation of his character, was the only standard of Christian virtue and the only assurance of everlasting life.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, the year 1835 was crucial in the history of the movement to free the slaves. Lewis Tappan assisted William Lloyd Garrison in outmaneuvering Arthur and two other Tappan brothers, both Unitarians living in Boston, who wanted to moderate the abolitionist crusade for a moment in search of broader popular support. Arthur then joined Lewis in financing an immense expansion of abolitionist propaganda through four monthly journals, scheduled so that one appeared in each week. They flooded the country in the twelve months following July, 1835, with a million pieces of abolitionist literature. The antislavery movement, having mounted this radical and public challenge to the South, never again could unite moderate Christians in a genteel moral consensus.<sup>13</sup>

That year also, Garrison embraced radically perfectionist piety as the only means of motivating the nation to free the slaves, liberate women, renounce warfare, and substitute love for force in the administration of justice. A company of able scholars have recently underlined the essentially evangelical commitments that governed the abolitionist crusade, not only in its earliest years, but during and after the year 1835, when Garrison began to advocate a platform of "universal reform." He aimed to overthrow "the empire of sin" by an agitation whose only weapons were truth and love.<sup>14</sup> Aileen Krador has shown that biblical ideas of righteousness dominated his thought until 1843, when he began to question the authority of the Scriptures, and 1845, when he discovered Thomas Paine. That before those dates Garrison's position paralleled that of Finney, Weld, and Orange Scott, is evident from an editorial entitled "Perfec-

tion," which he published in *The Liberator* on October 15, 1841. "Whether this or that individual has attained to the state of 'sinless perfection' " is not the issue, the unsigned editorial began. What matters is "whether human beings, in this life, may and ought to serve God with all their mind and strength, and to love their neighbors as themselves!" Rather than assailing the doctrine "be ye perfect," Garrison continued, believers who were "not wholly clean, not yet entirely reconciled to God, not yet filled with perfect love," should acknowledge that "freedom from sin is a Christian's duty and privilege" and should obey St. Paul's injunction to "put on the whole armor of God."<sup>15</sup>

It is tempting, now, to a Nazarene like myself, to devote the rest of this chapter to Wesleyan aspects of the movement "to reform the nation, and spread scriptural holiness over the land." Since my days in graduate school, when I wrote *Revivalism and Social Reform*, evidence has multiplied to indicate that holiness preaching has been an important catalyst to Methodist participation in movements for social justice, from Francis Asbury's time onward. Philip Bruce, a preacher stationed in Portsmouth, Virginia, wrote Bishop Thomas Coke on March 25, 1788, telling of immense revivals among African slaves as well as among free whites in Isle of Wight County. "Here liberty prevails," he wrote. "The conversion of the poor Blacks gives huge offense to the rich and great. I suppose if they dared, they would tear us in pieces: but through the grace of GOD, we regard them not, and had rather offend one half of the world to save the other, than let them all go quietly to hell together." On one preacher's circuit, in nearby Sussex and Brunswick Counties, Bruce continued, between twelve and fifteen hundred whites and a great number of blacks had been converted; and a friend had informed him that at the February court in Sussex, Methodists had filed deeds of manumission setting free more than one hundred slaves.<sup>16</sup> By the 1830s, Wesley's followers in New England had

established a reputation of commitment to the popular side in such political issues as universal white manhood suffrage, workingmen's rights, and a tax-supported system of free public schools. They generally endorsed the crusade for total abstinence sooner than others, in response not only to Wesley's influence, but to the cries of their American Indian converts and the free blacks and working-class whites in northern cities, who insisted that liquor was a tragic curse for their people.<sup>17</sup> And at the end of the century, Norris Magnuson has shown, such Wesleyan organizations as the Salvation Army and the Door of Hope Mission learned from the poor they served the necessity for a moral reconstitution of those social and legal structures that allowed exploitation of the indigent. Evangelicals of many persuasions, including Methodist William Arthur, author of the famous holiness tract *The Tongue of Fire*, came by the same route to a similar conclusion during the 1850s.<sup>18</sup>

But on the American scene, at least, the denominational approach is myopic, as indeed I find it to be, to some extent, in Bernard Semmel's study of what he calls *The Methodist Revolution* in England. I have briefly examined the reports of Moravian missionaries in Antigua in the years between 1800 and 1833, and have compared them with those of the Methodists, who were equally effective on that island. I find little difference between the efforts of the two missions to liberate black people from the molds in which their African past and their American enslavement had imprisoned them. An immensely detailed plan of personal interviews and moral instruction for individual converts kept Moravian missionaries busy from dawn to dark of every day. True, they scorned the preaching of academic theology, being convinced that to tell the simple story of the cross of Jesus was the surest way to awaken the hearts and minds of the Africans. Once awakened, however, the converts found that biblical teachings about purity, honesty, unselfishness,

loyalty to marital bonds, and a forgiving spirit—in short, the life of holiness—defined the character of a Moravian, despite what Methodists complained (and Semmel argues) was the antinomian character of the Moravian doctrine of justification.<sup>19</sup>

The same is true for the home-missionary movement that swept American Congregationalism in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Whether at Yale College or along the advancing frontier of Yankee settlement in New York, Pennsylvania, and the upper Midwest, revivalists and home missionaries whose doctrines were still cast in Calvinist language displayed the same purpose as the Methodists: to produce, through a free response to the gracious truth of the gospel, the sanctification of disorganized and demoralized persons.<sup>20</sup> The rising expectations of the millennium, which both home and overseas missions inspired, did not initially glorify nationalism or westward expansion, but demanded repentance. The millennial vision seems to have been at least as ecumenical as Wesley's and Coke's view of the world parish. Those who shared it proclaimed the judgment of God upon all laws, governments, and social institutions, whether in the United States or elsewhere, that stood in the way of hope for a just and holy future for all humankind.<sup>21</sup>

