THE SECOND GREAT AWAKENING AND WILLIAM MILLER'S COUNTERCULTURAL THEOLOGICAL APPROACH: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Alberto Tasso[1]

Abstract

The Second Great Awakening was one of the most influential movements in 19th-century America. It spread throughout New England, the Western frontier, and Charles Finney's revivals in the "burned-over district". William Miller's eschatological crusade happened during the final days of the Second Revival. Although Miller's preaching was shaped by this revival, there were also notable differences in his approach. This article compares the Second Great Awakening revival in America with the theology and hermeneutics of William Miller. The methodology is a literature review of primary sources and scholarly histories. In the Second Awakening, there was a shift from Calvinism towards Arminian free will. Enlightenment reason also played a significant role in biblical interpretation, alongside anticipation of an imminent earthly millennium. William Miller shared a version of Calvinism, placed an important role of reason in his theology, and was united in the fervor and millennium expectations of his era. However, Miller's sole focus was Jesus' premillennial return around 1843-1844 and not the ordinary post-millenarist view. Thus, his message was basically, proclaiming the imminent end of the world, not human progress. While impacted by his context, Miller's strict scriptural hermeneutic produced a historicist prophetic system that countered spiritualized eschatologies. The Second Great Awakening shaped Millerism, providing structure and enthusiasm. However, Miller's countercultural biblical focus and eschatological conclusions made his message both appealing and infuriating to many leaders of the Second Revival, including Charles Finney.

Keywords: Second Great Awakening; Calvinism; William Miller; Charles Finney; Revivalism; Millenarism.

Editor Científico: **Rodrigo Follis e Flavio Prestes Neto**
Organização Comitê Científico
Double Blind Review pelo SEER/OJS
Received: 09/02/2024
Approved: 19/08/2024

How to cite: TASSO, A. The second great awakening and William Miller's countercultural theological approach: a comparative study. **Kerygma**, Engenheiro Coelho (SP), v. 19, n. 1, p. e1614, 2024. DOI: https://10.19141/1809-2454.kerygma.v19.n1.pe1614

[1] Doctoral student in Adventist Studies and Systematic Theology at Andrews University, Michigan, (USA). Theology Professor at the Adventist University of São Paulo – UNASP/EC, São Paulo. E-mail: albertotasso@gmail.com

O SEGUNDO GRANDE REAVIVAMENTO AMERICANO E A ABORDAGEM TEOLÓGICA CONTRACULTURAL DE GUILHERME MILLER: UM ESTUDO COMPARATIVO

Resumo

O Segundo Grande Reavivamento foi um dos movimentos mais influentes da América do século XIX. Ele se espalhou por toda a Nova Inglaterra, a fronteira ocidental e os avivamentos de Charles Finney no "burned-over district". A cruzada escatológica de William Miller aconteceu durante os últimos dias do Segundo Reavivamento. Embora a pregação de Miller tenha sido moldada por esse reavivamento, também houve diferenças notáveis em sua abordagem. Este artigo compara o Segundo Grande Despertar na América com a teologia e hermenêutica de William Miller. A metodologia é uma revisão de literatura de fontes primárias e de pesquisas histórias acadêmicas. No Segundo Despertar, houve uma mudança do calvinismo em direção ao livre arbítrio arminiano. A razão iluminista também desempenhou um papel importante na interpretação bíblica, ao lado da expectativa de um milênio terrestre iminente. William Miller compartilhava uma versão do Calvinismo, atribuía um papel importante à razão em sua teologia, e estava unido no fervor e nas expectativas milenaristas de sua época. No entanto, o foco exclusivo de Miller era o retorno premilenar de Jesus por volta de 1843-1844, e não a visão pós-milenarista comum. Assim, sua mensagem era basicamente a proclamação do iminente fim do mundo, e não o progresso humano. Embora impactado por seu contexto, a estrita hermenêutica bíblica de Miller produziu um sistema profético historicista que se opôs às escatologias espiritualizadas. O Segundo Grande Reavivamento moldou o Millerismo, fornecendo estrutura e entusiasmo. No entanto, o foco bíblico contracultural de Miller e suas conclusões escatológicas tornaram sua mensagem atraente e irritante para muitos líderes do Segundo Reavivamento, incluindo Charles Finney.

Keywords: Segundo grande reavivamento americano; Calvinismo; Guilherme Miller; Charles Finney; Reavivamento; Milenarismo.

EL SEGUNDO GRAN DESPERTAR Y EL ENFOQUE TEOLÓGICO CONTRACULTURAL DE GUILLERMO MILLER: UN ESTUDIO COMPARATIVO

Resumen

El Segundo Gran Despertar fue uno de los movimientos más influyentes en los Estados Unidos del siglo XIX. Se extendió por toda Nueva Inglaterra, la frontera occidental y los avivamientos de Charles Finney en el "distrito quemado". La cruzada escatológica de Guillermo Miller ocurrió durante los últimos días del Segundo Avivamiento. Aunque la predicación de Miller estuvo determinada por este avivamiento, también hubo diferencias notables en su enfoque. Este artículo compara el avivamiento del Segundo Gran Despertar en los Estados Unidos con la teología y la hermenéutica de Guillermo Miller. La metodología es una revisión bibliográfica de fuentes primarias e histórias académicas. En el Segundo Despertar, hubo un cambio del calvinismo hacia el libre albedrío arminiano. La razón de la Ilustración también jugó un papel importante en la interpretación bíblica, junto con la anticipación de un milenio

terrenal inminente. Guillermo Miller compartió una versión del calvinismo, le dio un papel importante a la razón en su teología y estaba unido en el fervor y las expectativas milenarias de su era. Sin embargo, el único enfoque de Miller era el regreso premilenial de Jesús alrededor de 1843-1844 y no la visión posmilenarista común. Por lo tanto, su mensaje era básicamente proclamar el fin inminente del mundo, no el progreso humano. Si bien el contexto lo impactó, la estricta hermenéutica escritural de Miller produjo un sistema profético historicista que contrarrestaba las escatologías espiritualizadas. El Segundo Gran Despertar dio forma al millerismo, brindándole estructura y entusiasmo. Sin embargo, el enfoque bíblico contracultural de Miller y sus conclusiones escatológicas hicieron que su mensaje fuera atractivo y exasperante a la vez para muchos líderes del Segundo Avivamiento, incluido Charles Finney.

Palabras clave: Segundo Gran Despertar; Calvinismo; Guillermo Miller; Charles Finney; Revivalismo; Milenarismo.

INTRODUCTION

During the last few decades of colonial America and the initial years following the War of Independence, there was a significant religious shift in the United States. Two extraordinary movements of revival changed the religious landscape. The First and Second Great Revivals had a profound impact on America. Revivalism provided both the technique, the message, the organizational mechanism, and the rationale to shape American evangelicalism. It gave Americans faith in themselves as God's chosen people and reassured the ideals of freedom and liberty while they waited for the establishment of a new era, the Millennium (McLoughlin, 1974, p. 138).

Although William Miller's ministry occurred towards the end of the Second Awakening, historiography often associates it with the revivals but is also excluded from it as well. However, George Knight argues that the Millerite crusade should not be seen as a separate movement of the Second Great Awakening, but as an extension of it (Knight, 2010, p. 20). While many scholars have highlighted the commonalities between both movements, portraying Millerism as a product of its cultural and theological environment, it's important to note that Miller's message and methods were also counter-cultural.[2] This article outlines the

[2] Most academic studies on Millerism begin by analyzing the Second Great Awakening as the movement's background. Millerism is not seen anymore as an odd and fanatical religious group but as a reflection of the social and religious turmoil of the nineteenth century. Some of those who emphasize Millerism in the context of the Second Great Awakening are (Dick, 1994; Knight, 2010; McLoughlin, 1974; Rowe, 1985; 1993; Sandeen, 1974). The MA Thesis of Howard Krug proposes many connections between Charles Finney and William Miller's theology, see (Krug, 2008). Not so many recently have endeavored to explore the differences between Millerism and the religious time of the 19th century. George R. Night outlines Miller's countercultural premillennialism, but only briefly. See (Knight, 2010, p. 13-20). The major significant source of Millerism and American religious culture is Ruth Alden Doan's The Miller Heresy, Millennialism, and American Culture. She discusses the Millerite

Second Great Awakening and William Miller's ministry, comparing and contrasting both movements in their theological message and hermeneutics.

An Outline of The Second Great Awakening in America

The Second Great Awakening was an incredibly complex event, with many leaders and various nuances. No revivalist, denomination, or theology can capture its diversity (Caldwell, 2017, p. 101-103). Although many prominent leaders raised in this revival times, such as Nathanial William Taylor, Francis Asbury, and Charles Finney, Mark Noll suggests the second half of the 18th century did not produce a thinker that agglutinated in him the tone of the revival as Jonathan Edwards did in the first (Noll, 2002, p. 50). The Second Awakening was "more local in nature, involving leaders of different denominations whom each left their particular stamp on the revivals they oversaw" (Caldwell, 2017, p. 102).

Defining the date of the Second Awakening is not a consensus among historians. It is a fluid and unstable period with many nuances and different thoughts. Donald Matthews finds its beginnings as early as 1780, and Timothy Smith extends it until 1861 (Mathews, 1969, p. 42; Smith, 1957). However, the most common dating encompasses roughly between the 1790s and 1830s (McLoughlin, 1974, p. 134). The Second Revival could also be divided into three regions: (1) the New Divinity revival in New England, (2) the Methodist and Baptist revival in the western frontiers, and (3) the "Burned-over district" revival promoted by Charles Grandison Finney.[3]

The Regions of the Second Great Awakening

The New England Awakening happened under the leadership of Timothy Dwight and his pupil at Yale College, Lyman Beecher, leading student revivals with the conversion of large numbers of unitarians and deists.[4] The revivals were also present, particularly in the well-

phenomenon in light of its relationship to upheavals in 19th century American culture. However, her work did not explore Miller's thought and hermeneutics (Doan, 1987).

