mother, albeit for different reasons. Conversely, in their more egalitarian forms, all three approaches agreed, for very different reasons, that at least some women might legitimately speak as Protestants in the public arena.

Although for heuristic purposes, the three models can be distinguished on the basis of their understanding of the relationship between gender and society, the lines between them often blurred in practice. Distinguishing among them, however, allows a view of the fluid, competitive context in which Coe articulated his understanding of gender and Protestantism. In place of the usual depiction of a twentieth-century masculinizing backlash against a feminized Victorian Protestantism, a more complex picture emerges. In it, the more egalitarian versions of all three approaches found at least limited expression during the opening decades of the twentieth century only to be displaced by less-egalitarian approaches during the 1920s.

The Patriarchal Model

The patriarchal model had its roots in the Greco-Roman world. It was revitalized in the early modern period in the form of a political theory—classical republicanism—that identified "the health of the polity as a whole with the virtus or virility of an ancient warrior ideal." That ideal was particularly influential in the American context around the time of the Revolutionary War. Two historians, Susan Juster and Christine Heyman, have suggested that it had particular impact on early American Methodism. The Greco-Roman version of the model, however, was presupposed in the New Testament and in various ways adapted to Christian purposes in the New Testament itself. In that form, it was accessible to any close reader of the Bible.

This model divided society into the oikos (household) and the polis (city-state). Citizenship in the polis was open to free men capable of fulfilling military obligations. Non-warriors (children, women, and slaves) were all excluded from citizenship. The male property-owner was the head of the household. In this model, the health of the polity depended on the virtus (virtue or virility) of those (free males) designated to defend it. Free males of virtue were simultaneously heads of their households and citizens of the polis. In the household codes of the New Testament, Christ is explicitly described as "the head of the church" just as "the husband is the head of the wife" (Eph. 5:23). The most important metaphors for conversion to Christianity were based upon relationships within the household. Converts gained a place in the Christian household via marriage to Christ (as brides) or adoption as sons of God and joint heirs with Christ of the kingdom. In either case, God was the presumptive head of the Christian household.

The metaphor of adoption was particularly important in the Wesleyan tradition, where the experience of conversion and sanctification was linked to the indwelling of the Spirit of God such that "[t]he Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (Romans 8:16–17). When Coe said that Methodists in his youth "laid great store by 'testimony' to a 'personal experience' of 'conversion' and 'witness of the Spirit' or 'assurance' that one had been pardoned and 'accepted' of God," he was referring to testimony to one's adoption as "sons" or "children of God." As Coe indicated, early Methodists in England and America experienced the witness and indwelling of the Spirit in concrete ways. Those who held to the centrality of a distinctive experience of the Spirit were drawn toward Holiness camp meetings and into the independent Holiness denominations at the turn of the century.

In this model, identity, at least on the spiritual level, was unstable. Both men and women could and did metaphorically switch genders to become brides of Christ, sons of God, and brothers in or soldiers of Christ. Like Paul, they saw visions and were confused about whether they were in their bodies or out of their bodies. They were also at times overcome by the power of God or the Holy Spirit, who sometimes caused them to fall to the ground and sometimes spoke through them while they preached. When the power of God caused them to fall or speak out, it was no longer they who acted but God or the Spirit through them. When the power of God acted through them, they were not acting as themselves, much less as men or women. Turn-of-the-century women, particularly women associated with the more radical Holiness groups, gained access to traditionally male activities such as preaching when the power of the Spirit acted through them. They did so, however, not as women but as mouthpieces for God or the Holy Spirit.

