CULTURE, SPIRITUALITY, AND RELIGIONS: CONCEPTUAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

Jeff B. Pool, Ph.D.
Eli Lilly Chair in Religion and Culture
Professor of Religion
Chairperson, Department for Studies of
Religions and Spirituality
Berea College
Berea, Kentucky

The Faculty of the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality presupposes working definitions for the major terms in the departmental name ("religions" and "spirituality"), as well as for the notion of human "culture" from which the phenomena emerge to which those two major terms point. Those three major conceptual presuppositions identify and define the purpose and work of the Department, as well as the objects of its studies.

The departmental Faculty acknowledges the complex history of the concepts that the name for the the Department presupposes.[1] For that reason, clarifying the academic field of study to which the name of the Department refers requires definitions of the major terms in the departmental name. The name for the Department, "Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality," *explicitly* attests to two of the three most obvious principal conceptual presuppositions that inform and establish this academic field of study, but also *implicitly* points to a third conceptual presupposition that the two explicit conceptual presuppositions themselves presuppose: (1) the concept of "religions," which identifies human phenomena that both arise from and, in turn, shape human cultures; (2) the concept of "spirituality" that designates an essential dimension of human experience, of which religions or religious communities themselves constitute one family of ways through which individual humans and their societies express the spiritual dimension of human life; and (3) the concept of "culture" that most generally refers to a key feature of human life from which both human spirituality and human religions themselves emerge and which, in turn, help to shape culture itself. The following definitions and descriptions of these three conceptual presuppositions begin with the most general and move to the most specific of those three concepts: from the concept of "culture," through the concept of "spirituality," and to the concept of "religions."

I. THE CONCEPT OF "CULTURE"

First, like a vast number of other academic departments that study religious phenomena in other institutions of higher education, the departmental purpose, curriculum, Faculty, and work *presuppose* an *anthropological* concept of "culture." The Faculty in the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality, like the imminent historian of religions, Jonathan Z. Smith, regards "religion" as "an inextricably human phenomenon" and studies of religions and religious phenomena as "most appropriately described in relation to the Humanities and the Human Sciences, in relation to Anthropology rather than Theology."[2] Human cultures constitute entire or

"whole ways of life" or systems: patterns of behavior, customs, food, language and other modes of communication, acquired and accumulated knowledge, educational processes and patterns, forms of social organization, institutions, material artifacts, arts, music, technologies, ideas, values, symbols, style, mood, characteristic attitudes of human groups toward themselves and their world, worldview, and *ethos*, among many other human processes, patterns, practices, and products — including spiritualities and religions.[3] As Vilmos Csányi has noted, anthropologists generally identify three major overlapping spheres of culture: (1) "social culture" or "the interrelationships of people"; (2) "material culture" or "the production and use of artifacts"; and (3) "mental culture" or "those ideas not manifested in the other two [spheres of culture]."[4] P. C. Mundinger also has developed a more specific, yet complimentary and broadly-applicable, socio-biological definition of culture that emphasizes the relationships of culture and biological processes as well. Mundinger defined the notion of "culture" as "… a set of populations that are replicated generation after generation by learning — an overt population of functionally related, shared, imitable patterns of behavior (and any material products produced) and, simultaneously, a covert population of acquired neural codes for those behaviors."[5] Even more specifically, Edward Farley, a theological anthropologist, has described culture as "the traditions that govern beliefs and behavior," "[the] aspect of a social system or society" that provides a society "with its sense of direction" and that "carries its values through a deposit of symbols." Moreover, according to Farley, societal "subsystems and institutional vehicles" carry culture and serve "… to legitimate, [to] maintain, and [to] transmit the traditions" of culture.[6]

This multi-faceted anthropological understanding of human culture currently serves and historically has served as one major working presupposition for the work of the Faculty in the Department, specifically with respect to the emergence and development of spirituality and religions as important and usually central features of human cultures. *In other words, spirituality and religions do not sit* ***within*** *cultures, as somehow distinct and different from their cultural contexts: rather, spirituality and religions emerge as interwoven and integrated aspects of human cultures that also influence the shape of those cultures*.[7] On the basis of the previous reasons and factors, academic studies of religions and human spirituality do not presuppose some odd definition of the concept of "culture" that would remain peculiar in some way with respect to religious phenomena, as distinct from all other phenomena of human cultures. National and international academic studies of religious phenomena universally presuppose general definitions and understandings of the notion of human "culture." In this regard, with its current departmental name, the Faculty in the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality brings studies of religious and spiritual phenomena at Berea College into greater conformity with the study of religions and spirituality in the larger academy.

