

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Reformation & Revival* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ref-rev-01.php



Reformation
& **REVIVAL**
JOURNAL

CHRISTIAN
ONENESS

A Quarterly for Church Leadership

VOLUME 13 · NUMBER 1 · WINTER 2004

*Resounding the Chicago Call:
A Plea to Restore Evangelicalism's
Theological and Historic Foundation*



W. Brian Shelton

Unity is vital only if it is a vital unity.

CARDINAL JAN WILLEBRANDS

We cannot have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother. If anyone could escape outside of Noah's ark, then they can also escape outside the doors of the church.

CYPRIAN (BISHOP OF CARTHAGE, 3RD CENTURY)

For where the Church is there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace.

IRENAEUS (BISHOP OF LYONS, 2ND CENTURY)

Though the Church has many critics, it has no rivals.

ANONYMOUS

Over the last twenty years, it has become commonplace among scholars to admonish evangelical Christians in their assorted areas of weakness. Authors such as Mark Noll, Donald Bloesch, and David Wells have routinely offered constructive criticism to the evangelical world for its lack of theological, intellectual, historical, and cultural savvy.¹ One wonders if the charge of the ancient atheist Celsus aptly applies to evangelicals today, that Christians do not wish to give a reason for their belief, but keep repeating, "Do not examine, but believe!"² Amidst the reproaches by these authors there echoes a call from a neglected historic event that foreshadowed this recent impetus in scholarship. In May 1977, a group of significant evangelicals gathered in Chicago to make an appeal to evangelicalism. Their product was the *Chicago Call: An Appeal to Evangelicals*—a formal plea for evangelical Christians to step up their historical and intellectual capacities toward a more mature model of Christianity.³

The *Chicago Call* was a wake-up call, to observe and discover those qualities realized by the drafters yet lacking among American evangelical Christians. It was a call to rediscover an essential knowledge of the roots of our faith. It was a call to consider the practical yet powerful expression that traditional worship can serve in our spiritual lives. This event is

typical of a larger trend within evangelical Christianity now to explore the historic Christian faith and to capture the spiritual benefits of a well-grounded, Incarnational-based faith. It was also a landmark in the pioneering efforts of several Christians for whom this event would be personally spiritually fulfilling.

I would like to offer an analysis of this remarkable event because the echoes of its call sound synonymously with the initiatives of many Christians today, including the work of Reformation and Revival Ministries. This article first investigates the occasion and the nature of the *Chicago Call*. It introduces the participants and their burden for fellow evangelicals, and it examines the nature of their appeal. Next, this article analyzes the responses to the proclamation, and raises the question whether the evangelical world ever heard the *Call*. Finally, it weighs the lingering problems that prompted the appeal and asks whether the *Call* needs resounding following a quarter of a decade.

THE 1977 SOUNDING OF THE CHICAGO CALL

In May 1977, a group gathered in Chicago to make an appeal to the minds and souls of their fellow evangelicals. Many of these individuals were associated with Bible colleges, Christian liberal arts colleges, and conservative seminaries. Many were pastors, a few worked in publishing, news media, and in conservative seminaries, and some were prominent members of their community. This gathering was a diverse collection of Christendom, with invitations extended to Lutherans, Reformed Churches, Free Church members, Roman Catholics, and Eastern Orthodox.⁴ These people all shared the same burden for the welfare of the evangelical world.

It seems that the idea first came about in a conversation between Robert Webber, (professor of worship at Wheaton College and conference chairman) and Peter Gillquist (then editor at Thomas Nelson Publishing) concerning the need for Christians to have a more historic Christianity. Their analysis expanded and soon a small committee had formed that met regularly for discussion and prayer. They were united "in their

conviction that evangelical Christianity was suffering from a reduction of the historic faith and practice."⁵ The nature of their appeal was a recapturing of the mystery of worship, the power of symbols, and the continuity with tradition. Their firm commitments to evangelical institutions made them realize how they were speaking uniquely from inside the movement, as evangelical Christians sharing a liability with other evangelicals.