Spokesmen for the New Divinity were never able to see, or at least to admit, what their critics readily perceived—their adoption of many Methodist doctrines.<sup>22</sup> In the same year—1835—when the columns of Nathaniel Taylor's *Christian Spectator* made the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit the central issue in New England theology, Taylor published an attack on Wesley's doctrine of the witness of the Spirit, which represented the founder of Methodism as teaching that a subjective and personal revelation from God, rather than a transformed ethical life, attested one's conversion. Nathan Bangs remonstrated, but Taylor stuck to his charge. Methodists were only partially dismayed to

hear themselves denounced by Congregationalism's greatest intellectual leader for not making personal holiness the only assurance of saving grace.<sup>23</sup>

For these reasons, then, the story of Charles G. Finney and how, in the crucible of Oberlin's social activism, he forged a theology of liberation in which the Arminianized Calvinism of the New Divinity was the chief element, and his doctrine of "perfect sanctification" through the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the catalyst, seems to me to illuminate best the history of radical Christian social thought in nineteenth-century America. Among "new school" Congregationalists and Presbyterians generally, the notion of Christian perfection was radically new and therefore almost impossible to associate with a traditional order. Methodists, however, tended to link that doctrine as much with loyalty to their Wesleyan past as with concern for a revolutionary future. Some of them preached and wrote about Christian holiness without any reference at all to the social crisis of the 1830's, for which their message was newly relevant. Any such antiquarian or individualistic views were not possible for preachers whose roots lay in New England Calvinism. At Oberlin especially, the interaction of theological reflection and spiritual experience with revolutionary ideology and political action was evident in all parties, especially in the evangelist whom Arthur Tappan had made a professor of theology, Charles G. Finney.

Finney had consented, after some initial reluctance, to accept the appointment at Oberlin because he had become convinced that the church could not save the nation unless its members found a way to translate the doctrine of sanctification into concrete experience. He had carried his evangelistic crusade from western New York to Philadelphia, to New York City, Providence, and Boston; and then had become pastor of Arthur Tappan's circle of revivalist and antislavery radicals in New York City. There, however,

the institutionalized evil evident in urban culture, the optimism with which, in preceding years, he had anticipated the early onset of the millennium, was harder to sustain. Reform crusades—even one mounted to liberate "fallen women"—encountered withering opposition, some from less aggressive "new school" Calvinists. In the invitation to Oberlin, Finney saw an opportunity to train a company of leaders who would make the idea of Christian holiness the center of a renewed campaign to subject American society to the rule of Christ.<sup>24</sup> In agreement with the Tappans, Garrison, Beecher, and Weld, he thought the times demanded a widespread raising of public consciousness that the old order was in crisis and that justice and love were destined to prevail in the new. Equally necessary was a believable plan for socializing the dispositions of individuals. Oberlin College could supply a trained corps of revivalists, ready to declare judgment upon all institutions that ran counter to the law of God and to affirm the dawn of a new day; but only the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit could transform both them and the Christian public into God's instruments so that the dawn might become a reality.<sup>25</sup>

Finney's role, as he conceived it, was not to agitate for particular reforms so much as to provide spiritual inspiration and a Christian ideology for them all. When Arthur Tappan guaranteed that the Oberlin faculty and students would be free from the interference of trustees or other outsiders, and then guaranteed not only Finney's salary but whatever might become necessary to maintain the solvency of the school, the evangelist agreed to plant himself for half of each year at what he thought were the two arenas where America's moral destiny would be decided—New York City and the upper Midwest. The Oberlin venture did not in any sense, therefore, isolate him from the main currents of American social idealism. Rather, the college and community furnished him with a laboratory of both spirituality

and radical social action, in which the idea of Christian perfection soon reigned supreme.<sup>26</sup>

Both Finney and Mahan left behind autobiographies, written in their later years, which recounted, with some improvement from hindsight, the events at Oberlin between 1835 and 1840. Far from fitting the image of a backwoods evangelist, Mahan was a moral philosopher of great sophistication. His textbook, asserting an absolute standard of righteousness and directly challenging the increasingly popular utilitarian views of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, was the second most widely used in the standard course taught by college presidents to their senior classes in nineteenth-century America. Both Mahan and Finney, moreover, were very astute students of the English Bible; their study aimed not only at understanding theology but at cultivating their own spiritual life. They freely acknowledged that during Oberlin's first five years a deep hunger for the highest personal achievements of piety and righteousness was their primary motivation. Mahan wrote that though he had been an effective evangelist and had preached often at Methodist camp meetings, he found in St. Paul's writings evidence of a personal relationship with Christ that he did not know and for which he continually prayed.<sup>27</sup> Never, since Luther and Wesley, had theology and experience been so closely intertwined.

In September 1836, in the middle of the revival with which the college opened its second year, a student asked whether there were biblical grounds for Christians to anticipate a relationship with Christ that would enable them to live without committing sins that produced guilt and condemnation—in short, to live a morally sanctified life. President Mahan answered passionately, "Yes," though acknowledging he had not yet attained such a relationship. During that evening and the following day, however, he broke through to what he saw as the way to the experience of Christian perfection: faith in Christ's atone-

ment. "When I thought of my guilt, and the need of justification," he recalled, "I had looked at Christ exclusively, as I ought to have done; for sanctification, on the other hand, to overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil, I had depended mainly on my own resolution."<sup>28</sup>

The next evening he preached to the revival congregation on the text "The love of Christ constraineth us," declaring that both from Scripture and from his own experience, "We are to be sanctified by faith, just as we are justified by faith." Although he did not use the phrase "baptism of the Holy Spirit" in the sermon, as he remembered having done when he wrote his autobiography more than thirty years later, the version of the sermon that appeared in print in 1839 declared that "the appropriate office of the Holy Spirit" is to reveal the love of Christ so powerfully that it will enable Christians to consecrate themselves fully to him.<sup>29</sup> Later, in a thoughtful discourse entitled "The Divine Teacher," Mahan explained that the Holy Spirit "enlightens the intellect, and carries on the work of sanctification in the heart," presenting Christ to our minds "in such a manner, that we are transformed into His image" and freed from forlorn reliance upon "our own natural powers as moral agents."<sup>30</sup>

