THE VARIETY OF AMERICAN EVANGELICALISM

By Michael Gleghorn

Chapter 1: Introduction

The Variety of American Evangelicalism, edited by Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston, is a collection of essays by various authors dealing with the incredible diversity of theologies, movements, denominations and groups that could potentially be placed under the broad umbrella of "American Evangelicalism." Because of this diversity, note the editors, the fundamental question with which this book will deal is this: "Should we speak of the variety of American evangelicalism, the varieties of American evangelicalism, the varieties of American evangelicalisms, or even of American evangelicalism as a coherent category at all?" (2).

Chapter 2: Premillennialism and the Branches of Evangelicalism

In this essay Timothy Weber explores how premillennialism relates to some of the major segments, or branches, of evangelicalism. He defines a premillennialist as someone who believes "that there will be an earthly reign of Christ which will be preceded by his Second Coming" (6). This view has been present in America, in some form or fashion, "from the beginning of European settlement" (6). Although it suffered some setbacks when William Miller wrongly predicted the date of Christ's Second Coming as October 22, 1844, nevertheless, in its dispensationalist form it experienced something of a revival through the teaching of men like J.N. Darby and C.I. Scofield (8).

So how does premillennialism relate to evangelicalism? According to Weber there are four main branches of evangelicalism which he terms classical, pietistic, fundamentalist, and

progressive (12). *Classical evangelicals* tend to be associated with Lutheran and Reformed churches, while those in the *pietistic* camp tend to be associated with Methodists, Baptists, and Pentecostals. *Fundamentalists* were “shaped by the debates of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy,” while *progressives* were interested in reforming fundamentalism and ridding it of perceived weaknesses (e.g. anti-intellectualism) (12-13). Having made these various distinctions, Weber observes that premillennialism “found relatively little acceptance among classical evangelicals, made significant inroads among pietistic evangelicals, came nearly to dominate fundamentalist evangelicals, and . . . have only marginal support among progressives” (14).

Chapter 3: Fundamentalism and American Evangelicalism

In this essay George Marsden analyzes the complex relationship of fundamentalism and American evangelicalism. According to fundamentalist George Dollar’s definition in *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, “Historic fundamentalism is the literal exposition of all the affirmations and attitudes of the Bible and the militant exposure of all non-Biblical affirmations and attitudes” (24). Marsden draws attention to some of the important implications of this definition for understanding fundamentalism (24-25). In the first place, we see how fundamentalism is distinguished by a kind of *militant* opposition to all unbiblical ideas and attitudes. This militancy is primarily expressed in terms of a *battle* for the Bible. Second, we see that a *literal exposition* of the Bible is the proper way to interpret these writings—at least when such an interpretation is both possible and reasonable. Furthermore, though not explicitly mentioned in Dollar’s definition, Marsden says that we should also bear in mind “the very extensive overlap of dispensationalism and fundamentalism” (27). This is particularly important in Marsden’s view because the early dispensationalists were often inclined toward *separatism* from the major denominations, which in their eyes had often been corrupted by theological liberalism (28).

Such separatism, which was another defining characteristic of many fundamentalists, led to a significant rift in the ranks when Billy Graham, in his 1957 New York crusade, accepted

sponsorship from the city's council of churches. Since this meant that "some of his converts would be guided to liberal churches and denominations," many stricter fundamentalists separated themselves from Graham's ministry (30). Those who continued to support Graham, such as Carl Henry and Harold Ockenga, wanted "to distance themselves from fundamentalist extremes" (30). This group referred to themselves as "evangelicals" or "new evangelicals". It wasn't long, however, before these "new evangelicals" were also divided amongst themselves, this time over the issue of biblical inerrancy. "Progressives thought inerrancy too narrow a way to define biblical authority; more fundamentalistic neo-evangelicals insisted on inerrancy as a test of faith" (30).

So should fundamentalists be viewed as a sub-group within evangelicalism, or should they rather be seen as distinct from evangelicals? Although in one sense the two groups can be seen as distinct, especially considering how sharply fundamentalists and neo-evangelicals "dissociated themselves from each other" after WWII, nevertheless, in Marsden's view, "if we look at the broader picture since the eighteenth century, these are two very closely related subtypes within the larger evangelical movement. The wars between them have been so fierce precisely because they are particularly close relatives within an extended family" (33).