Initial discussions prompted concern over matters of polemics, such as to what extent any recovery of the early Church ought to suggest a rejection of Protestant or contemporary theologies. Such debate clarified the goals of the committee and framed the rhetoric with which they would describe their appeals. As they began to outline the shape of the *Call*, they decided to spell out the weaknesses of evangelicism and then move to set out the necessary correctives. This structure is reflected in the final product of the *Call*: a point of calling as heading, a smaller font objection or confession concerning evangelical propensities, and then a larger paragraph of appeal beginning, "Therefore we call for" or "Therefore we affirm." The composition, the conference, its background formulations, a related bibliography, and two different responses to the *Call*, are contained in the book *Orthodox Evangelicals: Who They Are and What They Are Saying*.⁶ The committee expressed their appeal in eight areas of deliberation, and the nomenclature chosen by the drafters to identify them can be seen in the table below. I have also summarized the main components of the *Call's* appeal in each area.

AREAS OF APPEAL OF THE CHICAGO CALL

Evangelical Neglect	Description of Negligence
Historical roots	Apostolicity, catholicity, pre-Reformation practice; real insights of the historic reform movements and general Christian heritage foundational to faith

AREAS OF APPEAL OF THE CHICAGO CALL

Evangelical Neglect	Description of Negligence
Biblical fidelity	High view of Scripture; biblical witness and its role in authority; objective hermeneutics over the personal and subjective
Creedal identity	Normative value of the ecumenical creeds; the contextual value of confessional statements
Holistic salvation	The Atonement with its emphasis on spiritual and material creation for life; recognition of the corporate as well as the individual implications of salvation
Sacramental integrity	The creation and the Incarnation affirm the material world as both object and vehicle for the creative activity of God's grace; the Church is the primary environment where visible signs and means of grace operate
Spirituality	The essential and complimentary relationship between contemplative and active spirituality; necessity of genuine prayer, discipline, and worship
Church authority	The necessity of biblical discipline in the community of faith; the absence of balanced, godly authority that fosters purity and accountability
Church unity	Fidelity to biblical and apostolic proclamation, worship, and doctrine; an effort toward the visible witness and unity of the Church in light of the Kingdom, present and future

Their concern for the evangelical world was a positive one. They wanted to "look beyond present limitations toward a more inclusive and ultimately more historic Christianity."⁷ They took little issue with doctrines of their immediate predecessors, claiming continuity with both the fundamentalism of the 1920s and 30s and the evangelicalism of the 1940s through 1970s. In the final draft the authors positioned "A Call to Historic Roots and Continuity" first, believing that the recovery of the past is essential to understanding the other imperatives. Modern believers are not cut off from the theology of earlier generations of Christians, but stand in a tradition of parallel struggles and beliefs. "As long as we exist in a narrow, isolated, and sectarian vacuum, there is no hope that we can be open to the broader and more inclusive scope of God's Church in history."⁸ In their recovery of the historical component, they shared the spirit of the Oxford movement, yet were cautious not to "jettison their Protestant heritage, but to *recover it in its finest models.*"⁹

In their recovery of the mystery and symbolism in worship, they insisted on the seriousness of worship lacking in many American evangelical Protestant services.¹⁰ The careless way that we often approach worship, the lack of symbolic depth in our worship expression especially with the Incarnation, the diluted homilies and neglected sacraments in many churches, the mystery that ought to accompany our worship, and the lack of creedal identity are all issues that the preliminary drafters of the *Call* challenged.

The shared passion of this small, preliminary committee resulted in a conference convention. They gathered with assorted ideas to converse, analyze, and parley about the state of their evangelical peers. The original committee was not even certain that any consensus would be reached, and some early hurdles confronted the group and forced decisions toward unity. Donald Bloesch reports how two divisions became apparent at the conference. There were those who sought to preserve what was Catholic and to subordinate the Reformation, looking to the undivided Church of the first five centuries for doctrine and authority. Others believed that the

Church must incorporate the contributions of the Reformation, particularly toward worship and doctrine. They regarded the Reformation as a "tragic necessity." He states: "It was tragic because it sundered the unity of the Western Church. It was necessary because the Church of Rome was not open to basic reform in doctrine, though it was amenable to various reforms in practice."¹¹ Bloesch also identifies a third group within the Catholic evangelical movement who appeal both to reform and also revival, seeking to preserve the historical while not forsaking the inward spiritual experience. It cares for the doctrine and spirit of the Church fathers and medieval Reformers while objects to the "unbiblical practices and notions" of any Christian tradition that serves only to hinder any kind of Church unity.¹²

