



THE SPRINGFIELDER

October 1975
Volume 39, Number 4

Pentecostalism in Historical Perspective

C. GEORGE FRY

UNLESS I AM MISTAKEN, it was the late Karl Barth who first coined the term "Culture-Protestantism."¹ By that expression Barth meant a kind of Christianity which "was as fundamentally oriented to this-worldly culture as Luther himself had been to a transcendent Christ."² Such "Culture-Protestantism," in the words of James Hastings Nichols, Professor of Modern European Church History, Princeton, "confused Christian faith with or closely related it to social, political, philosophical, and ethical programs."³ But perhaps it was the American moralist, H. Richard Niebuhr, who gave us the classic English-language description of this phenomenon:

In every culture to which the Gospel comes there are men who hail Jesus as the Messiah of their society, the fulfillment of its hopes and aspirations, the perfecter of its true faith, the source of its holiest spirit.⁴

When Professor Niebuhr wrote those words more than a generation ago, he had Protestant Liberalism in mind. Certainly Liberalism was the most dangerous accommodation of Orthodoxy to the cultural-ethos of the Western world at that time. Since then, however, a new manifestation of "Culture-Protestantism" has appeared. It goes by many different names. Sometimes its adherents call themselves "Pneumatics" or "Charismatics." Their adversaries identify them as *Schwaermer*, "Enthusiasts," "Spiritualists," or "Neo-Montanists." These labels are inspired by the claim of the advocates of this faith to have received "the Second Blessing," or "Fire Baptism," or "the gift of the Holy Ghost."

At its inception it was known as the Holiness Movement. Today it is widely recognized under the name "Pentecostalism."⁵ This movement, in spite of superficial differences from Liberalism, exhibits those features Dr. Niebuhr identified as characteristic of "Culture-Religion." For that reason I am persuaded that Professor Niebuhr's insight can be applied with great effectiveness to this most recent expression of "Culture Christianity."

When that is done, I am convinced that it becomes evident that Liberalism and Pentecostalism are in fact fraternal twins. Pentecostalism has arisen out of precisely those conditions that produced Liberalism. The two movements are derived from the same sources, made of identical stuff, promoted by a common skepticism, permeated by a pervasive humanism, dominated by an inescapable naturalism, saturated with materialism, and they both result in a perversion of the Gospel.

That is why it is an illusion to regard Pentecostalism as the very antithesis of Liberalism. This is as pernicious and absurd as suggesting that the cure for poliomyelitis is paralysis. More of the same is seldom a solution for a terminal illness! The medicine cannot be

the same as the sickness if recovery is the goal. The truth of the matter is that Liberalism and Pentecostalism have much more in common than in opposition. Their areas of essential convergence far outnumber the ones of superficial divergence.

This insight came to me slowly. The essential unity of Liberalism and Pentecostalism occurred to me rather gradually. But it was forced upon me by facts, facts of experience, the convincing sociological data of recent decades.

SOCIOLOGICAL DATA

When we survey the recent sociological scene, two strange developments force themselves on our attention:

1. We have the amazing development that Liberals seek the fellowship of Pentecostals.

Few would deny that Dr. Henry Pitney Van Dusen, long president of Union Theological Seminary, New York, was one of America's leading liberal Churchmen. In 1958 in a popular American periodical Dr. Van Dusen predicted that Pentecostalism was "a third arm of Christendom destined to stand alongside Catholicism and Protestantism."⁶ A few years later, in another context, Professor Van Dusen described his first visit to a Pentecostal Assembly as follows:

I felt rather at home. In spite of the vast differences—and they were certainly vast—I felt at home. I felt that I was stepping back in time to a primitive but very vital Christian experience. I do believe that Peter and Barnabas and Paul would find themselves more at home in a good Pentecostal service than in the formalized and ritualized worship of most of our modern churches.⁷

At first glance it seems almost incomprehensible that such a prominent Liberal leader could give such a glowing testimonial to the benefits of Pentecostalism. Either Dr. Van Dusen was unique, or else he had revealed some kind of important connection between the two movements.