Finney was not present that second evening and probably did not yet approve Mahan's decisive turn toward the idea that a "second crisis" of Christian experience was necessary for a life of sanctity. But he began immediately what proved to be a three-year process of working his way through the teachings of the Bible concerning the covenant of holiness. As always, it was necessary that his head precede his heart. That fall and winter, which proved to be his last in New York City, Finney included in the second series of his *Lectures to Professing Christians* one entitled "Sanctification by Faith," two on the subject of "Christian Perfection," another declaring "Love is the Whole of Religion," and a

final one titled "Rest of the Saints." This last lecture defined faith as "yielding up all our powers and interests to Christ, in confidence, to be led, and sanctified, and saved by Him." All these lectures had as their starting point the general outlines of the New Divinity.<sup>31</sup>

In the fall of 1838, when ill health prevented his spending the winter traveling in evangelistic work, Finney undertook to deliver a series of lectures on Christian perfection and published them in *The Oberlin Evangelist*, the faculty's new organ of religious and social reformation. In a letter to readers printed with the third lecture, he explained that in the years before 1835, he had been wholly and, he believed in retrospect, wisely committed to revival preaching aimed at securing the conversion of sinners. During his years in New York City, however, he became "fully convinced, that converts would die" and "that revivals would become more and more superficial, and finally cease, unless something effectual was done to elevate the standard of holiness in the church." He subsequently realized that he had known Christ "almost exclusively as an atoning and justifying Savior," but not as a sanctifying one. In the last two or three years, he continued,

I have felt as strongly and unequivocally pressed by the Spirit of God to labor for the sanctification of the Church, as I once did for the conversion of sinners. . . . God has been continually dealing with me in mercy. . . . How often I have longed to unburden myself, and pour out my whole heart to the dear souls, that were converted in those powerful revivals.

Through these lectures, then, he hoped to correct the deficiencies of his earlier ministry.<sup>32</sup>

The suggestion some scholars have made, following William McLoughlin, that such high-blown spirituality indicated a turning away from the movement to reform society, will not fit the facts. The years of 1839 and 1840

were vintage ones for Christian revolutionary ideology at Oberlin. Finney's *Skeletons of a Course of Theological Lectures*, published in the latter year, included several on human government in which he declared that

when one form of government fails to meet any longer the necessities of the people, it is the duty of the people to revolutionize. . . . In such cases it is vain to oppose revolution; for in some way the benevolence of God will bring it about. . . . God always allows His children as much liberty as they are prepared to enjoy.<sup>33</sup>

Finney claimed, in a passage cut from his *Memoirs* before their publication in 1876, that he led the faculty in resistance to racism. He reported that when students from the South questioned the propriety of eating at the same tables with black students, the faculty adopted his proposal that separate tables be set up where any who did not wish to eat with the blacks might take their meals; the historic arrangements thus being reversed, the separate tables remained empty.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, the lectures on sanctification themselves contained a radical attack on prevailing legal standards of business ethics and left little room for the profit motive.<sup>35</sup>

When in 1839, the Ohio legislature adopted a statute which seemed to extend the jurisdiction of Kentucky law over fugitive slaves to all of Ohio, Finney introduced a resolution at the next meeting of the Ohio Anti-slavery Society declaring the statute "a palpable violation of the Constitution of this state, and of the United States, of the common law and of the law of God," and announced that it was "a well-settled principle of both common and constitutional law that no human legislation can annul or set aside the law or authority of God."<sup>36</sup> At the commencement exercises in September 1839, Jonathan Blanchard presented his famous address, "A Perfect State of Society," to the Oberlin Society of Inquiry. More than a thousand

persons attended a meeting of the Lorain County Anti-slavery Society on commencement evening, denounced "the disgraceful 'Black laws' of Ohio," and resolved that the membership would "not support any man for the legislature" who did not favor the repeal of all Ohio laws "founded on a distinction of color."<sup>31</sup> The announcement of these events in the *Evangelist* accompanied a stirring account of schools for the children of fugitive slaves, which Oberlin graduates were maintaining in Canada, and a denunciation of the "blood-thirsty and land-coveting whites" of Florida who had waged a three-year war against the Seminole Indians and now were resisting the Indians' permanent settlement in the southern part of that state because runaway slaves would find protection among them.<sup>32</sup>

The development of Finney's doctrine of Christian perfection, then, reflected and reinforced his own revolutionary interest, and that of the Oberlin community generally, in reforming society. The lectures of 1838 and 1839, which we shall examine in a moment, demonstrate the essentially religious basis of this concern and help to explain why Oberlin's political radicalism won such widespread attention: It was rooted in the central theme of Old and New Testament Scriptures. The God of eternity had bound himself in covenant with those who would be his people, making them morally responsible to him and to one another in helping his kingdom come, as Jesus put it, and his will to be done on earth as it was in heaven. Unlike John Wesley, Finney drew deeply upon Moses and the prophets and upon the long tradition of Puritan, or covenant, theology. Moreover, his starting point in New Testament studies was not Moravian pietism, but Samuel Hopkins' distillation of the ethical teachings of Jesus and Paul into the law of disinterested benevolence—Wesley's "perfect love." When Finney discovered, apparently from his own study of the English Bible, the logical and historical links

between the covenant and promise in the Old Testament, and that of Jesus' covenant in the New—the promise of his continuing presence through the sanctifying comforter, the Holy Spirit—the circle was complete. He then proclaimed, as Wesley refused to authorize his preachers to say, that the entire sanctification of the believer's moral will is achieved through the baptism of the Holy Spirit. That proclamation did not reduce, but in fact radicalized, Christian concerns for social justice, for it offered to Calvinist, Pietist, and Arminian alike a way of repossessing the doctrine of the sovereignty of God over individuals as well as over the structures of society.

The result, Finney recognized, was a radical reshaping of what he called the "science of theology." Like other branches of knowledge, he declared, theology must be open to "new truth" and ministers of the gospel should cast aside the fear of changing their opinions about the teachings of the Scriptures.