[3] For a brief but very didactical description of the three regions, see (Caldwell, 2017, p. 102-106). The "Burned-over District" is an analogy between the typical fires of the forest and those revivals of the religious spirit. Charles Finney applied this expression to localities between Lake Ontario and the Adirondacks and helped popularize it (Finney, 1876, p. 78). Historians have extensively researched this region, especially Whitney R. Cross. He defined the "Burned-over District" as the portion of New York State lying west of the Catskill and Adirondack Mountains (Cross, 1950, p. 6).

[4] Students' revivals outburst also in Amherst, Dartmouth, Middlebury, and Williams colleges. There was a

established congregationalist churches in Western New England, but extended their influence into Presbyterian churches of New York and Pennsylvania. In the 1790s, revivals became frequent in the New Divinity congregations that accepted a less strict Calvinism. They were very much Edwardseans and reflected many concepts of the teachings of Samuel Hopkins and Joseph Bellamy, who both graduated from Yale in the first half of the 18th century.[5]

Moreover, a further revision of Calvinism, the New School Presbyterianism, appeared in Yale under Nathanial William Taylor by 1820 and influenced many revivals in this region. Thus, more theological, the New England revivals were intellectual and emotionally "quiet" conducted throughout the region's churches. Although there were emotions, they were yet calm and controlled to avoid enthusiasm (Caldwell, 2017, p. 102). That characteristic is strikingly different from the passionate, enthusiastic, and intensively emotional revivals in the Western frontiers.

The frontier societies were very distinct compared to New England's, much more pragmatic than traditional, exalted common sense over education, and democratic social organization over hierarchical ones (Caldwell, 2017, p. 103). In this context, the Baptists, but especially the Methodist way of doing religion, flourished.[6] In this second region of the revival, camp meetings were employed as the primary way of preaching and evangelizing. The camp meetings were spread to many places in the West, "from 1801 for years a blessed revival of religion spread through almost the entire inhabited parts of the west, Kentucky, Tennessee, the Carolinas, and many other parts, especially through the Cumberland country" (Cartwright, 1859, p. 45).[7] Barton W. Stone, a contemporary witness of these large groups, described how all that materialized:

combined effort to evangelize the nation through the colleges.

[5] Hopkins was a melancholic man who considered his preaching "as poor, low, and miserable, compared with what it ought to be" (Hopkins, 1805, p. 88). However, his writings achieved such influence that many New Divinity ministers became synonymous with "Hopkinsianism." Conversely, Bellamy was a large man with a strong voice and a forceful personality. In 1750 he published the first treatise of the New Divinity, *True Religion Delineated* (Holifield, 2003, p. 135-136).

[6] Although the Methodist leadership was topped by an episcopacy that was primarily administrative, the church leadership was in part charismatic and very engaged in the revivals. The leadership of Francis Asbury, who in 45 years in America, traveled more than three hundred thousand miles on horseback, delivering more than sixteen thousand sermons, all never earning more than sixty-four dollars a year. His sacrificial ministry inspired loyalty to the Methodism denomination. An inspired account of Asbury's life can be found in the three volumes of his personal journal (Asbury, 1821).

[7] For an introduction to these revivals see (Boles, 1972).

> The roads were literally crowded with wagons, carriages, horsemen, and footmen, moving to the solemn camp. The sight was affecting. It was judged, by military men on the ground, that there were between twenty and thirty thousand collected. Four or five preachers were frequently speaking at the same time, in different parts of the encampment, without confusion... This meeting continued six or seven days and nights, and would have continued longer, but provisions for such a multitude failed in the neighborhood (Stone, 1847, p. 37).[8]

Besides camp meetings, the three main characteristics of this region's revivals were (1) the intensively emotional meetings, (2) the amount of informally trained preachers and ministers, and (3) the explosion in the number of new churches established. The meetings were so loaded with deep emotions, that many physical manifestations appeared. Many experienced "the jerks", rhythmic motion of the head and torso forth and back. Others sobbed, had nervous shaking, and people cried out loud for divine mercy (Caldwell, 2017, p. 104). "I have seen the person stand in one place and jerk backward and forward in quick succession," in such an extreme way that "their head nearly touched the floor behind and before." (Stone, 1847, p. 40)[9]

There was also dancing, seen as "heavenly to the spectators" with "nothing like levity" (Stone, 1847, p. 40). The whole service was usually emotional, and "no matter whether they were saints or sinners," observed Methodist Peter Cartwright, "they would be taken under a warm song or sermon, and seized with a convulsive jerking all over, which they could not by any possibility avoid, and the more they resisted the more they jerked" (Cartwright, 1859, p. 48). Those extreme experiences were so powerful that they dragged the attention of families who would travel long distances, set up camp, and attend a series of preaching services that culminated in a celebration of the Lord's Supper (Caldwell, 2017, p. 104). Some evangelistic

[8] Stone also mentions that "the Methodist and Baptist preachers aided in the work, and all appeared cordially united in it - of one mind and one soul, and the salvation of sinners seemed to be the great object of all" (Stone, 1847, p. 37-38). The presbyterian ministry James McCready described the grandiosity of these meetings: "Multitudes crowded [in the Gasper River Congregation in southern Kentucky] from all parts of the country to see a strange work, from the distance of forty, fifty, and even a hundred miles away; whole families came in their wagons" (McGready, 1837, p. 129-134).

[9] Stone also tried to explain the phenomenon: "The jerks cannot be so easily described. Sometimes the subject of the jerks would be affected in some one member of the body, and sometimes in the whole system. When the head alone was affected, it would be jerked backward and forward, or from side to side, so quickly that the features of the face could not be distinguished... All classes, saints and sinners, the strong as well as the weak, were thus affected. I have inquired of those thus affected. They could not account for it; but some have told me that those were among the happiest seasons of their lives. I have seen some wicked persons thus affected, and all the time cursing the jerks, while they were thrown to the earth with violence" (Stone, 1847, p. 40).

innovations, such as the altar call also became very common in these revivals.[10]

One of the key successes of Methodism in the West was the circuit riders, ministers that were not fixed in a church but were itinerant.[11] Although many of those preachers of the frontiers lacked formal training, they had a "seniority system" with various stages of apprenticeship that trained a constantly increasing corps of men, including the laity. The lay leadership guaranteed strong guidance even when the itinerants were absent on their circuit. The Methodism and the revivals were extremely successful. From 1773 to 1813, they increased from 1,160 members to 214,307.[12] No other organization in America increased so rapidly over so large an area in so short a time (Mathews, 1969, p. 36-37).

The third region of the Second Great Awakening lies in the upstate region of New York and is wrapped up in one name, Charles Finney. His ministry as a revivalist began in the 1820s, some years after the advent of the Second Revival, and extended into the 1830s, during which he labored predominantly in New York state. The revivals sparked under his ministry were so massive that the region became known as the "burned-over district" (Caldwell, 2017, p. 105). Finney was not so much an innovator; he borrowed many of the Methodist's methodology in his "new measures" and adopted the New School Presbyterianism theology.[13] He understood revival as a "science:" "It is not a miracle... It consists entirely in the right exercise of the powers of nature" (Finney, 1835, p. 12).[14]

---

[10] Simple stated, the altar call is the calling of the preacher for the positive responders to the gospel at the end of a sermon to publicly move forward to a designated area, usually near the pulpit. One of the earliest accounts of this practice remounts to a small Methodist church in Maryland in 1798. In his Journal under the date of October 31 of that year, Jesse Lee wrote that after Asbury preached, Lee and Miles Harper exhorted the sinner and dismissed the audience. However, many were willing to remain. A song was sung, and one of the preachers requested all that "were under conviction to come together. Several men and women came, and fell upon their knees; and the preachers, for some time, kept singing, and exhorting the mourners to expect a blessing fro m the Lord" (Thrift, 1823, p. 243). Another account reports that under the shade of trees near a church in Delaware on May 24, 1801, William Colbert sang and prayed after the sermon and then "called upon the persons in distress to come forward and look to the Lord to convert their souls," In response to his invitation, "numbers came forward, and repaired to the Meeting house" where he "spent some time with them in prayer." William Colbert's Journal, mentioned in (Atkinson, 1884, p. 468). A good history of the altar call can be found in (Bennett, 2000, p. 29-47, 64-71; Coleman, 1958, p. 19-26).

[11] For an excellent explanation of how the Methodist circuit functioned with many original sources, see (Andrews, 2000, p. 205-216).

[12] In 1773, they had ten preachers, but in 1813 the number was as high as 678 (Methodist episcopal church, 1813, p. 6, 599, 612).

[13] The "new measures" were the application of the anxious seat, itinerancy, mixed praying, direct and colloquial preaching, speaking without notes, instrumental music, sustained seasons of private and public prayer, and protracted meetings. Finney described his measures in (Finney, 1835, p. 233-255).

[14] This quote could be easily misinterpreted as naturalist or manipulative of the audience. However, according to Finney, God works within the powers of nature. He defined miracles as divine interference, setting aside the

He was a lawyer in Adams, NY, underwent a religious conversion in 1821, received Presbyterian ordination in 1824, and began to preach the next year as a revivalist for a women's mission society in Utica (Cross, 1950, p. 152; Holifield, 2003, p. 361). Finney led a series of rivals in the "burned-over district" for over a decade.[15] The revival of Rome in 1825 spread and made him a figure of importance throughout America. The Rochester revival of 1830 was outstanding. Cross attested that "no more impressive revival has occurred in American history. Sectarianism was forgotten, and all churches gathered in their multitudes. The Presbyterians alone added six hundred in the village" (Cross, 1950, p. 154).

