

THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT CONFRONTS THE CHALLENGE OF THE
EMERGING PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT (1901–1919): AN ANALYSIS OF
PROXIMITY AND CONFRONTATION

A thesis submitted to
The University of Manchester
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Humanities

WILLIAM SNIDER

This research was carried out at
Nazarene Theological College, Manchester

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations	4
Abstract	5
Declaration and Copyright Statement	6
Acknowledgements	7
Dedication	8
INTRODUCTION	9
CHAPTER ONE: THE STATUS OF THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT AND EMERGING PENTECOSTALISM IN 1901	
1.1 Introduction	51
1.2 The Ministry and Impact of Martin Wells Knapp	52
1.3 Third Work of Grace in the Thought of the American Holiness Movement	54
1.4 Benjamin Hardin Irwin and the Third Work of Grace	57
1.5 Emergence of the Pentecostal Movement	61
1.6 Charles Parham and Topeka, Kansas	64
1.7 William Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival	70
1.8 Conclusion	79
CHAPTER TWO: OPPOSITION TO PENTECOSTALISM FROM THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT	
2.1 Introduction	81
2.2 National Holiness Association	83
2.3 Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America	90
2.4 The Free Methodist Church	95
2.5 The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene	104
2.6 Alma White and the Pillar of Fire	119
2.7 Holiness Church of California	124
2.8 God's Bible School and College	130
2.9 Conclusion	141
CHAPTER THREE: ACCOMMODATION TO PENTECOSTALISM WITHIN THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT	
3.1 Introduction	144
3.2 World Faith Missionary Association	145
3.3 A. B. Simpson and the Christian and Missionary Alliance	157
3.4 J. M. Pike and <i>The Way of Faith</i>	167
3.5 Conclusion	173
CHAPTER FOUR: ACCEPTANCE OF PENTECOSTALISM WITHIN THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT	
4.1 Introduction	175
4.2 Samuel G. Otis and The Christian Workers' Union	180
4.3 The Pentecostal Holiness Church (of North Carolina)	185
4.4 The Fire Baptized Holiness Church	191
4.5 The Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee)	194
4.6 The Church of God in Christ	201

4.7 Conclusion	207
CONCLUSION	209
BIBLIOGRAPHY	218
WORD COUNT: 83,030	

ABBREVIATIONS

American Holiness Movement – AHM

Assemblies of God – AG

Christian and Missionary Alliance – CMA

Christian Workers' Union – CWU

Church of God (Anderson, IN) – COGA

Church of God (Cleveland, TN) – COGC

Church of God in Christ – COGIC

Church of the Nazarene – CN

Fire Baptized Holiness Church – FBHC

Free Methodist Church – FMC

General Holiness Assembly – GHA

God's Bible School – GBS

Holiness Church of California – HCC

Ku Klux Klan – KKK

Methodist Episcopal Church – MEC

Methodist Episcopal Church South – MECS

Metropolitan Church Association – MCA

National Holiness Association – NHA

Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene – PCN

Pentecostal Holiness Church of North Carolina – PHCNC

Radical Holiness Movement – RHM

Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Churches – WMC

World Faith Missionary Association – WFMA

ABSTRACT

The University of Manchester
William Snider
Doctor of Philosophy

The American Holiness Movement Confronts the Challenge of the Emerging Pentecostal Movement (1901–1919): An Analysis of Proximity and Confrontation

This thesis examines the emergence of the modern Pentecostal Movement from the American Holiness Movement in the first two decades of the twentieth century. It argues that the reaction of the American Holiness Movement in its confrontation with Pentecostalism resulted in a tripartite response. The confrontation is introduced in its historical setting through a literature review and then placed in the social context of the Gilded Age. The Introduction further identifies a research gap to which the research contained in this thesis is directed, explains the narrative methodology of the historiography adopted, and gives a preview of the line of argument through a synopsis of the four chapters.

The initial chapter places the American Holiness Movement and Pentecostalism in juxtaposition at the outset of the confrontation in 1901. Three subsequent chapters identify and analyse the three-part reaction of the American Holiness Movement.

First, the segment of the movement resistant to glossolalia is recognised and supported by research identifying reasons for objecting to glossolalia and processes by which the resistance evolved in representative entities of the American Holiness Movement.

Second, an accommodating portion of the American Holiness Movement is identified, and their effort to remain neutral concerning glossolalia is explored and analysed. The research highlights a fluidity of personnel and ideas that emerged from this attempted neutrality, which resulted in the loss of identity with the American Holiness Movement and Pentecostalism.

Finally, the segment of the American Holiness Movement that accepted glossolalia is identified, and the process of arriving at this conclusion, which conflicted with their erstwhile fellows, is followed.

An examination of the antagonistic, accommodating, and acceding responses by different groups within the Holiness Movement demonstrates that the different reactions were partly determined by theological considerations, partly by scriptural interpretation, partly by evaluating the claimed deeper spirituality, partly by concerns about worship practices, and partly by concerns about the stability of the denominations already established. Without claiming to establish the legitimacy of the responses, the reactions and their rationale are identified.

The two-decade period examined begins with an event in Topeka, Kansas, in 1901, when tongues speaking was introduced to the American Holiness Movement. It concludes in 1919 when the self-identification term 'Pentecostal' passed from its historical roots in the American Holiness Movement to becoming the self-identifying term for persons espousing tongues-speech. It then became the common designation for tongues speaking in the public understanding. The removal of the word 'Pentecostal' in 1919 from the official name of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene signals that this transition in identification had occurred. The American Holiness Movement and Pentecostalism were separated, with the primary focus of disagreement being the practice and theological implications of glossolalia. They would remain two different movements, each with a worldwide constituency, and formally linked only by their common membership in the National Association of Evangelicals.

DECLARATION

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

1. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

2. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.

3. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example, graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

4. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=24420>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library’s regulations (see <http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/about/regulations/>) and in The University’s policy on Presentation of Theses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank my wife, Martha, who has been a tremendous source of encouragement, accepting both the extended time away from home without complaint and the preoccupation with the thesis when I was at home. She perhaps has heard more about ‘Pentecostalism’ than she ever wanted to hear.

I am grateful for my supervisors, Dr. Thomas A. Noble and Dr. Harold Raser. Dr. Noble was such a patient and gracious man. He was meticulous in his annotations of my chapters, which I deeply appreciate. I cherished the many opportunities to hear him tell stories about the British Holiness Movement, particularly the Church of the Nazarene in the British Isles. While my years in the program have been difficult for Dr. Raser due to his health issues, he has been extremely kind and always supportive of my efforts. A special note of appreciation to Dr. David Bundy, whose interest, support, and expertise have been of inestimable value.

I want to thank those who have been extremely helpful and even patient as I sought information. Particularly I want to thank Darrin Rodgers and Glen Gohr from the Flower Pentecostal Research Center, David Roebuck from the Dixon Pentecostal Research Center, Stan Ingersol of Nazarene Archives, Cathy Robling from the Marston Memorial Research Center, and Jane Higle from the Wesleyan Church Archives. Without these wonderful people, my task would have been much more difficult if not impossible.

I want to thank my brother, Gordon, for answers to multiple questions about the thesis process. I especially want to thank very special friends, Randall McElwain and William Kostlevy, for their encouragement, helpful suggestions, and patience, enabling a friend (and older student) to continue and finish.

Finally, I want to remember the legacy of my seminary instructor, the late Dr. Vinson Synan, from whom I learned the History of Pentecostalism and from whom I received continual encouragement whenever our paths would cross. He was a Southern gentleman and scholar indeed.