This model could also be adapted so as to rule out the manifestation of the spiritual gifts of inspiration and prophecy in this life and thus effectively to rule out female evangelism. Thus, late-nineteenth-century evangelicals in the Reformed wing of the tradition worked out the dispensationalist understanding of biblical prophecy, in part, as Margaret Bendroth has noted, to combat the "the rising popularity of female evangelists, especially in the holiness wing of evangelical Protestantism." In contrast to the more radical Holiness exegetes who interpreted spiritual gifts mentioned in Scripture as available in the present, dispensationalists emphasized the irreversible nature of original sin (with Eve taking most of the blame for the fall), the impossibility of realized (as opposed to imputed) holiness, and thus the impossibility of authentic spiritual gifts (e.g., inspiration, prophecy, and speaking in tongues) in this world/dispensation. Promises of spiritual gifts and equality
The Maternal Model

The roots of the maternal or domestic model go back to the early nineteenth century. Historians have discussed this model in relation to the emergence of “separate spheres” and the “ideology of domesticity.” As a social theory, it owes a debt to de Tocqueville and to the efforts of those such as Catherine Beecher who popularized and elaborated upon his ideas. It is usually understood as arising as a response, on the one hand, to industrialization (with its concomitant separation of work and home) and, on the other hand, to a need to reconceptualize the social order in the wake of political democratization and ecclesiastical disestablishment. This model has been widely associated with nineteenth-century Protestantism, but in my view it should be more narrowly associated with Protestantism of the respectable sort.

The maternal model divided society into a domestic and a civil sphere, but the civil was not merely equated with the state. In keeping with the theories of de Tocqueville and various eighteenth-century thinkers, the civil sphere was made up of associations, understood as loci of self-rule and the foundation for democratic society. The domestic sphere was understood as loci of self-sacrifice (subordination of self to the needs of the other) and a necessary corrective to the self-rule inculcated in civil sphere. Where in the patriarchal model the household was conceptualized as “not-male,” in the maternal model it was positively characterized in terms of maternal virtues. These virtues stood in opposition to the male virtues of self-rule demanded in the civic sphere. Where in the patriarchal model military virtues alone were sufficient to ensure the stability of the civil order, in the maternal model the virtues of both the domestic and the civic were necessary to ensure stability.

This basic interdependent opposition between domestic and civic gave rise to others: home/work, self-sacrifice/self-rule, maternal/paternal, and woman/man. The model was accompanied by a tendency (which gave rise to the feminization theories of Douglas and Welter) to associate religion, especially in the wake of disestablishment from the state, with the domestic sphere and to associate maternal virtues with Christian virtues. The “sentimental fiction” of the mid-to-late nineteenth century, much of it written by women, tended to heighten the association between maternal and Christian virtues, focusing theological attention on Jesus’ death on the cross as an act of voluntary self-sacrifice. Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin epitomized this tendency.

In the maternal model, gender identity and gender roles were understood as polarized and fixed, either biologically or normatively. There was little gender switching, even at a metaphoric level, and few trance-related behaviors (visions, ecstasy, and falling or preening under the power of the Spirit)—at least in public. The play in this model emerged in relation to two factors: the way gender was fixed and where the boundary between the domestic and civil was located. Those with a more traditional view of women’s roles tended to associate maternal virtues with a domestic sphere narrowly conceived in terms of the home and motherhood (i.e., a social location and role). In their view, the benefits of women’s influence on society would only be realized if women remained within the domestic sphere so conceived. Those who had a more progressive view of women’s roles tended to root maternal virtues in female nature (biology). Because, in their view, the virtues were biologically rooted, progressives believed that the benefits of women’s maternal influence on society would be most fully realized by a metaphoric extension of the domestic sphere beyond the literal confines of the home or even, according to some, through direct participation in civil society.

The maternal or domestic model was the dominant understanding of society during the Victorian Era. It was embraced most fully by the “respectable” classes and the denominations they frequented. It was the enthusiastic embrace of this model by Unitarians, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians that caused historians to depict nineteenth-century Protestantism as feminized. Denominations that had more populist or working-class constituencies, such as Methodists and Roman Catholics, were more complex. In its more egalitarian variant, that model informed the rise of Protestant women’s organizations such as the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, denominational home and foreign missionary societies, and deaconess training schools in the wake of the Civil War. Under the leadership of Frances Willard, a Methodist, the WCTU allied itself with the suffrage movement but did so to “protect the home” from alcoholism rather than to promote “women’s rights.” Similarly, Willard and other Methodist women pressed for access to governing and clerical authority within the church, but did so on the grounds of maternal virtues rather than equal rights.