As "systems," however, human cultures also contain diversity and do not constitute "seamless whole way[s] of life" or even "internally consistent wholes."[8] Rather, *any* given human culture contains sub-cultures, as well as struggles and conflicts for supremacy and leadership among groups within its society, for the dominance of a single worldview or understanding of reality and *ethos* over other competing worldviews and *ethe*.[9]

While a culture requires some stability to develop a specific character or style, a culture does not constitute and maintain a fixed or an immutable shape. In other words, although cultures shape the lives and experiences of people and groups within their societies, human agency, as well

as non-human factors and forces, also shape and change cultures across time. Human culture also changes as a result of both internal and external influences. Due to those factors, cultures rarely if ever fully succeed in maintaining sharp boundaries between themselves and different cultures, or in maintaining themselves as "self-contained" units: rather, cultures travel, synthesize, and change, not remaining fixed in any historical era or geographical context. Similarly, although a culture persists to some degree because many or most people or groups within a culture share a common viewpoint or worldview, a culture never achieves a consensus of support: all members of a society do not share the same viewpoint about all features of a dominant culture; diversity of perspective, resistance to the dominant culture, and even conflict about key features of a culture exist within societies. While cultures may contribute to social order, they also often if not usually contain features that generate resistance and stimulate changes in culture from various groups within a society.[10]

Historically, academic studies of religions, religious phenomena, and spiritualities more broadly, through a wide array of methods and academic disciplines, have examined precisely these interrelated factors that constitute human cultures, specifically in terms of the three large overlapping spheres of *social culture*, *material culture*, and *mental culture*, as they present themselves through the religions and, more broadly, the religious and spiritual phenomena of human cultures. The *current dominant academic or scientific approaches to studies of religions and religious phenomena* presuppose such anthropological understandings of human culture. Although the Faculty in the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality does not and cannot include experts from every academic discipline for studies of religious phenomena, religions, and spiritualities, the departmental Faculty, similar to its colleagues in the larger field of study, historically has presupposed and currently presupposes such an anthropological understanding of human culture; and, in varying degrees, in terms of several different methods, all members of the Faculty in the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality study religions, and religious and spiritual phenomena more broadly, in all three overlapping cultural spheres: *social culture*; *material culture*; and *mental culture*.

II. THE CONCEPT OF "SPIRITUALITY"

Second, the Faculty in the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality also presupposes a *broadly anthropological concept* of "*spirituality*," *as one major and even key dimension in the larger category of human culture itself*. The contemporary and increasingly-widespread *academic* distinction between the analytical category of "religion" and the analytical category of "spirituality" has emerged most emphatically, although not exclusively, from a widely-*popular* self-description that many people often currently employ to describe themselves, a self-description that one may hear regularly although not exclusively in North America and Europe: people describing themselves as "spiritual but not religious."[11] While some scholars who study religious phenomena from different perspectives and for different reasons have argued against the validity of this popular distinction,[12] other renowned scholars and researchers in both the social sciences and human sciences or humanities intentionally have developed this popular distinction into a clearly-and-coherently-designed academic investigative rubric with which they then have conducted their own specific studies of religion/s and spirituality.[13]