DEDICATION

To my father, Earl E. Snider (1920–1988),
whose love for history and books influenced my pursuit of knowledge.

He left for Heaven much too early but his memory lingers.

INTRODUCTION

In the first two decades of the twentieth century, the American Holiness Movement faced a crisis. Emerging out of Methodism, it had long identified Wesley's doctrine of 'entire sanctification' as a 'second blessing' with the baptism of the Spirit, which the apostles experienced at Pentecost, as related in Acts 2. However, at the beginning of the new century, some of the American Holiness Movement's number developed a new interest in and concern with spiritual gifts, particularly the gift of tongues or glossolalia. According to this new emphasis, only those who spoke in tongues as the apostles had at Pentecost could claim to be baptised in the Holy Spirit.

This thesis examines the debates leading to division between the groups, missions, and denominations that remained in the American Holiness Movement (AHM), rejecting the new emphasis, and those that embraced the new emphasis and took ownership of the term 'Pentecostal'. The focus of the thesis is the response of the AHM to Pentecostalism. Given the differences between the two movements at the outset of the two decades of confrontation, conventional wisdom might suggest a comprehensively negative AHM response. Extensive research contradicts this assumption. The thesis argues that the response to the new Pentecostalism by the AHM was diverse rather than singular, and was, specifically, tripartite—opposition, acceptance, and ambivalence. The objective of this thesis is to explore this diversity, employing historical and biographical narrative to demonstrate common themes in the diversity of groups. This will bring to light fundamental issues that underscored the debate, the personalities that led the discussion, and the interplay of personalities between the diverging movements. More specifically, the thesis is particularly concerned with the factors that influenced the different groups. The objective is to explain why some of these

groups rejected the new doctrine and practice, why some accepted it, and why some tried to take an intermediate position.

The tragic fratricide of the American Civil War forty years earlier left the American populace divided and resentful, particularly over the long-term effects of slavery, which had prompted the conflict. Characterised by some as a ‘brother against brother’ conflict, the war demonstrated the potential for carnage due to unresolved concerns in the political arena. Similarly, the conflict between the AHM and emerging Pentecostalism, known initially as the Apostolic Faith Movement, became a ‘brother against brother’ and ‘sister against sister’ confrontation. Portions of the AHM rejected the practice of glossolalia, some minimised its importance, and still others adopted it. As opinions developed and lines of demarcation were drawn, the landscape of Wesleyan/Holiness advocates resembled a battlefield where accusations, broken relationships, and questionable ethics left the carnage of war amongst professors of Christian perfection and perfect love, tragically mirroring what Grant Wacker called the ‘travail of a broken family’.¹ This Introduction places both movements in the social setting of the Gilded Age, identifying prominent issues such as race relations, the emergence of the middle class, advancement of lifestyle, and social stratification. It identifies a research gap in exploring the conflict between the AHM and the Pentecostal Movement. It also identifies the methodology of the thesis as historical narrative focusing on primary documents such as periodicals, biographies, and denominational histories.

The Relationship between the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements

In 1971, Pentecostal historian Vinson Synan published *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States*, in which he asserted that ‘John Wesley . . . was the spiritual

¹ Grant Wacker, ‘Travail of a Broken Family: Radical Evangelical Responses to the Emergence of Pentecostalism in America, 1906-1916’, in Edith Blumhofer, Russell Spittler, and Grant Wacker, eds., *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 23-49.

and intellectual founder of modern holiness and Pentecostal Movements'.² Synan was joined by Reformed theologian Frederick Dale Bruner, who wrote, 'Out of the worldwide holiness movements, the Pentecostal Movement was born'.³ Wesleyan theologians/historians Donald Dayton and Melvin Dieter concurred with the conclusion of Synan.⁴ However, some in the AHM disavowed any relationship to emerging Pentecostalism. B. F. Haynes wrote,

Holiness is not to be charged with responsibility for any of the exaggerations or absurd fanaticisms which have claimed its paternity by parading themselves in its name. We disavow all responsibility for or connection with the so-called "tongues movement".⁵

Edith Waldvogel argued the case for Calvinist origins, in her dissertation entitled 'The "Overcoming Life": A Study of the Reformed Evangelical Origins of Pentecostalism'.⁶

Pentecostal historian William Menzies commented, 'There is no question that the seedbed for modern Pentecostalism was the holiness revival of the later nineteenth century', but he insisted that there were other influences.⁷ Others sought the roots of Pentecostalism in the Roman and Anglo-Catholic traditions, while some emphasised purely heavenly origins.⁸ A writer in *The Apostolic Faith* declared, 'The Lord was the founder and He is the Projector of this movement'.⁹ The debate occupied both the Wesleyan Theological Society and the Society for Pentecostal Studies. There may well be a shared heritage in a broad understanding

² Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1971), 13.

³ Dale Frederick Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1970), 44.

⁴ Donald Dayton, "'Christian Perfection" to the "Baptism of the Holy Ghost"', in Vinson Synan, ed., *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins* (Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Logos, 1975), 52, and Melvin Dieter, 'Wesleyan-Holiness Aspects of Pentecostal Origins', in Synan, ed., *Aspects*, 59.

⁵ B. F. Haynes, *The Beauty of Holiness*, 2nd ed. (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1927), 12.

⁶ Edith L. Waldvogel, 'The "Overcoming Life": A Study in the Reformed Evangelical Origins of Pentecostalism', (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1977).

⁷ William Menzies, 'The Non-Methodist Origins of the Pentecostal Movement', in Synan, *Aspects*, 83.

⁸ Donald Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1987), 36.

⁹ *The Apostolic Faith* (December 1906), 1. See also Carl Brumback, *Suddenly . . . From Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1961), 48: 'To find the "Father of the twentieth-century Pentecost," one must look beyond the merely human to the divine, even as one must look beyond the Apostles to find the "Father of the first-century Pentecost".'

of Christianity, but the AHM offers the most precise explanation for the origins of Pentecostalism.

The theological landscape of the American colonies in the eighteenth century was a variegated fabric of religious ideas ranging from the Church of England to the Society of Friends. The Methodists brought the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection into this conflicted maze. But Wesley's doctrine of 'entire sanctification' was modified by eager and pragmatic Americans to focus on its immediate realisation. The proponents of this understanding became known as the American Holiness Movement. This American understanding of Wesley evolved an even more emphatic expression of Christian perfection called the Radical Holiness Movement (RHM), the seedbed for modern Pentecostalism of the later nineteenth century. The result of two decades (1901–1919) of conflict would be a new strand of thought to expand the variegated fabric of the American religious experience.

Literature Review

The formal organisation of the AHM occurred in 1867 with the creation of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness at the first holiness camp meeting held at Vineland, New Jersey.¹⁰ The invitation to all interested parties read, 'Come, brothers and sisters of the various denominations, and let us . . . make common supplication for the descent of the Spirit upon ourselves, the church, the nation, and the world'.¹¹ The camp meeting became standard practice for promoting entire sanctification, extending from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific.¹²

¹⁰ J. E. Searles, *History of the Present Holiness Revival* (Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1887), Melvin Dieter, *The Holiness Revival in the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1980), and Kenneth O. Brown, *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler: "Wholly and Forever Thine"; Early Leadership in the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness* (Hazelton, PA: Holiness Archives, 1999).

¹¹ William McDonald and J. E. Searles, *The Life of the Rev. John S. Inskip* (Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1885), 190.