Van Dusen was not unique. Dr. James I. McCord, for many years president of Princeton Theological Seminary, in a semi-modalistic statement, confessed that

Ours must become the Age of the Spirit, or God active in the world, shaking and shattering all our forms and structures, and bringing forth responses consonant with the Gospel and the world's needs.⁸

Or again, Mr. John L. Sherrill, writer for Norman Vincent Peale's *Guideposts* magazine, son of the late Professor Lewis J. Sherrill of Union Theological Seminary, and member of the Episcopal Church, has written his spiritual autobiography, an odyssey that includes both Liberalism and Pentecostalism as compatible parts of a unified faith.⁹ Or again, the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of world Anglicanism, who perhaps could best be characterized as a Liberal-Evangelical, said earlier this year in an interview that

... if you are to have a truly ecumenical movement, there must be three strands in it, not two. Not only the Catholic, not only the Evangelical, but also the real stratum of the New Testament which could broadly be called charismatic.¹⁰

His Grace attributed his understanding of Pentecostalism to Leslie Newbigin, a Presbyterian bishop in Anglican orders serving a union church composed of Protestants as varied as Baptists and Episcopalians. Both these prelates, who could properly be said to live in the mainstream of Liberal ecumenism, believe that Pentecostalism "has brought a certain joy and liberty which is certainly lacking in the two main other divisions" of Christianity.¹¹

Perhaps the most persuasive testimony is that of the late Dr. Paul Tillich, long one of the most articulate spokesmen of Protestant Liberalism. Though Professor Tillich died in 1965, before Pentecostalism had fully surfaced in mainline Protestantism, he expressed himself at length on this subject. In a lecture to his students on Montanism Dr. Tillich lamented the exclusion of that movement from Catholic Christianity. Tillich felt that this rejection resulted in a four-fold loss:

(1) The canon was victorious against the possibility of new revelations . . . (2) The traditional hierarchy was confirmed against the prophetic spirit. . . (3) Eschatology became less significant than it had been in the apostolic age. . . (4) The strict discipline of the Montanists was lost, giving way to a growing laxity in the church.¹²

Strange as it may sound, I suspect that if Professor Tillich had lived into the 1970's, he would have been a prime candidate for conversion to the Charismatic Movement. How he would have reconciled his errant sexuality with Pentecostal piety, I do not know. This theology, however, would have been highly compatible with Pentecostalism. This Liberal theologian was candid enough to confess that he found in the ancient Montanists his natural allies. For Modernists and Montanists share three common "enemies"—the binding authority of the Scriptures, the regular teaching ministry of the Churches, and a view of Christian history that stressed continuity rather than catastrophe.

Liberalism appears harmonious with Pentecostalism.

2. We have the amazing development, furthermore, that Pentecostals seek the fellowship of Liberals.

Many Charismatics have confessed that fraternity with Liberals is possible and desirable. For example, David du Plessis, a prominent South African Pentecostal, felt that he had received a message from the Lord which told him to go to "the very headquarters of the most liberal, the most intellectual, the most ecumenically minded of modernists."¹³ For du Plessis that could only mean the World Council of Churches. Arriving there, he found himself warmly welcomed as a long-lost brother by the ecumenical bureaucrats, who

... not only listened, they made notes as he talked, they

picked up phones and read the notes to others, they paid attention.

It was the beginning. . . . One theologian would call another and introduce him. He was shunted from college to university to seminary.¹¹

Perhaps this explains why many Pentecostal Churches have had no problem in seeking and accepting membership in the World Council of Churches. It also sheds light on the mobility of many Pentecostals between denominations and indicates how a Kathryn Kuhlman, modern-day Montanist prophetess, can fellowship with liberal Catholics and why Oral Roberts, charismatic faith-healer, can migrate with little sense of confusion from "down home" in Oklahoma Pentecostalism to the middle class respectability of Methodism and network television.