Generally, many researchers and scholars have come to understand the concept of "spirituality" as the larger category, while understanding the concept of "religion," referring especially to both historic and contemporary religious communities or traditions, as a sub-category of the larger category of "spirituality," as one family of ways in which many people have chosen and continue to choose to exercise or to express their spiritualities.[14] For example, one contemporary *philosopher* declares that "… spirituality and religion are not the same," describing "spirituality" as "a much broader concept than the rather specialized notion of religion," "… a *human* phenomenon," "part and parcel of human existence, perhaps even of human nature."[15] Similarly, because the category of "spirituality" (rather than the category of "religion") "… includes the values, priorities, overall purposes, and principles that a person may use to live by, whether or not these are stated in identifiably religious terms or are conceptualized as religious by the individual," the *psychologists*, Raymond F. Paloutzian and Deborah A. Lowe, also regard "spirituality" as the broader category.[16] Over the course of several decades, Robert Wuthnow (a renowned *sociologist* of religions) traced the demographic shift in the United States from that which he characterized as the *public* form of religion (religious communities, organizations, or institutions) to that which he characterized as the more *personal and individual* forms of religion. Wuthnow described this change as the shift from a "spirituality of dwelling" (the public forms of religion) to a "spirituality of seeking" (the personal and private forms of religion).[17] Although on the surface Wuthnow's distinction seems too sharp and simplistic, he certainly understood *both* that a spirituality of dwelling or belonging also contains, leads to, or produces forms of spiritual quest or seeking in individual humans *and* that a spirituality of seeking also discovers or produces forms of spiritual community, dwelling, or belonging for groups of people. Nonetheless, as the distinction itself clearly indicates, his work also suggests that he at least implicitly understood "spirituality" as the larger category that includes "religion/s" (as public or institutional) as a sub-category.

On the basis of the previous important demographic changes of direction and corresponding academic developments, the Faculty in the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality presupposes the previous distinction between *religions* and *spirituality*. As one element of the theoretical basis for the name of the Department, the concept of "spirituality" points to the interior or subjective dimension of human life, that which people "experience privately in [their] subjective awareness," specifically indicating the following features of human life: "… the internal process of seeking personal authenticity, genuineness, and wholeness; transcending one's locus of centricity; developing a greater sense of connectedness to self and others through relationship and community; deriving meaning, purpose, and direction in life; being open to exploring a relationship with a higher power that transcends human existence and human knowing; and valuing the sacred."[18]

III. THE CONCEPT OF "RELIGIONS"

Third, although scholars who study religious phenomena define the term "religion" in many different ways, members of the Faculty in the Department for Studies of Religions and Spirituality generally employ the following understanding as a working description of the term with which they fulfill their responsibilities and conduct the work of the Department. Similar to Malory Nye, the Faculty assumes that, in most if not all human cultures, people produce and participate in a "field of cultural activity" to which they give (or to which one may apply) the label "religion." Again, similar to Nye's approach to the cultural field of religions, the Faculty in the Department examines how the phenomena that appear in this field of cultural activity operate and function "*as part of*, not separate from, the rest of cultural life."[19] In itself, as Roger W. Stump similarly states, *a religion* constitutes "… a cultural system, an integrated complex of meanings, symbols, and behaviors articulated by a community of adherents," a system that "… encompasses a set of normative conceptions or 'givens' that inform the ways in which people understand, act within, and influence the world that they inhabit."[20] Moreover, and following the academic methodological distinction between *spirituality* and *religions*, the Faculty of the Department regards *a* religion (understood as a more public, communal, organizational, and institutional phenomenon) as predominantly a "spirituality of dwelling" or belonging (to borrow Wuthnow's phrase), a sub-category and specific form of the broader anthropological category of "spirituality." *Various religions or specific religious traditions and communities, then, comprise one family of ways in which humans and human communities express, actualize, or instantiate the broader anthropological factor of human spirituality*.

On that basis, then, the departmental Faculty identifies, describes, and analyzes the major dimensions that appear through the diverse phenomena of any specific religion-as-a-cultural-system. Generally, the Faculty borrows and employs a well-known, widely-respected, and often-utilized working set of analytical categories to elucidate the dimensions of a religion or religions, which Ninian Smart both developed from and employed to guide his own studies of religions: (1) the social, political, organizational, or institutional dimension of religions; (2) the ritual, practical, and devotional dimension of religions; (3) the experiential or emotional dimension of religions; (4) the moral and legal dimension of religions; (5) the mythic or narrative dimension of religions; (6) the intellectual, doctrinal, or philosophical dimension of religions; and (7) the material (artistic, symbolic, architectural) dimension of religions.[21]

