

**Children of the Same God:
Unitarianism in Kinship with Judaism and Islam
Minns Lectures, 2009
Rev. Dr. Susan Ritchie**

Lecture Four:

Andover Newton Divinity School; Tuesday, April 28

Children of the Same God: Resistances and Possibilities in the North American Unitarian Engagement with Islam and Judaism

Thank you for having me here. It gives me special pleasure to give this lecture at Andover Newton. Central to my story tonight is a remembering of how it was that the once cohesive and coherent Puritanism of New England splintered into a thousand of different strands, ever more precisely defined by internal homogeneity and external antagonisms. It is good that those strands gather together again in this place.

In the previous lectures of this series, I have demonstrated how continental European Unitarianism was formed in large part by the desire to honor Christianity's close kinship with Judaism and Islam. Convinced that Christians, Muslims, and Jews were a part of the same religious family, Unitarians emerged as those liberal Christians who resisted theologies of God that could not be freely shared across traditions. This theology led various European Unitarian groups to be in creative exchange with their contemporary Jewish and Muslim neighbors. And while the realities of anti-Semitic and anti-Islamic persecution troubled this intention at different points in our history and geography, the ideal was an important part of Unitarian religious identity.

Until very recently, North American Unitarianism has demonstrated far less inclination towards multi-religious kinship than was evidenced in European Unitarianism. One might be tempted to write this off to the uniqueness of the American Unitarian theological journey, which was more Arminian whereas the European journey was more Arian. American Unitarians were strangely willing to assume the label of "Arian" when it was hurled at them by their enemies, but it is a somewhat misleading representation. To be an Arian suggests a focus on the

theological issues originally constellated around the 4th century bishop Arius, which as I illustrated in my first lecture, involved a distinct anti-Trinitarianism coupled with a concern for multi-religious toleration. The development of American Unitarianism involved some of these flavors, but more prevalent was the slowly developing Arminian trend. This Arminianism emphasized human free will as well as the positive assessment of human nature and reason that suggests that the exercise of free will is usually for the good.

And yet Arminianism alone is not adequate to explain the difference in relationship to multi-religious engagement between North America and Europe. British Unitarians, themselves distinctly Arminian, showed a great appetite for multi-religious encounter, as I briefly discussed in Lecture Two of this series. Moreover, it sheds no light on the fascinating developments within contemporary North American Unitarian Universalism.

More people than ever are identifying as Jewish and Muslim Unitarian Universalists, and more of these people than ever consider themselves to be actively practicing both sides of a hyphenated faith. Hence in the UUA pamphlet “Discovering Unitarian Universalism from Catholic and Jewish Perspectives” Linda Weltner describes Unitarian Universalism as a place to which she can “bring” her Jewishness even as she celebrates her belonging new community. For her, Unitarian Universalism provides a hospitable home for “both/and multiple religious identities.”

This position is also echoed by an increasing number of Muslim Unitarian Universalists, a few of whom, I have been very touched to learn, have found the close relationship I have described between 16th century Transylvanian Unitarians and Muslims helpful to them as they come to understand their dual identities as UU Muslims. I spent this fall teaching at our Starr King seminary, and I was also pleased to meet there a number of self identified Muslim Sufi Unitarian Universalists preparing for the ministry. Not incidentally, Starr King is currently explicitly redefining its educational mission as multi-religious, seeing in multi-religious education a uniquely appropriate mission for a Unitarian Universalist seminary.

I agree with historian Jerome Friedman that these changes must represent the resurgence, after some of suppression, of an older Unitarian commitment more hospitable to multi-religious expression than our earliest North American expressions. Specifically, I will suggest that the precise social location of early North American Unitarianism dampened for generation what might have otherwise been a natural multi-religious interest, but that this social location is now shifting. Our potential relationships to Islam have been troubled by the racialization of Islam in North America. Early Northern American Unitarianism's social conservatism, which, highly valuing social coherence and order, was likewise not particularly interested in crossing race divides. Our relationship with Judaism has been hampered by a similar but different racializing of Judaism, but also by a particular inheritance from the Puritans in the form of a tendency to assign Jews a particular role in even liberal Christian triumphalism.