The exceptional feature of Finney's revival was its phenomenal dignity. There were no agonizing souls falling in the aisles, no cries or rapture ones shouting hallelujahs (Cross, 1950, p. 154-155). He did not "sound like preaching, but like a lawyer arguing a case before a court and jury." The sermon was "a chain of the closest logic, brightened by felicity of illustration and enforced by urgent appeals from a voice of rare compass and melody." His style was particularly appealing to the "high classes" but "worked its way down to the bottom of society," attracting nearly everybody (Staton, 1885, p. 22-23). His ministry influenced a region not far where William Miller, in the 1830s, would initiate his preaching on the prophecies in the book of Daniel and his premillennial views.[16]

William Miller, after his conversion from deism around 1816, followed the Baptist faith, the denomination of many of his relatives (Bliss, 1853, p. 26). The Baptists, like the Methodists, experienced immense growth during the end of the 18th to mid-19th centuries, but unlikely they did not embrace a unified revival theology.[17] The Baptist identity primarily focused on their ecclesiology, not their soteriology. The issues such as believer's baptism, covenantal theology, the autonomy of the local congregation, and religious liberty were more fundamental for them than a revival theology. So, "we find the full spectrum of revival

laws of nature. For him, all laws of matter and mind remain in force. They are neither suspended nor set aside in a revival.

[15] Cross describes Finney as a man "graceful in motion, skilled in vocal music, with a voice of extraordinary clarity, tone, and ranges of power and pitch, he spoke without mannerisms in concise, familiar figures. Having been not only a lawyer but also an accomplished horseman, marksman, and sailor, he could utilize parables meaningful to common folk" (Cross, 1950, p. 152).

[16] Miller's ministry did not start in the burned-over district. First, he moved his preaching east, and only in the 1840s he will impact the region of upstate New York.

[17] Around 1784, there were around 35,000 Baptists in the United States; around 1840, there were more than 570,00 regular Baptists. In 1855, there were around 956,000 Baptists, including Regular, Non-mission, Free-will and Seventh-day Baptists. See (Baird, 1844, p. 462, 503).

theologies reflected in early American Baptists. Some were Arminian, some embraced Edwardsean revival theology, while others were traditional Calvinists of varying degrees" (Caldwell, 2017, p. 144-145).[18]

Millerism and the Second Awakening

After a long study of the Bible and its prophecies, Miller gave his first public lecture about the Advent on the second Sunday of August 1831 in Dresden, NY (Rowe, 2008, p. 98).[19] The service started in the log house of his brother-in-law, Hiram S. Guilford, and it was so enthusiastically received that the services were moved to the church. Miller stayed all week, and a spiritual revival took place (Miller, 1845b, p. 19). From that time on, Miller responded to invitations in the country churches of New York, New England, and Canada.[20] Revivals followed, and he was not able to answer half of the calls coming from Baptists, Methodists, and Congregationalists (Dick, 1998, p. 4-5).[21]

Miller first moved east and preached mainly in New England territory and not so much in the west or the frontier. That changed when the movement gained momentum with the acceptance of Joshua V. Himes, a restorationist Christian pastor of Boston, and with the publication of the leading paper of Millerism, *Signs of the Times,* in 1840. By the time appointed for Jesus' return in 1844,[22] Miller had already been able to speak to about one in twenty New Englanders. If the other Millerite ministers were added, it is easy to see that the movement heavily impacted this region. Miller corroborated that he had given 4,500 lectures over twelve years to about 500,000 people.[23]

---

[18] In general, freewill Baptists adopted the Arminian revival theology; other names, such as Jonathan Maxy and Andrew Fuller, advocated an Edwardsean theology, and some of the Baptists located in Philadelphia and Charleston, SC were traditional Calvinists.

[19] Most Millerite historians agree that Miller's first public lecture was in 1831. However, in Miller's personal accounts, appears the year 1833. Sylvester Bills, one of the early historians, attributes it to a printer's mistake or an "error in Mr. Miller's memory. As no mention is made of this in the letter to Elder Hendryx, from which the previous extract is made, he could not have gone to Dresden before the second Sabbath in August, 1831" (Bliss, 1853, p. 97-98; Miller, 1845a, p. 3; 1845b, p. 18-19).

[20] For an academic study of the impact and influence of Millerism in the Eastern Townships, see (Fortin, 2004, p. 13-41).

[21] In 1834, he received a license to preach by the Baptists. By 1835, he also was carrying a certificate with the signatures of between seventy and eighty ministers from various denominations who supported his preaching and attested the belief of the soon return of Christ by 1843 (Bliss, 1853, p. 120-122; Miller, 1845b, p. 19).

[22] Miller first preached about Jesus' return between the spring of 1843 and 1844. He accepted the date of October 22, 1844, proposed by Samuel Snow, only a few days before, on October 6, 1844 (Bliss, 1853, p. 270).

[23] Miller was very conservative when describing the numbers of his movement. He believed that there were

The Millerite revivals could become as emotional as the Methodism of the frontier, and fanatism appeared with a certain frequency.[24] However, Miller's lectures, Like Finney's awakening, were usually solemn and intellectual. Nevertheless, Miller was not a trained minister and, undoubtedly, did not see his preaching and revivals as "science," applying specific techniques. His goal seems to present his prophetic understanding through logic, reason, and biblical fundament. Ellen White, co-founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, accepted Millerism in 1840 when she was only 12 years old in Portland, ME. She described his preaching as "not flowery or oratorical, but he dealt in plain and starling facts … he supported his statements and theories by Scripture proof as he progressed" (White, 1915, p. 26). She also recalled how the meetings usually went:

> No wild excitement attended the meetings, but a deep solemnity pervaded the minds of those who heard. Not only was a great interest manifested in the city, but the country people flocked in day after day, bringing their lunch baskets, and remaining from morning until the close of the evening meeting (White, 1915, p. 20).

Although the Second Great Awakening deeply impacted New England and Western New York State with revivals, theological reform, and millennium ideas, Miller was not directly in touch with these reformers whose backgrounds were urban. It is true that Millerism, as part of the Second Awakening, had used many of the standard practices of the day, such as camp meetings, protracted town meetings, the anxious seat, and altar calls. However, there is uniqueness in Miller's message. He had made a biblical discovery and felt a tremendous responsibility for warning people to get ready to meet Jesus. This made Miller a fervent

about fifty thousand in 1,000 different locations. He also knew of about 200 ministers in the United States and Canada who embraced his views (Miller, 1844, p. 196; 1845b, p. 22).

[24] In the 1844 millerite camp meeting held in Exeter, NH, James White, also co-founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, was present and described the arrangement: "There are many tents upon the ground, some of them resembling houses of worship, in size and shape, more than the small tents usually seen upon Methodist campgrounds. These furnished ample accommodations for the thousands of believers present." More than twenty cities were represented, each one with its respective tent. The one from Watertown, MA, was next to the Portland, ME tent, where James White was meeting. The Watertown group became disruptive with loud shouting and clapping. A fanatism appeared in the form of "holy flesh" perfectionism. White recalled that the meetings continued with a "general gloom" spread over. However, when Samuel Snow rose to speak for two days in a row, connecting the Day of Atonement of Daniel 8:14 to the Karait calendar, establishing the date of Jesus' returning to the autumn of 1844, "the deepest solemnity pervaded the entire encampment… but what of the Watertown fanatics? In the intense interest upon the subject of time, taken by the entire crowd, these were forgotten" (White, 1868, p. 154, 163).

preacher and considered the greatest evangelistic influence in the northeastern United States between 1840 and 1844 (Dick, 1998, p. 5, 34).

THE THEOLOGICAL MESSAGE OF THE SECOND GREAT AWAKENING AND MILLER'S PROPHETIC PROCLAMATION

The "Arminianization" of American Religion

Historians for many years considered the Second Great Awakening a transition from Calvinist predestinarianism to Arminianism associated with the defeat of deism (McLoughlin, 1974, p. 142). However, it is not so simple as that. Although Methodism and Arminianism really grew during this period, Calvinism was still very present. In New England, upper New York, and the Ohio Valley, theologians revised Calvinism in an increasing effort to make Edwardsean Calvinism more revivalist by making it more reasonable (Holifield, 2003, p. 342). The so-called New Haven and Oberlin Theology are examples of that.

In general, the prominent Calvinist denominations of the First Great Awakening, such as the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, were no longer the significant forces of revival, as they came to be displaced by the rapid growth of Methodism and the Baptists (Caldwell, 2017, p. 100-101). Even among the revivals in New England during the Second Awakening, which was overlooked mainly by Congregationalists, the New Divinity revivals and The New School Presbyterianism, less strict forms of Calvinism, dominated the scenery.

Simply stated, the central theological theme in the Second Revival was the same as the First: justification by faith, repentance, and salvation, but without a clear predestinationist framework.[25] The New Divinity School brought different flavors to the revival theology in New England. Very much influenced by Edwards' revision of Calvinism, these New England revivals were united by a ministerial education system known as the prophets' schools.[26] It started during the First Great Awakening when Jonathan Edwards received students in his house for theological training. It was later expanded by Samuel Hopkins and Joseph Bellamy, both major

[25] Jonathan Edwards made the justification by faith the centerpiece of his sermons during the revival in Northampton, and one major theme of Whitefield's sermons was the "absolute necessity" for utter dependence on the justifying grace of God in Christ. This topic was major in the theologians of the Second Revival but with a less predestinationist emphasis. See (Holifield, 2003, p. 95).

[26] For an excellent introduction on the role and function of the schools of prophets, see (Kling, 1997, p. 185-206).

names of the Second Revival.[27]

This system expanded Edwardsean theology in a consistent way. Toward the end of his life, Hopkins observed that New Divinity was increasing among Congregationalists, and that "there are now more than one hundred in the ministry that espouse the same sentiments in the United States of America" (Hopkins, 1805, p. 103). The New Divinity theology was coherent Calvinism in the emphasis on the sovereignty of God's election but emphasized, more than Edwards, the natural ability to repent, even though, for them, human hearts necessary incline to hate God (moral inability).[28] Edwardsean revivalists told the sinful that since they had a natural ability to repent, they were, therefore, responsible if they failed to do it (Holifield, 2003, p. 122). This is why some nineteenth-century traditional Calvinists disliked this particular idea of freedom of the will, with many arguing against them as semi-pelagian.[29]

By 1820, Nathaniel William Taylor concluded that Unitarians and traditional Calvinist critics of the New Divinity School needed a new response. Yale Divinity School was founded with this purpose in mind in 1822, and Taylor was its first professor of theology (Caldwell, 2017, p. 119).[30] Taylor gave new labels for the Edwardsean distinction of "natural ability" and "moral inability" with a minimized language of inability, effectively emphasizing the sinner's theoretical ability to make themselves a new heart.[31] Also, he defended the assumption that God's grace can actually lead to the suspension of a sinner's selfish principles, which enables

[27] Bellamy was the first to establish a school for the training of New Divinity and the champion of the Schools of Prophets, training personally more than sixty ministers in Bethlehem, CT. Near the end of Bellamy's career, Nathanael Emmons of Franklin, MA, became a Professor of the New Divinity, training more than 90 ministers (Kling, 1997, p. 194-195). Hopkins trained Jonathan Edward Jr., who in turn taught Timothy Dwight, president of Yale from 1795 to 1817 and a key name in the Second Great Awakening.