¹² Searles pointed to sixty-seven camp meetings, eleven tabernacle meetings, the establishment of a periodical, and the publication of multiple holiness books as evidence of this success, noting that 'these meetings had been,

However, despite the progress in promoting the doctrine of entire sanctification, disagreements concerning doctrine and praxis developed. Two conferences convened (in 1885 and 1901) to deal with these problems, with the result that the movement was reconfigured to include new leadership and new priorities. In 1885, a General Holiness Assembly (GHA) was called, ostensibly to deal with two primary problems.¹³ The first was the lingering debate concerning Phoebe Palmer's 'Altar Theology',¹⁴ which seemed to some to contravene John Wesley's teaching concerning assurance to a second work of grace via the direct witness of the Holy Spirit.¹⁵

The GHA of 1885 also discussed the increasingly contentious debate concerning the 'Church Question'. The National Holiness Association (NHA) originated primarily within the Methodist Episcopal Church (MEC) in the cities of the eastern United States, with leaders who were loyal to the Methodist background. Consequently, issues of 'come-out-ism' (voluntary withdrawal from the MEC) and 'put-out-ism' (perceived involuntary removal from the MEC) were problematic.¹⁶ The NHA frowned upon 'come-out-ism', and the 1885 GHA did not bring closure to this contentious issue.

to a marvellous extent, scenes of Pentecostal power and baptisms of the Holy Ghost'. Searles, *History of the Present Revival*, 15.

¹³ S. B. Shaw, ed., *Proceedings of the National Holiness Assembly Held at Park Avenue M.E. Church, Chicago, May 20-26, 1885*, reprint (Oklahoma City, OK: C.E. Jones, 2002).

¹⁴ Phoebe Palmer, *The Way of Holiness with Notes by the Way*, 2nd ed. (New York: Lane and Tippett, 1845). On Palmer, see Harold Raser, *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1987), 149-226, Charles Edward White, *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist and Humanitarian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury, 1986), 125-143, Ivan Howard, 'Wesley Versus Phoebe Palmer: An Extended Controversy', *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 6 (1971): 31-40, and Kevin Lowery, 'Fork in the Wesleyan Road: Phoebe Palmer and Christian Perfection', *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 36, no. 2 (2001): 186-222.

¹⁵ Critics of Palmer included Nathan Bangs and Hiram Mattison. Both contended the Palmer understanding of assurance was not authentically Wesleyan. For Bangs, see Abel Stevens, *Life and Times of Nathan Bangs* (New York: Carlton and Porter, 1863), 396-402. For controversy between Mattison and Palmer, see White, *Beauty of Holiness*, 52-58. For a defence of Palmer, see J. H. Perry, *Reply to Prof. Mattison's "Answer," Etc.; Being the Summing up of the Case of Professor Mattison against Mrs. Palmer* (New York: John Gray, 1856).

¹⁶ See Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness, Vol. 1: The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1962), 28-30, and Charles Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1974), 47-61; 90-105.

Endeavouring to achieve unity, there was a call for a second GHA in 1901.¹⁷ Two hundred nineteen delegates attended; but the assembled did not include primary representatives of a radical element of the Holiness Movement who chose not to attend.¹⁸ The lingering problem of the ‘Church Question’ remained unresolved. An increasing proliferation of holiness entities that knew no loyalty to Methodism followed. Class distinction, education levels, regions, and race relationships alienated this new constituency from those with historical ties to the MEC. The increasingly egalitarian composition of the movement would shape the NHA into the next century.

In the interim between the two conferences, new items of disruptive concern emerged. The first issue was divine healing.¹⁹ The first person with a healing ministry in the United States was Ethan Otis Allen, primarily localised in New England.²⁰ Charles Cullis²¹ introduced the practice to the AHM in the 1870s, with the concept promoted by William Boardman²² and A. B. Simpson.²³ Many adherents to entire sanctification accepted the practice.²⁴ The NHA did not.²⁵ NHA President Charles Fowler said emphatically, ‘The

¹⁷ S. B. Shaw, *Echoes of the General Holiness Assembly* (Chicago: S. B. Shaw, 1901). Kostlevy says ‘the General Holiness Assembly deeply disappointed its sponsors’. William Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progressive Era America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 72. Despite concessions made concerning the ‘church question’, divine healing, and premillennialism, unity was not only elusive but purposefully disrupted by radicals who perceived the NHA to be compromised by its association with organised religion, i.e. Methodism.

¹⁸ The NHA felt it had made every effort to seek agreement with the discontented. As Haney noted, ‘There was a strong disposition on the part of the [General Holiness Assembly] to fraternize with those who differed with us, and what could be done to reconcile existing differences was freely done’. M. L. Haney, *The Story of My Life: An Autobiography* (Normal, IL: author, 1904), 376-377. However, radicals cited the proviso that ‘all side issues irrelevant to the objects herein specifically stated, will be necessarily excluded from the discussions of the assembly’ as grounds for withholding support. Shaw, *Echoes*, 10.

¹⁹ Paul Chappell, ‘The Divine Healing Movement in America’, (PhD diss., Drew University, 1983).

²⁰ Nancy Hardesty, *Faith Cure Divine: Healing in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 8-9. For Allen, see ‘Miracles Wrought Through Prayer: The Story of a Man Who Walked with God’, *The Pentecostal Evangel* (July 8, 1939), 1.

²¹ See W. H. Daniels, *Dr. Cullis and His Work: Twenty Years of Blessing in Answer to Prayer* (Boston: Willard Tract Repository, 1885), and William Snider, ‘Introduction of Faith Healing into American Evangelicalism: A Study of the Life and Influence of Dr. Charles Cullis’ (Master’s thesis, Cincinnati Christian University, 2008).

²² William Boardman, *The Great Physician* (Boston: Willard Tract Repository, 1881).

²³ A. B. Simpson, *The Gospel of Healing* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian, 1915), and A. B. Simpson, *The Fourfold Gospel* (Harrisburg, PA, 1890).

²⁴ For John Inskip, see McDonald and Searles, *Life of Inskip*, 279-280. For William Boardman, see Simpson, *Great Physician*, 1-26. For A. B. Simpson, see Simpson, *Gospel of Healing*, 155-174.

question of divine healing is not vital—it is not necessarily related to one’s salvation here or hereafter’.²⁶ A resolution directed that it was inadvisable to give prominence to the doctrine of divine healing in NHA sponsored camp meetings.²⁷ The 1901 GHA found it necessary to retract this position.

A second area of concern was the second coming of Christ. Methodists generally held a postmillennial understanding, which provided not only for the salvation of the lost but also for the civilising of sinful society in preparation for the millennial reign of Christ. Understanding the Lord’s return to be somewhat in abeyance, there tended not to be an urgency in anticipation. NHA loyalists such as Daniel Steele and George W. Wilson provided strong defence for this position.²⁸ The NHA leadership was primarily committed to this position and saw alternative understandings to be ‘sidelines’ from their primary work of promoting entire sanctification. But the doctrine of premillennialism found a home in the Holiness Movement, and the home was with the more radical elements of the South and West.²⁹ Martin Wells Knapp was an early pioneer of this ‘radical holiness’ element,³⁰ joined

²⁵ For a defence of the ‘non-essential’ definition of divine healing, see Fowler, *Christian Unity*, 124-125, 129-130. For a contrast in positions held on divine healing, see William McDonald, *Modern Faith Healing Scripturally Considered* (Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1892), and Kelso Carter, *A Full Salvation for Soul and Body: Divine Healing or The Atonement for Sin and Sickness* (New York: John Alden, 1888). After personal illness, Carter revised his position regarding faith healing. See Kelso Carter, “Faith Healing” Reviewed after Twenty Years (Boston: Christian Witness, 1897).