Now that the harmony of Liberalism with Pentecostalism is evident, I think I can make it less puzzling by sharing a quotation ascribed to General Hans von Seeckt of the German Army. Secret military provisions of the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 made possible collaboration between the Weimar Republic and the Soviet Union. When this Prussian aristocrat, an arch-monarchist, was asked how he could in good conscience cooperate with Russian commissars, all dedicated Bolsheviks, he is said to have replied with the following illustration. From his desk he took a metal meter stick, bent it, and remarked, "Ends are never far apart. See, they easily meet. But neither can ever touch center."¹⁵ What he meant was that both monarchism and Communism were pledged to autocracy, not democracy. In our context, I propose that Liberalism and Pentecostalism are compatible because they stand in staunch opposition to Orthodoxy. This hostility is inevitable because they share certain theological conceptions derived from their host-culture. These notions place them outside the living center of Biblical Christianity.

This convergence of Liberalism and Pentecostalism is evident in three areas, for they both (1) have a distorted view of history, (2) repudiate the method and message of Orthodox theology, and (3) reject the authority of Scripture.

HISTORICAL DISTORTIONS

Both Liberalism and Pentecostalism share certain misconceptions about history. This is suggested by a basic inconsistency they possess—they profess to be both modern and ancient simultaneously.

Liberalism emphasized its novelty. Washington Gladden called his beliefs a *Present Day Theology*.¹⁶ Other Liberals spoke of the "new theology," suitable for a civilization that had produced the "New Freedom," the "New Nationalism," the "New Deal," the "New Frontier," the "new Woman," the "new immigrant," the "New South," the "New West," the "new American," the "new generation," and the hourly radio "news." In the 1920's Liberals boasted of being "Modernists," in the 1930's of being "Progressive," in the 1940's of being "Realists," in the 1950's of being "Existentialists" with the *New Orthodoxy* (really the *newest* Heterodoxy), in the 1960's of being

"Radicals," and in the 1970's of being "Secularists." The recurring basic vocabulary included the words "new," "now," "relevant," "contemporary," "current," "modern," and "recent." These are the indispensable trade terms for any Right Reverend Richard Relevant.

Pentecostalism also prides itself on being very *au courant*. Perhaps not all Charismatics are as brazen as the Reverend Leroy Jenkins, Central Ohio evangelist-entrepreneur, who recently received nation-wide publicity because of a Flip Wilson comedy-parody of his church on prime television time. Brother Leroy sued the Black comedian because he did not appreciate allegedly derogatory references to the name of his establishment, the "Holy Hill Cathedral of the Church of What's Happening Now." Other Pneumatics are more modest in their nomenclature. Most, however, would agree that Pentecostalism is the most modern possible expression of the Christian religion. This is because the Chrismatic Gospel is designed for the last days. These are the "end times." Professor G. Ernest Wright articulated their belief when he wrote:

... the consummation of the Kingdom of God is to be marked by a great revival of the charismatic happenings. Both leaders and people will then be Spirit-filled and Spirit-empowered on a scale hitherto unknown.¹⁷

Pentecostalism is persuaded that the outpouring of the Spirit has occurred both as a "sign" of the times as well as the "confirmation" of the faith in this age.

Paradoxically, both Liberalism and Pentecostalism also claim great antiquity. Each movement asserts, in a unique fashion, that it is a restoration of primitive Christianity.

Liberalism believed that it was both necessary and possible by means of "historical reasoning" to pass beyond the accumulated "barnacles of tradition" to arrive at an "accurate" estimation of Jesus. The problem was really quite simple. Somewhere along the line Jesus had gotten "lost" in the Church. It was the task of modern theologians to "save" him. At the start of the century Adolf Harnack assured us that Jesus had been obscured by Greek philosophy. Thirty years later Harry Emerson Fosdick taught us that the real culprit was Calvinist theology. More recently Rudolf Bultmann has told us that the villain was Jewish mythology. While no one was exactly sure when, where, why, or how Jesus disappeared (or even what he would look like when found), all agreed that it was a calamity because "true Christianity" went with him. All were confident, however, that they could find him. The first step was to scuttle all clues that we already possessed! This theology would bypass the Church, with its Creeds, Confessions, Councils, Biblical Canon, and Christ-figure. Orthodoxy had only a "religion *about* Jesus." Somewhere in the early first century was the *real* Master with the "religion *of* Jesus." While Liberals were always rather vague about the content of this message, they were very dogmatic in their insistence that no other theology could possibly be correct.