I was to a wonderful extent blind to my profound ignorance of the word of God, till about three years past. Since that time I have been able to read it with a degree of astonishment in respect to my former ignorance which I cannot express. . . . I pray the Lord to deliver me, and to deliver the ministry, from the absurd prejudice that chains them and the Church to a set of stereotyped opinions on all religious subjects.<sup>33</sup>

Finney began the lectures, then, with one which, based on a text from the fifth chapter of I John, equated eternal life with the present experience of sanctity, rather than with a future experience of blessedness. True faith, he said, is "receiving Christ as indwelling Savior," who becomes "*the eternal life of the soul.*" God's presence does not alter human nature, but enables the Christian to begin a life of complete obedience.<sup>40</sup> The second lecture, based on Jesus' response to those who asked him, What shall we do? insisted that



Calvinists and Arminians alike were attempting to produce faith by obedience, despite God's directive that holiness flows from "faith which works by love." Finney declared that in his earlier *Lectures on Revivals* he had erred in not showing "that the exercise of faith is the first thing to be done." The key element in that faith, he wrote, is "the consent of the heart or will" to the truth of God's faithful love, as "perceived by the intellect." Trust stems from "confidence in the character of God."<sup>41</sup> The third in this trilogy on hope, faith, and love was titled "Devotion," which Finney defined with characteristic concreteness as "that state of the will in which the mind is swallowed up in God, as the object of supreme affection." In such a life of devotedness, "We not only live and move *in* God, but *for* God." He renounced the tendency to separate devotion from duty, including faithfulness in the ordinary duties of business life. And he rebuked those who forget that "devotion belongs to the will," not to the "ever-varying states of emotion," which some "are prone to call religion."<sup>42</sup>

For the fourth in the series, Finney revised one of his earlier *Lectures to Professing Christians* entitled "True and False Religion," based on Galatians 5:1. True religion, he said, is the opposite of slavery: It is genuine liberty permitting one to act out of love. "The true Christian never yields to the will of God by constraint" but is drawn and persuaded, engaged and committed by joyous awareness that "infinite wisdom and love" make Christ the soul's "supreme, eternal choice."<sup>43</sup> Slavery consists of being obliged to choose between two evils. The slaves in the American South were not, strictly speaking, in a state of involuntary servitude, he said, for they "prefer being as they are, to being in a worse condition—to being imprisoned or whipped for attempting to escape." Though the religion of many persons is analagous to such slavery, he said, true faith brings genuine liberty.<sup>44</sup>

Finney then turned to two lectures on the law of God. Its demands were wholly fulfilled, he said, following the commands of both Moses and Jesus, to love God with all your heart, soul, and mind, and to love your neighbor as yourself. Drawing upon but expanding Samuel Hopkins' idea of disinterested benevolence, he made a crucial distinction between loving oneself as an act of benevolence, and mere self-indulgence. Even more important, however, was Finney's explanation that by "love of the heart" he did not mean simply an emotional attachment.

By the heart I mean the will. Emotions, or what are generally termed feelings, are often involuntary states of mind . . . and of course do not govern the conduct. Love, in the form of an emotion, may exist in opposition to the will. . . . [Since] the will controls the conduct, it is, therefore, of course, the love of the heart or will that God requires.<sup>45</sup>

The second talk on divine law set forth the doctrine that behind the American Constitution stood a higher law—disinterested benevolence, or pure love—which Hopkins had declared was defined by the nature of God and the sum of human duty.

In the light of this law [Finney wrote] how perfectly obvious is it, that slavery is from hell. Is it possible that we are to be told that slavery is a divine institution? What! Such a barefaced, shameless, and palpable violation of the law of God authorized by God himself? And even religious teachers, gravely contending that *the Bible sanctions this hell-begotten system?* "Oh shame where is thy blush?" What! Make a man a slave—set aside his moral agency—treat him as a mere piece of property . . . and then contend that this is in keeping with the law of God?<sup>46</sup>

The two lectures came to a climax, characteristically, in a concrete application of the law of radical love to the ethics of conducting business. Every violation of the rule of disinterested benevolence, or perfect love, "is fraud and

injustice," not only toward God but "toward every individual in the universe." To transact business merely upon the "principles of commercial justice" that are upheld by courts of law is "rebellion against God"; in a Christian, such behavior is "real apostasy," for which restitution must be made in all cases possible, "or there is no forgiveness." Fiercely denouncing on this ground not only slaveholders and merchants who priced goods beyond their real value, but speculators in western lands, Finney declared that such offenders must "give back their illgotten gains" or suffer damnation. He then outlined the proper Christian attitude toward wealth in terms that differed from John Wesley's popular formula, "Gain/save/give all you can." "The law of love," he said, "requires that we should afford everything as cheap as we can, instead of getting as much as we can. The requirement is that we do all the good we can do to others, and not that we get all we can ourselves. The law of God is, sell as cheap as you can—the business maxim, as dear as you can." Not content to leave the matter there, Finney added a third lecture titled "Glorifying God," which defined holiness as faith in practice, decried the love of money, and praised simplicity of life, particularly in clothing and food; then it returned grandly, to link the idea of holiness to the first question of the Westminster catechism.<sup>47</sup>

The eighth lecture, on "True and False Peace," followed a letter to readers of the *Evangelist*, which had revealed that Finney's doctrine of "sin in believers" was very close to Wesley's, as was his appeal to converts to have faith in Christ, the sanctifying Savior. The lecture itself dealt with the psychic dimension of choice. When conscience and will unite in holy commitment to God, peace is complete. But to yield one's will to conscience or to persuasion, without a deep conviction that God is trustworthy—that is, without a motive rooted in the assurance of his love—is to paper over cracks in the wall.<sup>48</sup>

By late April, both Finney's lectures and his accompanying letters revealed the results of his deepening personal quest for biblical understanding. The scriptural promise of a renewed covenant of grace, taken from the prophecy of Jeremiah as well as from the Epistle to the Hebrews, laid a basis in logic for the subject that preoccupied him in the succeeding months—the work of the Holy Spirit. And his dawning awareness that the Christian needs divine help beyond the mere illumination of the intellect was evident in his thoroughly Wesleyan exposition of chapters 7 and 8 of the Epistle to the Romans.<sup>49</sup>