²⁶ Fowler, *Christian Unity*, 124-125.

²⁷ For divine healing, see Heather Curtis, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), and Nancy Hardesty, *Faith Cure: Divine Healing in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003).

²⁸ Daniel Steele, *Antinomianism Revived* (Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1887). For Steele, see Kenneth Brown, ‘Steele, Daniel’, in William Kostlevy, ed., *Historical Dictionary of the Holiness Movement* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2001), 284. George W. Wilson, *The Sign of Thy Coming* (Boston: Christian Witness, 1899).

²⁹ For shift of the AHM from postmillennialism to premillennialism, see Randall J. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 161-174. D. William Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought* (Dorset, UK: Deo, 1996), 91-114, and Tiffany Enos, ‘The Death of Postmillennialism in the Holiness Tradition Following World War I’ (Master’s thesis, George Fox University, 2001), 31.

³⁰ See ‘Martin Wells Knapp and the Origins of the Radical Holiness Movement’, in Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*, 17-36, and David Bundy, ‘Religion for Modernity: Martin Wells Knapp and the Radical Holiness Network of the American Progressive Era’, *World Christianity and the Fourfold Gospel* 1 (2015): 43-80. For Knapp’s eschatology, see Martin Wells Knapp, *Flashes from Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies, or, Devices of the Devil Unmasked* (Cincinnati, OH: Office of the Revivalist, 1898), 136-163, and *Holiness Triumphant: or, Pearls from Patmos, being the Secret of Revelation Revealed* (Cincinnati, OH: God’s Revivalist Office, 1900).

by contemporaries such as L. L. Pickett,³¹ W. B. Godbey,³² H. C. Morrison,³³ Seth Rees,³⁴ G. D. Watson,³⁵ Beverly Carradine,³⁶ and C. W. Ruth.³⁷ But even that grouping is too small to identify the pervasive transition within the movement from postmillennialism to premillennialism. The issue created a polarisation within the movement.

The aftermath of the GHA of 1901 saw a vastly altered landscape for the AHM. The authority centre moved from New York, Boston, and Philadelphia to the Midwest, where Isaiah Reid and the Iowa Holiness Association were the dominant force.³⁸ The leadership transitioned from the older Methodist loyalists to a younger, broader-minded, more independent, and more adventuresome set realised in Reid, John P. Brooks, and P. F. Bresee. The literary face of the National Holiness Association (NHA) would shift from *The Christian Witness*, published in Chicago, to an array of publications representing the many denominations for which the doctrine of entire sanctification was the primary self-identification. The association's focus more closely resembled the Four-Fold Gospel of A. B. Simpson, although the cause of holiness as a second work of grace was certainly not abandoned. This reconfigured AHM would provide leaders to meet the challenge of emerging Pentecostalism.

³¹ L. L. Pickett, *The Blessed Hope of His Glorious Appearing* (Louisville, KY: Pickett, 1901). For Pickett, see Kostlevy, 'Pickett, Leander Lycurgus', in Kostlevy, ed., *Historical Dictionary*, 236.

³² W. B. Godbey, *Jesus is Coming* (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1901).

³³ H. C. Morrison, *The Optimism of Pre-millennialism* (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1927). See also Henry Clay Morrison, *Some Chapters of My Life's Story* (Louisville, KY, 1941), and Percival Wesche, *Henry Clay Morrison: Crusader Saint* (Berne, IN: Herald, 1963).

³⁴ W. B. Godbey and Seth Rees, *The Return of Jesus* (Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, n.d.).

³⁵ G. D. Watson, *Christ Returneth: Being Expositions of the Transfiguration and Other Prophetic Scriptures on the Coming of the Lord* (Columbia, SC: Way of Faith, [1900?]). For Watson and his eschatology, see Steven Lennox, 'The Eschatology of George D. Watson', *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 29 (Spring-Fall, 1994): 111-126. For G. D. Watson's evolution from postmillennialism to premillennialism, see William Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 107-110. For G. D. Watson, see Eva Watson, *Glimpses of the Life and Work of G.D. Watson* (Cincinnati, OH: God's Bible School and Revivalist, 1929).

³⁶ For Beverly Carradine, see William Kostlevy and Gary-Ann Patzwald, 'Carradine, Beverly', in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 43-44.

³⁷ See M. W. Knapp, *Electric Shocks from Pentecostal Batteries, or, Food and Fire from Salvation Park Camp-Meeting* (Cincinnati, OH: Office of the Revivalist, 1899), 122.

³⁸ See Jim Kerwin, 'Isaiah Reid (1836-1911), His Life, Leadership, and Influence in the American Holiness Movement' (Master's thesis, Regent University, 2006).

Adopting the Pentecost paradigm for entire sanctification by the AHM was a critical adjustment in understanding the doctrine and experience. Wesley himself did not make this distinction. By making the day of Pentecost the prototype for the second work of grace, the AHM followed John Fletcher and Adam Clarke in shifting the focus of entire sanctification from a teleological pursuit to an instantaneous enjoyment of purity with a publicly displayed supernatural demonstration as a norm for reception of the second work of grace.³⁹ By the end of the nineteenth century, a perceived absence of such demonstration left some dissatisfied with the movement's apparent lack of divinely imparted power. The idea of the third work of grace began to be promoted by a Baptist-turned-Methodist/holiness minister in the American Midwest named B. H. Irwin.⁴⁰ Synan says, 'Irwin's fire-baptized movement was an important bridge to Pentecostalism in that attention was given to the unique, empowered action of the Holy Spirit separate from the cleansing work of the Spirit in sanctification'.⁴¹ Doug Beacham concludes, 'Irwin's contribution to the pre-Azusa holiness matrix was that he argued for more experiences beyond the "second" work of traditional Wesleyan sanctification'.⁴²

The ministry of Irwin affected a Wesleyan Methodist lay minister named Charles Parham.⁴³ In 1900 Parham opened a faith-directed Bible school in Topeka, Kansas, where he challenged students to determine the primary characteristic of the Day of Pentecost and similar events recorded in the Book of Acts. The conclusion was glossolalia. On January 1,

³⁹ Richard Gilbertson identifies three principal changes that occurred in Wesleyan/Holiness theology as the AHM evolved from Wesley to Palmer. See Richard Gilbertson, *The Baptism of the Holy Spirit: The Views of A.B. Simpson and His Contemporaries* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian, 1993), 13.

⁴⁰ For Irwin, see Vinson Synan and Daniel Woods, *Fire Baptized: The Many Lives and Works of Benjamin Hardin Irwin: A Biography and a Reader* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2017.) Additional information is provided in Martin Schrag, 'The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Rev. Benjamin Hardin Irwin', *Brethren in Christ, History and Life* 4, no. 1 (June 1981): 3-29.

⁴¹ Vinson Synan, *Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Revival, 1901-2000* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 35.

⁴² Beacham, *Azusa East*, 75.

⁴³ For the influence of Irwin on Parham, see James R. Goff Jr, *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism* (Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), 54-57, 194.

1901, Parham laid hands on Agnes Ozman to receive the Holy Spirit, as demonstrated on the Day of Pentecost.⁴⁴ He testified that she spoke in multiple foreign languages. The experience, repeated in the lives of Parham and others, led to the conclusion that glossolalia was the initial evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

In 1905 Parham journeyed to Houston, Texas, to present his findings concerning the Holy Ghost baptism. Among his students was William Seymour, an aspiring young African American minister.⁴⁵ Seymour was convinced of the teaching of Parham but had not yet enjoyed the baptism when he was invited to become a pastor in Los Angeles, California. Seymour's new congregation rejected his presentation of Parham's understanding, but finding his own glossolalia experience, he continued his ministry in the abandoned Stevens African MEC located on Azusa Street in Los Angeles. Vibrant services followed with large numbers of people attending, resulting in a revival that reached multitudes, including seekers from various parts of the United States and worldwide.