ENDNOTES

[1] Much of the discussion and research on these three concepts comes from the following publications: Jeff B. Pool, "Toward Spirituality of Post-Christian Disciples of Jesus," *Communio Viatorum* 53 (2011): 3–48; and idem, "Prologue: The Study of Christian Religions," in *Introduction to Christian Religions* (New York, New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, forthcoming). For historical studies of the concept "culture," see the following works: Terry Eagleton, *Culture* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2016); Tomoko Masuzawa, "Culture," pp. 70–93, in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Kathryn Tanner, *Theories of Culture: A New Agenda for Theology*, Guides to Theological Inquiry Series, ed. Kathryn Tanner and Paul Lakeland (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1997), 3–24; and Raymond Williams, "Culture and Civilization," pp. 273–74, in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. and the Free Press, 1967). Similarly, scholars have devoted significant attention to tracing the history of the term "religion," as illustrated by the following brief accounts: Kevin Schilbrack, *Philosophy and the Study of Religions: A Manifesto*, Wiley Blackwell Manifestos Series (Chichester, West Sussex, England: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 115–35; and Jonathan Z. Smith, *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 179–96. Additionally, see the following similar historical accounts of the term "spirituality": Bernard McGinn, "The Letter and the Spirit: Spirituality as an Academic Discipline," pp. 26–35, in *Minding the Spirit: The Study of Christian Spirituality*, ed. Elizabeth A. Dreyer and Mark S. Burrows (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005); and Philip Sheldrake, *Spirituality: A Brief History*, 2d ed., Wiley-Blackwell Brief Histories of Religion Series (Chichester, West Sussex, England: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., 2013).

[2] Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1993; Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1978), 290.

[3] Bruce Grelle, "Culture and Moral Pluralism," pp. 129–30, in *The Blackwell Companion to Religious Ethics*, ed. William Schweiker, Blackwell Companions to Religion Series (Oxford, England, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd., 2008); and Malory Nye, *Religion: The Basics*, 2d ed. (New York, New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2004), 43–44. As elaboration of this understanding, also see Clifford Geertz's still very influential *anthropological* descriptions of the concepts of "*ethos*" and "worldview": Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York, New York: Basic Books Publishers, Inc., 1973), 127.

[4] Vilmos Csányi, *Evolutionary Systems and Society: A General Theory of Life, Mind, and Culture* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, General Evolution Research Group, 1989), 148.

[5] See P. C. Mundinger, "Animal Cultures and a General Theory of Cultural Evolution," *Ethology and Sociobiology* 1 (September 1980): 183–223.

[6] Edward Farley, *Good and Evil: Interpreting a Human Condition* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Fortress, Press, 1990), 56.

[7] The substance of and research for this section come from the following manuscript-in-progress: Jeff B. Pool, *Introduction to Christian Religions* (New York, New York: Routledge Taylor Francis and Group, forthcoming), Chapter 1, "Defining the Object of Study: 'Christian Religions,' " 2–3.

[8] Grelle, "Culture and Moral Pluralism," 130; Tanner, *Theories of Culture*, 42.

[9] This proposal employs the grammatically-correct Greek term "*ethe*," as the plural form of the more well-known Greek loan-word "*ethos*." On the role of *power* in culture, see Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York, New York: International Publishers, 1971).

[10] For well-developed accounts of this post–modern perspective on the nature of human culture, see the following works: Tanner, *Theories of Culture*, 40–56; and Seyla Benhabib, *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002), 1–23.