They soon merged into a body of agreement with an official, eight-point plea known as *The Chicago Call: An Appeal to Evangelicals*. For many of these members, this event was a coming home experience. According to Robert Webber, it was a climactic point in the spiritual journey of many of the drafters:

What is happening to us is analogous to the growth process. The adult still has the same identity as when a child, but the child has grown outside of himself. So we are still evangelicals, but evangelicals in the process of growing out of our previous narrow strictures.¹³

For many of them, they hoped that this event would prompt a sense of graduation toward spiritual maturity for the evangelical world, and not just for themselves. Their vision for what the Church ought to be found relief in a handful of fellow believers who shared the recognition of the weakness of evangelical Christians.¹⁴

Besides setting forth an agenda for evangelical accomplishment through the last two decades of the twentieth century, they also sent a challenge to those who might share in the burden of its success. The committee laid the burden of reform upon three areas of the evangelical world: Christian secondary schools ought to teach Church history and histori-

cal theology, evangelical publishing houses ought to publish good, solid reading material rather than the "pop" literature that so easily sells, and the local church ought to create a catchy vision for these important components of our faith.¹⁵

RESPONSE TO THE CHICAGO CALL

The *Call* brought more reaction from popular news magazines than it did from the evangelical world. Several news magazines took the *Call* as a serious bidding and responded favorably to its intentions and the gathering that had drafted it. *Christian Century*, a liberal Christian magazine, said that this kind of call ought to "help conservative Protestants and some Catholics look into overlooked dimensions of the faith and life, and that is, all to the good."¹⁶ Furthermore, they joined the appeal by saying that if "mainline" churches do not respond that "it is probable that some Evangelicals on their own will find other rooms to occupy, spiritual chambers that will duplicate what the mainline people earlier set out to do."¹⁷ *Christianity Today* agreed, "The Chicago Call will serve its purpose if it promotes reflection and discussion about the themes it addresses."¹⁸ They warmly accepted the appeal of the Chicago group:

One does not have to agree with each of its confessions and affirmations (or with whatever one cares to read between the lines) in order to endorse heartily, as we do; the giving of "careful theological consideration" to these matters. And where present practice is found to be out of keeping with biblical precept, let us "be doers of the word, and not hearers only."¹⁹

Newsweek magazine filled their religious editorial page with a report of the meeting. They described the call in more polemic language, however, such as how the drafters were "rejecting the evangelical emphasis on personal conversion experiences and private interpretations of the Bible."²⁰ Nonetheless, *Newsweek* correctly emphasized the plea to return to the roots of evangelicalism, which was the essential cry of the drafters.

Interestingly, *Newsweek* and *Christianity Today* provided an

insightful cultural analysis about the role of the meeting. It depicted the *Chicago Call* as part of a growing trend among evangelicals that are turning to traditional worship styles. *Christianity Today* said, "Like the Chicago Declaration and the Lausanne Covenant, it will not cause much to happen that would not have happened anyway. But it can serve as a useful stimulus for discussion and debate."²¹ *Newsweek* remarked, "The Chicago Call reflects a growing effort among educated evangelicals to find deeper roots."²² This latter comment raises the question of whether this event is a comprehensive need for an immature evangelical world or if this is merely several high-brow believers with a preference for more aesthetic worship styles. There is often comment that the movement is a drift of some highly educated individuals pursuing an aesthetic worship experience. A simple glance at the drafters' strong educational affiliations certainly does not disqualify this hypothesis. David Wells, professor of theology at Gordon-Conwell Seminary, describes the intentions of the movement as exactly that: "It is the positive attempt to form an amalgam between an evangelical 'heart piety' and a more broadly based and ecclesiastically centered tradition."²³

A more critical question may be asked about the response of the typical evangelical. Has the call been answered by many evangelicals who are rooting their faith more in the historical and crafting their worship in more Incarnational-based symbols? I recently asked a colleague fresh from Chicago's evangelical circles (seven years at a large evangelical divinity school) about his opinion of the *Chicago Call*, and he remarked that he had never heard of it. Is this typical, and how much less might a person further from the geographic source have knowledge of the *Call*? Although difficult to measure, most evangelicals did not hear the *Call* nor even heard about the *Call*. To my knowledge, neither Barna nor any books such as *Religion in America* have examined the trend and reported on it; no such trend toward traditional worship is mentioned in Church indicator studies.²⁴ This is evidence of the small number—or perhaps a quiet movement—of Evangelicals participating in this sort of "revival."