The Pentecostal reading of the events of Pentecost challenged the AHM. While the roots of the new understanding were located in a Methodist/Holiness heritage, the practice of glossolalia as the required evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was problematic, resulting in a conflict between Christians and once again exemplifying Grant Wacker's 'travail of a broken family'.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Agnes LaBerge, *What God Hath Wrought* (Chicago: Herald, 1921).

⁴⁵ For Seymour, see Gaston Espinosa, *William J. Seymour and the Origins of Global Pentecostalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), Larry Martin, *The Life and Ministry of William J. Seymour* (Joplin, MO: Christian Life, 1999), Rufus Sanders, *William Joseph Seymour: Black Father of the 20th Century Pentecostal/Charismatic Movement* (Maitland, FL: Xulon, 2003), Craig Borlase, *William Seymour: A Biography* (Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2006), Vinson Synan and Charles Fox, Jr, *William Seymour: Pioneer of the Azusa Street Revival* (Alachua, FL: Bridge Logos, 2012), and Douglas Nelson, 'For Such a Time as This: The Story of Bishop William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival' (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 1981). An interview with Seymour is included in Charles Shumway, 'A Critical History of Glossolalia' (PhD diss., Boston University, 1919).

⁴⁶ Wacker, 'Travail of a Broken Family', 23-49. Charles Jones describes the relationship between the AHM and Pentecostalism as that of 'mother and child'. Charles Jones, 'Anti-Ordinance: A Proto-Pentecostal Phenomenon?', *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 25, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 7-23.

The Gilded Age

While this thesis considers the interaction between the AHM and emerging Pentecostalism specifically, these movements did not exist in isolation from the contemporaneous story of American life. The time involved, referred to as the Gilded Age, was characterised by dramatic changes produced in American society through invention, industrialisation, and, ironically, poverty. Identifying the parameters of the Gilded Age is problematic. Heather Cox Richardson says that no one is quite sure what time period the Gilded Age and Progressive era covers.⁴⁷ Elizabeth Perry and Karen Smith are sure that the name assigned to this time is misleading, and they suggest the term implies a ‘false glitter over a cheap base’.⁴⁸ They contend that the apparent prosperity of the times ‘did not touch most of the nation’s working classes’.⁴⁹

In her volume, *New Spirits: Americans in the Gilded Age, 1865-1905*, Rebecca Edwards says the post-Civil War years brought reconstruction to the vanquished aspirations of the American Southland and adjustments in American life in general. She sees industrialists like John Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie riding the crest of scientific achievement and developing financial empires with products that altered the everyday life of the average American, both as to income and consumer appetite. Increased industrialisation shifted labour opportunities from rural America to the cities, which in turn became overcrowded.⁵⁰ Edwards cites a national population altered by addressing immigration issues and the relocation of freed slaves. However, despite concerns, there was renewed

⁴⁷ Heather Cox Richardson, ‘Reconstructing the Gilded Age and Progressive Era’, Christopher McKnight Nichols and Carol C. Unger, eds., *A Companion to the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 7.

⁴⁸ Elizabeth Israels Perry and Karen Smith, *The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era: A Student Companion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 134.

⁴⁹ Perry and Smith, 134.

⁵⁰ Charles Jones argues that rural life, the staple environment of the American family and religious life, was exchanged for the financial advantages of urban life. See Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 58.

confidence.⁵¹ And with the uptick in American progress, Edwards sees Americans enticed ‘to offset hard work and thrift with a new devotion to comfort, leisure, and pleasure-seeking’.⁵² But all was not utopia.

As the rich grew richer, the poor grew poorer. In 1866, the new National Labor Union observed, ‘There is [a] dividing line—that which separates mankind into two general classes, the class that labors and the class that lives by others’ labor’.⁵³ Between these two extremes, a new class of Americans emerged. The term ‘middle class’ first appeared in the *Century Dictionary* in 1899 as the contrast between jobs and a career became more evident. Wage differentials between ‘white-collar’ employees and ‘blue-collar’ labourers became more pronounced. With the widening gap in income levels came the organisation of labour unions to protect the rights of the working class. Farmers facing declining income organised the National Grange, laying the foundation for the Populist Revolt of the 1890s. As society became stratified based on economics, it emphasised class, with status determined by buying power. This was evident even in the African American community. In his volume, *The Rise to Respectability: Race, Religion and the Church of God in Christ*, Calvin White Jr. identifies the emergence of a younger black generation interested in exchanging their cultural past for upward economic and social mobility to validate their modernity.⁵⁴

Material gain often robs society of its sensitivity for those left out of success. This marginalisation creates fertile soil for cultural conflict. In her volume, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877–1919*, Nell Painter says that the compassion for African Americans that had emotionally charged the nation in pre-Civil War days had largely

⁵¹ Ratner observes, ‘It is important to remember, however, that both confidence and anxiety may become more intense in the same society, and at the same time, for optimism about the future may be coupled with deep fears’. Lorman Ratner, *Powder Keg: Northern Opposition to the Antislavery Movement, 1831-1840* (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 132.

⁵² Rebecca Edwards, *New Spirits: Americans in the Gilded Age, 1865-1905* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 82.

⁵³ Heather Cox Richardson, *West from Appomattox: The Reconstruction of America after the Civil War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 14.

⁵⁴ Calvin White Jr., *The Rise to Respectability: Race, Religion and the Church of God in Christ* (Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2012), 3.

dissipated.⁵⁵ Joseph Thomas concludes that ‘At the turn of the century the attitudes of most northerners had hardened against bringing the freedmen into social equality with whites.’⁵⁶ Matthew Avery Sutton adds that during the late 1800s, Southern state legislatures enacted laws that codified segregation.⁵⁷ But the racial conflict was not relegated to the old South. Sutton says *de facto* segregation continued to govern race relations in the North and West.⁵⁸ Court rulings seemed to be reversing gains on the Civil War battlefield, with the 1896 *Plessey vs Ferguson* ruling establishing the ‘separate but equal’ formula for race relations. The effect was segregation with government approval. In the wake of the Supreme Court ruling, the nation experienced violence directed against Blacks, often for the most presumptuous of reasons. To be Black was to be guilty until proven innocent. Consequently, ‘African-Americans, at the turn of the century, faced innumerable challenges as race and racism shaped Americans’ approach to just about every facet of life from politics to entertainment to religion’.⁵⁹

The response of Blacks to these circumstances was mixed. Omar H. Ali writes:

Violence and the threat of violence against African Americans led some black leaders to pursue less militant action and methods—a survival strategy under Jim Crow. Publicly eschewing either political action or migration out of the South, Booker T. Washington’s accommodationist approach to “racial uplift” became a way for African Americans in the South to cope with their conditions.⁶⁰

Other Blacks began to reject the conciliatory approach to racial reconciliation suggested by Booker T. Washington, choosing a more militant search for respectability suggested by W. E.

⁵⁵ Nell Painter, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877–1919* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989), 1-3.

⁵⁶ Joseph Thomas, *Perfect Harmony: Interracial Churches in Early Holiness-Pentecostalism, 1880-1889* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2014), 6. August Meier concurs, saying, ‘public opinion in the North had come to feel that Negroes were an inferior race, unfitted for the franchise, and that white domination was justified’. August Meier, *Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915: Racial Ideologies in the Age of Booker T. Washington* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1969), 161. Thomas maintains that by ‘crossing racial, ethnic and national lines, radical Holiness fellowships began to define unity in a way that was counter to the late nineteenth-century American ethos’. Thomas, *Perfect Harmony*, 14.