By the end of the nineteenth century, progressive Victorian Protestants
faced contradictions inherent in using the virtues of the domestic sphere to
gain access to the civic. Although women’s organizations were explicitly es-

tablished to extend the maternal virtues attendant on the domestic sphere,
they were also associations, in de Tocqueville’s sense, which inevitably and
in contradiction to their explicit ideology trained women in the habits of self-
rule essential to democratic civil society. As the first generation of “new
women” entered colleges and the newly co-educational universities during
the 1880s and 1890s and in record numbers chose careers in women’s colleges
and settlement houses over heterosexual marriages, the contradictions
among ideology, aspiration, and practice became acute. 43

The Scientific Model

The scientific model emerged at the turn of the century. Broadly speaking,
itst roots were in the new social sciences, especially psychology, sociology, and
anthropology, associated with the modern coeducational university. More
narrowly, it is associated with the functional psychology of William James
and the Chicago School, especially John Dewey and George Herbert Mead.
In Protestant circles, its chief exponent was George Coe. It began as a phil-
osophically informed (social) psychology that was simultaneously empirical,
functionalist, evolutionary, and pragmatic and expanded into education,
sociology, and anthropology. The model was generated by progressive intellec-
tuals who desired a way of life consistent with what they took to be the
implications of modern science. Although they were intellectuals, they were
anti-elite in orientation and convinced that the ideal of inquiry upheld by
science was accessible to the “rank-and-file membership of an educated,
 democratic society.” 44

Two key concepts informed the scientific model: a developmental concep-
tion of a self that emerged through social relationships and the idea of soci-
ety as a social organism. Social evolution and self-evolution (the development
of the self) were considered correlative once the self had arisen out of the life
process. The emergence of the self (a distinctively human feature based in
language) made possible the emergence of human society. Society, made up
of groups and communities of various sizes and degrees of complexity, arose
out of family relationships that made the emergence of the self possible.
Schools, churches, and government were understood as extensions of paren-
tal relationships. Democracy, in its ideal sense, depended upon the develop-
ment of selves that exhibited their own individuality and at the same time
took the attitude of those they were affecting (Mead) or selves that could
mutually attain freedom in the world as it is (Coe). 45

The scientific model stood apart from the others in its rejection of dual-
isms. Family, school, church, and society were not divided into separate
spheres but rather were conceived as progressively wider, more inclusive in-
stances of community. Balance was a virtue and led to an emphasis on the
importance of a balanced approach to the masculine and the feminine. What
that meant in practice depended on whether masculine and feminine at-
tributes were identified (normatively or biologically) with men and women.
Those who upheld the less-egalitarian variant of this model correlated
gendered attributes (e.g., the masculine and feminine) with actual or ideal
male and female natures. They viewed marriage and motherhood as the most
suitable path for women and understood heterosexual marriage, the site
where complementary natures were joined, as the foremost means of realiz-
ing balance. Those who did not conform to this model (e.g., effeminate men
and masculine women) were labeled as moral or biological deviants. If gen-
dered attributes (masculinity and femininity) were understood as indepen-
dent of gender identity and roles, then a balance of attributes (androgyny)
could be either found or cultivated. Balance could then be achieved in the
individual independent of heterosexual marriage.