So what exactly was the cultural specificity of the American Unitarians? My favorite image for this identity comes from Perry Miller, that delightfully snarky historian of the New England Puritans. After writing about the failures of American theologians after Jonathan Edwards to fill the old bottle of Calvinism with a new wine worthy of the interest of the younger generation, he goes on to mention a brand new vintage:

“Unitarianism was an entirely different wine from any that had ever been pressed from the grapes of Calvinism, and in entirely new bottles, which the merchants of Boston found much to their liking. It was a pure, white dry claret that went well with dinners served by the Harvard Corporation, but it was mild and guaranteed not to send them home reeling and staggering.”ⁱ

Within American Protestantisms, one's relationship to staggering and reeling turns out to be quite important. To stagger and reel openly would group one with the old enemies of the New England Puritans, the Antinomians. Puritans famously dismissed as Antinomian those who, like Anne Hutchinson and the Quakers, felt that their inward connection with God was strong and sure enough to justify the defiance of human law when it proved to be at odds with personal conscience. Drunkenness was a frequent trope employed by the Puritans to explain the danger

of this approach, which as one minister wrote, is “like strong wine, it makes men’s judgments to reel and stagger, and which are drunk therewith.”ⁱⁱ

The Puritans of course hated the potential disorder that could be wrought upon society by people (women, perhaps especially) claiming a religious truth independent of the church, the state, social convention, or reason, at least as it was defined by established authorities. Nor were these objections merely prudish and controlling, as too people often incorrectly assume about Puritans. The New England elders were nation and community builders who could see the very real downside of a trend that could so easily be fractious and could and did lead to a variety of irresponsible individualisms. And indeed, how many plagues of such individualism have troubled and trouble Unitarian/Universalism still.

Yet while they understood its dangers, it was the Puritans themselves who first brewed the dangerous Antinomian wine, even if they managed to keep it tightly corked. At the heart of New England Calvinism was a deeply mystical vein which taught that all true believers might be completely regenerated in Christ through faith alone. This suggestion of inward moving and transforming divinity was controlled by heavily applied doctrines of original sin and predestination, but it was there.

This is important to our story, because Unitarianism is in many ways the inheritor of both the Puritan inspired sense of indwelling divinity and a new manifestation of Puritan caution. Puritans and Unitarians were both averse to staggering and reeling, but for the Unitarians, a new tempering force was in effect: specifically, a class and racial location that conflated the social good with the status quo. What was once held at bay by inflexible doctrines was now controlled by the very fineness of that white claret.

The inherent tensions of this arrangement do much to explain some of the ambivalences of American Unitarian identity, so well captured by Daniel Walker Howe, and so I quote:

“(The 19th Century Unitarians were) men of many paradoxes. Religious liberals and social conservatives, at once optimistic and apprehensive, nationalistic and

cosmopolitan, they were elitists in a land dedicated to equality, proponents of freedom of conscience who supported a religious establishment, and reformers who feared change.”

But in speaking of Unitarian social location, I want to be both extremely cautious and extremely specific. Cautious in that I agree with Thandeka that contemporary Unitarian Universalists tend to take an odd and unhelpful pleasure in actually overstating our historic class situation.ⁱⁱⁱ Early American Unitarians did generally represent a privileged class, but theirs was a negotiated privilege and therefore always somewhat precarious. Hence there is a great need to be absolutely specific when speaking of Unitarian social position.

And specifically, early 19th century Unitarianism represented a marriage between families of money with families of background. In short, persons of great economic capital but with little cultural capital established mutually beneficial alignments with persons of cultural but little economic capital. On the part of the clergy, these arrangements were a deliberate way of negotiating the loss of status that came with the changing role of minister in a disestablished church.