⁵⁷ Matthew Avery Sutton, *American Apocalypse: A History of Modern Evangelicalism* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2014), 11.

⁵⁸ Sutton, 11.

⁵⁹ Sutton, 11.

⁶⁰ Omar H. Ali, ‘African Americans’, in Nichols and Unger, *Companion*, 117.

B. DuBois. After all, if ‘In America, racism was first and last the besetting sin of white people’, as Grant Wacker suggests, then ‘victimisation’ would ever haunt the worldview of African Americans, since history could not be changed.⁶¹ Still others, Ali writes,

did not fit political or ideological categories in responding to Jim Crowe. Some, as Shane White and Graham White write in “Stylin: African American Expressive Culture from Its Beginnings to the Zoot Suit,” defied white expectation or deference under Jim Crowe through individual bodily displays (including dressing, walking, gesturing, and arranging one’s hair in certain ways) or through collective public displays (such as parading). In these ways defiance took the form of performances that were indirect and therefore ambiguous in their meaning.⁶²

Thus, at the turn of the century, concerns about racism were tinderbox dry. In his essay, ‘G.T. Haywood: Religion for Urban Realities’, David Bundy confirms the volatility of race relations even in Northern cities.⁶³ The ministry of G. T. Haywood occurred in Indianapolis, Indiana, where restlessness amongst Blacks created an uneasiness amongst Whites. The White reaction was apparent by the growing influence of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK). The reconstruction climate only confirmed long-held suspicions and allegations concerning integration in the South. In his assessment of the ‘new South’, *The Promise of the New South: Life after Reconstruction*, Ayers observes that ‘whites wanted “the New South and the Old Negro”’.⁶⁴ There was a feeling that racial animosities and prejudice were more intense than before the Civil War. Blacks harboured bitterness, longing for revenge to adjust perceived wrongs. Whites were apprehensive. While not referencing racism as a problem plaguing the Holiness Movement, Charles Jones is forthright in saying, ‘Organized holiness did not promote social reform’.⁶⁵

⁶¹ Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 226.

⁶² Ali, ‘African Americans’, 119.

⁶³ David Bundy, ‘G.T. Haywood: Religion for Urban Realities’, in James Goff Jr. and Grant Wacker, eds., *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders* (Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2002), 237-253.

⁶⁴ Edward L. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 427.

⁶⁵ Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 135.

In his essay, 'Charles Harrison Mason: The Interracial Impulse of Early Pentecostalism', David Daniels says that, while instituting racial integration seems to have been the particular burden of the offending White race, Mason offered an example of a proactive pursuit of racial amelioration. His leadership of the Church of God in Christ (COGIC) as an 'interracial experiment' of denominational affiliation with Whites was revolutionary in his own time, even amongst Pentecostals. Daniels calls it 'a radical moment in American History'.⁶⁶

However, race was not the only complicating feature in America. There was also the role of women in a male-dominated social structure. The consensus of society that the place for women was in domestic circumstances was passing. Leigh Ann Wheeler writes,

Gilded age Americans lived in a society built around a fraying ideal of separate spheres, according to which women reigned in the private or domestic sphere . . . men ruled in the public sphere where the competitive values of the market and politics held sway.⁶⁷

Through the aegis of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, women's domesticity began to be exchanged for a public platform in an appeal against the evil of alcohol. This foray into a moral discussion in a popular arena became a catalyst to propel women into advocacy groups, asking for men's rights to be conveyed to women. But despite new opportunities, the place of women was a confusing mix. Rebecca Edwards says that for women, it was both liberating and demeaning. Job opportunities were now open to women but paid poorly while demanding long hours.⁶⁸

Richardson, however, refuses to define the Gilded Age through the issues of race, gender, or class. These issues are components of a much larger picture, which she equates to a revolution. She writes,

⁶⁶ David Daniels, 'Charles Harrison Mason: The Interracial Impulse of Early Pentecostalism,' in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 117.

⁶⁷ Leigh Ann Wheeler, 'Inventing Sexuality: Ideologies, Identities and Practices in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era', in Nichols and Unger, *Companion*, 102.

⁶⁸ Edwards, *New Spirits*, 65.

Reinterpreting this era as one of contest over the nature of government, and thus of American citizenship and even over America itself reveals its larger themes. The years from 1865 to the election of 1920 amounted to the creation of a new nation, a nation that had been reconstructed after the cataclysmic Civil War.⁶⁹

The question remained about how the church would respond to these turbulent times. Unfortunately, the American church was in a state of flux. In his essay, ‘The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880-1910’, Grant Wacker sees the church as accepting a *status quo*, which he describes as mainstream church life derived from the Reformed tradition and reflected in the middle class.⁷⁰ There were reactions to this norm. First, the ‘New Theology’ tended to a more progressive attitude towards theology, the Bible, and history, while endorsing evolutionary theory and the social gospel. The marginalised would find themselves the object of pity but hindered by a class structure that was reluctant to alter its identification lines. The second reaction, according to Wacker, was evangelicals for whom evangelism was the primary moving force. Although there were exceptions, this understanding seems to preclude concern for earthly status. Wacker understands the AHM and Pentecostalism as part of the evangelical response, although both were distinguished from the broader evangelical grouping by theology, Christian experience, and worship methodology. The church seemed ill-prepared for the social challenges awaiting it as it pressed its way into a new and more modern century. While Wacker discusses the preparedness of the American church, in general, for the concerns of the Gilded Age, he also identifies the AHM and Pentecostalism explicitly in the American religious milieu. Their reactions to the dilemmas raised by the Gilded Age need to be examined.

The American Holiness Movement and the Gilded Age

⁶⁹ Richardson, ‘Reconstructing the Gilded Age’, 19.

⁷⁰ Grant Wacker, ‘The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880-1910’, *Journal of American History* 72, no. 1 (June 1985): 45-62.

In his volume, *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*, Mark Noll acknowledges the origins of the AHM in the thought of John Wesley. George Marsden also identifies the AHM as a 'revival within Methodism'.⁷¹ But Noll further explains the relationship between the AHM and its maternal home in Methodism by saying Wesley's understanding was Americanised via Phoebe Palmer, who followed ideas of 'an uninformed plastic world seeking to be shaped by personal initiative' rather than an other-worldly invasion of grace.⁷² In her essay, 'Phoebe Palmer: Spreading "Accessible" Holiness', Diane Leclerc understands Palmer's frustrated desire for Christian holiness as the catalyst for propounding a 'shorter way' that permitted and even demanded immediate appropriation of sanctifying grace.⁷³ Palmer built upon a terminological transition from John Wesley to John Fletcher, which became more than semantic. Leclerc suggests that the immediate availability of entire sanctification to all who seek it by faith foreshadows an egalitarian understanding of Christian ministry that releases women to Christian service.⁷⁴ Furthermore, Leclerc sees Palmer's requirement for testimony to entire sanctification as implicitly providing freedom, if not a mandate, for women to speak publicly.

But the implementation of envisioned freedoms came slowly. Blacks initially attended the National Association of Camp Meetings, but the list of African American speakers and participants was not extensive.⁷⁵ Prominent Blacks such as evangelist Amanda Smith and African Methodist Episcopal (AME) bishop Alexander Wayman were speakers at Vineland,

⁷¹ George Marsden, *Religion and American Culture: A Brief History* (San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1990), 154.