Pentecostalism accepts the Liberal analysis in full. It concurs in the conviction that there is a serious deficiency in the current procla-

mation of the Church. This is due to the apostasy of Orthodoxy which offers people only a partial and incomplete Gospel. Now, however, we have a rare new opportunity. For the first time in centuries there can be a recovery of primitive Christianity. It is essential that Christians "seize the moment." This novel insight provides the one thing necessary for the Church to survive, thrive, and revive. Acceptance of the "new theology" will cause the Church to have both "modernity" and "antiquity," for it is nothing less than a return to "the old time religion" which is also "the faith of the last days." Such a "leap of faith" will bring certainty, an element of finality said to be lacking in "dead Orthodoxy."

While the diagnosis is identical, the prescription is different. Liberalism appealed to "the historical method," by which it meant a supposed impartial, objective, scientific investigation of data as the way to achieve religious certainty. This would eventually lead to the "real" or "historical" Jesus. Faith would finally rest on fact. Ultimately "historical reasoning" would provide the answer. It did not. So Pentecostalism rests its case on "the psychological moment," by which is meant a radically subjective search for an immediate, emotional, personal revelation from God. This "instant of inspiration" (or "filling with the Spirit") will result in an encounter with Jesus as a "living reality" in the heart, creating a "faith-fact" that the covert now regards as "more sure than anything else on earth."

How can Liberalism and Pentecostalism possess simultaneously both venerable antiquity and ultra-modernity? Only with great difficulty. The price is a basic ambiguity, which results in a four-fold misunderstanding of history:

1. Both movements rest on a refusal to take history seriously. Liberalism and Pentecostalism seek to annihilate time, to deny the reality of two thousand years of Christian history. It is as if they had paid a visit to the "time lab" of Dr. Wonmug and had joined Alley Oop in a rapid journey into the distant past, bypassing all the chronological landmarks along the way. Liberalism called the time-machine "reason," Pentecostalism names it "experience." The difference does not matter, for the result is to revert to a mythological, rather than an historical, mode of thinking.¹⁸

2. Both Liberalism and Pentecostalism deny the possibility of real historical continuity. Because of this they reflect a catastrophic rather than a developmental view of the history of Christianity.

A decade ago John Opie, Jr., attacked this problem in a profound and helpful essay entitled "The Modernity of Fundamentalism."¹⁹ Opie came to the conclusion that both Fundamentalism and Liberalism, in spite of their claims to antiquity, were actually products of Victorian culture. The main reason for their "cultural captivity" was their "tunnel theory" of Church History, which taught that "true Christianity" had gone underground shortly after the death of Jesus, not to surface again until the nineteenth century. Their oblivion to the persistence of the faith through the ages caused both Fundamentalists and Modernists to confuse the folklore of their own era with the living confession of the apostles. This is precisely the plight of Pentecostalism.

3. Without a past, Liberalism and Pentecostalism both become guilty of "presentism," the obsession of a generation with itself. This a kind of "cultural narcissism." Unable to contemplate the Scriptures, deprived of the proper corrective of the past, both Liberalism and Pentecostalism were forced to find within the current moment the stuff from which to build a theology. That meant they idealized themselves and their labors. The result was idolatry, the inevitable impulse of natural man to elevate the penultimate and temporal to the status of the ultimate and eternal. According to the Decalogue, this is the first sin to be confessed and avoided.²⁰

4. Finally, since it is intolerable for sinful man to constantly contemplate himself (perhaps that is part of the essence of hell), an escape must be provided. Denied the Biblical perspective of eternity, deprived of a past, Liberalism and Pentecostalism seek to flee the prison of the present through an obsession with the future. This sickness, so prevalent in our times, has been named "neophilia." According to the book of *Acts* it is a symptom of a pagan society, for the Athenian philosophers

. . . took hold of him [Paul] and brought him to the Areopagus, saying, "May we know what this new teaching is which you present? For you bring some strange things to our ears: we wish to know therefore what these things mean." Now all the Athenians and the foreigners who lived there spent their time in nothing except telling or hearing something new (*Acts* 17:19-21).²¹

Against the "sensationalism" of Pentecostalism and the "novelties" of Liberalism, it is the task of Orthodoxy to proclaim the "Good News" of the Scriptures. Rooted in history, it alone has a sense of futurity valid enough to deliver from futility.