However, there remains in some evangelical circles certain "trends" to restore these features of worship and emphasize continuity with our historical roots. Many young college people are trying these more traditional denominations, often to the surprise of the Protestant community.²⁵ These groups of people bear the label "Catholic Evangelicals" or "Orthodox Evangelicals" depending on the nuance of their appeal. Their evidence can be seen occasionally in popular magazines and bookstore shelves that invite the revival of certain lost aspects of our faith, such as Arthur Paul Boers' "Learning the Ancient Rhythms of Prayer" in *Christianity Today* and new personal workbooks such as Kenneth Boa's, *The Trinity: A Journal* and *Historic Creeds: A Journal*.²⁶ Donald Bloesch lists some people and publications that reflect this trend, as well as some publishing companies that support such works.²⁷ Their efforts are slowly witnessed in the contemporary American Church, but appear almost inconsequential in the larger masses of the evangelical world.

RESOUNDING THE CHICAGO CALL

Do the problems that prompted the *Chicago Call* back in 1977 still exist? Has the evangelical situation changed, or does our situation warrant a resounding of the *Call*? A cursory observation answers in favor of resounding. There has been some progress in evangelical interest in Church history and patristic theology, such as InterVarsity Press' *Ancient Christian Commentary* series that will supply a collection of patristic commentaries on every book of Scripture. D. H. Williams has received some attention with his challenge to Free Churches to welcome the historical and theological tradition of the Christian faith within their own Free Church context.²⁸

However, it is certain that evangelical Christianity is (generally) no more mature or historically based twenty-five years after the *Chicago Call*. Whether one concedes the need for improved worship style or for a reconnection with our historical roots, the problems within evangelicalism remain, and books that criticize the evangelical Christian world are beginning to appear timeless. There are several new reasons why

the *Chicago Call* ought to be reverberating through evangelical America.

In this postmodern culture, the appeal of the *Call* booms louder now than it did in 1977. The postmodern rejection of authority has led to a profound irreverence for the traditional views of religion, and even evangelical Christians can fall prey to the snubbing of traditional worship. That the early Church might hold more authority than the twenty-first century congregational institution is seen as threatening to personal religious liberty and to the spirit of subjective, diverse truth characterizing our culture. In this postmodern world, personal truth trumps absolute truth in a way that makes one's own way of worship—albeit conceptually lacking or even wrong—just as viable as any rooted in two thousand years of Christianity or any with profound symbols of the Incarnation. Robert Webber's newest work, *Ancient-Future Faith: Rethinking Evangelicalism for a Postmodern World*, tackles the problem of rewriting the historical, traditional Christian significance for a postmodern heart and mind.²⁹

Furthermore, the seeker-sensitive model church (typical of the mega-church model) has been accused of diluting the gospel message in order to accommodate a culturally-minded America.³⁰ An emphasis on "heart felt needs" and "state of the art" worship has abandoned the simple message of sin and repentance observed by almost two millennia of Christianity. Michael Scott Horton describes the phenomenon this way:

[There was] a change in emphasis from a God-centered, objective, historical faith that is for me, but outside of me, to a man-centered, subjective, existential faith that is almost exclusively concerned with personal experiences with the Spirit or with Jesus. The shift is reflected in the comment, "Let's just love Jesus—theology just gets in the way."³¹

In addition, many Protestant evangelicals outside of the Reformed tradition are embracing process and openness theologies in an effort to feel a God who is closer and who empathizes more. These theological systems try to make the traditionally incommunicable attributes of God more com-

municable; they reduce God's omniscience, his transcendence, and his eternity in order to help Christians recognize the presence of God in their lives and circumstances.³² Whereas the *Chicago Call* endorses the return of worship features that restore the awesome and mysterious presence of God, these modern theologies reduce God to one who is lacking in splendor and mystery.