Five lectures on "The Promises," printed from May through the middle of July, bore the fruits of his study of the old and new covenants. "We never keep the commandments, only as we take hold of the promises," Finney began. "By this I mean that grace alone enables us, from the heart, to obey the commandments of God." In a vastly complex recitation of Old Testament promises that "belong emphatically to the Christian church," with special emphasis on God's pledge recorded in Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36, to put a "new heart" within his people—passages that he quoted at length three or four times in the first lecture—Finney burst through to an assertion that holiness consists in partaking of the divine moral nature. This did not mean that God had promised "to change our constitution—to destroy our personal identity—and make our spiritual existence identical" with his. Rather, Christians were invited to become "partakers of the moral nature, or attributes or perfections of God," which are "by the Spirit, through the promises, begotten in our minds." This assertion, though couched in the language of God's moral government, was staggering to anyone not teethered on the apostle Paul. It clearly made the work of the Holy Spirit central to the new covenant. And that covenant, Finney now saw, was not the promise itself or an "outward precept" or "any outward thing whatever, but

an inward holiness brought about by the Spirit of God—the very substance and spirit of the law written in the heart by the Holy Ghost.”<sup>50</sup>

This study of the promises inspired Finney’s decisive turn to the language of Pentecost in order to expound the covenant of grace. On further examination of the Scriptures, he concluded that “the blessing of Abraham,” which Paul wrote had “come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ,” was not simply Christ himself, but the Holy Spirit. The promises of the Spirit’s coming formed “one unbroken chain from Abraham to Christ,” completed when the risen Lord pledged to his disciples that they should be baptized with the Spirit. Finney declared that Christians must receive this “blessing of Abraham” which, though it begins in “perception of the truth,” is complete only when their wills are yielded to “the guidance, instruction, influences, and government of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>51</sup> It was now clear to him, he said, that Christ and the apostles regarded the day of Pentecost “as the commencement of a new dispensation,” in which the old covenant was set aside only in the sense that it was fulfilled in the new.<sup>52</sup>

In this rich context of scriptural and covenant theology, Finney finally was able to declare the doctrine of sanctification through the baptism of the Holy Spirit. “Every individual Christian may receive and is bound to receive this gift of the Holy Ghost at the present moment,” he proclaimed. Christians who have been born again do not have that gift “in such a sense as it is promised in these passages of the Holy Scripture, or in a higher sense than [the Spirit] was received by the Old Testament saints, . . . of whom it was said that ‘they all died in the faith, not having received the promise.’”<sup>53</sup>

In 1840, Finney’s “Letters to Ministers of the Gospel” urged them to preach earnestly the doctrine he had so recently come to understand himself. They should spare no

pains to help new converts realize their need of the experience of entire sanctification. He acknowledged again that his instruction to converts had in former times “been very defective,” for he had not seen clearly “that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is a thing universally promised . . . to Christians under this dispensation, and that this blessing is to be sought and received after conversion.” Baptism in the Holy Spirit “is the secret of the stability of Christian character,” he declared; new converts need “to be baptized into the very death of Christ, and by this baptism to be slain, and buried, and planted, and crucified, and raised to a life of holiness in Christ.”<sup>54</sup>

Throughout all their lectures and letters of those years, Finney and Mahan consistently declared that the only assurance that God was accomplishing his purpose in human lives was ethical: the righteousness that showed itself in radical rejection of all sin, whether individual or structural, through faith in Jesus Christ. Again and again, they and other members of the Oberlin faculty rang the changes on this theme, renouncing what they alleged to be the antinomianism of the Oneida “perfectionists” on one hand and, on the other, the unwillingness of conservative Calvinists to trust the promises of God.<sup>55</sup>

Here was a theology cradled in experience and nurtured in the Scriptures, just as Wesley’s had been. And the experience was that of persons ready to organize their lives around the pursuit of a right relationship with God, attested to by just and loving relationships with their fellow human beings and by a holy war on the corrupt structures of society. The immediate background, however, was that of the revitalized Calvinist ethics of Samuel Hopkins, rather than the Anglican moralism that had launched Wesley on his quest or the pietism that had enabled him, at a crucial juncture, to see that he could realize that quest only through trust in Christ. The social context, moreover, was that of the

optimism of a new nation, where hopes were blossoming for a social order hallowed by divine grace and hence characterized by justice and love.

Finney's earlier preaching had so stressed the freedom of human beings and their responsibility to repent and make new lives, as to allow the charge that he ignored the role of God's grace in sanctification. Now, however, he was affirming that divine grace, poured out in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, was indispensable to the sanctification both of persons and of the institutions of society. Individual Christians must receive that divine gift by a faith so reasonable and a consecration so deliberate as to leave their moral responsibility fully intact to help build a righteous society and a holy character. Never a Pelagian, I think Finney had found a way to reclaim the doctrine of God's sovereignty without becoming a Calvinist, either. He had discovered in Scripture, he believed, a pentecostal version of covenant theology, which brought within reach the evangelical unity that Wesley and Whitefield had pursued but never were able to grasp. Rooting the experience of the baptism of the Spirit in the Old Testament covenant of holiness also insulated it against the anti-intellectual and mystical corruptions that Wesley had feared and that, alas, forgetting Finney, twentieth-century Pentecostals often seem to have embraced.

In conclusion, my commitment to open communication prompts me to try to say plainly what I conceive a theology of liberation requires, when grounded in the religion of Moses and Jesus and addressed to the circumstances of humanity's present varied enslavements.

It demands first an awakening among the oppressors and the oppressed of a consciousness of the presence of the eternal God in history and therefore of the continuing truthfulness, both within and outside history, of the

commandment to love him with all our hearts and minds and to love our fellow human beings as, by his grace, we are rightly enabled to respect ourselves.

Second, it requires a full commitment—of which we are entirely capable by the power inherent in the story of Jesus, as it is proclaimed in the Gospels—to follow his example, the only model we have of the holy person. As dying and risen Lord, he gives himself in holiness that we might be sanctified in the truth and that we might, in that continuing gift of sanctity, rejoice also for his ready forgiveness of the daily imperfections and the frequent folly of our efforts to follow him.