[28] Edwards made a distinction between "natural necessity" and "moral necessity". Holifield summarizes Edwards' thought: "He distinguished between natural necessity and moral necessity. He conceded the absence of freedom and moral accountability when a 'natural necessity,' a natural impediment external to the will, made it impossible for people to do what they willed. Moral necessity, however, meant only that the will could not defy its own inclination or disposition. Agents could not will, in a single act of volition, other than as they willed in that act. The will could not will two opposite things at the same time. But this moral necessity offered no impediment to freedom in its 'plain and obvious' sense for it assumed the fact of choice and the natural ability to act." (Holifield, 2003, p. 121-122) See (Edwards, 1957, p. 159)

[29] A fierce criticism made by a Presbyterian ministry against the theology of conversion in the revivals is made by John Thomson. He argued especially against the overly emotional manifestations, particularly, in the frontiers. See (Thomson, 1741)

[30] The transition to Yale marked this new version of Edwardsean theology, known as New Haven Theology.

[31] Taylor spoke of the sinner's "certainty" of sinning "without the necessity" of doing so. In other words, there is no ontological necessity to sin because nothing or no one is coercing humankind; they sin freely. It is a moral choice. This concept is extensively discussed in (Taylor, 1859, p. 131-140). See also (Sweeney, 2003, p. 73-76).

them to consider the gospel claims in a sinless state (Caldwell, 2017, p. 125).[32] Taylor's thought was known as New Haven theology.

The American Revolution, with the ideals of democracy and freedom, alongside a new wave of humanistic optimism, was a booster for these new ideas. Between 1800 and 1860, the average American could no longer accept that men were too depraved to play any part in their salvation. Instead, Americans adopted these ideals that God had given man the ability, the freedom of the will to understand his fallen state, repent his sins, and turn to Christ for help and salvation.[33] No other religious group benefited more from these emphases on human will than the Methodists. With their expansion, the Arminian outlook of Methodism replaced the Calvinistic outlook of Congregationalism to become one dominant theological position of the nineteenth century (McLoughlin, 1974, p. 142).

America Methodist pioneers, many of those trained by John Wesley himself, arrived in the 1760s and 1770s and brought with them a clear Arminian theology.[34] Under Francis Asbury's leadership, Methodism became a "vast engine of salvation" (Noll, 2002, p. 330). The Methodist revival theology included these three fundamental components: (1) the emphasis on the God of Love, a loving Creator that made human beings with free will so that man can have a genuine redemptive relationship with him through faith[35]; (2) the significance of the

[32] Taylor was heavily criticized by many of his contemporaries. Joseph Harvey of Westchester denounced him as a Pelagian wolf in orthodox sheep's clothing. Bennet Tyler, a conservative Edwardsean Congregationalist and president of Dartmouth College, also accused him of Pelagianism. Edward Dorr Griffin blamed him for being a modern speculator (Griffin, 1833; Harvey, 1837, p. 171; Tyler, 1837).

[33] Donald Mathews proposed in 1969 that the Second Awakening brough a unique system of social organization. His view is yet very influential in the to any serious study on the revival. He suggested that "as Americans faced new strains imposed by independence and intellectual turmoil, they were also busily engaged in attempting to impose order upon their society." The Revolution "provided a political and social world view which was conducive to building a new religious community based on common participation in a holy life." So, "both Revolution and Revival put it to the people - would they be free or no? If they answered affirmatively, they were expected to order themselves accordingly into a new society, whether a *novus ordo seculorum* or a church". The Second Awakening establish the theological foundation of freedom society for the new formed American Society (Mathews, 1969, p. 35-36).

[34] For histories on early American Methodism, see (Hempton, 2005; Schmidt; Richey; Rowe, 2012; Scott, 1955; 1964).

[35] Methodists cast the Calvinist God's sovereignty, presenting a God that wisely administrates creation and interacts with creatures instead of the terms of boundless power, unconditionality, and decree. See, for example, how Nathan Bangs refuted a minister who followed Hopkins' idea of sovereignty: "If every event which comes to pass, is brought to pass by God's plan, as you call it, or is an effect of his decree, then there can be no event, however trivial in itself, however wicked, foolish, and inconsistent, but what is included in this plan which you ascribe to God, and which, according to your statement, is the effect of his uncontrollable decree... for all events, whether they be wicked or good, foolish or wise, absurd or consistent, you intimate are included in God's plan." God's election is also related to the human moral response, not a unilateral decree. He adds that to affirm that God election of Jacob over Esau "without any respect to their moral characters" is "one of the most shocking

universal offer of the gospel, rejecting the limiting doctrines of predestination, inability, and limited atonement[36]; (3) an emphasis on holiness and Christian perfection as the goal of Christian Living under the influence of the Spirit.[37]

In comparison with New England revival theology, there are some clear similarities since the major call of the revivals was the conversion of the souls into a new spiritual relationship. In both regions, the major sermon topics were justification by faith and grace. The spiritual outcome was similar: "a combined passion for freedom with an exceptionally strict moral code" and a reformed lifestyle (Higham, 2001, p. 157). As Taylor's theology taught that a sinless state resulted in salvation, Methodism emphasized holiness.[38] However, the followers of Wesley, using Arminian free will theology, brought the concept of freedom and liberty to a whole new level.

From a sociological point of view, this emphasis on sanctification provided "that internalization of authority so essential to counterbalance the destruction of external authority" (McLoughlin, 1974, p. 141). The American Revolution deposed the traditional kingly authority of England. In this sense, they were the first country not to have a controlling and all-compassing authority, such as the Pope, the archbishop, or the king. The Second Revival concept of freedom was not libertinage or theological antinomianism but, in a sense, a transferring of authority from the external powers to the individual responsibility with himself, the country, and the church.

New York Upstate uncovered the great exponent of New Haven Theology in Charles Finney, which was the most prominent name using Taylor's dogmatics.[39] He saw himself as an

---

ideas... it is utterly impossible for the God of love, of justice and goodness, to form such determination" (Bangs, 1815, p. 15, 105).

[36] The Methodist theology agreed with traditional Calvinist with a strong affirmation of the total depravity of human nature. They also accepted the prevenient grace actuating in human free will. In the *Articles of Religion,* it is stated that "the condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us..." (Methodist episcopal church; Roberts, 1840, p. 12). Asa Shinn, an itinerant preacher at the time of the Awakening, asserted the clear Methodist doctrine of a universal offer of salvation: "We say Christ's death render such satisfaction as reconciled justice and holiness to our probation and to the free offer of eternal life to every man" (Shinn, 1831, p. 147).

[37] Bangs claimed the high level of sanctification as the result of salvation upheld by Methodists: "Christian may arrive to such a state of perfection as to keep the gracious law under which the gospel of Christ places him, so as, in this sense to be delivered from sin" (Bangs, 1815, p. 183).

[38] The American Methodism was rooted in Wesley's goal of raising a holy people. The preachers, according to them, were called to "reform the continent, and spread Scripture holiness over these lands" (Methodist episcopal church; roberts, 1840, p. 4).

[39] Characterizing Finney's thought is not easy and has puzzled scholars. Finney also did more than anyone else

independent theologian and his studies of the Bible as "workings of my own mind as they were revealed in consciousness" (Finney, 1876, p. 54). However, when he eventually became a professor of theology at Oberlin College (Ohio) in 1835, Finney used much of Edwardsean's and Taylorite's theological vocabulary (Holifield, 2003, p. 362). It is unclear how much direct influence Taylor had in Finney since they met with some frequency during the 1830s, but Taylor distanced himself starting in 1833.[40]

Consequently, Oberlin's theology also disclosed this unorthodox form of Calvinism. Not completely Arminian as the Methodism in the frontiers, Finney emphasized as Taylor that moral depravity was a "voluntary attitude of the mind." (Finney, 1876, p. 154). It was the choice of self as the ultimate end. Sin is natural to mankind, and there are temptations. Nonetheless, sin does not consist in these appetites and propensities but "in the voluntary committal of the will to their indulgence" (Finney, 1858a, p. 258). Finney also had a strong emphasis on morals and emphasized even more than Taylor the role of obedience and holiness. He qualified the doctrine of justification as a condition of obedience to the law. For Finney, "true faith, from its very nature, always implies love or obedience to the moral law" (Finney, 1858a, p. 117).

With nuances of a Calvinist eternal security doctrine, Finney defended that true repentance is a change so deep and fundamental that the person never changes back and ends in salvation (Finney, 1858b, p. 161). Moreover, sanctification was not merely evidence of justification but a condition to it. God justified only the sanctified (Finney, 1858a, p. 392). His emphasis on human freedom of will and holiness made some scholars associate him with Methodism.[41] Even though he could consciously emulate some Arminian concepts, his road to holiness is paved in obedience, and the road of Methodism is paved more in the role and influence of the Spirit in the believer's life.[42]

The great measure of success of the Second Great Awakening was not the burst of

---

to popularize Taylor's views. Still, some would say that he was the archetypal Jacksonian Arminian, a democratic critic of the leading traditions of Calvinism. However, "most careful observers… have come down somewhere between these still-popular views, depicting Finney for what he was—a rather unusual and inconsistent New Haven–style Edwardsean preacher" (Sweeney, 2003, p. 150-151).