⁷² Mark Noll, *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 361.

⁷³ Diane Leclerc, 'Phoebe Palmer: Spreading "Accessible" Holiness', in Henry Knight III, ed., *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street: Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal Visions of the New Creation* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010), 90-98.

⁷⁴ Leclerc, 98.

⁷⁵ Irving E. Lowrey, 'The Need of Holiness Evangelists among the Colored People', *The Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness* (November 19, 1885), 1.

New Jersey.⁷⁶ Wayman also preached at the second camp meeting held in Manheim, Pennsylvania.⁷⁷ A service for Black participants was included at the Landisville, Pennsylvania, Camp meeting, but it was segregated.⁷⁸ NHA president Charles Fowler declared slavery to be ‘the most atrocious crime under the sun’ and lamented continued racial division of national churches, saying it might be ‘expediency’. However, he did not go so far as to point an accusing finger at the Holiness Churches.⁷⁹ The efforts to include African Americans within the AHM were short-lived.

It would appear that the AHM succumbed to the surrounding societal values. In her biography of Pillar of Fire founder Alma White, Susie Stanley offers an explanation for the association of White with the KKK. Stanley explains that White’s association with the controversial organisation was based on ‘anti-Catholic’ concerns and not race, but she acknowledges that White ‘unfortunately accepted racist attitudes prevalent in the United States’.⁸⁰ White states her attitude towards African Americans clearly in her volume, *The Ku Klux Klan in Prophecy*, where she says,

For the best interests of all concerned, the black race should occupy the place intended for it by the Creator. It is within the rights of civilization for the white race to hold the supremacy; and it is no injustice to the colored man.⁸¹

⁷⁶ Amanda Smith, *An Autobiography: The Story of the Lord's Dealings with Mrs. Amanda Smith, the Colored Evangelist* (Chicago: Christian Witness, 1921). See Grant Shockley, ‘Wayman, Alexander Washington’, in Nolan B. Harmon, ed., *The Encyclopaedia of World Methodism*, vol. 2 (Nashville: United Methodist, 1974), 2476.

⁷⁷ For discussion of the Manheim camp meeting, see William Kostlevy, ‘Christian Perfectionism in Pennsylvania Dutch Country: The 1868 Manheim camp meeting of the National Holiness Association’ (presentation, Young Center for the Study of Anabaptist and Pietist Groups, Elizabethtown, PA, November 13, 1997).

⁷⁸ Adam Wallace, ed., *A Modern Pentecost: Embracing a Record of the Services of the Sixteenth National Camp-Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness Held at Landisville, PA* (Philadelphia: Methodist Home Journal, 1873), 203-206. Kenneth Brown records conflict concerning race in other holiness camps. Brown, *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler*, 222-223.

⁷⁹ Fowler, *Christian Unity*, 43-44.

⁸⁰ Susie Cunningham Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire: The Life of Alma White* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim, 1993), 85, 91. See Stanley, 85-93. J. Lawrence Brasher uses a similar argument for his grandfather, evangelist John L. Brasher, in *The Sanctified South: John Lakin Brasher and the Holiness Movement* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 157.

⁸¹ Alma White, *The Ku Klux Klan in Prophecy* (Zarephath, NJ: The Good Citizen, 1925), 135.

Even Charles Price Jones, an African American holiness leader and co-founder of the Church of God in Christ, seems to have accepted the situation without surrendering his dreams for racial harmony. Dale T. Irwin says, 'He [Jones] was realistic in his assessment of what was possible at the turn of the century'.⁸² The Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Churches (WMC), a constituent member of the AHM and an early abolitionist group, maintained separate 'colored' conferences, and African American evangelist Amanda Smith said the Free Methodist Church (FMC), an early abolitionist group, also experienced racial prejudice.⁸³

A comment by the founder of the Church of the Nazarene (CN), P. F. Bresee, identifying African Americans at the Azusa Street Mission as 'colored', bears examination.⁸⁴ Research shows the term was a commonly accepted identification for African Americans by both Blacks and Whites. Charles L. Perabeau, in his dissertation, 'The Church of the Nazarene in the U.S.: Race, Gender, and Class in the Struggle with Pentecostalism and Aspirations Toward Respectability, 1895-1985', comments, 'It would be speculative to presume Bresee's intentions, and there is a danger of reading too much'.⁸⁵ He adds, 'There is no evidence to suggest that leaders within the Church of the Nazarene intentionally spurned the tongues movement on account of the multiracial fellowship at the Azusa Street Revival'.⁸⁶

However, there was a more emphatic approach to racial concerns in the AHM. In his essay, 'God's Trustee: Martin Wells Knapp and Radical Holiness', Wallace Thornton Jr. says that Martin Wells Knapp established a community of ministries in Cincinnati, Ohio, which

⁸² Dale T. Irwin, 'Charles Price Jones: An Image of Holiness', in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 37-50.

⁸³ Smith, *Autobiography*, 115.

⁸⁴ For a more extensive examination of the term 'colored', see 97n76 in this thesis.

⁸⁵ Charles Perabeau, 'The Church of the Nazarene in the U.S.: Race, Gender, and Class in the Struggle with Pentecostalism and Aspirations Toward Respectability, 1895-1985' (PhD diss., Drew University, 2011), 97.

⁸⁶ Perabeau, 98.

pioneered an interracial environment that Thornton calls ‘Pentecostal primitivism’.⁸⁷ As an illustration of Knapp’s racial inclusiveness, early Pentecostal founder William Seymour found a home with Knapp-founded ministries.

Being predominantly white argues for some inherent cause and effect that restrained the AHM from involvement with African Americans. But African American minister James Earl Massey offers a slightly different explanation for the absence of African Americans in the AHM. In an essay on ‘Race Relations and the American Holiness Movement’, Massey says Black participation had been limited, in part, because the issues of importance to the AHM were not the primary issues of concern to Blacks. Instead, Massey says, ‘the concern of black believers has been for salvation and survival, with the social implications of the faith being viewed as far more germane than an emphasis on a strictly personal pietistic inwardness’.⁸⁸ He also says that Blacks had not been attracted to holiness as presented by the AHM because ‘Christian perfectionism seemed “too Methodistlike” to those who were Baptist by orientation and it seemed too unattainable to those who did not hear a clear enough explanation about the doctrine’.⁸⁹ Rufus Burrow Jr., an admirer of Massey, complains that Massey is ‘too concerned about being politically correct’.⁹⁰ Burrow contends the absence of intentional evangelism by the AHM, in general, and the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) (COGA), in particular, obtains from fundamental racism.⁹¹ Brandon Winstead agrees. In his volume, *There All Along: Black Participation in the Church of the Nazarene, 1914-1969*, Winstead insists there was little effort made to evangelise them. He understands the lack of

⁸⁷ Wallace Thornton Jr., ‘God’s Trustee: Martin Wells Knapp and the Radical Holiness Movement’, in Knight, *From Aldersgate to Azusa*, 152.

⁸⁸ James Earl Massey, ‘Race Relations and the American Holiness Movement’, *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 31, no. 1 (1996): 44-45. Thomas seems to support this conclusion regarding the focus of Black religion: ‘Bring an end to racism and the full integration of blacks within American society always has been a predominant function and goal of black churches.’ Thomas, *Perfect Harmony*, 9.

⁸⁹ Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire*, 46.

⁹⁰ Rufus Burrow Jr., *Making Good the Claim: Holiness and Visible Unity in the Church of God Reformation Movement* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016), 141.