As has been well chronicled by several gifted historians, the liberal clergy responded to diminishment of their political role and social prestige by promoting their cultural and literary credentials, strategically moving their field of influence to include literature just as their religious and civic voices carried less power.^{iv} Historians like Ann Douglas claim that this move backfired as it forced ministers to form alliances with the women who dominated both the production and consumption of religious and popular literature, which she feels excluded the ministers from realms of serious masculine influence. But the fact of the matter is that the liberal ministers were largely successful not only in establishing themselves as purveyors of literary culture but in other positions of useful influence. Clergymen often served as the guides and administrators of new philanthropies funded by mercantile money. And often the marriage of financial and intellectual culture was quite literal, as when wealthy 19th century merchants began to encourage the marriage of their daughters to liberal men with cultural and intellectual accomplishments but without significant funds.

The British 19th century novelist Elizabeth Gaskell brilliantly portrays the similar dynamic in England in her works. In *North and South*, the daughter of a presumably Unitarian minister is forced to surrender the living offered by his bucolic southern parish and relocate to the northern industrial town of Manchester. He trades on his cultural and intellectual capital in order to scratch out a living. He gives public lectures on the classics to workingmen, and private lessons to the mill owners and operators, who while highly intelligent, were lacking in liberal education. Meanwhile, his daughter starts a romance with one of the mill operators, even though she is initially horrified by what she sees as his immoral exploitation of his workers. To her credit, she also establishes real connections to the area's poor. Nonetheless, in the course of this relationship, she learns to subtly adjust her idealism to the pragmatics of industry, while he comes to demonstrate an interest in self-betterment, and moves to improve his relationship with his workers.

This dynamic encapsulates the best and the worst of Unitarian social ethics: On the one hand Unitarian ethics were open enough to adapt to changing circumstances, and could modify its own idealisms when proven naïve, allowing for real if not revolutionary changes. On the other, this sort of negotiation does require and result from a complicity and even dependency on power. Historian Peter Fields puts this in the bleakest possible way, saying that the Boston Brahmins “transformed God’s covenant with the Puritans for into a class compact with a privileged elite.”^v But in its own way this too overstates the case. Again, the match of cultural and economic capital was not permanent agreement, but a negotiated and changeable settlement that would have been void if Unitarian leaders staggered and reeled over too many significant class, political, or racial lines.

And this brings us to the case of Islam and its relationship to American Unitarians. The famous story about Moors from the biography of case of Universalist George DeBenneville illustrates how significantly the category of Islam was racialized in the 19th century, and how many divides would have to be crossed if an elite white person were interested in engagement with Muslims.

DeBenneville went to sea as a young boy of 12, and he had a formative experience when his ship docked in Algiers and he encountered some “Moors” for the first time. We might remember that “Moors,” is a derisive and racialized term applied

by Europeans, often rather loosely, to Berber and Arab Muslims from the Iberian Peninsula, the previous home of Al-Andalus; although in this case DeBenneville uses it to describe Algerians.

In any case, several men DeBenneville described as “Moors” had just come aboard his ship with food and drink for the sailors, when one of the men fell and injured his leg. DeBenneville was revolted at what he thought was an excessively emotional reaction when two of the injured man’s companions fell to the ground alongside their friend, kissed his wound, shed copious tears over it, and then cried loudly, apparently to the sun. DeBenneville confronted them with their heathen silliness, only to have them tell him that they kissed their wounded companion’s leg in sympathy, that they shed the tears so that the salt would clean the wound, and that they cried to the sun so that the creator would have compassion and heal him quickly.

This experience was the first that set DeBenneville on his path to a powerful conversation to an explicitly multi-religious belief in universal salvation. He wrote of the Moors, “are these men Heathens? No, I confess before God that they are Christians, and I myself a Heathen! Behold the first conviction that the grace of our Sovereign God employed: he was pleased to convince a white person by blacks, one who carried the name of a Christian, by a Pagan, and who was obliged to confess himself a Heathen.”^{vi}

Thandeka has written movingly of how deBenneville’s conversion involved a lot of staggering and reeling across social divides, and how this was manifested in his body. She writes:

His mind did not transform him; his body did, his tears, pounding heart, and torrential feelings constituted a revelation that challenged the racial, class and religious creeds that were core to his self-concept.^{vii}

However we understand his conversion, De Benneville’s story makes it clear high the cost in self identity would be for crossing those who dared to cross the boundaries separating liberal white Protestants from Muslims. Perhaps, then, we should not be surprised that it is not until the advent of 19th century

Transcendentalism that we find Unitarians expressing much interest in Islam, and then it is through books, translations of sacred texts, and traveler's accounts rather than engagement with living Muslims.