Finally, a Christian theology of liberation anticipates that only in the power of the Holy Spirit, as a strength but not as a substitute for our responsible choice and action, can we do what is true—that is, be both loving and just. Only in this way can Christians sustain that continuing revolution in persons and institutions that the church is called to foment, in order that Christ's kingdom might come and his will might be done, both in and beyond this present world.

What the Scriptures, Old and New, say with authority to those who will make this trinity of holy commitments, is that love, defined in God's own mighty acts as loyalty—as faithfulness in covenanted relationships—offers both prophetic judgment and redemptive healing to the human community. This principle of faithful love is intensely personal, insistently social, and never static. It stands at the center of biblical revelation and unfailingly emerges at the apex of humane aspirations in every age and in every cultural setting. Jesus made it the touchstone of his strategy to overpower the structures of racism, male chauvinism, and economic oppression, which were the major strongholds of injustice in his time, as in ours. His pacifism, like that of his modern follower Martin Luther King, was no idyllic or sentimental escape from pain and

violence, for it brought down violence upon his own head and upon the leaders of the early church. The Christian *shalom*, the peace through grace which he breathed upon his hurting and angry disciples on the evening of Easter day and into their lives on the morning of Pentecost, sustained a passionately realistic strategy. He offers it to us in preference to the violent options that have been available to deal with inequality, jealousy, anger, and shame, since the first encounter of the sons of Adam, just east of Eden.

Being free and responsible, then, the Christian community is to expect no blueprint for the new society from the hands of God, but is to rejoice in the use of our common intelligence to deal with social realities as we find them. In this freedom that God has bestowed, I believe we are called to improvise creatively the structures of custom and of law that seem to us to promise fulfillment, in our times and places, of the covenants and promises of a holy community. There are many forms and acts that may embody beauty, purity, and love, and hence many ways to build a life and to reconstruct a society. Our heavenly Father, who rejoiced in his own works, rejoices also in ours. His government, as any proper Arminian should realize, is a moral one, and its chief glory is the moral response his faithfulness inspires in those who willingly participate in it.

That the moral freedom of the Christian community, like that of the Christian individual, is always constrained within the bonds of social and psychic reality on the one hand and, on the other, by the authority of the truth that is revealed in Jesus and, fragmentarily, in our own consciences, creates the tension that makes acts of liberation and social reform so complete a challenge to Christian intelligence. Freedom without constraint would bore us; its expression would require no exercise of mind or will. For from our mothers' arms, the constraints have given our freedom its meaning and value.<sup>56</sup>

Finney's doctrine of freedom under grace, and the Wesleyan and Puritan sources from which it drew much of its biblical basis, sustained just such a theology of liberation, I think. It united human wills with God's will, in free and loving choice.

evaluation of Wesley's economic position, see *Economic Ethics*, pp. 111-12. In commenting on Wesley's economic views, J. A. Faulkner, *Wesley as Sociologist, Theologian, Churchman* (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1918) says, "It only touches the surface of a condition that needed severer remedies—remedies that none in England then proposed and few now propose" (p. 12).

45. H. E. Luccock and Paul Hutchinson, *The Story of Methodism* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1925) note that Wesley "saw the evils, and he made Methodism the kind of religious movement which expressed its sanctification by its devotion to the removal of those evils" (p. 210).

#### Chapter 6. Timothy L. Smith

1. Documentation for this, as for other points in this essay where the work is cited, appear in Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957), pp. 105, 116-17.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 181, 184-85. Cf. Donald Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), pp. 73-85; Donald G. Mathews, "Orange Scott: The Methodist Evangelist as Revolutionary," *The Antislavery Vanguard: New Essays on the Abolitionists*, ed. Martin Duberman (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965), pp. 71-101.
3. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Lewis Tappan and the Evangelical War Against Slavery* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve Press, 1969), pp. 129-30.
4. Smith, *Revivalism*, pp. 104-5, 108-13; Dayton, *Evangelical Heritage*, pp. 15-24, 35-43.
5. Wyatt-Brown, *Tappan*, p. 131.
6. Charles G. Finney, *Lectures to Professing Christians* (New York: John S. Taylor, 1837), nos. 17, 19, 20. This work has appeared in many subsequent editions.
7. George M. Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), pp. 59-87; Nathaniel W. Taylor, "The Revolution in the Presbyterian Church," *The Quarterly Christian Spectator*, vol. 9 (December 1837), pp. 597-646, a little-noticed article in which Taylor equated New School doctrine with the New England Theology and raised the slavery issue (p. 629); Smith, *Revivalism*, pp. 26-27, 185-87.
8. Taylor, "Revolution," *Christian Spectator* (December 1837), pp. 599, 604-17. Sidney E. Mead, *Nathaniel William Taylor, 1786-1858: A Connecticut Liberal* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), underplays the perfectionist ethics in Taylor's theology.
9. Robert Merideth, *The Politics of the Universe: Edward Beecher, Abolition, and Orthodoxy* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1968), pp. 73-84.