Chapter 4: The Limits of Evangelicalism: The Pentecostal Tradition

In this chapter Donald Dayton attempts "to describe the theological vision of pentecostalism and to compare it with that of evangelicalism" (37). Although many interpreters of pentecostalism have focused on its most distinguishing feature (i.e. glossolalia, or "speaking in tongues"), Dayton contends that such an approach is too limited (37). In his view, not only does this inhibit "the fullest understanding of the movement," it "also precludes critical evaluation of its most distinctive claims" (38). In order to get at the heart of this movement, Dayton suggests adopting the "four fundamental teachings," proposed by the modern Assemblies of God theologian Stanley Horton, as the basis of his theological and historical analysis (41).

These “four fundamental teachings” include “salvation, healing, the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and the second coming of Christ” (41).

To cite just one example of how these teachings function within Pentecostal theology, consider the issue of healing. Pentecostals observe that Jesus performed many miracles of healing during his earthly ministry. They also note that such miracles “were part of the post-Pentecost experience of the early church.” Because of this, they claim, we can be sure that the power of the Holy Spirit can also “manifest itself in our own day in miracles of divine healing, at least in the lives of those who truly have experienced the pentecostal baptism and know to look for such blessings” (44).

So how are we to think about pentecostalism? Is it a subcategory of evangelicalism or a distinct theological alternative? In Dayton’s view, it all depends on what “paradigm” we use in describing the nature of evangelicalism. For example, he claims that Bernard Ramm, in *The Evangelical Heritage,* adopts “a sort of ‘Presbyterian’ paradigm for understanding the nature of evangelicalism” (50). In Dayton’s view, it’s very difficult “to see pentecostalism as a subcategory of . . . evangelicalism” so long as we adopt this paradigm (50). But Dayton says that Ramm’s views are almost entirely incorrect and wrong-headed. He thinks that evangelicalism is better illuminated by what he calls the “classical” paradigm. This paradigm sees the roots of evangelicalism in pietism, Puritanism, revivalism, and the two Great Awakenings (48). If we conceive of evangelicalism in terms of this “classical” paradigm, Dayton suggests, then pentecostalism is indeed “a subcategory of evangelicalism” (51).

Chapter 5: Adventism

Writing about the Seventh-day Adventist movement, Russell Staples begins by observing that “it grew out of the Millerite movement” (57). In the midst of many social and political changes in the early 19th century, many Americans turned to a study of biblical prophecy to shed light on all that was happening. One of these people was William Miller (58). Through a detailed study of prophecy, Miller eventually calculated that the day of Christ’s

Second Coming would be October 22, 1844 (59). Naturally, as the date drew near, excitement among the early Millerites reached fever pitch (59). But when Christ failed to return as expected, the movement was devastated, referring to this event as the Great Disappointment (60). As one might expect, some Millerites left the movement, but others continued to await Christ's soon return, assuming that the calculations may have simply been off by a few years (60). "The Seventh-day Adventist Church arose out of one of the smaller segments of the Millerites" (60).

According to Staples, Adventists have a high regard for the Bible, believing it to be the inspired and authoritative word of God. They do not, however, affirm the doctrine of biblical inerrancy (62). Their view "of doctrines relating to the Fall and sin and salvation constitute a thoroughgoing evangelical Arminianism" (63). However, Adventists are also committed to a number of distinctive doctrinal positions which tend to set them apart from evangelicals. Such views include "conditional immortality, seventh-day Sabbatarianism . . . acceptance of the gift of prophecy in the ministry of Ellen White, and teachings about the priestly work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary" (65). Of particular interest to many non-Adventists is the prominent place given to the writings of Ellen White (1827-1915). Although Staples insists that Adventists do not derive their doctrines from the teachings of White, he nonetheless admits that she has had a profound influence on the movement's life and thought (66). Thus, while Adventists and evangelicals share much in common (e.g. a high regard for Scripture, missionary zeal, etc.), there are also enough differences to make one cautious about identifying Adventism as just another sub-group within evangelicalism (68-9).