[40] Taylor wrote to Finney seeking answers, since Mr. Nettleton stated that Taylor in a private meeting with Finney had expressed a diverse idea from those which he had published about regeneration, special grace, and divine moral suasion. Taylor asked for Finney to recant (Nathaniel Taylor, letter to Charles G. Finney, 3 nov., 1833).

[41] See for example, (Cross, 1950, p. 159; Finney, 1858a).

[42] For one of the most relevant analyses of the relation of Finney with New Haven Theology, contrasting with Methodism see (Guelzo, 1997, p. 61-94; Sweeney; Guelzo, 1998, p. 1-3).

revivals, given that the phenomenon had appeared before in the First Great Revival. The real achievement was in the number of new churches organized, which could persist when enthusiasm faded. The impact was much more effective because of the number of converts who remained in the churches once "their emotions had been channeled from public ecstasy into private devotion" (Mathews, 1969, p. 35-36). The Awakening was a recruiting impetus. It brought people into the church in unprecedented numbers.[43] Millerism will benefit from that and surf in the wave of the Second Great Awakening.

The "One Doctrine" Movement and the Theological Message of William Miller

Millerism is usually described as an undertaking of one solo doctrine, the imminent Second Coming of Jesus. Until the summer of 1843, Millerism was very interdenominational, and eventually, other topics than prophecies appeared in their publications.[44] Nevertheless, no other theological topic suppressed the soon coming of Jesus, especially in Miller's sermons and articles. In a letter to Joseph Atwood in 1831, Miller, even before his public ministry, showed a mature theology that he would consistently follow:

> These are the last time truly. And you may depend upon it my friends, that Jesus will come within 12 years, 1843 or before. In that year the prophecies will be completed, the dead saints or bodies will rise, those children of God who are alive then, will be changed, and caught up to meet the Lord in the air, where they will be married to him. The world and all the wicked will be burnt up (not annihilated) and then Christ will descend and reign personally with his Saints, and at the end of the 1000 years the wicked will be raised, judged and sent to everlasting punishment (this is the second death) (William Miller, Letter to Joseph Atwood, 31 may., 1831).

The summary of Miller's teachings is (1) the imminent and personal Second Coming of Jesus; (2) Jesus would come at the end of the 2300 years, around the year of 1843, based on the prophecies of Daniel 8 and 9[45]; (3) the literal resurrection of the body of the saints by the

[43] The growth in the number of church members in the first half of the 19th century was way higher than this period's already impressive populational growth. The church members in general citizenry increased from around 5 percent to 10 percent in 1800 to about 25 percent in 1850 (Gaustad, 1974, p. 8).

[44] For example, there are some references to the seventh day Sabbath in Millerite publications, a major topic that would be developed later, after 1844, in the branch of "bridegroom" Adventist. Merlin Burt cataloged the Sabbath references in the Millerite publications (Burt, 2002, p. 45-53).

[45] Miller's expression "around the year 1843" was regarded as too general. Sylvester Bliss recorded that by the arrival of the "long-for year", he prepared and published a synopsis of these views. These are stated in sixteen

time of the Second Coming; (4) Jesus would come before the millennium, adopting a premillennialist view; (5) a millennium of peace on earth.[46] Miller believed that his truth was so important and urgent that his followers should not cloud the clarity of their message by emphasizing other doctrinal points. To do so would risk divisions and sectarianism in the Adventist rank (Knight, 2010, p. 46).

After the disappointment of 1844, Miller proved his discomfort with the spirit of "sectarism and bigotry" that some had developed within the movement. He also attributed that many of the disputations of his days were caused using terms not found in the Scriptures, including the main theological conflict of the Second Great Awakening, the differences between the Calvinist and the Arminian. Discussing in the context of "eternal security," Miller illustrated that as a company of men in the lower story of a house when the tide is entering, and there is no escape only by a rope. All are in the same dilemma and endeavor to lay hold of the rope. But one is afraid of not having held the right rope; the other is sure of the rope but is afraid the rope will break (Miller, 1845b, p. 4-5). He called them foolish for quarreling with each other, for "one supposes the rope may break, and the other that it is the wrong rope" (Miller, 1845b, p. 5)

Although Miller, in 1845, argued that the Arminian controversy was secondary in view of the Second Coming, he showed an inclination for Calvinism. Raised as a Baptist, "the Calvinist culture shaped his youthful religiosity" (Rowe, 2008, p. 15). The statement of beliefs he drew up in 1822 is yet confusing and could hint at a limited atonement: "All those for whom Christ intervened" could be saved. But it can also be understood as Arminian, since in article seven, he argued for an unlimited atonement: "Jesus Christ is an offering of God to sinners for their redemption from sin, and that those who believe in his name may take him by faith, go to God, and find mercy; and that such will in no wise be rejected" (Miller *apud* Bliss, 1853, p. 78).

short articles with proof texts. In the last one, he attested that he was "fully convinced that sometime between March 21, 1843, and March 21, 1844, according to the Jewish mode of computation of time..." (Bliss, 1853, p. 171-172; White, 1875, p. 170-172).

[46] In 1831, William Miller prepared a series of eight articles for a Baptist periodic, the *Vermon Telegraph*, which was published between November 1832 and March 1833. This article was incorporated in pamphlet format and published in 1833 in Vermont. The tract had multiple editions. Probably the most circulated edition was the 1842, published by Joshua V. Himes. In this articles, a summary of Miller's beliefs is provided by himself.

> By 1833, Miller's correspondence pointed to the preference for Calvinism. He affirmed that those who try to "shun the restricted atonement" get stuck. "The only way for the general folks, is, to say nothing, and think less" (William Miller, letter to Hendryx, 10 apr., 1833).
> In 1838, he expressed his dissatisfaction with the success of the Arminians, lamenting their influence: "Our churches as well as ministers have all departed from the Calvinistic creed, and to mention 'Election' would in a public congregation produce about as much effect as an electrical battery with the whole congregation hold of the conductor" (William Miller, letter to Hendryx, 8 sept., 1838).[47]

In his most theological book, *Evidence from Scripture and History*, Miller vehemently criticized the New Haven Theology principles and the Edwardsean theologians' impact during the Second Great Awakening. The emphasis that humans have the natural ability to choose between good and evil could not be accepted by him. He stressed that "we are now taught that man can make himself a Christian as easily as he can turn about in the highway." He believed "the depravity of the human heart, our dependence on God, and indebtedness to grace, are abundantly taught in the Scriptures" (Miller, 1842a, p. 157-158).

He also rejected Finney's thought of sanctification as a necessity for justification, "that obedience or baptism is regeneration; that works are the medium of acceptance with God, and that the righteousness of Christ is not imputed." Without mentioning it by name, Miller credited this New Haven School, such as the Oberlin Theology, as the prophetic fulfillment of the Laodicean church's lukewarm condition (Rev. 3:14-22) (Miller, 1842a, p. 158). It's worth noting that he remained consistent with his approach as outlined in his *Apology and Defence*, choosing not to involve himself in doctrinal disputes and instead focusing on the doctrine of the Second Coming. Calvinism and Arminianism were only briefly mentioned in official publications and were only discussed in more depth in his private conversations.

Several scholars have observed that the triumph of Millerism can be attributed to its resemblance, rather than its contrasts, with the evangelical movement prevalent during that era. David Rowe argued, "Millerites are not fascinating because they were so different from everyone else but because they were so like their neighbors" (Rowe, 1993, p. 15). Everett Dick's analysis proposes that the movement was one of the common people, led by a farmer from upstate New York and carried on by the middle class. Most of the lecturers were lay preachers, and the ministries who embraced the doctrine were mostly ordinary local

[47] For the inclination of Miller to Calvinism, see (Rowe, 2008, p. 150-151).

preachers or itinerant circuit riders (Dick, 1994, p. 165).

Although Miller emphasized eschatology and the fulfillment of prophetic events in a chronological sequence, he stayed committed to conventional evangelical beliefs (Fortin, 2004, p. 12).[48] Thus, Millerism is no longer considered a movement that relies on sensationalism, emotion, and hysteria, as suggested by Clara Endicott Sears in the early 1900s (Sears, 1924).[49] However, the similarities of Millerism with the religious milieu could not be a sole explanation. If they were so aligned with their culture, why did Millerism provoke such a strong controversy? Doan suggests that Millerite images of imminent supernatural intervention into the world conflicted with a growing evangelical belief in gradual change brought about by the transformation of the hearts of believers (Doan, 1993, p. 129-130).

Therefore, Millerism was unequivocally radical and critical of the evangelical majority. By the end of 1843, with the "come out of Babylon" movement, leadership had begun "to shift from Miller, Himes, and Litch to a newer and more radical group that contained such men as Storrs, Mash, and others yet to rise to prominence" (Knight, 2010, p. 133). "Come-outerism" was not only present in Millerism, but "formed part of the social and cultural context in which Millerism flourished" (Doan, 1987, p. 122). For such a group, compromise with error was unacceptable and they quested for greater purity for Christianity (Doan, 1987, p. 122; Knight, 2010, p. 131). That is why many Millerites quickly separated from the evangelical churches. Miller, though, seems to have adopted a more cautious approach. He held that people should stay in their churches until they were turned out, and in 1845, he looked back at the call to come out of Babylon as a "perversion of the Word of God" (Miller, 1845b, p. 25).

Many of Miller's contemporaries had long been making prophetic calculations, but Miller's was more dramatic because it was more exact and precise. However, in many other aspects, his doctrine could be virtually characterized as orthodoxy. It is true that Miller opposed many approaches to religion and criticized many of his contemporaries, but he was publicly dogmatical majorly on two points: Christ would come, and He would do so about 1843

[48] Besides Cross' *Burned-Over District*, a good overview of how Millerism was theological orthodox and with resemblance to other denominations is (Rowe, 1985). Ruth Doan also commented that "Millerites were, in their origins, good evangelical Protestant Americans." (Doan, 1987, p. 254).