10. Edward Beecher, "The Nature, Importance, and Means of Eminent Holiness Throughout the Church," *The American National Preacher: Or Original Sermons—Monthly*, vol. 10 (June and July 1835), pp. 193-94, 197, 203. Merideth, *Politics of the Universe*, pp. 91-101, shows the relationship of these sermons to Beecher's friendship and alliance with abolitionist Elijah P. Lovejoy, from 1834 to Lovejoy's death at the hands of a mob in October, 1837.
11. These articles in *The Christian Spectator*, vol. 7, appeared unsigned, as did all the others of which I presume Taylor to be the author: "Man's Dependence on the Grace of God, for Holiness of Heart and Life" (March 1835), pp. 76-89; "The Nature and Application of Divine Influence in the Salvation of Man" (June 1835), pp. 301-21; "An Inquiry into the True Way of Preaching on Ability," pp. 223-57; "The Scriptural View of Divine Influence" (December 1835), pp. 591-97, in which the discussion of the work of the Holy Spirit (pp. 595-97) seems to me to lay down the basis in logic for Charles G. Finney's later use of the terminology "baptism of the Holy Ghost."
12. William Ellery Channing, *The Perfect Life, in Twelve Discourses* (Boston: Roberts, 1873). I have recently discovered that the "Dr. C." to whom Charles G. Finney refers in his *Memoirs* (New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1876), pp. 356-57, is identified in the manuscript version (Oberlin College Archives) as William Ellery Channing.
13. Wyatt-Brown, *Tappan*, p. 131.
14. Aileen S. Kraditor, *Means and Ends in American Abolitionism: Garrison and His Critics in Strategy and Tactics, 1834-1850* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1967), pp. 59, 79-82.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91. Cf. pp. 24-25, showing Garrison's agreement with the New Divinity and hence, with Finney and Mahan, on the nature of depravity and of free will, a context for Garrison's thought of which Kraditor is largely unaware.
16. Philip Bruce, "An Extract of a Letter . . . to Bishop Coke, dated Portsmouth, Virginia, March 25, 1788," *The Arminian Magazine* [American], vol. 2 (November 1790), pp. 563-64, came to my attention through my student, Thomas C. Johnsen. Cf. the idea of sanctification as liberation from sin through love, "the inward law of the gospel, the law of the Spirit of life," in a sermon by "Dr. Cutworth," vol. 1 (September 1789), pp. 444-45.
17. George Claude Baker, *An Introduction to the History of Early New England Methodism, 1789-1839* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1941), pp. 37-38, 45-82; Smith, *Revivalism*, pp. 154-59, 169-72, 184-85; letter from James B. Finley, Dayton, Ohio, December 3, 1819, to the editor, *The Methodist Magazine*, vol. 3 (January 1820), pp. 34-40, quoting statements by Indian chiefs praising the liberating power of the "good Spirit" from addiction to whisky; "State Legislation on The Temperance Question," *The A. M. E. Christian Recorder* (August 17, 1854), p. 70.
18. Norris Magnuson, *Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work,*

- 1865-1920 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1977), pp. 165-78 and generally, pp. 101-2, 117, 124-26, 140-42; Smith, *Revivalism*, pp. 148-77; William Arthur, *The Tongue of Fire; or, The True Power of Christianity* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1880), pp. 52-57, 110-32, 145-46.
19. Accounts of British Methodist overseas missions in *The [American] Methodist Magazine*, vol. 1 (1819), pp. 30-36, 193-200, 313-19, and *passim*, do not refer at all to the doctrine of sanctification, though the journal shows Methodists in the United States were continually interested in the subject. For the Moravians, see their American journal, *The United Brethren Missionary Intelligencer and Religious Miscellany . . .*, vol. 2 (First Quarter 1825), pp. 9-10. Cf. *Periodical Accounts Relating to the Missions of the Church of the United Brethren*, vol. 1 (1790), pp. 7-15.
  20. Robert T. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 27-35; Thomas H. Skinner, review of *Thoughts on Evangelizing the World*, *The Christian Spectator*, vol. 9 (June 1837), pp. 291-295; "Encouragement to Effort, for the Speedy Conversion of the World," *CS*, 7 (March 1835), pp. 1-8.
  21. Garth M. Rosell, "The Millennial Roots of Early Nineteenth-Century Reform: An Examination of Charles G. Finney's Theology of Social Action" (paper presented to the Hopkins-Harwichport Seminar in American Religious History, 1975).
  22. Typical of many others is Asa Rand's description of Lyman Beecher's New Divinity as resembling "in its prominent features and bearing Wesleyanism," a "strange mingling of evangelical doctrine with Arminian speculation, . . . tending to produce spurious conversions," *The Baptist Weekly Journal of the Mississippi Valley* (August 9, 1833).
  23. "Wesleyan Methodism on the 'Witness of the Spirit,'" *Christian Spectator*, vol. 9 (June 1837), pp. 176-82 and *passim*, and W.M.B., "Letter to the Christian Spectator on the Witness of the Spirit," *Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review*, vol. 8 (October 1837), pp. 457-76, review the controversy.
  24. Wyatt-Brown, *Tappan*, pp. 65-70, 129-31, 138-41.
  25. *Ibid.*, pp. 109-14, 121-28; Kraditor, *Means and Ends*, pp. 22-25, 78-81; Finney, *Memoirs*, pp. 333-43.
  26. William G. McLoughlin, *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham* (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1959), pp. 108-113, misunderstands Finney's choice of role as that of pietistic withdrawal from social action, an interpretation which the events at Oberlin, described hereafter, do not sustain. Cf. Dayton, *Evangelical Heritage*, pp. 15-24.
  27. Edward H. Madden, *Civil Disobedience and Moral Law in Nineteenth-Century American Philosophy* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968), pp. 44-45 and *passim*. Cf. D. H. Meyer, *The Instructed Conscience: The Shaping of the American National Ethic* (Philadelphia: University