Changing views of sexuality, especially women’s sexuality, profoundly af-
fected the scientific model. In the maternal model, bourgeois Victorians asso-
ciated mothers and children (both understood as asexual) with the domes-
tic sphere; in the scientific model, twentieth-century modernists defined the
family in terms of the husband and wife. In keeping with the findings of the
“sexologists,” intimate relations between women, accepted in the maternal
model, were increasingly viewed with suspicion by all but the most prog-
ressive. Sexologists introduced the terms heterosexual and homosexual to define
what was “normal” and what was “deviant.” Where the maternal model
encouraged homosocial institutions and relationships, the scientific model
tended to undercut them as long as gendered attributes (masculinity and
femininity) were linked with gender identity and roles. 46

Conclusion

The scientific model was in competition with the two other models at the
turn of the century, and its most progressive advocates were not in church-
es. Intent on overturning the old canons of masculinity and femininity and
upholding an androgynous, independent, self-supporting ideal for women,
they described themselves as feminists (rather than feminine), thus intro-
ducing a modern term into common English usage. 47 Although university-related
academics and Protestant modernists generally embraced the scientific mod-


el, most did not adopt the radically egalitarian version associated with the second generation of new women. Coe, who appeared only moderately progressive on women's issues when compared to the most egalitarian progressives outside the church, was probably as progressive as any within the church.48

By the 1920s, large, coeducational universities had abandoned the nineteenth-century ideal of "educated motherhood" (the maternal model) for the new, sociologically informed, and sexualized ideal of the "wife-companion" (the scientific model).49 The patriarchal model in its less-egalitarian form lived on among fundamentalists, however. The spread of dispensational exegesis among traditional Protestants gradually undermined the more egalitarian exegesis associated with the radical wing of the Holiness movement. The multisided battles of the 1920s between fundamentalists and modernists within the churches and conservative and progressive proponents of the new science in the broader society led to the marginalization of both fundamentalists and progressive new women. By the 1930s the less-egalitarian variant of the scientific model was dominant among the educated classes, and neo-orthodoxy was displacing modernism among bourgeois Protestants.50

Coe's call for masculine balance in the turn-of-the-century church carried potentially radical implications for women insofar as it separated gender attributions (masculinity and femininity) from gender identity and roles. Pushed to its most radical conclusions, this model created room for androgynous selves and independent career women, married and single. Coe, however, did not push the model that far. Although he was identified with radical causes over the course of his career, his activism centered on economic and military issues. Although he was privately supportive of many early-twentieth-century feminist goals, he did not, as far as I know, explicitly embrace feminism, nor did he take public stands on issues such as women's suffrage. Moreover, while not pushing the feminist possibilities inherent in the scientific model, Coe's promotion of the modernist approach to Protestantism undercut the bases of women's authority in the other two competing models. By explaining Methodist supernaturalism in naturalistic terms, The Spiritual Life undercut the authority of women called to preach by the power of the Holy Spirit in the Holiness tradition. By stressing the complementarity of the masculine and feminine and linking it to an emphasis on the complementarity of the husband and wife in marriage and the family, the scientific model undercut the dualisms that informed the idea of separate male and female spheres.

Although to speak of Protestantism as masculinized at the turn of the century is, in my view, overly simplistic, the eventual collapse of the mater-
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33. George Coe and Sarah Knowland married with a “mutual understanding of her ambition.” When Coe was at the University of Southern California early in his career, Sarah Coe became the director of the piano department. When he was offered a fellowship in Germany, they accepted so both could advance their educations. When he was offered a position at Northwestern University after a year in Germany, he insisted that she stay on for two additional seasons in Berlin, he returning in the summers to be with her.” Charles S. Braden, “In Evanston,” *Religious Education* 47 (1952): 98; George A. Coe, Sadie Knowland Coe, *A Chapter in a Life* (Privately published, 1906). Rosenberg (Beyond Separate Spheres, 62–68) contrasts psychologists at Columbia and Clark universities, who had more traditional marriages and were unsupportive of women graduate students and research on gender, with those at Chicago. “Music Matters of the Past Week,” *Alameda* [Calif.] Argus, Aug. 26, 1905, Coe Papers.
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