Even given this, some of the early outbreaks of Unitarian interest in Islam were quite interesting. In 1853 the Unitarian minister William Alger published "the Poetry of the East," an anthology of poems written in Persian, Sanskrit, and Arabic, which proved popular and sold quite well. A year later he followed that up with an article in the *Christian Examiner* entitled "The Piety and the Poetry of the Islamic Sufis." Alger's understanding of Sufism was rather incomplete, and his efforts to rewrite it as a form of 19th century Romanticism are today at least, rather obvious. But he is profoundly sympathetic, and after a brief but fascinating warning against falling too deeply for what he explicitly names Oriental Antinomianism, he goes so far to recommend Sufism as a practice that might provide a welcome depth of spiritual practice for interested Unitarians. He writes in oddly suggestive language that:

"(the Sufis can help) lead us to a state of faith and fruition, that healthy state of full Christian piety wherein we feel, in oft and favored hours, a rapture of calmness, a vision of heaven, a perfect communion of the Father, confessing with electric shudders of awe and joy the motions of the Spirit as the hand of God wanders solemnly among the chords of the heart." ^{viii}

In spite of this colorful recommendation, there is no evidence that any Unitarians took up Sufism as a result. Indeed, the only account we have of 19th century Unitarians directly pursuing Islam is from a dubious if fascinating source: Orestes Brownson, Universalist turned Unitarian minister, founding member of the Transcendentalist Club, and later convert to Catholicism. In his autobiography "The Convert" he claims that a fair part of his frustration with Unitarian Transcendentalism was his concern that they had crossed the line from drawing inspiration from various world religious traditions to outright appropriating them. He writes this of his time as a Unitarian:

"...there were among us those who openly claimed the Maometans as good Unitarians, and were quite disposed to fraternize with them.... One of the most

brilliant and gifted of the early Unitarian ministers of Boston actually did go to Turkey, turn Mahometan, and become a Moslem preacher. He published in English a volume of Mohometan sermons, which I once read. I thought them equal to most Unitarian sermons I had seen or heard.”^{ix}

I have tried mightily to find traces of such a person or such a book, without success. And of course, the fact that Brownson does not name the minister suggests hyperbole. Indeed, it is a little hard to imagine that the prevalent Unitarian tendency would have been conversion to Islam when actually; the weakness of the Transcendentalist inspired approach was to borrow from Muslim sources without overt concern for cultural specificity. As Arthur Versluis has pointed out: “for many Transcendentalists, Saadi, Hafiz, and other Islamic poets represented literary or poetic interchangeability.”^x This of course was Emerson’s approach, to borrow freely across traditions under the impression that deep truth speaks with the same voice regardless of its historical or cultural location. We believe that we have learned better than this, and yet, in many ways this dynamic lives on in North American Unitarian Universalist congregations that, for example, happily invoke Sufi poet Rumi, while still failing to situate him into the specificity of his Islamic context.

And yet, I do see hope for the North American UU engagement and enmeshment with Islam, which I will turn to after we explore the American Unitarian relationship to Judaism, which has been much influenced by our Puritan past.

The Puritans had an odd relationship to Jewish identity; they both appropriated it for themselves, and defined it as radically racially “other.” The Puritans believed that like Moses, they were running God’s “errand into the wilderness,” and that they were in North America to build the New Jerusalem. In this scenario, the Puritans, not the Jews, were now God’s chosen people. The Puritans became frantic to convert Jews to Christianity, both as evidence of a transfer of covenant, and as a mark of the coming of the promised end age.