[11] Researchers have also gathered evidence about the popularity of this often-uncritical popular distinction in the United States: see, e.g., Liesa Stamm, "The Dynamics of Spirituality and the Religious Experience," in *Encouraging Authenticity and Spirituality in Higher Education*, by Arthur W. Chickering, Jon C. Dalton, and Liesa Stamm (San Francisco, California: Josey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint, 2006), 37–38; Jennifer A. Lindholm and Helen S. Astin, "Understanding the 'Interior' Life of Faculty: How Important Is Spirituality?" *Religion and Education* 33 (Spring 2006): 65; and Reid B. Locklin, *Spiritual But Not Religious? An Oar Stroke Closer to the Farther Shore* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2005), 2–5. Moreover, recent demographic research about religious preferences provides correlative evidence with respect to the growing popularity of the self-description ("spiritual not religious"). Despite *both* the large percentage of the global human population that identifies as religiously-affiliated *and* the fanatic religious fervor that has inspired so many religious extremists and has produced such destructive horrors for humanity, according to the results of the research by the Pew Research Center (PRC) in 2010, 16.3 percent of the total global human population identifies as religiously-*un*affiliated, the third largest human population (even higher than the number of people who identify themselves as Hindu) with respect to this demographic research about religions. While this group includes those who identify as atheists and agnostics, in the study by PRC, a large percentage of those who include themselves in this category also hold some religious beliefs (such as, some form of belief in God or an ultimate reality) and "engage in certain kinds of religious practices" (Pew Research Center, "The Global Religious Landscape: A Report on the Size and Distribution of the World's Major Religious Groups as of 2010," Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life [December 2012] pp. 9, 24 [http://www.pewforum.org/files/2014/01/global-religion-full.pdf]). According to a related demographic study by PRC in 2012, the number of people who identify as religiously-*un*affiliated continues to grow rapidly in the United States: from 15.3 percent of adults in the United States in 2007 to 19.6 percent of adults in the U.S. in 2012 (Pew Research Center, " 'Nones' on the Rise," Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life [9 October 2012] [http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/]). These conclusions remain consistent with the previous study by PRC to which this proposal has referred: http://www.pewforum.org/files/2014/01/global-religion-full.pdf. Moreover, according to these studies, this growing population in the U.S. includes especially "millenials" (young people "born between 1981 and 1996) (Tom Gjelten, "Poll Finds Americans, Especially Millenials, Moving Away From Religion," *National Public Radio* [3, 5 November 2015], p. 4 [http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/11/03/454063182/poll-finds-americans-especially-millennials-moving-away-from-religion]; also, again, see Pew Research Center, " 'Nones' on the Rise," Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life [9 October 2012] [http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/] and http://www.pewforum.org/files/2014/01/global-religion-full.pdf.).

[12] As one example, Stephen Prothero has argued that this distinction usually *suggests* "disdain for so-called organized religion," "authentic piety" as "fundamentally a matter of practice, not belief," or "religion stripped down to its experiential dimension." Prothero decries this tendency as "a form of faith that denies its connections to the institutions, stories, and doctrines that gave it birth—religion without memory." He regards the popular sharp distinction between "spirituality" and "religion" as a reflection of "religious illiteracy" in the United States (Stephen Prothero, *Religious Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know—and Doesn't* [New York, New York: HarperOne, An Imprint of HarperCollins Publishers, 2007], 5, 146, 147). Reid B. Locklin, in his argument for "a spirituality of institutional commitment," also argues against the validity of this popular distinction from his own perspective as a Roman-Catholic theologian and teacher of "religious studies" (Locklin, *Spiritual But Not Religious*, 2-5, 132–35). Also, see the following questions about this demographic tendency: John Blake, "Are There Dangers in Being 'Spiritual but Not Religious'?" CNN Website (9 June 2010, 11:47 a.m.): http://www.cnn.com/2010/LIVING/personal/06/03/spiritual.but.not.religious/index.html.

[13] Employing their carefully-developed distinction between spirituality and religion, social-scientific investigators from the Higher Education Research Institute of UCLA conducted multi-year empirical studies of spirituality and religiosity in the development of college students, as well as the roles of spirituality and religions in the lives of faculty in higher education, through the "Spirituality in Higher Education Project." See results from their findings in the following major publications: Alexander W, Astin and Helen S. Astin, *Meaning and Spirituality in the*

Lives of College Faculty: A Study of Values, Authenticity, and Stress (Los Angeles, California: UCLA, Higher Education Research Institute, 1999); Alexander W. Astin, Helen S. Astin, and Jennifer A. Lindholm, *Cultivating the Spirit: How College Can Enhance Students' Inner Lives* (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint, 2011); and Jennifer A. Lindholm, *The Quest for Meaning and Wholeness: Spiritual and Religious Connections in the Lives of College Faculty* (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Brand, 2014).

