Will Spirituality Have a Past?
GTU Distinguished Faculty Lecture
Arthur Holder
November 9, 2010


Yesterday is History,

'Tis so far away –

Yesterday is Poetry –

'Tis Philosophy –


Yesterday is mystery –

Where it is Today

While we shrewdly speculate

Flutter both away

       — Emily Dickinson[1]


If Emily Dickinson were writing that poem today, perhaps she would say that

"Yesterday is Spirituality" as well. Contemporary students and practitioners of

spirituality certainly continue to "shrewdly speculate" on the mysterious nature of the

past. Mindful that both spirituality and history are wont to flutter away while we are

talking about them, I hasten to offer some musings on their relationship in order to

stimulate further conversation with my three distinguished faculty respondents and with

all of you. This will be a kind of "small plates" presentation consisting of three mini-

lectures on different topics. (Think tapas or dim sum!) My focus will be on Christian

spirituality because that is what I know best, but I hope that those of you who are more

familiar with other religious traditions might be able to make some connections during

the discussion period. And at the end of the lecture, I will address some particular issues

with implications for interreligious dialogue.

But first I should deal briefly with the complicated but important question: "What do you mean by 'spirituality' anyway?" We need to remember that spirituality is "an idea not a thing."[2] Like many terms (academic and otherwise), spirituality is a word that takes on different meanings in different realms of discourse. Tonight I am addressing three topics situated in three different discourses, so each part of this lecture will employ a different definition of spirituality. I will give them to you as we go along, so hopefully this will not be too confusing.

## I. The future of "spiritual traditions"

For this part of the lecture, I want to use a definition of spirituality taken from Oliver Davies, a historical theologian writing about Christianity in early medieval Wales. He says that spirituality is "a complex of theological ideas, sacramental experience, religious forms of life and interior piety that construct Christian existence at a particular time and place."[3] So according to this definition there are as many Christian spiritualities (plural) as there are identifiable groups of Christians.

Most histories of Christian spirituality devote a chapter or a book each to the spiritualities of various religious orders, "schools," or denominations. Of course there are other ways of categorizing spiritualities, for example by gender, race, language group, or country of origin, or by using typologies such as cataphatic vs. apophatic, contemplative vs. active, or culturally accommodated vs. counter-cultural. But the "spiritual traditions" approach has been dominant.[4]

At first glance this method of categorization may seem obvious, but perhaps it is not so obvious when we stop to think about it. Most of the founders of these various

Christian movements did not set out to start a distinct "school." None of the traditions has ever existed in isolation. Many were intentional blendings of two or more other traditions. To take an example from my own field of research: the art historian Michelle Brown has studied what she calls the "combined ethnicity" in the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon manuscript known as the Lindisfarne Gospels. Her conclusion is that the artists and scribes who produced this great work of Anglo-Saxon spirituality were not just being eclectic in their selection of motifs. They were consciously making the point that to be Christian in their context meant encompassing within one identity the "Italian, Byzantine, Coptic, Frankish, English, British, Pictish, and Irish components of the universal Church."[5] Examples could easily be multiplied; for instance, early Methodist spirituality brought together elements taken from Anglican, Puritan, Lutheran, Moravian, and French Catholic sources. Often what is most interesting and inspiring about the various spiritual traditions is not how they kept themselves separate from each other but how they have interacted from their very beginnings right up to the present day.

But how should we think theologically about the relationships among spiritual traditions? In the period of the Reformations (both Protestant and Catholic) and for some time afterward, spiritualities different from one's own were often identified as heretical and defective, or at least as unwelcome competitors for market share. By the early twentieth century, historians of spirituality (mostly Roman Catholic clergy and members of religious orders) often saw the different spiritual traditions as more or less incidental variations on a common theme derived from dogmatic theology.[6] Today we are more likely to think of diverse spiritualities as "charisms" (Greek for "gifts"), implying both that they are God-given and that each one has a beneficial contribution to make to the

whole Christian community. Since Vatican II called for each Roman Catholic religious order to return to the spirit of its founder in order to recover its own distinctive charism, scholars have often understood the witness of different spiritual traditions with reference to the Pauline notion of a diversity of gifts bestowed by the Holy Spirit for the building up of the entire body of the church.