Consider this historical snapshot: in 1696 the powerful Puritan divine Cotton Mather is sitting in his study, completing his *Magnalia Christi*, his famous history of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Using the strongest possible

biblical and mythic language, he is retelling the stories of the Hebrew Bible, only this time with the Puritans cast in the lead. As the narrative develops, Mather numbers himself as one of Israel's great prophets. At this very time he also begins to wear a skullcap while at work in his study, to refer to himself as Rabbi Mather, all while devoting his minimal spare time to writing rather desperate polemics aimed at converting Jews (he even wrote an entire book directed in a failed attempt to convert just one Jewish family).^{xi}

Having appropriated Jews religious identity but not racial identity for themselves, the next step was to wonder who might be racially but not religiously Jewish. Many Puritans could not resist the temptation to think of Native Americans as these racial Jews—as descendents of a lost tribe of Israel.^{xii} Various Lost Tribes theories have waxed and waned in popularity at different points in American history, with some persisting even into the 19th century, with a few archaeologists still trying really hard to see find of Hebrew verse on native artifacts.

This Puritan construction of both Jewish and Native identities was not directly adopted within American Unitarianism, and indeed, we have the excellent work of Dan McKanan to show how it is that Unitarians and other religious liberals struggled with the legacy of Puritan violence towards Native Americans, and how they reimaged themselves into a different relationship with that inheritance.^{xiii}

Yet within early North American Unitarianism we find some of the same patterns of appropriation of Jewish identity that characterized the Puritan attitude. Consider as an odd but intriguing example, the case of none other than Henry Adams. Raised within the circle of Bostonian Unitarian privilege, he eventually stopped identifying as a Unitarian, although he often still spoke as an insider. Indeed, his work frequently plays with how claiming an outsider status is often the reflection of privileged belonging, such as when he makes his famous remarks about the smugness Unitarianism in “The Education of Henry Adams.” In his denunciation of Unitarian smugness, he just reinforces his connection to both. Here is the famous passage:

Nothing quieted doubt so completely as the mental calm of the Unitarian clergy. In uniform excellence of life and character, moral and intellectual, the score of

Unitarian clergymen about Boston, who controlled society and Harvard College, were never excelled. They proclaimed as their merit that they insisted on no doctrine, but taught, or tried to teach, the means of leading a virtuous, useful, unselfish life, which they held to be sufficient for salvation. For them, difficulties might be ignored; doubts were waste of thought; nothing exacted solution. Boston had solved the universe; or had offered and realized the best solution yet tried. The problem was worked out.^{xiv}

This self identification of Adams' as being born to a restricted tribe of privilege has been given special attention by scholars seeking to understand his curious relationship with Judaism. As a young man he demonstrated a progressive and distinctively anti-racist opposition to anti-Semitism. But by the mid 1890s, not coincidentally shortly after the economic meltdown of 1893, his personal letters reveal the growth of an anti-Semitic obsession. In attempting to understand some connection between these two different attitudes, scholars have turned to the opening of the *Education of Henry Adams*.^{xv} It reads:

In the third house below Mount Vernon Place, Feb. 16, 1838, a child was born, and christened later by his uncle, the minister of the First Church after the tenets of Boston Unitarianism, as Henry Brooks Adams. Had he been born in Jerusalem under the shadow of the Temple, and circumcised in the Synagogue by his uncle the high priest, under the name of Israel Cohen, he would scarcely have been more distinctly branded, and not much more heavily handicapped, in the races of the coming century....

This albeit rhetorical appropriation of Jewish identity points to a troubling pattern within Unitarianism that resurfaces in the Transcendentalists and which persists right into the twentieth century. For underlying these appropriations is a fairly continuous sense that the dawn of a new age of multi-religious understanding is at hand, if only Jews will stop insisting on a distinct identity.