Chapter 6: The Theological Identity of the North American Holiness Movement: Its Understanding of the Nature and Role of the Bible

Paul Merritt Bassett begins this chapter by claiming that while "most holiness people do identify with American evangelicalism," nevertheless, they have "a history and spirituality that finally make impossible . . . any essential synonymity" (72). Central to the identity of the holiness movement is the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification. As Bassett explains it,

entire sanctification is a "divine cleansing from the tendency to sin willfully, a gifting with unconditional love to God and neighbor, and an empowerment for doing the will of God" (73-4). It is a gift of God's grace, "given instantaneously and received by faith, of which the expression is unreserved consecration or surrender to the will of God" (74).

So how do holiness advocates understand the nature and role of the Bible? And how do their views differ from those of evangelicals? According to Bassett, Wesley's view of Scripture (which holiness advocates embrace) was derived from a very close reading of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion in the Church of England, especially article 6 on "The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation" (77-8). Reflecting on this article, Wesley came to believe that "the Bible is authoritative because it is sufficient for salvation" (78). Particularly important in this regard, Wesley thought, was the inner witness of the Holy Spirit. "In fact, Wesley doubted that the letter of Scripture has positive value apart from the operations of the Spirit" (82).

Although Wesley's thought has been crucially important for those in the holiness movement, nevertheless, at the close of WWI, "holiness people began to call for full-scale theologies done by their own scholars" (90). According to Bassett, the "clearest and most complete exposition of the theology of the holiness movement was that of H. Orton Wiley" (91). And Wiley's doctrine of Scripture is essentially the same as Wesley's (92-4). For this reason, says Bassett, the holiness movement really represents "an alternative way of being Christian" from that of evangelicals (94).

Chapter 7: Are Restorationists Evangelicals?

In this chapter Richard Hughes seeks to answer the question, "Are restorationists evangelicals?" He begins his inquiry by observing that "both Protestant evangelicals and Protestant restorationists ultimately descend from the sixteenth-century Reformation" (109). Luther is cited as an example of one holding to the *reformatio* sentiment, whereas Zwingli is representative of the *restitutio* ideal (110). Hughes distinguishes these two perspectives as

follows: *reformatio* "*points fundamentally to any biblically-informed Christian orientation wherein the believer relies on the power of God rather than on one's self." Restitutio*, on the other hand, "*depends on human potential and the ability to discern and implement the ancient Christian traditions, and often results in postures of profound self-reliance"* (111). According to these definitions, then, the question Hughes is interested in is this: are restorationists (i.e. those embracing the *restitutio* model) evangelicals?

In order to answer this question, Hughes turns to his own denomination, the Church of Christ, as an example of a group who embodied an almost purely *restitutio* perspective throughout the period of 1870-1950 (113). He first goes back to the early second-generation leader of the movement, Alexander Campbell. Deeply influenced by Scottish Common Sense Realism (or "Baconianism"), Campbell was impressed "by the ability of natural facts to bring consensus in the realm of natural science." In light of this, he "surmised that an emphasis on biblical 'facts' would likewise bring union among Christians" (115). He went so far as to urge that Christians should only preach and teach these "Bible facts" with "Bible words" (115). Although Campbell himself "often insisted that mere intellectual assent to 'gospel facts' is not saving faith," his followers were often not so careful (116). As Hughes observes, the Churches of Christ would often later emphasize "that the gospel consisted simply of 'facts to be believed, commands to be obeyed, and promises to be enjoyed.'" (117). Indeed, he argues that between the years 1870-1950 members of the Churches of Christ would have explicitly repudiated the evangelical label—many of them going so far as to even deny the doctrine of justification by faith alone (119, 123).

Thankfully, movement in an evangelical direction did eventually come to these Churches. Through the work of men like K.C. Moser, Thomas Olbricht, and others, the Churches of Christ, especially since about 1960, have increasingly stood within the spectrum of evangelical theology (128). According to Hughes, "many pulpits in this heritage increasingly proclaim the traditional evangelical message of justification by grace through faith" (128). So while the previous emphasis of these Churches on *restitutio* tended to lead them *away* from

evangelical theology, many of them have since come around to adopting the more evangelical *reformatio* perspective.

Chapter 8: Black Religion and the Question of Evangelical Identity

In this essay Milton Sernett explores the history of the relationship between blacks and the broader evangelical community. As one might well imagine, given the history of blacks in America, “black theology” is primarily concerned with the issue of “full liberation, both spiritually and politically” (135). Many African-American pastors and theologians have drawn the parallel between the slavery of God’s people in Egypt (and their subsequent deliverance) and that of Africans in America. As Absalom Jones, “this country’s first ordained black Episcopal priest,” proclaimed in 1808: “The deliverance of the children of Israel from their bondage, is not the only instance, in which it has pleased God to appear in behalf of oppressed and distressed nations” (136).