[14] Wayne Teasdale, *The Mystic Heart: Discovering a Universal Spirituality in the World's Religions* (Novato, California: New World Library, 1999), 17–18. As another significant example, one group of experienced leaders in higher education, scholars in the areas of psychology, educational leadership, and anthropology, argued for development of policies, programs, and practices in institutions of higher education that would complement the emphasis on rational empiricism, would encourage "increased spiritual growth and authenticity" in students, faculty, and staff, and would "create a better balance" between rational empiricism and "other ways of knowing, being, and doing." These scholars developed their argument on the basis of a shared understanding of both "spirituality" and "religion," which they borrowed from Wayne Teasdale (Arthur W. Chickering, "Our Orientation," in *Encouraging Authenticity and Spirituality in Higher Education*, by Arthur W. Chickering, Jon C. Dalton, and Liesa Stamm [San Francisco, California: Josey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint, 2006], xiii, 7–9). See the following scholarship that also develops similar concepts of "spirituality" and "religion": P. C. Hill, K. I. Pargament, R. W. Hood, Jr., M. E. McCullough, J. P. Swyers, D. B. Larson, and B. J. Zinnbauer, "Conceptualizing Religion and Spirituality: Points of Commonality, Points of Departure," *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 30 (2000): 51–77; B. J. Zinnbauer, K. I. Pargament, A. B. Scott, "The Emerging Meanings of Religiousness and Spirituality: Problems and Prospects," *Journal of Personality* 67 (1999): 889–919; P. G. Love and D. Talbot, "Defining Spiritual Development: A Missing Consideration for Student Affairs," *NASPA Journal* 37 (1999): 361–75; Jennifer A. Lindholm and Helen S. Astin, "Understanding the 'Interior' Life of Faculty: How Important Is Spirituality?" *Religion and Education* 33 (Spring 2006): 65; Jennifer A. Lindholm and Helen S. Astin, "Spirituality and Pedagogy: Faculty's Spirituality and Use of Student-Centered Approaches to Undergraduate Teaching," *Review of Higher Education* 31 (Winter 2008): 185; Alyssa N. Bryant and Helen S. Astin, "The Correlates of Spiritual Struggle During the College Years," *Journal of Higher Education* 79 (January/February 2008): 25n.1; Liesa Stamm, "The Dynamics of Spirituality and the Religious Experience," in *Encouraging Authenticity and Spirituality in Higher Education*, 37–38. Also see the following similar descriptions of spirituality: J. Dyson, M. Cobb, and D. Forman, "The Meaning of Spirituality: A Literature Review," *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 26 (1997): 1183–88; N. C. Goddard, "A Response to Dawson's Critical Analysis of 'Spirituality' as Integrative Energy," *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 31 (2000): 968–79; and R. A. Tanyi, "Towards Clarification of the Meaning of Spirituality," *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 39 (2002): 500–509.

[15] Robert C. Solomon, *Spirituality for the Skeptic: The Thoughtful Love of Life* (Oxford, England, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2002), 9–10. Similarly, André Comte-Sponville, a well-respected contemporary French philosopher, distinguishes "spirituality from religion," regarding religion as "… merely one of its possible forms." According to Comte-Sponville, spirituality and religion "… are as whole and part, genus and species. All religions involve spirituality, at least to some extent, but all forms of spirituality are not religious" (André Comte-Sponville, *The Little Book of Atheist Spirituality*, trans. Nancy Huston [New York, New York: Penguin Books, Penguin Group, Inc., 2006], 136).

[16] Raymond F. Paloutzian and Deborah A. Lowe, "Spiritual Transformation and Engagement in Workplace Culture," p. 181, in *Psychology of Religion and Workplace Spirituality*, ed. Peter C. Hill and Bryan J. Dik, Advances in Workplace Spirituality: Theory, Research, and Application Series, series ed. Louis W. Fry (Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, Inc., 2012).