Consider the curious blend of multi-religious interest and appropriation of Jewish identity that exists in Joseph Priestly. Joseph Priestley was one of the few American Unitarians to show much interest in world religions before the Transcendentalist era, a result, perhaps of his more European style of faith. In his

1770 publication *An Appeal to the Serious and Candid Professors of Christianity*, Priestly in moves reminiscent of Michael Servetus, suggests a strong kinship of Judaism, Islam, and Christianity through their similar emphasis on the unity of God. He argues that preserving this kinship should be the main motivation for the establishment of Unitarian churches. He writes:

The great offense to Jews, Mahometans, and the world at large, being the doctrine of the Trinity, it is highly necessary that societies of Christians should be formed expressly on this principle of the Divine Unity, that it may be evident to the world, that there are Christians, and societies of Christians, who hold the doctrine of the Trinity in as much abhorrence as they themselves can do.^{xvi}

As fair minded as this sounds, we would not want to forget that Priestley's goal was not to preserve the independent dignity of Judaism, but to get the Jews to convert to Unitarianism. Priestly was an adamant millenarian, which is to say that he was sure that the arrival of the kingdom of God was close at hand, and that such an event would, like the Puritans believed, be marked by the mass conversion of Jews to Christianity. It is indicative then, that he appends an "Address to the Jews" to his most famous work of comparative religion, "A Comparison of the Institutes of Moses with those of the Hinduoos and other ancient Nations." This address to the Jews, added to the end of a work explaining the falseness of non-Christian religions, urges Jews to understand the falseness of their own convictions and move to accept their role in bringing about the Christian end times.

One might think that such an attitude could not have lived much past Priestley's day. And yet...As Arthur Verslius so convincingly argues in his work on American Transcendentalists and Asian Religions, the Transcendentalists' understanding was also colored by a millenarian attitude. While not as explicitly Christian as Priestley, the Transcendentalists nonetheless also looked towards the arrival of an entirely new period of hitherto unimaginable progress and deep understanding. Moreover, this period would be recognizable by the Jewish adaptation of Transcendentalism's own liberal post-Christian position.

This same belief persists throughout late 19th century Unitarianism, as formal and informal exchanges between Unitarians and Reform Jews grew. By this time there

was an established tradition of pulpit exchanges between Reform rabbis and Unitarian ministers. These rabbis and ministers felt that they shared a common hope for “the imminent arrival of a ‘religion of humanity’ characterized by the belief in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.”^{xvii} But this agreement, as broad as it was, would eventually prove divisive.

Rabbi Israel Wise was one person who believed strongly in a similarity of outlook, calling Unitarians and Jews “spiritual cousins”, and establishing relationships with leading Unitarians. In his memoirs, he recalls meeting Daniel Webster in 1852, and how the two men agreed that “there was no essential difference in the matter of doctrine (between reform Jews and Unitarians), but (only) in historical development.”^{xviii} This shared understanding moved Webster to remark that “we are all Unitarians,” which pretty much got to the heart of what would become a bone of contention between the two movements. For while both Reform Judaism and Unitarians each looked forward to a day of religious universalism, each continued to see their own tradition as the only logical host for that universalism. So while at first it seemed a great concession to say that only history separated the two traditions, those specific historical differences soon came to mean everything. Rabbi Wise for his own part was deeply shocked when he realized that even many of the non-Christian identifying Unitarians of the Free Religious Association (on whose Board he served as a part of the Association's deliberate recruitment of Jews) still held to the belief that Christian revelation and experience had superseded the Jewish one. Rabbi Wise for his own part believed that the only original and adequate revelation was that of Moses, and the ironic and hurtful clash of a Unitarian and Reform Jewish triumphalism commenced.

Theological commonalities that once were celebrated became a threat requiring all parties to demonstrate more fully one's allegiance to one's people. This was most profoundly demonstrated in 1886 when Rabbi Solomon Sonneschein visited the American Unitarian Association headquarters in order to pursue the possibility of a Unitarian pulpit. As historian Benny Kraut, who explored this episode in depth writes, “the contemptuous Jewish denunciations of (Rabbi Sonneschein's) action and the varied sources from which they came, reveal much about the true limits of American Reform Judaism, which were demarcated as much by ethnic-communal

concerns as by religious-theological ones.” I believe that the same could be said of Unitarianism at the same time.