As Sernett notes, most of the early African American Christians identified themselves as Baptist and Methodist (138). They were attracted to the vision of a God of love, who cared for them and who had sent His Son to die for them—just as He had for white people (139). Over time, they “used the egalitarian impulse of evangelicalism to affirm their psychological ‘somebodiness’ in the midst of a hostile environment, and to assess the failures of whites to practice the egalitarian ethic” (140). After the Civil War, they began forming their own institutions, “separate and apart from the white power structure” (141). Their churches “became the single most important vehicle for the exercise of an independent social and cultural life” (141).

In the twentieth-century, black churches tended to be theologically conservative. Nevertheless, they largely avoided “the twentieth-century controversy of fundamentalists versus modernists” (142). While embracing the Bible’s authority for faith and practice, they have generally not developed “rigid doctrines of inerrancy” (142). Although they would hold many things in common with the broader evangelical community, Sernett observes that they have often

been ignored by that community (143). Partly for this reason, the National Black Evangelical Association (NBEA) was founded in 1963, "as an umbrella organization for black evangelicals dissatisfied with the predominantly white National Association of Evangelicals" (143-44). Thus, Sernett concludes his essay by observing that evangelical theology and ethics "must meet on the common ground of equality and justice if the evangelical identity is to bridge racially discrete Christian communions" (145).

Chapter 9: Baptists and Evangelicals

In this chapter Eric Ohlmann takes a brief look at Baptists and other evangelicals. Although his analysis reveals a few differences, it primarily shows substantial overlap in the theology, convictions, and actions of both groups.

Ohlmann begins by pointing out a few things about Baptists, both theologically and sociologically, that provide a context for deeper understanding. "Theologically," he says, "Baptists have drawn heavily upon seventeenth-century Puritanism" (149). Sociologically (and historically) the most important thing to understand about Baptists is "their status as dissenters and sectarians" (149). Within this theological and sociological context, Baptists developed the following convictions and values: "a strong aspiration toward spiritual and ethical ideals, a strong conviction of personal responsibility for the Christian life, an emphasis on religious experience, deep concern for religious freedom, and an emphasis on biblical authority" (149).

Ohlmann next turns to a discussion of evangelicals. He shows that, like their Baptist counterparts, evangelicals also aspire toward spiritual and ethical ideals, emphasize personal responsibility and the importance of religious experience, and have a high regard for the inspiration and authority of the Bible (155-58). Only on the matter of promoting and defending the importance of religious liberty have evangelicals often lagged a bit behind their Baptist brethren (157). But even here, "they usually have had an affinity for it" (158). In light of this, it is hardly surprising that Ohlmann concludes his essay by noting that the similarities between Baptists and other evangelicals certainly exceed their differences (159).

Chapter 10: Pietism: Theology in Service of Living Toward God

In this chapter, John Weborg critically engages the theology and practices of American evangelicalism from the perspective of classical Lutheran pietism (161). Broadly speaking, pietism focuses on living one's life in a manner that is pleasing to the Lord (161). It arose as a reaction against a highly intellectualized and systematized form of theology. As Weborg observes, "When theology is done in this fashion, it cannot help but be highly polemical" (162). And such early pietists as Philip Jakob Spener were troubled by the fact that such theology so infrequently led to a fervent love of God and neighbor (163). Moreover, it often failed to inspire a "ministry of 'jealousy-making.'" That is, it rarely led those outside the church to be jealous of the lives of Christians (166).

So what does Weborg have to say about evangelicalism? He contrasts the views of pietists with those of evangelicals on three different issues: Scripture, conversion, and revivals (175). Regarding Scripture, he notes that pietists (unlike evangelicals) have been a bit wary of the doctrine of inerrancy (176). In his view, making inerrancy a key issue tends to "make epistemology a part of the evangel to merge the formal and the material principles of the Reformation, namely, the roles of authority and redemption" (176). And this, Weborg thinks, is a mistake. Concerning conversion and revivalism, pietism cautions that on *overemphasis* on conversion as a moment of decision and on revivals as the products of human causation detract from the sovereignty of God's gracious initiative and make of salvation a merely "human, all too human" affair (178-79).