However, I think the force of the *Call* is hindered by another, more substantial problem. The marks which are dear to evangelicals include being individually-faith centered, non-sacramental based, and often with a contemporary-styled worship. Like the pietism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there is a cry for a more personal study of the Bible, avoidance of religiosity, better spiritual training for members, and strong preaching to make the Christian life more fervent. It seems to me that their distaste for the systematic emphasis of the Reformers and the rigid, impractical appearance of Scholasticism is likened unto the evangelical Protestant's appetite for a heartfelt desire.³³ I concur in analysis with Wells insofar that the movement is suggesting a change in the very thing that makes Protestant evangelical worship just that: a shift to personal worship by each individual when connection with God seems lost in the sacerdotal model of traditional worship. Why should these supposedly "superficial" evangelicals return to that which they see as even more superficial? To many evangelicals, this trend's conviction for worship seems opposed to the evangelical style, appearing to be only an aesthetic regard for the liturgical and the mysterious. Wells points out the irony, "This is precisely what some of those at the *Chicago Call* considered to be evangelicalism's last hope, without which profundity would be forever lost and shallow superficiality forever present."³⁴

Despite this incongruence between worship styles, the present author believes that orthodox Evangelicals have made a sagacious admonition to evangelical theology. We should recover the historical connection to our past, restore powerful communication through symbols, and reinstate an atmosphere of reverence and mystery that might help any Christian

become more deeply satisfied. This is more than a mere suggestion, as most drafters of the *Chicago Call* have forsaken their own denominations to find a more traditional, fulfilling worship service. Their example serves as a representative of this larger trend, which one can only hope has American Evangelicals examining who they are, from whence they come, and to where they will go from here.

Author

W. Brian Shelton is assistant professor of systematic and historical theology at Toccoa Falls College in Northeast Georgia. He has an M. Div. from Covenant Theological Seminary and recently completed a Ph. D. in historical theology from Saint Louis University, specializing in early Church theology. Brian is committed to uncovering the historic advantages that characterize patristic theology and the meaningful worship of the early Church. He is married and the father of two daughters. This is his first contribution to *Reformation & Revival Journal*.

Notes

1. Mark Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994); Donald G. Bloesch, *The Future of Evangelical Christianity: A Call for Unity Amid Diversity* (Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday, 1983) and *Crumbling Foundations: Death and Rebirth in an Age of Upheaval* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984); David F. Wells, *No Place For Truth, or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993). See also Michael Scott Horton, *Made in America: The Shaping of Modern American Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991).
2. Origen, *Contra Celsus* 1:9. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989).
3. The *Chicago Call* can be found in the work commemorating the event, *The Orthodox Evangelicals: Who They Are and What They Are Saying*, edited by Robert E. Webber and Donald Bloesch (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1978). The Communion of Evangelical Episcopal Churches provides a copy of the *Call* on-line at: <http://www.theceec.org/11chicagocall.html>.
4. No Eastern Orthodox representative came.
5. Webber, *Orthodox Evangelicals*, 24.
6. See note #3 above for bibliographic information. It seems that the self-appointed name, "Orthodox Evangelicals," describes the doctrinal preservation of the historic Christian Church in its orthodox form, and preserves the evangelical emphasis on our relationship with Christ. An

- alternative name is "Catholic Evangelicals," so referenced by Bloesch in *The Future of Evangelical Christianity*, 48-52.
7. Webber, *Orthodox Evangelicals*, 19.
 8. Webber, *Orthodox Evangelicals*, 27.
 9. Webber, *Orthodox Evangelicals*, 25.
 10. For an analysis of the ways that evangelical worship should consider beneficial traditional features in worship, see my article titled, "Cultural Accommodation and the Worship Dilemma in American Protestant Churches," in *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 35 (2000): 23-33. For an analysis of the trend to return to more traditional styles of worship, see the feature story by Gary Burge, "Missing God at Church: Why So Many Are Rediscovering Worship in Other Traditions" in *Christianity Today* 41:11 (1997): 20-27. For an analysis of the biblical and historical roots of Christian worship, see Robert Webber, *Worship Old and New: A Biblical, Historical, and Practical Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994).
 11. Bloesch, *Future of Evangelical Christianity*, 50-51. He identifies the first group with the New Covenant Apostolic Order, now the Evangelical Church. Bloesch credits Jaroslav Pelikan as the source for the notion of the Reformation as a "tragic necessity." Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), 45-57.
 12. Bloesch, *Future of Evangelical Christianity*, 51. Bloesch includes himself and the leaders of the *Chicago Call* in this third category.
 13. Webber, *Orthodox Evangelicals*, 20. Robert Webber provides additional personal accounts that reflect the mood of relief that the gathering provided for them (19-28).
 14. Some members of the committee have published their spiritual pilgrimages, such as Robert E. Webber, *Evangelicals on the Canterbury Trail: Why Evangelicals Are Attracted to the Liturgical Church* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Morehouse Publishing, 1985) and Peter E. Gillquist, *Becoming Orthodox: A Journey to the Ancient Christian Faith*. (Ben Lamond, California: Conciliar Press, 1992). Gillquist also edited a collection of similar testimonies of Protestants that turned to Eastern Orthodoxy for spiritual fulfillment: *Coming Home: Why Protestant Ministers Are Becoming Orthodox* (Ben Lamond, California: Conciliar Press, 1992).
 15. Webber, *Orthodox Evangelicals*, 37-38. The section is titled, "How Can These Changes Come About?"
 16. *Christian Century*, 94 (1977): 527
 17. *Christian Century* 94 (1977): 527.
 18. *Christianity Today* 21 (1977): 27.
 19. *Christianity Today* 21 (1977): 27.
 20. *Newsweek*, May 23, 1977, 76.
 21. *Christianity Today* 21 (1977): 27. The magazine incorrectly predicted, "It will not cause much to happen"; *Christianity Today* itself would later devote a whole issue to the trend and feature the *Chicago Call* as a large