Interestingly enough, the Roman Catholic magisterium has sometimes applied this notion of diverse spiritualities as charisms to Protestant communities (famously referred to in the documents of Vatican II as the "separated brethren"). Thus in the Council's *Decree on Ecumenism* we find the following remarkable statement: "Nor should we forget that whatever is wrought by the grace of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of our separated brethren can contribute to our own edification. Whatever is truly Christian never conflicts with the genuine interests of the faith; indeed, it can always result in a more ample realization of the very mystery of Christ and the Church."[7] Even more recently, Pope Benedict XVI has spoken of the "Anglican patrimony" as something worthy of being preserved by any groups of Anglicans who will accept his invitation to enter the new ordinariates now being established within the Roman Catholic Church.[8]

But what we might call the "charismatic" interpretation of Christian denominationalism actually has a long and venerable history in ecumenical circles. As long ago as 1885, the great German Reformed church historian Philip Schaff wrote:

> Every Christian church or denomination has its special charisma and mission, and there is abundant room and abundant labor for all in this great and wicked world. The Roman Church can not do the work of the Greek, nor the Protestant that of the Roman, nor the Lutheran that of the Reformed, nor the Anglican that of the

Independent or Wesleyan. We do not wish the Episcopalian to become a
Presbyterian or Congregationalist; nor the Lutheran to become a Calvinist; nor the
Calvinist to become an Arminian, or *vice versa*. The cause of Christ would be
marred and weakened if any one of the historic churches should be extinguished,
or be absorbed into another. Every denomination ought to be loyal to its own
standards, and walk in the paths of its ancestry, provided only its *esprit de corps*
do[es] not degenerate into spiritual pride and sectarian bigotry.[9]

While such irenic understandings of denominations as bearers of diverse charisms
is certainly to be preferred to blanket condemnations of heresy, a simplistic application of
the concept may distort the historical realities and impede real ecumenical advance. To
the extent that we think of distinctive spiritual traditions as charisms, we typically
consider those traditions as precious (and unchanging) treasures to be preserved and
maintained in pure condition. So naturally we want to trace the stream back to its source
before it commingled with other streams. We assume that earlier is better, change is
vandalism, and hybridity is a form of treason.

But this is to forget that in Christian theology charisms are gifts of that same Holy
Spirit of which Jesus declared that it "blows where it chooses" (John 3:8). The spiritual
traditions are not now—and in fact have never been—static, unitary, or self-contained.[10]
Surely they can be described in the same terms that the historian William Sewell has
applied to all human cultures as "distinct worlds of meaning": they are normally
"contradictory, loosely integrated, contested, mutable, and highly permeable."[11] From the
beginning, Christian spiritualities have been constructed through the eclectic and
syncretistic blending of ideas and practices borrowed, begged, and stolen from diverse

religious and cultural settings—often without acknowledgment and usually without much concern for preserving the integrity of what has been taken from elsewhere.[12] As Sewell says in explaining how cultural coherence actually works:

> Authoritative cultural action, launched from the centers of power, has the effect of turning what otherwise might be a babble of cultural voices into a semiotically and politically ordered field of differences. Such action creates a "map" of the "culture" and its variants, one that tells people where they and their practices fit in the official scheme of things.[13]

In other words, a culture is not so much a set of prescribed answers as a set of contested issues that people are committed to arguing about.

For Sewell, then, to study any culture is to investigate both the dominant powers' ordering of difference and the opposition's resistance to that ordering. Applying that insight to the study of Christian spiritual traditions, I would say that our task is to explore the many and varied ways in which a Christian community has struggled to organize and standardize the practices of faithful discipleship, and also the ways in which the community has resisted and transformed those practices. The cultural "maps" we call "spiritual traditions" serve to mark the boundaries and the contested sites within these ever-changing and overlapping negotiated territories. To study such a tradition historically is not to extract its essence or draw fences around the supposed limits of its charismatic reach but rather to set it in relation to a kaleidoscopic pattern of relationships with many other traditions that also stretch across immense distances of time and space.