Chapter 11: Evangelicalism: A Mennonite Critique

In this essay Norman Kraus offers a rather trenchant critique of evangelicalism from a Mennonite perspective. Before offering his critique, Kraus draws our attention to a number of ways in which evangelicalism has different priorities and values than the Mennonite community. For one thing, whereas Anabaptist-Mennonites come from a long tradition of prophetic witness against social injustice, evangelicals have done comparatively little along these lines (189-90).

Secondly, Kraus contends that at "the heart of anabaptism . . . is a new hermeneutical approach to Scripture and a confessional approach to witness" (190). He contrasts this with "the apologetic and polemic approach of American evangelicals in communicating the Christian message" (190). In his view, this reduces faith to a merely "intellectual assent to doctrines about God and Jesus" (190). Finally, he says, the two movements have radically different visions of the church (191). Whereas evangelicals view the "goal of the church" as "the spiritual renewal of the nation," the Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition sees such a goal as dangerously prone to the worst aspects of worldliness and unthinking nationalism (192). In particular, it easily leads to conflict with two of the central doctrines of the Mennonites: *nonconformity* and *nonresistance.* Nonconformity is that aspect of discipleship which deals with a rejection of worldliness and the world's institutions (among which Kraus numbers the evangelical churches!). Nonresistance is "biblical pacificism," the rejection of war and violence. Here, Kraus perceptively argues that American evangelicals often naively identify "national values with the Christian gospel" and often conflate the nation's military causes with the cause of God (194).

In the concluding section of his essay, Kraus offers a "critique" of evangelicalism (196). Here he keys in on four things that have undercut the effectiveness of evangelicalism "as a genuine renewal movement" (197). We've already discussed the first of these weaknesses, namely, evangelicalism's espousal of nationalism and the American military establishment (197). The second weakness Kraus mentions is that our "mission ideology" is "basically imperialistic" (198). Third, he insists that American evangelicals have imbibed far too much of "the spirit of individualism" which has led to an "inadequate theology of the church" (198). And finally, he thinks that "evangelicalism continues to have a problem defining its working concept of authority" (199). Here, like many of the other authors in this volume, he zeroes in on the doctrine of inerrancy, which he believes "makes something other than God absolute" (200). Until we deal more radically with these problems, writes Kraus, "we cannot expect to see a genuine 'evangelical *renaissance*'" (200).

Chapter 12: Evangelicals and the Self-Consciously Reformed

In this paper Mark Noll and Cassandra Niemczyk look at three examples of "Reformed resistance" to the broader American evangelical community. They show how those adopting the Reformed perspective "have criticized, yet also gradually accommodated themselves to, the prevailing tendencies of at least some American evangelicals" (205). For our purposes, it will be sufficient to look at just one of their examples.

On June 11 1936, J. Gresham Machen and a small group of followers "seceded from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. to form what eventually was to become the Orthodox Presbyterian Church" (OPC) (208). Later that year, it still looked like this new group of conservative Presbyterians might just carry the day and "supplant the old denomination as the recognized heir of the great Presbyterian tradition" (208). However, by the spring of 1937 Machen's loyal followers had already divided into two different groups (209).

Although the OPC desperately wanted a broader influence, their rather inflexible opposition to other Christians who did not share all the details of their view ultimately failed to win them many friends or influence many people (210). Indeed, the early leaders of the OPC viewed non-Reformed evangelical churches as "not just 'different,' they were clearly inferior to the spiritual defenders of truly Reformed faith" (211). Sadly, as Noll and Niemczyk observe, at a time in which "evangelical parachurch and ecumenical activity revived, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church retreated to the sidelines" (211).

Interestingly, however, "the hard line against non-Reformed believers has mellowed" over time (213). At the time this paper was written (in the late 1980's) those most open to cooperating with American evangelicals were "the denomination's officials" (214). Noll and Niemczyk conclude that trying "to maintain a Reformed position in America seems to lead inevitably to some accommodation of Reformed doctrine to the more practical pieties of the American experience" (214).