REPUDIATION OF THEOLOGY

This proclamation is necessary because Pentecostalism, like Liberalism, is a repudiation of Orthodox theology. It is obvious that Liberalism, in the words of one historian, "drastically departed from traditional viewpoints."²² The Modernists candidly called for the abandonment of classical Christianity and for a "Reconstruction in Theology." Pentecostalism, however, has been received by many as a restoration of apostolic Christianity. This, however, is far from the case. If anything, it represents an even more serious challenge to the theology of the Church than Liberalism. That becomes evident when one reconsiders the method of Orthodox theology.

According to Professor Theodore G. Tappert there are three formative principles in Orthodox theology—Scripture, reason, and tradition.²³ Scripture is the sole authoritative source and norm; reason is the method, and tradition provides the historical context.

From the genesis of Christianity theologians have worked in this fashion to arrive at doctrinal statements that are Biblically responsible, intellectually sound, emotionally satisfying, consistent with the history of the believing community, and socially significant. Conversely, where there is truth there is error. Light produces shadow.

From the Apostolic Age to the present, Heterodoxy, or Polydoxy, as some prefer to "christen" it, has disdained this theological method and has derived a divergent message. Heresy results when the authority of Scripture is rejected and when the tools of the theologian, Reason and Experience, are forced, in the absence of Revelation and Tradition, to yield a philosophy. Once the Canon has been repudiated and the Confessions ignored, reason and experience can only seek to discover meaning in contemporary culture. This is exactly what has occurred in Liberalism and Pentecostalism. The former prefers reason, the latter experience. Both end in "Culture-Religion," of idolatry.

In the previous section we have seen the manner in which both Liberalism and Pentecostalism repudiate history or Tradition. The next section will analyze their rejection of Scripture. At this point we must consider the "cult of irrationality." The "irrationality" so evident in Pentecostalism has a two-fold history:

1. In part it is the end product of a tradition of antirationalism in Western philosophy. Paradoxically enough, antirationalism is the result of Rationalism itself! The eighteenth century sages who so confidently trusted in reason to lead them to the "heavenly city" had forgotten that, while intellect is a good servant, it is a poor master, that it is only a tool not a truth, a method not a message, that it is a means not an end. Within two generations the grandchildren of the *philosophes* realized that reason alone led only to constant analysis, the dissection of life until only death remained. Literally in bondage to death, they rose in revolt, enthroning "feeling" as god, in a last desperate effort to find life. The list of "irrational revolutionaries" is long, illustrative, and insightful—Nietzsche, Sorel, Bergson, Emerson, Schleiermacher, Rousseau, Whitman, William James, William Blake, D. H. Lawrence, Ernest Hemingway, Soren Kierkegaard, and Sigmund Freud. This is the philosophical seed of Pentecostalism.

2. The cultural ancestry was provided by the legacy of anti-intellectualism in the Anglo-Saxon world. Leonard Wolf stated, "No people ever despised and distrusted the intellect and intellectuals more than the British." But they have been surpassed by their American cousins. Historian Richard Hofstadter, has written the startling story of *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* with penetrating brilliance.²⁵ Here is the social milieu in which Pentecostalism could ferment. Against these modern and national aberrations, Orthodoxy appeals to the Catholic heritage of sanctified reason in the service of Scripture in order to produce *systematic* and *holistic* theology.

A REJECTION OF BIBLICAL AUTHORITY

Both Liberalism and Pentecostalism doubt the authority of the Canon. Liberalism prefers subtraction, Pentecostalism addition to the Word. But the end result is the same, the multiplication of errors. Both movements illustrate the same phenomenon, the manner in which the Modern Church is engaged in a mighty flight away from the Scriptures.