**II. The future of antiquity in the Emerging Church**

For this second part of the lecture, let's use a definition of spirituality from Rowan Williams, who calls our attention to the appropriative work that is incumbent upon every individual Christian who stands before the received tradition: "And if 'spirituality' can be given any coherent meaning, perhaps it is to be understood in terms of this task: each believer making his or her own that engagement with the questioning of the heart of faith which is so evident in the classical documents of Christian belief."[14]

As a kind of case study, I want to look at what is often called the "Emergent Church" or the "Emerging Church" (although some people make distinctions between the two). This movement has developed over the last thirty years or so, mainly in evangelical and some mainline Protestant communities in New Zealand, Australia, Britain, and North America. There is no single organizational structure or creedal system, but in general we can describe the Emerging Church as avowedly post-denominational, postmodern, and post-secular. The emphasis is on the biblical story rather than doctrinal propositions, communal mission rather than individualistic evangelism, embodied worship rather than intellectualized instruction, engaged social action rather than the politics of the culture wars. There is much more that could be said here about the Emerging Church, but I should at least acknowledge that many of its participants would reject the kind of dichotomies that I have used to describe the movement. They prefer to say that their movement is both/and rather than either/or, which is why I have called attention to distinctive *emphases* that Emerging Church folks see as required in the current historical moment.

Another characteristic feature of the Emerging Church is its positive appreciation for the history of Christian spirituality; in fact, a major strand within the movement

identifies itself as the "Ancient/Future Church." Besides the late Robert Webber who is widely recognized as the movement's founder, other popular authors such as Phyllis Tickle and Brian McClaren have called for evangelical Christians to recover ancient Christian practices such as daily prayer, Sabbath, fasting, Eucharistic worship, pilgrimage, the liturgical calendar, and tithing.[15]

Much that is to be found within the Emerging Church movement appeals to me both as a scholar and as a practicing Christian. My own journey of faith actually proceeded along very similar lines, from mainline Protestantism to evangelical near-fundamentalism to communitarian social activism and eventually into what seemed to me at the age of twenty to be the ancient/future promise of the Episcopal Church. I would not presume to tell the Emerging Church folks today how they ought to proceed, and I realize that there are many sophisticated voices of theological and historical critique within the movement itself.[16] But I will venture to offer some reflections on four topics that just might be helpful to those in the movement.

First, it seems that many of the calls for renewal and reform in the Emerging Church are falling into the old trap of romanticizing some ecclesiastical Golden Age and creating rigid periodizations of church history such as Phyllis Tickle's notion of 500-year cycles marked by the papacy of Gregory the Great in the sixth century, the Great Schism between East and West in the eleventh century, the Great Reformation in the sixteenth century, and now the Great Emergence in the twenty-first century. I suggest it would be not only more historically accurate but more helpful theologically to think in terms of ongoing complex cultural negotiations of the sort described by William Sewell, to whom I referred in the first part of the lecture. Or one might turn to dynamic and interactive

notions of the "traditioning" process as advanced by biblical scholars like Ellen Davis and Walter Brueggemann, by church historians such as Dale Irvin and Euan Cameron, and by Latino/a theologians like Orlando Espín and Nancy Pineda-Madrid.[17]

Second, I note that advocates for the Emerging Church often reject belief, dogma, and creed in favor of heartfelt "faith," or denigrate institutional forms while praising the realm of mystery. Even in the postmodern context, I believe there is still value in the insights of the Catholic Modernist theologian Baron von Hügel (1852-1925) who said that religion has three elements that although always in some degree of conflict must nevertheless be held together: the institutional, the intellectual, and the mystical.[18] It is healthier to attend to all three elements and the synergy among them rather than to focus on one element or another to the detriment of the other two.

Third, although I appreciate the Emerging Church movement's focus on spiritual practices, there is perhaps a tendency there (but by no means only there) to conceive of practices as wholesome activities that work their wonders apart from any grounding in particular communities of memory and interpretation. As a corrective, it is good to listen to such theoreticians of practice as Pierre Bourdieu, Michel de Certeau, and Anthony Giddens who remind us that every practice involves thought as well as action, communities as well as individuals, and historically conditioned negotiations of power and agency.[19]

Fourth, there is much concern about how the movement can or should relate to traditional church institutions. Some Emerging Church folk will eventually find their way into (or back into) historic churches such as Roman Catholic, Orthodox, or mainline Protestant denominations. But even those who remain unaffiliated may be less

individualistic and rootless than they sometimes appear. (And with current developments

in technology and communication, we probably need to revise our understanding of what

community is and how it works.)