[17] Robert Wuthnow, *After Heaven: Spirituality in America Since the 1950s* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1998), especially 1–18. See the following recent collection that examines contemporary and growing dimensions of this trend: Justine Afra Huxley, ed., *Generation Y, Spirituality and Social Change* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2019).

[18] Lindholm, *Quest for Meaning and Wholeness*, 3, 5; and A. Astin, H. Astin, and Lindholm, *Cultivating the Spirit*, 3, 27.

[19] Nye, *Religion*, 18.

[20] Roger W. Stump, *The Geography of Religion: Faith, Place, and Space* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2008), 7.

[21] In one of his books, Ninian Smart identified seven dimensions of religions: "practical and ritual dimension"; "experiential and emotional dimension"; "narrative or mythic dimension"; "doctrinal and philosophical dimension"; "ethical and legal dimension"; "social and institutional dimension"; and "material dimension" (Ninian Smart, *The World's Religions*, 2d ed. [Cambridge, England, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1998], 13–21). Similarly, in their efforts to re-formulate Christian systematic theology, Ninian Smart and Steven Konstantine emphasize that Christian doctrine does not exist in isolation from other dimensions of Christian religion. For this reason, they situate their study of Christian beliefs and doctrine within the larger reality of Christian religion, again identifying these same seven categories of religion: "belief" or "doctrine"; "myth or sacred narrative"; "ethics, including politics"; "ritual"; "feeling and experience"; "institutions"; and "material manifestations" (Ninian Smart and Steven Konstantine, *Christian Systematic Theology in a World Context*, World Christian Theology Series, series ed. Frank Whaling [Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1991], 22–23). In an earlier book, Smart employed six similar categories in his phenomenological approach to the study of Christian religions: "doctrine, myth, ethics, experience, ritual and institution" (Smart, *Phenomenon of Christianity*, 11). In one of his more recent books, Smart re-arranged the dimensions that he has identified into eight rather than seven categories: "the ritual or practical dimension"; "the doctrinal or philosophical dimension"; "the mythic or narrative dimension"; "the experiential or emotional dimension"; "the ethical or legal dimensions"; "the organizational or social" dimension; "the material or artistic dimension"; and "the political and economic dimensions" (Ninian Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred: An Anatomy of the World's Beliefs* [London, England, United Kingdom: Harper Collins Publishers, 1996], 9–11). One recent study of Christian religion has applied key elements of Smart's now popular categorization of religious dimensions (see Gail Ramshaw, *What Is Christianity? An Introduction to Christian Religion* [Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2013]). Recent historical studies also have approached the study of Christian religions through collections of texts from primary sources, by providing categories that resemble Smart's approach, with respect to key dimensions of religion, as organizing principles for those sources. As one example, Robert E. Van Voorst has organized a collection of primary Christian texts or sources in terms of several major periods of Christian history. Within each period in his historical outline of Christian religions, however, he has organized texts in terms of five major categories: (1) "religious events in the period"; (2) "the life of the institutional church, its organization and worship" during each historical period; (3) "the teachings of Christianity on various subjects" in each period; (4) "the ethics of the Christian tradition," in terms of both personal and social morality, during each historical period; and (5) "the relationships of Christianity to its rivals inside and outside the Christian movement" in each period of history (Robert E. Van Voorst, *Readings in Christianity*, 3d ed. [Stamford, Connecticut: Cengage Learning, 2015], 11). Similarly, yet with an inverted organizational approach, Mary Gerhart and Fabian E. Udoh have also designed a massive collection of primary texts through which to study "Christianity as a world religion." They have organized their collection of sources, however, through a series of similar topics or categories, wherein each category contains documents that cover the whole span of Christian history: (1) "Biblical Traditions and Interpretations: Sources of Authority"; (2) "Early Influences on Emerging Christianity"; (3) "Early Forms of Christianity"; (4) "Rituals and Patterns of Worship"; (5) "Structures of Community: Ways of Living, Decision Making"; (6) "Mysticism, Philosophy, Theology: Demands on the Intellect"; (7) "Twentieth-Century Issues and Challenges"; and (8) "Christianity and Other Religions as World Phenomena" (Mary Gerhart and Fabian E. Udoh, ed., *The Christianity Reader* [Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2007], vii–xiv, 2).