- of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), pp. 89-97, on Mahan as moral philosopher; Finney, *Memoirs*, pp. 340-51; Asa Mahan, *Out of Darkness Into Light . . .* (Boston: The Willard Tract Repository, 1876), pp. 125-31, 133-36.
28. Asa Mahan, *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection*, 4th ed. (Boston: D. S. King, 1840), pp. 185-87.
  29. *Ibid.*, pp. 186-87. Cf. Mahan, *Out of Darkness*, pp. 139-47.
  30. Mahan, *Scripture Doctrine*, pp. 163-93, prints this lecture, which includes the cited personal testimony; the quotation is from p. 172. This volume, printed on a Methodist press in Boston, uses Wesleyan terms such as "perfect love" and "entire sanctification" freely.
  31. Finney, *Memoirs*, p. 340; Finney, *Lectures to Christians*, p. 213.
  32. Charles G. Finney, "Letters to Readers," *The Oberlin Evangelist* (hereafter cited as *OE*), vol. 1 (January 30, 1839).
  33. Finney, *Skeletons of a Course of Theological Lectures*, vol. 1 (Oberlin: James Steele, 1840), p. 24.
  34. Finney, manuscript of *Memoirs*, Oberlin College Archives. Garth Rosell called my attention to this passage.
  35. *OE*, 1 (March 14, 1839), p. 51; (March 27, 1839), p. 57.
  36. Dayton, *Evangelical Heritage*, p. 47.
  37. *OE*, 1 (September 11, 1839), p. 157.
  38. *Ibid.*
  39. *OE*, 2 (April 22, 1840), pp. 67-68.
  40. *OE*, 1 (January 1, 1839), pp. 9-10.
  41. *OE*, 1 (January 16, 1839), pp. 18-19.
  42. *OE*, 1 (January 30, 1839), pp. 26-27.
  43. *OE*, 1 (February 13, 1839), p. 34.
  44. *Ibid.*
  45. *OE*, 1 (February 27, 1839), p. 41.
  46. *OE*, 1 (March 13, 1839), p. 50.
  47. *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51; *OE*, 1 (March 27, 1839), pp. 59-60.
  48. *OE*, 1 (April 10, 1839), pp. 49, 65-67.
  49. *OE*, 1 (April 24, 1839), pp. 74-75; (June 19, 1839), pp. 106. Cf. Mahan, *Scripture Doctrine*, pp. 52-58, 101-3, on Romans 7 and 8; Cutworth's sermon, *Arminian Magazine*, pp. 429, 444, 446, on the "law of the Spirit of life" in Romans 8.
  50. *OE*, 1 (May 22, 1839), pp. 89, 90; (June 5, 1839), p. 97; (June 19, 1839), p. 106 for the quotation; for the other two lectures, the issues for July 3 and July 17.
  51. *OE*, 1 (August 14 1839), pp. 137-38. Cf. Finney's letter "To Ministers of the Gospel of all Denominations," *OE*, 2 (June 3, 1840), p. 92, also using the terminology "baptism of the Holy Ghost" freely. The two references thus bracket the writing of the summary lectures, published in Charles G. Finney, *Views of Sanctification* (Oberlin, Ohio: James Steele, 1840), in which the term does not appear, but in which Finney explains his preference for "entire sanctification" over "entire consecration," on both biblical and practical grounds (pp. 194-95).
  52. *OE*, 1 (August 28, 1839), p. 147.

53. *OE*, 1 (August 14, 1839), p. 138.
54. *OE*, 2 (May 6, 1840), p. 76. Cf. the letters in the same series in the two succeeding issues: (May 20, 1840), p. 84; (June 3, 1840), p. 92. Finney composed these letters shortly after completing the last seven lectures in the series on Christian perfection, printed in *OE* from January through mid-April, 1840, and in July of the same year, in his *Views of Sanctification*. These concluding lectures recapitulated the logic of the earliest ones in the series and do not employ the terminology of Pentecost, which led scholars (including myself), who previously relied chiefly on that volume and neglected to read the *Evangelist* carefully, to suppose that Finney did not at this state teach the doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.
55. *OE*, 1 (August 14, 1839), p. 140.
56. I am instructed on this point by Joseph H. Smith, "The Psychoanalytic Understanding of Human Freedom: Freedom From and Freedom For," *The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, vol. 26 (1978), pp. 87-107.

#### Chapter 7. Donald W. Dayton

1. *Newsweek* (October 25, 1976).
2. George Gallup, Jr., "US in Early Stages of Religious Revival?" *Journal of Current Social Issues*, vol. 14 (Spring 1977), pp. 50-55.
3. Dean Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches are Growing* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).
4. Ralph Winter, review of several recent books on evangelicalism, *Christianity Today* (April 9, 1976), p. 38.
5. Heinrich Bornkamm thus explicates *The Heart of Reformation Faith* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).
6. Ian Bradley, *The Call to Seriousness* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1976), p. 22.
7. For this concept, cf. Winthrop Hudson, "The Methodist Age in America," *Methodist History*, vol. 12 (April 1974), pp. 3-15; C. C. Goen, "The 'Methodist Age' in American Church History," *Religion in Life*, vol. 34 (1964-65), pp. 562-72.
8. David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, *The Evangelicals* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), reissued in paperback (Grand Rapids: Baker, Book House, 1977) with a new chapter on the holiness/pentecostal traditions—added in part in response to criticisms of the book by Timothy Smith and myself.
9. Martin Marty, *The New Shape of American Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1959), p. 28.
10. Cf. James E. Hamilton, "Academic Orthodoxy and the Arminianizing of American Theology," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, vol. 9 (Spring 1974), pp. 52-59.
11. Smith, *Revivalism*.
12. Claude Welch, *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), p. 201.

13. Robert Whalen, "Millenarianism and Millennialism in America, 1790-1880" (Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1972).
14. See his various writings on the subject, but especially Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).
15. Cf. especially the pioneering work of Smith, *Revivalism and Called Unto Holiness* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962); Melvin Dieter, "Revivalism and Holiness" (Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1973); and the work of Charles Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974) and *A Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974).
16. Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 5.
17. See for example, Ronald Nash, *The New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963).
18. Richard Quebedeaux, *Young Evangelicals* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).
19. Howard Lindsell, *Battle for the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976).
20. Dayton, *Evangelical Heritage*.
21. Carl Henry, *Uneasy Conscience* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1947).
22. Cf. John Oliver, "A Failure of Evangelical Conscience," *The Post American*, vol. 4 (May 1975), pp. 26-30.
23. Roger Anstey, *The Atlantic Slave Trade and British Abolition, 1760-1810* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1975).
24. Anne C. Loveland, "Evangelicalism and 'Immediate Emancipation' in American Antislavery Thought," *Journal of Southern History*, vol. 32 (May 1966).
25. John L. Hammond, "Revival Religion and Anti-Slavery Politics," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 39 (April 1974).
26. Cf. Luther Lee, "Women's Right to Preach the Gospel," *Five Sermons and a Tract by Luther Lee*, ed. and intro. Donald W. Dayton (Chicago: Holrad House, 1975).
27. B. T. Roberts, *Ordaining Women* (Rochester, N.Y.: Earnest Christian Publishing House, 1891).
28. Seth Cook Rees, *The Ideal Pentecostal Church* (Cincinnati: Martin Wells Knapp at the Revivalist Office, 1897), p. 41.
29. Mrs. J. Fowler Willing, "Women and the Pentecost," *Guide to Holiness*, vol. 68 (January 1898), p. 21.

#### Chapter 8. Nancy A. Hardesty

1. Robert F. Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Epworth Press, 1945), p. 223.