In this regard, we might fruitfully compare the Emerging Church movement with

the so-called "spiritual but not religious" population studied by sociologist Courtney

Bender in her recent book *The New Metaphysicals: Spirituality and the American*

*Religious Imagination*.[20] In Bender's ethnographic study of practitioners of yoga,

alternative health, and the spiritual arts in Cambridge, Massachusetts, she found that

these "new metaphysicals" were drawing on concepts, language, and practices derived

from nineteenth-century transcendentalists and theosophists, many of whom had

frequented the very same Cambridge neighborhoods a century and more earlier. These

contemporary practitioners were often unaware of their predecessors in the metaphysical

tradition, and for the most part uninterested in them beyond a cursory nod of

acknowledgement. And yet, they were by no means unreflective about their experiences;

nor were they solitaries carrying out their explorations in isolation. As Bender writes:

> These activities signaled participation in a history that was carried in practice
>
> rather than in other forms of memory: the pivotal importance of religious
>
> experience in these living articulations positioned practitioners within religious
>
> traditions that are indicated through arguments about how experience itself works.
>
> These religious practices complicate the importance of traditions, theologies,
>
> hierarchies, and institutions, given that they simultaneously reproduce and hide
>
> their genealogies.[21]

Bender's fascinating study has challenged the sharp division many of her sociological colleagues have tried to make between "spirituality" and "religion." As she puts it, "visions of contemporary spiritual seekers as cultural and theological orphans adrift in fragmented, post-religious worlds miss the mark."[22] In fact, these Cambridge seekers, like many of their Berkeley counterparts, often gather in church basements or synagogue study rooms to share their experiences, to read sacred texts of both conventional and esoteric varieties, and to weave complex communal narratives in which there are no coincidences but only mystical connections heretofore unrevealed.

Like Bender's metaphysicals, perhaps those in the Emerging Church movement are considerably more engaged with historical traditions and institutional structures, both religious and secular, than they—or the scholars who study them—have yet to acknowledge.

## III. The future of historic traditions in an interreligious world

For the final part of the lecture, I want to employ a definition that I developed recently for a dictionary article on "Christian Forms of Spirituality":

> Spirituality is human engagement with reality at its most fundamental level, whether that reality is identified as divinity or the cosmos or the deepest dimensions of the self. . . . Thus spirituality may be understood as the human experience of—and response to—all that is good, beautiful, and true.[23]

This rather generic definition enables us to introduce some qualitative measures into our discussion of spirituality. Can historic spiritual traditions such as those we know and love

here at the GTU still do the job of supporting human flourishing in the contemporary world?

By and large, Americans today are not dogmatic or exclusivist about religion. That is one finding from the 2008 *U.S. Religious Landscape Survey* conducted by the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life.[24] Among the 78% of Americans who say they are affiliated with a particular religious group, there are 70% who agree that "Many religions can lead to eternal life," and 68% who agree that "There is more than one true way to interpret the teachings of my religion." What does this mean for us at the GTU?

Our response to all of this will depend in part on our approach to ecumenical and interreligious dialogue. So I want to assess three different metaphors for relationships among great religious traditions. The first two I am borrowing from their appearance in Stephen Prothero's recent book *God Is Not One:  The Eight Rival Religions That Run the World—and Why Their Differences Matter*.[25]

In the first chapter of his book, Prothero evokes the familiar image of the various religions as different paths climbing up the same mountain. He associates this image with the perennialist approach to comparative religion espoused by Huston Smith among many others. If all the traditions are going to end up at the same place eventually, then their different starting points and stopping places don't really make much difference. As Prothero observes, this approach to interreligious dialogue often ends up obscuring the very real differences that have been the source of many conflicts over the centuries and still today. Moreover, the end result is often to accommodate other religions to my own religion's version of what the top of the mountain looks like. But Buddhists don't want to get to the Christian heaven; they want to attain nirvana, which is not exactly the same

thing. At first glance, this metaphor may appear to affirm interreligious dialogue, but eventually winds up making it irrelevant or imperialistic.