Orthodoxy had affirmed four truths concerning the Bible as the Word of God—that it possess sufficiency (it teaches all that is needed

to know for salvation), efficacy (is produces saving faith), perspicuity (or clarity; a person with normal mental abilities can comprehend it), and authority (it is the only source and standard of doctrine). On those premises Protestantism was founded and flourished.

Doubt concerning these affirmations sprang up in the Enlightenment. After the Rationalists had destroyed the authority of Scripture for the people, they had to put something in its place. The only answer was a Radical Subjectivism. The self became the ultimate authority. Trust was not something "imposed" by an Objective or External Authority, it was something to which the person must be "disposed" by factors within himself.²⁶

By the nineteenth century this "dispositionalist doctrine" was widespread. Robert Borwning, in "Paracelsus," said:

Truth is within ourselves; it takes no rise
From outward things, what'er you may believe.

Soren Kierkegaard wrote, "I do not know the truth except when it becomes part of me."

This radical Subjectivism became a cornerstone of Liberalism. Dr. Vincent Taylor, British Methodist, confessed, "There are no external authorities. Thank God!"²⁷ His countryman, Dr. Raynor Johnson, stated:

I am no prepared to hand over to any other person, though wise and learned, or to any institutions however ancient or sure of its position, my inalienable right to search for ever-growing and ever-expanding truth. I believe the craving for security in belief is one which arises from within ourselves, and can only be met adequately from resources which are within ourselves.²⁸

A third Briton, Dr. Leslie Weatherhead, long the the pastor of London's City Temple, exclaimed: "truth has no authority within me until I perceive it to be true."²⁹

Having centered the locus of authority in the self, not the Scriptures, the Liberals had a second problem. What faculty of the self is the source of truth? On this issue nineteenth century theology polarized. Some Liberals remained loyal to the Rationalism of the Enlightenment, locating truth in the mind. This thorough-going Mentalism reached its logical conclusion in the Idealism of G.F.W. Hegel. Conversely, however, other Liberals repudiated Rationalism and turned to Romanticism. What J. J. Rousseau was for philosophy, they were to theology. Representative of this approach was Friedrich Schleiermacher, who saw *feeling* not *thinking* to be the ultimate authority in religious matters.³⁰

Liberal theology was fascinated with Schleiermacher. A century later, another Berliner, Adolf Harnack, defined Christianity as follows:

It is not a question of a 'doctrine' being handed down by uniform repetition or arbitrarily distorted; it is a question of a *life*, again and again kindled fresh, and now burning with a flame of its own.³¹

Religion is life, life *felt*. Professor Cecil Cadoux put it bluntly, "the final authority is bound to be the inner light."³² John Oman, his compatriot, defined religion as listening "when reality speaks to us."³³ It is but a slight step to saying that religion is speaking when reality is felt in us. For that is exactly how Liberalism is transmuted into Pentecostalism!

For a century Liberalism had preached experience—then Pentecostalism suddenly produced it! No wonder the Liberal and Neo-Orthodox theologians were at a loss when the Pentecostals started talking. How could they condemn the rampant empiricism and subjectivism of Pentecostalism when that is precisely the approach they had previously recommended? Pentecostalism, therefore, is the logical end of Liberalism. It would be very proper, in my opinion, to build a Friedrich Schleiermacher Memorial Pentecostal Church. No one is more deserving of the honor.³⁴