Chapter 13: Lutheranism

In this essay Mark Ellingsen argues that the reason Lutheranism has often failed to identify itself more closely with evangelicalism is due to certain perceived limitations in the latter's theology and practice. "According to the Lutheran Confessions . . . justification by grace through faith is the main or chief article of Christian doctrine" (223). Indeed, Ellingsen observes that evangelicals often view Lutherans as insufficiently concerned with sanctification because of "an undue . . . concentration" on this doctrine (228). But this, he thinks, is based on a misunderstanding. In the Lutheran scheme, justification is understood "in terms of conformity to Christ or union with Christ" (229). Thus, for Lutherans, "the Christian life, sanctification, takes care of itself, happens spontaneously when justification is rightly proclaimed and grasped in faith" (230). Ellingsen suggests that one of the reasons many Lutherans feel ill at ease with evangelicalism is due to the latter's stress on "holiness and sanctification," an emphasis which he believes constitutes one of evangelicalism's "primary limits" (231).

Out of "four distinct theological movements within Lutheranism," there is really only an offshoot of one which is inclined to identify itself with evangelicalism, namely, an offshoot of pietism referred to as *neopietism* (234). What accounts for this difference? According to Ellingsen, one of the main things that neopietism shares with evangelicalism is a "common interest in theories of biblical inspiration" (234-35). In addition, evangelicals and neopietists also share an interest in orthodox polemics and a commitment to holiness and sanctification (234, 238). Thus, concludes Ellingsen, "only Lutherans who are compatible with neopietist convictions—sharing the pietist emphasis on sanctification and critical perspective towards Roman Catholicism, as well as the orthodox concern with theories of biblical inspiration and polemics—are at home in the evangelical coalition" (238).

Chapter 14: Some Doubts about the Usefulness of the Category "Evangelical"

In this, the first of two concluding essays, Donald Dayton argues "that the category 'evangelical' has lost whatever usefulness it once might have had" and suggests that "we can

very well do without it" (245). In the first place, Dayton says, the very word "evangelical" is unclear, imprecise, and even "inaccurate in some of its fundamental connotations" (245-46). This has the unfortunate effect of actually hindering our attempts to truly understand the phenomena we are studying (246). For by applying a common label to the manifold and diverse movements that are often lumped under the category "evangelical" we can actually inhibit the sort of nuanced understanding these movements really deserve (248).

Of course, Dayton admits that there must be some commonalities. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain why "a certain cluster of churches have come together in, for example, the National Association of Evangelicals" (248). Nevertheless, Dayton does not believe that such commonalities ultimately add up to a "family resemblance' that binds together all the movements described in this book" (250). Are there really some set of important characteristics that cause "holiness churches" to more closely resemble "Orthodox Presbyterians" instead of mainstream Methodists? Dayton doesn't think so (250). Indeed, he says, "I find myself unable to make a common label 'evangelical' describe the range of movements covered in this volume" and "I would rather call for a moratorium on the use of the term, in the hope that we would be forced to more appropriate and useful categories for analysis" (251).

Chapter 15: American Evangelicalism: An Extended Family

In this final essay, Robert Johnston argues that although evangelicalism is a complex, diverse, difficult-to-describe movement, the various members which are often lumped under the "evangelical umbrella" nonetheless bear a "family resemblance" to one another. The notion of "family resemblance" is borrowed from Wittgenstein's 1953 work, *Philosophical Investigations*. According to Johnston, the notion offers us great explanatory scope for understanding the complexity of American evangelicalism. "As in any family," he writes, "category boundaries are not always well defined. The poorer members (i.e., less representative) of categories often contain attributes from other categories which cause lines to be blurred and decisions to remain probabilistic. (For example, is a daughter-in-law a member of the family, or not?) (255-56).

In support of the "family resemblance" theory, Johnston cites a number of scholars who point out that *most* evangelicals typically emphasize three or four central ideas. For example, Thomas Askew mentions four: "*The Bible* is the sole authority for belief and practice, and salvation comes through belief in the gospel. *Conversion* is a personal experience necessary for beginning a deliberate Christian life. The self-conscious *nurture* of spirituality and holiness is to be sought . . . . And *mission*, both evangelism and social reform, is a Christian obligation" (261). Although different scholars may describe these notions in slightly different terms, there is such broad agreement on these central ideas that Johnston believes we are warranted in seeing a "family resemblance" among the various groups typically recognized as "evangelical" (261).