Then at the end of his book, Prothero recalls the ancient Indian folk tale in which a number of blind men are grasping different parts of the elephant. One grasps the trunk and says this great object is a hose; another holds an ear and says it is a fan; still another reaches out for a leg and says it is a pillar, and so on. The point here seems to be about the universal limits of human religious knowledge. No one religion really gets it right, but none of them is entirely wrong either. If only there were some sighted person (the scholar of comparative religion, perhaps?) who could put all the fragmentary pieces together into a single comprehensive vision of reality! Barring that unlikely scenario, we can only agree to hold our different religious opinions lightly as we learn to live and let live. There is an attractive humility in this folktale, but it doesn't really promise much in the way of mutual understanding.

So neither the mountain metaphor nor the tale about the elephant is going to motivate us for the hard work of ecumenical and interreligious dialogue that we are engaged in here at the GTU. Either we are all going the same place already, or there isn't much hope of coming to a better understanding of one another. But there is another metaphor that better fits our common experience, I think, which is to conceive of religious traditions as different languages or (as George Lindbeck called them in his 1984 book *The Nature of Doctrine*), different cultural-linguistic systems.[26] There may be some family resemblances between two or more languages, but each one needs to be appreciated on its own terms. We can strive to produce more or less accurate translations, but ultimately if you want to understand another culture you just have to learn their

language. And as you develop some facility in another language, you begin to appreciate aspects of your own language in a different way. For one thing, you come to see that every language is more than just a set of labels for describing things; it is a means of communication and creativity—in fact, a thing of beauty and an invitation to encounter with truth.

Of course languages (like religions) borrow from one another and are constantly interacting. But even languages like English that have developed from a melding of two or more linguistic traditions have their own particular grammar, vocabulary, inflexion, and tone. Learning another language is a way to enter another world, or to experience your own world in a new way. And the best way to learn another language is from a group of native speakers. Not just one linguist with expertise in the language, but a vibrant community of people for whom that language constructs everyday reality in all its conflicts and consolations. I will leave it to you to make the appropriate application to ecumenical and interreligious dialogue at the GTU, but I hope you see the possibilities here.

I recently came across a quotation from a teacher of my own tradition that has opened my mind and heart to a more expansive vision of religious unity. William Porcher DuBose (1836-1918) was an American Episcopal priest and theologian who thought deeply about Christian ecumenism. I especially value what he had to say about the wisdom of our differences. Not wisdom that comes in spite of difference, but wisdom that we can only learn if we take those differences seriously. Here is what Dubose wrote in 1906:

We need the truth of every variant opinion and the light from every opposite point of view. The least fragment is right in so far as it stands for a part of the truth. It is wrong only when, as so often, it elevates into a ground of division from the other fragments just that which in reality fits it to unite with and supplement them. . . . So let us agree to disagree, if conscientiously we must, in all our manifold differences; and, bringing all our differences together, let us see if they are not wiser than we, and if they cannot and will not of themselves find agreement in a unity that is higher and vaster than we.[27]

Paradoxically, we are most capable of being inclusive and tolerant when we are most deeply committed to our own historical traditions in all their particularity. At the GTU we have had long experience with learning the languages of the diverse religious traditions here. In the future I expect we may find that we need to devote at least as much effort to learning the various dialects spoken within our respective traditions, because the intra-communal struggles are often more heated these days—and more fraught with peril—than relations with those outside the group. In any case, I believe that those of us who have participated in the immersion language learning lab of the GTU will be well prepared to study and to lead whatever new forms of religious belonging may be on the horizon. At least this will be true as long as we remain alert to what we have to learn from the wisdom of our differences.

[1] Emily Dickinson, "Yesterday is History," in *Poetry X* 25 Aug 2004; http://poetry.poetryx.com/poems/3680/; (27 October 2010).

[2] The phrase is borrowed from John D. Niles, "Appropriations: A Concept of Culture," in *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity*, ed. Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles (Gainesville, Fl.: University Press of Florida, 1997), 209: "Anglo-Saxon England is an idea, not a thing."

[3] Oliver Davies, *Celtic Christianity in Early Medieval Wales* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1996), 2.

[4] See Philip Sheldrake, "Types of Spirituality," in *Spirituality and History*, rev. ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 196-221.

[5] Michelle P. Brown, "'In the Beginning was the Word': Books and Faith in the Age of Bede," Jarrow Lecture, 2000, 25.