FOOTNOTES

1. The real origins of *Kulturprotestantismus* are to be found in the Enlightenment. For the eighteenth century background of this development see chapters three and four of Karl Barth's *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1973), pp. 80-173.
2. James Hastings Nichols, *History of Christianity, 1650-1950: Secularization of the West* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1956), p. 251.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 290.
4. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1951), p. 83. For a full analysis of "Culture-Religion," see pp. 83-115.
5. For a fuller discussion see "Pentecostalism: A New Kind of Culture-Religion," by C. George Fry in the library of Concordia Theological Seminary.
6. "Christendom's Third Force," *Life* XII (June 6, 1958), p. 36.
7. Quoted by John J. Sherrill, *They Speak With Other Tongues* (Old Tappan, New Jersey: Spire Books, 1974), pp. 29, 30.
8. James I. McCord, "Fall Convocation Address," Princeton Theological Seminary, September 12, 1961.
9. See Sherrill, *They Speak With Other Tongues*.
10. Quoted by David Virtue, "An Interview with the Archbishop of Canterbury," *Christianity Today* XIX (July 18, 1975), p. 5.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought*, edited by Carl H. Braaten (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1968), p. 41.
13. Sherrill, *They Speak With Other Tongues*, p. 56; and David J. du Plessis, *The Spirit Bade Me Go: The Astounding Move of God in the Denominational Churches*, revised edition (Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International, 1970).
14. Sherrill, *They Speak With Other Tongues*, p. 57.
15. Charles Morley, "The Rapallo Treaty," lecture, Department of History, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, August 14, 1963.
16. Washington Gladden, *Present Day Theology*, second edition (Columbus, Ohio: McClelland and Company, 1913).
17. G. Ernest Wright, *The Rule of God* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960), p. 126.
18. Rudolf Bultmann unwittingly confessed the ultimate folly of Liberalism

with his proposal to demythologize the Scriptures. It is surprising that the Liberal method, which professed to be *historical*, could end up with only something *mythological*. Norman Pittinger, in a moment of amazing candor, actually called for the *re*mythologizing of the faith. See *Rethinking the Christian Message* (Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1956).

19. John Opic, Jr., "The Modernity of Fundamentalism," *The Christian Century* LXXXII (May 12, 1965), pp. 608-611.
20. Orthodoxy has a vivid sense of the catholicity or continuity of the faith. The Lutheran Fathers accepted the ancient creeds and councils as well as the Greek and Latin doctors as part of the ongoing exposition of Scripture in the Church. Matthias Flacius in his *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* "mentioned 700 witnesses through every century of the Christian era, even during the height of papal power, who had not 'bowed the knee to Baal' and could be called forerunners of Protestantism. Flacius' list included even Catherine of Siena and Thomas Aquinas." See Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism: A Study of Theological Prolegomena* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970), p. 36.
21. Paul's opinion of this practice is evident from his last letter, that to Timothy, when he identified such an illness inside the Christian Church as a form of heresy. He warned St. Timothy that "the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching, but having itching ears they will accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own likings, and will turn away from listening to the truth and wander into myths" (2 Tim. 4:3,4).
22. Francis P. Weisenburger, *Ordeal of Faith: The Crisis of Church-Going America, 1865-1900* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 184.
23. Theodore G. Tappert, "Orthodoxism, Pietism, and Rationalism, 1580-1830", *The Lutheran Heritage, Volume 2 of Christian Social Responsibility*, edited by Harold C. Letts (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957), p. 43.
24. "G. E. Moore," *Encounter* XII (January, 1959), p. 68.
25. Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963).
26. For a description of "impositional" and "dispositional" religion, see W. T. Stace, *Religion and the Modern Mind* (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1952), pp. 212-247.
27. Vincent Taylor, "Authority and Belief," *Methodist Recorder* XC (October 30, 1952), p. 126.
28. Raynor Johnson, *A Religious Outlook for Modern Man* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1962), p. 36.
29. Leslie Weatherhead, *The Christian Agnostic* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 56.
30. The idea is developed in Friedrich Schleiermacher, *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*, translated from the German by John Oman (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958).
31. Adolf Harnack, *What is Christianity?*, translated from the German by Thomas Bailey Saunders (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957), p. 11.
32. Cecil Cadoux, *Catholicism and Christianity* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928), p. 117.
33. John Oman, *The Natural and the Supernatural* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), p. 101.
34. The suggestion is more fitting than one would at first imagine. Schleiermacher began in Pietistic Moravianism, the same root at Methodism-Holiness Movement-Pentecostalism.