impetus for it. But, insightfully they suggested that the trend is a trend on its own; any impetus that this *Call* might create is supplementary to this trend.

22. *Newsweek*, May 23, 1977, 76.
23. David F. Wells, "Reservations about Catholic Renewal in Evangelicalism" in *The Orthodox Evangelicals*, 213, which was a response to the *Call*. This disapproval may be surprising from Wells, since he has offered his own criticisms to the evangelical world in works such as *No Place For Truth or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993). Here, he challenges the attitude of irrelevance with which evangelicals treat theology: "I have watched with growing disbelief as the evangelical Church has cheerfully plunged into astounding theological illiteracy" (4). The book *Orthodox Evangelicals* also contains, "A Roman Catholic Appraisal of the Chicago Call" by Dominican Benedict Viviano—a predictable response by a Roman Catholic hoping for a similar response among fellow Catholics.
24. George Barna's recent "State of Religion in America" book does not mention it (*The Index of Leading Spiritual Indicators*, Dallas: Word Publishing, 1996), nor does Julia Mitchell Corbett's thorough *Religion in America* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Publishing, 1990). Additionally, there is no evidence of such a trend in Eileen W. Lindner's, *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches 1998* (66th issue. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), nor in Martin B. Bradley, et al., *Churches and Church Membership in the United States 1990: An Enumeration by Region, State, and County Based on Data Reported for 1333 Church Groupings* (Atlanta: Glenmary Research Center, 1992).
25. Burge, "Missing God at Church," 22.
26. Arthur Paul Boers, "Learning the Ancient Rhythms of Prayer," in *Christianity Today* 45:1 (2001): 38-45. Kenneth Boa, *The Trinity: A Journal* (Colorado Springs: Navpress, 2000) and *Historic Creeds: A Journal* (Colorado Springs: Navpress, 2000).
27. Bloesch, *Future of Evangelical Christianity*, 52.
28. D. H. Williams, *Retrieving the Tradition and Renewing Evangelicalism: A Primer for Suspicious Protestants* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
29. Robert E. Webber, *Ancient-Future Faith: Rethinking Evangelicalism for a Postmodern World* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999).
30. Burge, "Missing God at Church," 22ff.
31. Horton, *Made in America*, 155.
32. Clark Pinnock is typical of this effort, as seen in his edited work, *The Openness of God: A Biblical Challenge to the Traditional Understanding of God* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1994). A comprehensive evangelical treatment of Open Theism can be found in eight essays of the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 45 (2002). For two fresh Arminian objections to these theologies, see Jon Tal Murphree, *Divine Paradoxes: A Finite View of an Infinite God: A Response to Process and Openness Theologies* (Camp Hill, Pennsylvania: Christian Publications, 1998) and

Robert E. Picirilli, "An Arminian Response to John Sanders's *The God Who Risks: A Theology of Providence*," in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44 (2001): 467-91.

33. Such language reminds one of Phillip Jakob Spener's (d. 1705) popular work, *Pia desideria (Pious Longings)*, the manifesto of the Pietism Movement.
34. Wells, "Reservations," 214.