[6] Philip F. Sheldrake, *Explorations in Spirituality: History, Theology, and Social Practice* (New York: Paulist Press, 2010), 33.

[7] Walter M. Abbott, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II: Introductions and Commentaries by Catholic Bishops and Experts; Responses by Protestant and Orthodox scholars*, (New York: Guild Press, 1966), 349.

[8] Benedict XVI, *Anglicanorum Coetibus: Providing for Personal Ordinariates for Anglicans Entering into Full Communion with the Catholic Church,* VI.5; http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_ben-xvi_apc_20091104_anglicanorum-coetibus_en.html; (27 October 2010).

[9] Philip Schaff, *Christ and Christianity* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885), 299-300.

[10] The rest of the first part of this lecture is taken from Arthur Holder, "The Problem with 'Spiritual Classics," *Spiritus: A Journal of Christian Spirituality* 10 (2010): 26-7.

[11] William H. Sewell, Jr., "The Concept(s) of Culture," in *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*, ed. Gabrielle M. Spiegel (New York and London: Routledge, 2005), 89-91.

[12] See Kwok Pui-Lan, "Interfaith Encounter," in *The Blackwell Companion to Christian Spirituality*, ed. Arthur Holder (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 532-49.

[13] Sewell, "Concept(s) of Culture," 92.

[14] Rowan Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge: Christian Spirituality from the New Testament to St. John of the Cross* (Boston: Cowley, 1991), 1.

[15] Among Robert E. Webber's many published works, see *Common Roots: A Call to Evangelical Maturity* (Grand Rapids, MI : Zondervan Publishing House, 1978); for more titles see www.ancientfutureworship.com. See also Phyllis Tickle, *The Great Emergence: How Christianity is Changing and Why* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008); Brian McLaren, *Finding Our Way Again: The Return of the Ancient Practices* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2008). For a liberal Protestant assessment of the current trajectory of global Christianity that includes some appreciative comments about the Emerging Church movement, see Harvey Cox, *The Future of Faith* (New York: HarperOne, 2009), especially pp. 218-9.

[16] See, for example, the contributions in Mark Husbands and Jeffrey P. Greenman, eds., *Ancient Faith for the Church Future* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008) and Chris Armstrong, "The Future Lies in the Past: Why Evangelicals are Connecting with the Early Church as They Move into the 21st Century," http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2008/february/22.22.html; (26 October 2010).

[17] Ellen F. Davis, "Critical Traditioning: Seeking an Inner Biblical Hermeneutic," *Anglican Theological Review* 82 (2000): 733-51; Walter Brueggemann, *An Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon and Christian Imagination* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003); Dale T. Irvin, *Christian Histories, Christian Traditioning: Rendering Accounts* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998); Euan K. Cameron, *Interpreting Christian History: The Challenge of the Churches' Past* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2005); Orlando O. Espín, "Traditioning: Culture, Daily Life and Popular Religion, and Their Impact on Christian Tradition," in *Futuring Our Past: Explorations in the Theology of Tradition*, ed. Orlando O. Espín and Gary Macy, 1-22 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2006); Nancy Pineda Madrid, "Traditioning: The Formation of Community, The Transmission of Faith," in *Futuring Our Past: Explorations in the Theology of Tradition*, ed. Orlando O. Espín and Gary Macy, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2006), 204-26.

[18] Baron Friedrich von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and Her Friends*, 2 vols. (London: J. M. Dent & Sons; New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1909).

[19] Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

[20] Courtney Bender, *The New Metaphysicals: Spirituality and the American Religious Imagination* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).

[21] Bender, *New Metaphysicals*, 2.

[22] Ibid., 3.

[23] Arthur Holder, "Spirituality, Christian Forms of," in *Cambridge Dictionary of Christianity*, ed. Daniel Patte (Cambridge University Press, 2010), 1183.

[24] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. *U.S. Religious Landscape Survey* (2008); http://religions.pewforum.org; (6 November 2010).

[25] Stephen Prothero, *God Is Not One: The Eight Rival Religions That Run the World—and Why Their Differences Matter* (New York: HarperOne, 2010).

[26] George A. Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984).

[27] William Porcher Dubose, *The Gospel in the Gospels* (Longmans, Green & Co, 1906), ix-xi.