[49] Howard Krupp, in his thesis, presents a summary of scholars that reject Sear's view and saw Millerism as traditional in both doctrine and values and not oddity like other radicals such as the Oneida Community or Shakers. See (Krug, 2008, p. 8-14). An interesting study made by Ronald L. Numbers and Janet S. Numbers analyses the relation of the religious excitement of the 19th century, including Millerism, and insanity. See (Numbers; Numbers, 1993, p. 92-117).

(Cross, 1950, p. 291).

For sure, Millerites were countercultural on a broad scale, even though Miller's thought was certainly connected with the evangelical ethos within a movement of revivalism and millennial fever. However, taking into consideration Miller's thought and theology, two aspects remain countercultural and differentiate himself in relation to the mainstream revivalist's theology of the Second Great Awakening: (1) his historicist hermeneutics based on more radical *sola scriptura,* creating a comprehensive eschatological system with an imminent supernatural intervention; culminating with (2) a premillennialism view of the Second Coming.

The Second Great Awakening Hermeneutics, Miller's rules of interpretation, and the Millennial Fever

The Second Great Awakening was a crusade of human reason. Even the Methodist revival, which could be summarized in a short list of doctrines, such as salvation, perfection, and the witness of the Spirit, insisted on the rationality of faith. When defending their doctrines, "they employed the ideas of the Scottish philosophers, the discoveries of mental science, the confirmation of natural theology, and the Christian evidences" (Holifield, 2003, p. 272). In 1831, Asa Shinn also wrote about the rules of evidence in pursuing religious truth based on logic and reason. For the Methodist preacher, human reason was only weakened by the fall, but he was still capable of understanding God's revelation alone.[50]

Joseph Stevens Buckminster's death in 1812 is the symbolic birth of modern American biblical criticism (Holifield, 2003, p. 191). He thought that biblical criticism would explode Calvinist theology and many supernatural explanations would succumb under the loyalty to evidential logic (Buckminster, 1814, p. 105-107). Nevertheless, during the Second Great Awakening, criticism did not have much of an impact because the preachers still held the Bible in high esteem. Although the revivalists placed great importance on human reasoning, they still saw the Bible as divinely inspired and the main source of authority. The regular 19th-

[50] He responded to his critics' argument of the inability of human reason after the fall with three points: (1) human reason is weakened by sin but not become all deceitful; (2) The fall has introduced many "disorders of the passions" and " corruptions of the heart," but our intelligent faculties themselves, have not become deceitful only affected; and (3) if the reason were all corrupt, there would be no other way to get instruction from the Bible since reason faculties were the reason was the medium of judging revelation (Shinn, 1831, p. 34-36).

century Baptists believed that the Bible was "the true center of Christian union and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried" (Baird, 1844, p. 459).

Charles Finney's preaching style, described as a "chain of the closest logic," and his lectures in the "science" of revival demonstrate how the role of reason was a major force in his theology (Staton, 1885, p. 22). He understood that the reason of man, unaided by divine illumination, can understand the historical facts of religion, just as any other historical facts. And grasp the doctrinal proposition of the gospel, including the law of God. Man, alone, can see and understand by himself that "he is a sinner, and that he cannot be saved by his own works." However, this is the limit of reason for Finney. "Mere intellect never will move the soul to act", so the next steps to salvation and sanctification were achieved by the influence of the Holy Spirit (Finney, 1858b, p. 400-402). This emphasis on human reason and its neutrality is consistent with the revision of Calvinism at that time.

At least once, Finney published a list of five "well-settled rules" of Bible interpretation: (1) Different passages must be so interpreted, if they can be, as not to contradict each other; (2) language is to be interpreted according to the subject matter of discourse; (3) respect is always to be had to the general scope and design of the speaker or writer; (4) texts that are consistent with either theory, prove neither; (5) language is to be so interpreted if it can be, as not to conflict with sound philosophy, a matter of fact, the nature of things, or immutable justice (Finney, 1994, p. 254).[51] The first four are sound orthodoxy reformed principles, but the latter one demonstrates how important the role of human reason was for Finney in his theology.

William Miller's use of the Bible and his Rules of Interpretation

William Miller's interpretation of the Bible was shaped by his previous adherence to deism, as well as the Enlightenment, along with other theologians who were part of the

[51] Charles Hodge, in his systematic theology, published in 1873, shared his thoughts on Finney's emphasis on reason at the same time as strength and weakness: "The system of Professor Finney is a remarkable product of relentless logic. It is valuable as a warning. It shows to what extremes the human mind may be carried when abandoned to its own guidance. He begins with certain axioms, or, as he calls them, truths of the reason, and from these he draws conclusions which are indeed deductions, but which shock the moral sense, and prove nothing but that his premises are false" (Hodge, 1997, p. 8-9).

Second Great Awakening (Crocombe, 2014, p. 230). His conversion in 1816 from deism led him to study the Bible, adopting a rationalistic method of Biblical interpretation (Freed, 1995, p. 15). His friends, after his conversion, often taunted him for his "blind faith." He responded by arguing that the apparent contradiction in the Bible could be all harmonized (Miller, 1845b, p. 2-3). Thus, he equated proof of the Bible's inner consistency with evidence of its inspiration, by which he sought an "empirical verification for faith" (Freed, 1995, p. 15; Rowe, 1985, p. 9). Miller, in his endeavor, even called the Bible a "feast of reason."[52]

The principles of hermeneutics, known as "Miller's Rules of Bible Interpretation,"[53] are mainly part of the Protestant tradition. The first four rules are related to general instructions of interpretation. For him, all scripture is necessary and understandable, Scripture is its own expositor, and "every word should have its own scriptural meaning … and have no contradiction" (Miller, 1836, p. 5). The remaining rules were predominantly concerned with eschatology. He favored a literal sense of prophecy and the use of comparison of texts within the Bible as the tools to interpret the symbols of Daniel and Revelation.[54]

Miller adopted a more literal approach to the principle of *sola scriptura* than most of the prominent figures of the Second Great Awakening. For Miller, the logic and harmony of the Bible were evidence of the supernatural nature of the Scriptures but not the primary method for biblical interpretation. He did not support the optimistic Jacksonian humanistic beliefs about human reasoning and moral neutrality, which the New Haven Theology and Charles Finney upheld.[55] Rather, he believed that human intelligence should be used in the Bible restricted to merely "good sense."[56] Furthermore, Miller clearly rejected the influence

[52] Miller continues: "all that was dark, mystical, or obscure to me in its [Bible] teachings, had been dissipated from my mind, before the clear light that now dawned from its sacred pages" (Miller, 1845b, p. 12).

[53] The two major sources enumerating Miller's hermeneutic principles are the introduction of his lectures, published in 1832, and a letter he wrote regarding prophetic interpretation (Miller, 1836, p. 3-10; 1840, p. 25-26). This letter was also published in a schematic arrangement in (Himes, 1841, p. 20-24). A revised form of his rules appeared also in (Hale, 1843, p. 103-106; Miller, 1842b, p. 4).

[54] For a summary and an analysis of Miller's rules of interpretation, see (Damsteegt, 1977, p. 16-20).

[55] One key aspect of the Jacksonian era was the power and ability of the common man. The Second Awakening was mainly conducted by lay people or untrained ministers. The interpretation of the Bible should not be restricted to clergy or privileged men. Miller's message would also appeal to the lay and common people as truth accessible to them. Rowe states that Miller "explained how each person could discover the truth he had found, thus making the secrets of revelation accessible to any believer. In this regard, his views were the religious counterpart of the political antinomianism and popular democracy of the age of the common American" (Rowe, 1993, p. 13).

[56] Miller, in his rules of interpretation, frequently used the term "good sense" as a synonym for reason: "If you put on the right construction, it will harmonize with the Bible and make good sense, otherwise it will not?" (rule

of philosophy in his theology (Miller, 1845b, p. 36). This literal interpretation of the Bible ultimately led to his prophetic understanding.

Miller wrote that in his personal Bible discoveries, he "laid by all commentaries, former views and prepossessions, and determined to read and try to understand" for himself (Himes, 1841, p. 11). It is reasonable to say that, as an avid reader, he had "examined various religious and biblical works before he began his intense study of the Bible in 1816" (Knight, 1993, p. 40). Bliss quotes N. Southard, who wrote in 1843 that Miller "never had a commentary in his house, and did not remember reading any work upon the prophecies except Newton and Faber, about thirty years ago" (Bliss, 1853, p. 243).[57] Newton and Faber were interpreters who followed the historicist approach and heavily relied on the works of Joseph Mede. It is likely that Miller became familiar with historicism through them; Mede by the way was premillennialist.

Ernest Sandeen pointed out that, indeed, "few non-Adventist scholars would contest the general position of Adventist historians that Miller formulated his positions on the return of Christ in 1843 quite independently" (Sandeen, 1974, p. 110).[58] It is true that Miller's methodology was not unique, as Kai Arasola observes that "no … American Protestant interested in Biblical prophecies in the early half of the nineteenth century could avoid encountering the traditional historical method" (Arasola, 1990, p. 48). However, Miller's interpretations and dates were more accurate than others, and he was more closely and exclusively to the Bible than any other enthusiast of the half-century.[59]

---

10). In his rule 11: "If it makes good sense as it stands … then it must be understood literally, if not, figuratively." And in rule 12: "To learn the true meaning of figures… if it makes good sense, you need look no further" (Himes, 1841, p. 21-22). Jeff Crocombe proposes that the use of "good sense" is the "foundation of Miller's rules." It seems that it is an exaggeration of Miller's intentions. The fundamental of Miller's interpretation rules is the sufficiency of the Bible to interpret itself. See (Crocombe, 2014, p. 230).

[57] Besides Thomas Newton and George Stanley Faber, Freed also includes that Miller read John Gill (Freed, 1995, p. 16).

[58] A story registered in 1843 recalled a minister who stopped by Miller's home. Not finding him, the clergyman requested to examine his library. "His daughter conducted the visiter [sic] into the northeast room, where he has sat so many hours at his ancient desk. Those two books [The Bible and Cruden's Concordance] and no other lay on the table. 'This is his library', said she. The clergyman was amazed" (Southard, 1843, p. 88).