There is more we might say on this topic, but alas, time is limited, and I would like to fast forward to the present, and to a particular hope I see expressed in our contemporary Unitarian Universalist position. At different, numerable points in our history--one most poignant example being right now--Unitarian Universalism has experienced extraordinary anxiety in relationship to its self-identity. It seems apparent to me that our failures in self-understanding point to a contradiction between our ideals, and the various and real constraints that have forced us to live outside those ideals. I believe that the increasing presence of Jews and Muslims in our congregations, as well as the anti-racist work that we have done and of which we have so much left to do, is both the result and the cause of hopeful fractures in our not so very helpful allegiance to a long moribund social location. It is my hope that it might now be possible to claim the multi-religious aspect of our ideals more fully. Not because the conversion of Jews and Muslims shows us a triumph, not even because doing so might allow us to escape our neurosis in relationship to our identity, but because we will finally have realized that it is impossible to serve justice, not to mention the God shared by Jews, Christians, and Muslims, without some staggering and reeling.

ENDNOTES

i Perry Miller, “From Edwards to Emerson,” *The New England Quarterly* 13 (December 1940): 589-617

ii Miller, 596.

iii Thandeka, *Learning to Be White* (Continuum International Publishing Group, 2000).

iv Ann Douglas, “Clerical Disestablishment,” “Feminine Disestablishment,” “Ministers and Mothers” in *The Feminization of American Culture* (1977; New York: Noonday Press, 1998): 17-121. Peter S. Field, “The Birth of the Brahmins” and “Towards a Secular High Culture” in *The Crisis of the Standing Order: Clerical Intellectuals and Cultural Authority in Massachusetts 1780-1833* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998): 47-110. Lawrence Buell, “Unitarian Aesthetics and Emerson’s Poet Priest,” *American Quarterly* 20:1 (Spring 1968): 3-20.

v Peter Fields 110.

vi As quoted by Thandeka, “The Life of Small Group Ministries,” www.uua.org website, accessed Feb. 25, 2009.

^{vii} Thandeka, above.

^{viii} Arthur Versluis, *American Transcendentalism and Asian Religions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993): 149.

^{ix} Versluis, 133.

^x Versluis, 83.

^{xi} Arthur Hertsberg, "The New England Puritans and the Jews," *Hebrew and the Bible in America: The First Two Centuries* Shalom Goldmann, editor, (Hanover: University Press of New England): 1993: 105-122.

^{xii} Richard Popkin, "The Rise and the Fall of the Jewish Indian Theory," *Hebrew and the Bible in America: The First Two Centuries*, Shalom Goldmann, editor, (Hanover: University Press of New England): 1993: 61-69.

^{xiii} Dan McKanan, *Identifying the Image of God: Radical Christians and Nonviolent Power in the Antebellum United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). Daniel Buchanan, "Tares in the Wheat: Puritan Violence and Puritan Families in the Nineteenth Century Liberal Imagination," *Religion and American Culture* 8:2 (Summer 1998): 205-236.

^{xiv} Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, 1918.

^{xv} J.C. Levenson, "The Etiology of Israel Adams: The Onset, Waning, and Relevance of Henry Adam's Anti-Semitism," *New Literary History* 25 (June 1994):569-600.

^{xvi} Joseph Priestley, *Works*, ii. 394f quoted in J. van den Berg "Priestly, the Jews and the Millennium" David S. Katz and Jonathan I. Israel eds., *Sceptics, Millenarians and Jews* (Leiden: EJ Brill, 1990): 256-274; 260.

^{xvii} Benny Kraut, "Judaism Trumphant: Issac Mayer Wise on Unitarianism and Liberal Christianity," *American Jewish Studies Review* 7-8 (1982-3): 179-230; 180. See also Benny Kraut "The Ambivalent Relations Between American Reform Judaism and Unitarianism in the Last Third of the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23 (1986): and Benny Kraut, "A Unitarian Rabbi? The Case of Solomon H. Sonneschein," Todd M. Endelman, Editor, *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1987): 272-308.

^{xviii} Kraut, "Wise,"186.