[59] Cross is the one that attested to these two specific characteristics of Millerism: "[Miller's] chronology merely elaborated and refined the kind of calculations his contemporaries had long been making but became more dramatic because it was more exact, and because the predicted event was more startling." About the use of the Bible, Cross argues that "no other enthusiasts of the half-century, in fact, stuck so closely and exclusively to the Bible as did the Millerites" (Cross, 1950, p. 290-291, 296). Although it is usually not included as one of the mainstream developments within the Second Awakening, Restorationism was a movement with a certain impact, particularly in Millerism. This group intended to restore Christianity to the plain doctrine of the Bible and the early church. Although, according to Dick, only 8% of the Millerites belonged to this group, many preeminent

Miller's precision was not based only on a date established for the Second Coming but a whole prophetic system. It is noteworthy that Miller put forth a sequence of predictions, incorporating Daniel 7 to 12 and Revelation 13, that provide a comprehensive understanding of the events leading up to the Second Coming of Jesus. After the so-called first disappointment of 1843, Josias Litch explained the essence of the movement as not based only on time-setting:

> The doctrine does not consist in merely tracing prophetic periods, although that is an important part of the work. But the whole prophetic history of the world is given in the pages of inspiration, is recorded in history, and affords indubitable evidence of the fact, that we have approached a crisis... no disappointment respecting a definite point of time can move them, or drive them from their position, relative to the speedy coming of the Lord (Litch, 1844, p. 80).

The Millennial Fever in the Nineteenth Century and Miller's Premillennialist Approach

An important distinctive feature of Miller's prophetic system was the idea that Jesus would come before and not after the Millennium described in Revelation 20. In the 19th century, America was experiencing a millennial fever in the aftermath of the French Revolution. It was the force behind the rebirth of the prophetic expectation of the one thousand years. The events regarding Napoleon and the dethronement of the Pope in 1798 have been described as a prophetic Rosetta Stone that boosted the interpretation of Daniel and Revelation (Sandeen, 1974, p. 108). The result was that America was "drunk on the millennium" with many prophetical expectations (Sandeen, 1970, p. 42).

According to popular belief at the time, it was thought that Christ would return at the end of the millennium, after one thousand years (Knight, 2010, p. 15). Miller's ultimate conclusion, however, was that Christ would come before the millennium. At that time, the dead saints will rise, the world will be purified by fire, and Christ will descend and reign personally with the saints for a thousand years on a renewed earth (Miller, 1842a, p. 23). Although Miller was not alone in his premillennial views, the major voices in the Second

leaders, such as Joshua Himes and Joseph Bates were restorationists. The strict hermeneutic that Miller adopted was attractive to this group (Dick, 1994, p. 166).

Awakening could agree with the nearness of the millennium, but not in its meaning.[60] The glorious future proposed by many revivalists was based on human progress and times of peace, not the end of the world, as Miller proposed.[61]

Lyman Beecher, the revivalist from Yale, anticipated an imminent millennium as a culmination of revivals, new missionary movements, and the efforts of temperance societies (Froom, 1954, p. 100-101). George Bush, a professor at New York University, wrote Miller that he had "entirely mistaken the nature of events which are to occur when those periods have expired" (Bush; Miller, 1844, p. 11). Although Charles Finney's millennialism rarely appeared in his theological works, he tried to convince Miller that "what he expects to come after the judgment, will come before it [the millennium]" (Finney, 1843, p. 58). Finney condoned the optimism of his days and believed that the millennium "would have fully come in the United States before this day" if there were not so many oppositions to the revivals (Finney, 1835, p. 282).

Some credited the Millerism success to the decrease of optimism by the end of the 1830s caused by many factors, including the economic depression of 1837 (Cross, 1950, p. 214-215; Krug, 2008, p. 31). However, it is a too simplistic explanation. Millerites were optimistic in their expectation of the imminent end of the world. Besides, the appeal of Miller's movement was also in its distinctive characteristics: a biblical message with a strict *sola scriptura* hermeneutics and a prophetic system based on a historicist approach while not abandoning the protestant orthodox. In a revived American Society, this is a recipe for success. In many ways, Millerism was unexpected, shocking, and even infuriating to the standards of the Second Great Awakening (Anderson, 1993, p. 89).

CONCLUSION

To summarize, the Second Great Awakening had a significant impact on American

[60] During a series of conferences held at the Albury estate in Britain, numerous Anglicans, and members of the Established Presbyterian church in Scotland concluded that the Second Advent of Christ would take place prior to the millennium. This was summarized by Henry Drummond, who was a member of Parliament (Drummond, 1829, p. 2-3). For other examples of premillennialist views, see (Sandeen, 1974, p. 108-110; Smith, 2021).

[61] John Humphrey Noyes precisely described the expectations of this time: "The whole world seems to be looking for a Revolution. Some expect an orthodox Millennium; others, a golden age of phrenology; others still, a physiological regeneration of the human race; and not a few are awaiting, in anxious or hopeful suspense, the trump of the Second Advent and the day of judgment" (Noyes, 1847, p. 52).

evangelicalism. It not only introduced new techniques and organizational mechanisms but also conveyed a powerful message that shaped America as it is today. It reaffirmed the ideals of freedom and liberty, fostering a sense of hope and anticipation for a new era, the Millennium. The Second Revival spread mainly into three different regions: (1) New England, (2) the Methodism of the frontiers, and (3) the burned-over district in upstate New York.

In its theology, the Second Great Awakening saw the expansion of Arminianism and the revision of Calvinism. The New Divinity School and New Haven Theology reviewed the Calvinist concept of depravation and argued for the human natural ability to choose salvation. They laid over humanity the responsibility of piety. Besides, the Arminian Methodism was the denomination that benefited most of the Second Revival and experienced unprecedented growth. Charles Finney, the greatest evangelist of the time, also disclosed an unorthodox form of Calvinism. Not completely Arminian as Methodism, Finney emphasized, as the New Haven theology, that moral depravity was a voluntary attitude of the mind. It was the choice of self as the ultimate end.

The orthodoxy of Calvinism that undermined human liberty and emphasized God's sovereignty was no longer suitable in the post-American Revolution Era. Therefore, this revised form of Calvinism dominated New England's scenery and Finney's revivals. William Miller was a man with one doctrine, the soon return of Christ, and did not engage in the discussions between traditional Calvinists and Arminianism. However, in a private setting, he showed some preference for Calvinism and especially criticized Finney's theology that sanctification was necessary for justification and that human will was not completely depraved.

Regarding hermeneutics, the Second Great Awakening placed a high value on the Bible and recognized its spiritual and supernatural qualities. However, it also emphasized the importance of human reason as a principle for interpreting it. Additionally, they were anticipating the millennium's arrival, and there was a strong resurgence of prophetic interpretation at that time. In this context, Millerism was undoubtedly part of the Second Great Awakening and shared with this movement the millennium fever, the devotion to prophetic interpretation, and the revival of religious piety. However, Miller also started a countercultural movement that (1) involved strict adherence to the principle of *Sola Scriptura*, which meant being more biblical than his peers; and (2) through the lens of historicism,

created a comprehensive system of prophetic interpretation that accurately predicted the times and events leading up to the premillennial Second Coming of Jesus.

REFERENCES

ANDERSON, Eric. The Millerite use of prophecy: a case study of a "striking fulfilment". In: NUMBERS, Ronald; BUTLER, Jonathan (ed.). **The Disappointed:** millerism and millennialism in the nineteenth century. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1993. p. 78-90.

ANDREWS, Dee. **The Methodists and Revolutionary America, 1760-1800:** the shaping of an evangelical culture. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

ARASOLA, Kai. **The End of Historicism:** millerite hermeneutic of time prophecies in the old testament. Uppsala: University of Uppsala, 1990.

ASBURY, Francis. **The Journal of Rev. Francis Asbury**. New York: N. Bangs and T. Mason, 1821. v. 3.

ATKINSON, John. **Centennial History of American Methodism**. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884.

BAIRD, Robert. **Religion in America**. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1844.

BANGS, Nathan. **The Errors of Hopkinsianism Detected and Refuted**. New York: John C. Totten, 1815.

BENNETT, David. **The Altar Call:** its origins and present usage. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2000.

BLISS, Sylvester. **Memoirs of William Miller**. Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1853.

BOLES, John. **The Great Revival, 1787-1805:** the origins of the southern evangelical mind. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1972.

BUCKMINSTER, Joseph. **Sermons by the Late Rev. Joseph S. Buckminster**. Boston: John Eliot, 1814.

BURT, Merlin. **The Historical Background, Interconnected Development and Integration Of The Doctrines Of The Sanctuary, The Sabbath, And Ellen G. White's Role In Sabbatarian Adventism From 1844 To 1849**. 2002. Thesis (doctorate in philosophy) - Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, 2002. Available at: https://cdn.centrowhite.org.br/home/uploads/2022/11/AND099.pdf. Access at: 23 out. 2024.

BUSH, G.; MILLER, W. **Reasons for Rejecting Mr. Miller's Views on the Advent, by Rev. George Bush; With Mr. Miller's Reply**. Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1844.

CALDWELL, Robert. **Theologies of the American Revivalists:** From Whitefield to Finney. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2017.

CARTWRIGHT, Peter. **Autobiography of Peter Cartwright, the Backwoods Preacher**. London: Alexander Heylin, 28, Paternoster Row, 1858.

COLEMAN, Robert. The origin of the altar call in American Methodism. **The Asbury Journal**, 12, n. 1, p. 19-26, 1958. Available at: https://place.asburyseminary.edu/asburyjournal/vol12/iss1/6/. Access at: 23 out. 2024.

CROCOMBE, Jeff. A Feast of Reason - The legacy of William Miller on Seventh-day Adventist hermeneutics. In: COLE, Ross; PETERSEN, Paul (ed.). **Hermeneutics, Intertextuality and the Contemporary Meaning of Scripture**. Adelaide: Avondale Academic Press, 2014. p. 227-238.

CROSS, Withney. **The Burned-over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Region in Western New York, 1800-1850**. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1950.

DAMSTEEGT, Pieter. **Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission**. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.

DICK, Everett. N. **William Miller and the Advent Crisis:** 1831-1844. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1994.

DICK, Everett. The Millerite Movement. In: LAND, Gary (ed.). **Adventism in America**: a history. Revised ed. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1998.

DOAN, Ruth. **The Miller Heresy, Millennialism, and American Culture**. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.

DOAN, R. A. Millerism and Evangelical Culture. *In*: NUMBERS, Ronald; BUTLER, Jonathan (ed.). **The Disappointed:** Millerism and millennialism in the nineteenth century. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1993. p. 119-138.

DRUMMOND, Henry. **Dialogues on Prophecy**. London: James Nisbet, 1828. v. 1.

EDWARDS, Jonathan. **Freedom of the Will**. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1957. (The works of Jonathan Edwards).

FINNEY, Charles. **Lectures on Revivals of Religion**. 2nd ed. New York: Leavitt, Lord & Co., 1835.

FINNEY, Charles. Remarks. **Oberlin Evangelist**, v. 5**,** n. 8, p. 57-64, 1843. Available at: https://cdm15963.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/evangelist/id/1368/rec/138. Access at: 24 out. 2024.

FINNEY, Charles. **Lectures on Systematic Theology**. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1858a.

FINNEY, Charles. **Lectures to Professing Christians**. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1858b.

FINNEY, Charles. **Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney**. New York: A. S. Barnes & Company, 1876.

FINNEY, Charles. **Finney's Systematic Theology:** the complete and newly expanded 1878 edition. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 1994.

FORTIN, Denis. **Adventism in Quebec:** the dynamics of rural church growth 1830-1910. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2004.

FREED, Anne. A feast of reason: the appeal of William Miller's way of reading the Bible. **Adventist Heritage**, v. 16, n. 3, p. 14-21, 1995. Available at: https://scholarsrepository.llu.edu/advent-heritage/33/. Access at: 24 out. 2024.

FROOM, LeRoy. **The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers:** the historical development of prophetic interpretation. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1954. v. 4.

GAUSTAD, Edwin. Introduction. In: GAUSTAD, Edwin (ed.). **The Rise of Adventism**. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. p. 11-20.

GRIFFIN, Edward. **The Doctrine of Divine Efficiency, Defended Against Certain Modern Speculations**. New York: Jonathan Leavitt, 1833.

GUELZO, Allen. An heir or a rebel? Charles Grandison Finney and the New England theology. **Journal of the Early Republic**, v. 17, n. 1, p. 61-94, 1997.

HALE, Apollos. **The Second Advent Manual**. Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1843.

HARVEY, Joseph. **An Examination of the Pelagian and Arminian Theory of Moral Agency as Recently Advocated by Dr. Beecher in His 'Views in Theology'**. New York: Ezra Collier, 1837.

HEMPTON, David. **Methodism: Empire of the Spirit**. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.

HIGHAM, John. From boundlessness to consolidation. In: GUARNERI, Carl (ed.). **Hanging Together:** unity and diversity in American culture. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001. p. 149-166.

HIMES, Joshua (ed.). **Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology, Selected from Manuscripts of William Miller; With a Memoir of His Life**. Boston: Moses A. Dow, 1841.

HODGE, Charles. **Systematic Theology**. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 1997. 3 v.

HOLIFIELD, Brooks. **Theology in America:** Christian thought from the age of the puritans to the civil war. New Haven, NY: Yale University Press, 2003.

HOPKINS, Samuel. **Sketches of the life of the late, Rev. Samuel Hopkins, D.D. Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Newport**. Hartford: Hudson and Goodwin, 1805.

KLING, D. W. New Divinity Schools of the Prophets, 1750-1825: A Case Study in Ministerial Education. **History of Education Quarterly**, v. 37, n. 2, p. 185-206, 1997. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/369359. Access at: 24 out. 2024.

KNIGHT, George. **Millennial Fever and the End of the World**. Boise: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1993.

KNIGHT, George. **William Miller and the Rise of Adventism**. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 2010.

KRUG, Howard. **Charles Finney and William Miller: Revivalists, Reformers, and Millennialists Looking Downward and Upward**. 2008. Dissertation (Master of Arts) - Department of History, State University of New York College, Brockport, New York, 2008.

LITCH, Josiah. The rise and progress of Adventism. **Adventist Shield and Review**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 46-92, 1844. Available at: https://adventistdigitallibrary.org/adl-367101/advent-shield-and-review-may-1-1844. Access at: 24 out. 2024.

MATHEWS, Donald. The second great awakening as an organizing process, 1780-1830: An Hypothesis. **American Quarterly**, v. 21, n. 1, p. 23-43, 1969.

McGREADY, James. **The Posthumous Works of the Reverend and Pious James M'Gready**. Nashville, TN: J. Smith's Steam Press, 1837.

MCLOUGHLIN, William. Revivalism. In: GAUSTAD, Edwin (ed.). **The Rise of Adventism**. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. p. 119-153.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH. **Minutes of the Methodist Conferences**. New York: Daniel Hitt and Thomas Ware, 1813.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH; ROBERTS, R. R. **The doctrines and discipline of the Methodist Episcopal church**. New York: George Lane, 1840.

MILLER, William. **Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ, about the Year 1843**. Troy, NY: Kemble & Hopper, 1836. v. 1.

MILLER, William. Letters. No. 5. **Signs of the Times**, v. 1, n. 4, p. 25-26, 1840. Available at: https://documents.adventistarchives.org/AdvRelated/STM/STM18400515-V01-04.pdf. Access at: 24 out. 2024.

MILLER, William. **Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ, about the Year 1843**. Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842a. v. 2.

MILLER, William. Rules of interpretation. **The Midnight Cry,** v. 1, n. 1, p. 4, 1842b. Available at: https://documents.adventistarchives.org/AdvRelated/MC/MC18421117-V01-01.pdf. Access at: 25 out. 2024.

MILLER, William. Address to second advent believers. **Signs of the Times and Expositor of Prophecy**, v. 6, n. 24, 1844.

MILLER, William. Mr. Miller's apology and defence. **The Adventist Herald and The Morning Watch**. v. 10**,** n. 1, p. 1-8, 1845a.

MILLER, William. **William Miller's Apology and Defence**. Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1845b.

NOLL, Mark. **America's God:** from Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002.

NOYES, John. **The Berean:** A manual for the help of those who seek the faith of the primitive church. Putney, VT: Office of the Spiritual Magazine, 1847.

NUMBERS, Ronald; NUMBERS, Janet. Millerism and madness: a study of "Religious Insanity" in nineteenth-century America. In: NUMBERS, Ronald; BUTLER, Jonathan (ed.). **The Disappointed:** Millerism and millennialism in the nineteenth century. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1993. p. 1-16

RICHEY, Russel; ROWE, Kenneth; SCHMIDT, Jean. **American Methodism:** a compact history. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2012.

ROGERS, Elder. **The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone**. Cincinnati: J. A. & U. P. James, 1847.

ROWE, David. **Thunder and Trumpets:** Millerites and dissenting religion in upstate New York, 1800-1850. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

ROWE, David. Millerites: a shadow portrait. In: NUMBERS, Ronald; BUTLER, Jonathan (ed.). **The Disappointed:** Millerism and millennialism in the nineteenth century. 2nd ed. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1993. p. 92-118.

ROWE, David. **God's Strange Work: William Miller and the End of the World**. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.

SANDEEN, Eernest. **The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930**. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970.

SANDEEN, Ernest. Millennialism. In: GAUSTAD, Edwin (ed.). **The Rise of Adventism**. New York: Harper & Row, 1974

SCOTT, Leland. Methodist theology in the nineteenth century. 1954. Dissertation (PhD) - Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1954.

SCOTT, Leland. The message of early American Methodism. In: **The History of American Methodism.** Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1964. v. 1. p. 291-359.

SEARS, Clara. **Days of Delusion:** a strange bit of history. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

SHINN, Asa. **An Essay on the Plan of Salvation**. 2nd ed. Cincinnati: John H. Wood, 1831.

SMITH, John. **A Dream of the Judgment Day: American Millennialism and Apocalypticism, 1620-1890**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

SMITH, Timothy. **Revivalism and Social Reform**. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.

SOUTHARD, N. The Home of WM Miller. The Midnight Cry. **:** 88 p. 1843.

STATON, Henry. **Random Recollections**. Johnstown, NY: Blunck & Leaning, 1885.

SWEENEY, Douglas. **Nathaniel Taylor, New Haven Theology, and the Legacy of Jonathan Edwards**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

SWEENEY, Douglas; GUELZO, Allen. Are there two roads to holiness? Charles G. Finney and the reinterpretation of Wesleyan/Holiness origins: a conversation between Allen Guelzo and Douglas A. Sweeney. **Wesleyan/Holiness Studies Center Bulletin**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 1-4, 1998. Available at: https://place.asburyseminary.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=revitalizationbulletin. Access at: 30 out. 2024.

TAYLOR, Nathaniel. **Lectures on the Moral Government of God.** New York: Cark, Austin & Smith, 1859. v. 1.

THOMSON, John. **The Doctrine of Convictions set in a clear Light, Or, An Examination and Confutation of several Errors relating to Conversion**: being the substance of a sermon preached by the author to his own and a neighbouring congregation, with some enlargements. Philadelphia: A Bradford, 1741.

THRIFT, Minton. **Memoir of the Rev. Jesse Lee with Extracts from his Journals**. New York: N. Bangs and T. Mason, 1823.

TYLER, Bennet. **Letter on the Origin and Progress of the New Haven Theology**. New York: Robert Carter and Ezra Collier, 1837.

WHITE, Ellen. **Life Sketches of Ellen G. White**. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1915.

WHITE, James. **Life Incidents**. Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1868.

WHITE, James. **Life of William Miller**. Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1875.