⁹¹ For a history of ministry amongst African Americans from a holiness denomination, see James Earl Massey, *African Americans and the Church of God Anderson, Indiana: Aspects of a Social History* (Anderson, IN: Anderson University Press, 2005).

Black congregations in the CN to be the result of the preponderance of the denomination being White and the lack of vision to reach African Americans.⁹²

It would be foolish to claim that, in the racially troubled times of 1901–1919, unhealthy attitudes concerning race could not be found within a movement that preached ‘perfect love’. How these attitudes shaped the movement’s attitude towards Pentecostalism has yet to be proven. In his book *Pentecostalism in America*, R. G. Robins offers what could be a summarising statement on the AHM and race:

Viewed as a whole, radical holiness fell short of 21st-century racial ideals, but it stood out in its own day for its racial tolerance and for the degree to which it allowed African-Americans to share and shape a predominately Anglo-American movement.⁹³

Even Jemar Tisby, in his highly critical commentary on the American church and racism, acknowledges that

whenever there has been racial injustice, there have been Christians who fought hard against it in the name of Jesus Christ. Christianity has an inspiring history of working for racial equality and the dignity of all people, a history that should never be overlooked.⁹⁴

Attitudes involving gender were also problematic for the AHM. Methodism, from its earliest times, had endorsed the role of women in proclaiming the gospel and nurturing Christians.⁹⁵ But ordination appears to have been reserved for males. George Marsden comments, ‘Some educated women took advantage of the movement’s openness to spiritual authority regardless of gender’.⁹⁶ But Briane Turley says that Methodists tended to place women in a domestic setting.⁹⁷ The AHM generally encouraged women to use their gifts in

⁹² M. Brandon Winstead, *There All Along: Black Participation in the Church of the Nazarene, 1914-1969* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2013), 1-28.

⁹³ R. G. Robins, *Pentecostalism in America* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010), 12.

⁹⁴ Jemar Tisby, *The Color of Compromise: The Truth about the American Church’s Complicity in Racism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019), 19.

⁹⁵ Paul Wesley Chilcote, *John Wesley and the Early Women Preachers of Methodism* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 1991).

⁹⁶ Marsden, *Religion and American Culture*, 154.

⁹⁷ Briane Turley, *A Wheel Within a Wheel: Southern Methodism and the Georgia Holiness Association* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1999), 133-144.

public ministry.⁹⁸ As his booklet, *Woman Preacher*, reflects, W. B. Godbey supported women's right to preach.⁹⁹ AHM stalwart Seth Rees, in his book *The Ideal Pentecostal Church*, noted critically, 'Nothing but jealousy, prejudice, bigotry, and a stingy love for bossing in men have prevented woman's public recognition by the church'.¹⁰⁰ Alma White, the first female bishop of a religious body in United States history, was naturally very supportive. She rejected the notion of 'woman's sphere', saying this understanding 'originated not with God but with men'.¹⁰¹ She supported the National Women's Party and a national Equal Rights Amendment for women. P. F. Bresee and the CN were supporters of women in ministry.¹⁰² Carl Bangs quotes Bresee as saying, 'Some of our best men are women'.¹⁰³ The WMC and the FMC were also supporters of women's ministry, although slower in accepting women's ordination.¹⁰⁴ However, perhaps ironically, African American holiness leader Charles Price Jones objected to women preaching or serving in leadership in the church.¹⁰⁵

C. Douglas Weaver addresses the class origins of the AHM, saying that wealthy people were inclined to reject the holiness emphasis based upon its doctrine of separation from the world. Weaver understands the people of the AHM to be generally of the poor to middle-class economic status, and their role in society was largely reactionary, resisting

⁹⁸ Janette Hassey, *No Time For Silence: Evangelical Women in Public Ministry Around the Turn of the Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986), 52-55.

⁹⁹ Godbey, *Woman Preacher* (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1891).

¹⁰⁰ Seth Rees, *The Ideal Pentecostal Church* (Cincinnati, OH: M.W. Knapp, 1897), 41.

¹⁰¹ Rees, *Ideal*, 99. For discussion of White and women's rights, see Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire*, 98-114.

¹⁰² Diana Declerc, 'Phineas Bresee and the Women of the Church of the Nazarene', *Grace and Peace* 21 (Spring 2014): 33-36.

¹⁰³ Carl Bangs, *Phineas F. Bresee: His Life in Methodism, the Holiness Movement and the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1995), 201.

¹⁰⁴ Maxine L. Haines and Lee M. Haines, *Celebrate Our Daughters: 150 Years of Women in Wesleyan Ministry* (Indianapolis, IN: Wesleyan, 2004). B. T. Roberts, *Ordaining Women* (Rochester, NY: Earnest Christian, 1891).

¹⁰⁵ Dale Irvin, 'Charles Price Jones: Image of Holiness', in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 48.

urbanisation, expansion of railroads, and newly industrialised business.¹⁰⁶ He cites Charles Price Jones as an example of one who opposed modernity.¹⁰⁷

Pentecostalism and the Gilded Age

The emergence of Pentecostalism late in the Gilded Age requires investigation.

Tracing the origins of Pentecostalism can be problematic. Augustus Cerillo observes,

Pioneer students of Pentecostalism . . . saw little need to seek explanations for their movement's beginnings within the historical process, nor did they search for casual connections between Pentecostalism's emergence and a turn-of-the-century American context of profound socioeconomic, political and religious transformations.¹⁰⁸

But while Pentecostals sought to distance themselves from the corrupted world around them, they were impacted by their culture. Edith Blumhofer comments, 'Yet, despite people's best intentions, it gradually became apparent that . . . in many ways, Pentecostals, like everyone else, was molded by the larger culture'.¹⁰⁹

While Pentecostals disavowed their genesis in the ethos of the world around them, they also internally disagreed about the geographical/personal origins of Pentecostalism. James Goff Jr. insists that Parham was the founder of the Pentecostal Movement because he was the first to link glossolalia with the baptism of the Spirit.¹¹⁰ But MacRobert objects by minimising the role of Parham, suggesting his only contribution to Pentecostalism to be the initial evidence understanding of glossolalia. Instead, he highlights Azusa Street, saying, 'It is of great significance that the Pentecostal Movement was born, not in Parham's Bible School in Topeka, Kansas, but at an all-black prayer meeting in a black ghetto in Los Angeles'.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁶ C. Douglas Weaver, *Baptists and the Holy Spirit: The Contested History of the Holiness-Pentecostal-Charismatic Movements* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019), 6.

¹⁰⁷ Weaver, 71.

¹⁰⁸ Augustus Cerillo Jr., 'The Beginnings of American Pentecostalism: A Historiographical Overview', in Blumhofer, Spittler, and Wacker, *Pentecostal Currents*, 229.

¹⁰⁹ Edith Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 89.

¹¹⁰ Goff, *Fields White*, 11.

¹¹¹ Iain MacRobert, *The Black Roots and White Racism of Early Pentecostalism in the USA* (London: Macmillan, 1988), 81.

Gastón Espinosa weighs the arguments for the origins of Pentecostalism and assigns the ‘primal and primary though not exclusive’ influence to Seymour.¹¹² Others refuse to be prejudicial to either source, citing the historical significance of both. In his volume, *America’s Religious History: Faith, Politics, and the Shaping of a Nation*, Thomas Kidd traces the origins of glossolalia to the ministry of Parham, and subsequently to Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival.¹¹³ Writing in *Religion in American Life*, Randall Balmer seems to concur.¹¹⁴

Ethnically, the origins of Pentecostalism are traced to Black heritage. MacRobert identifies the practices of Pentecostalism demonstrated at Azusa Street as historically rooted in Black Christianity, even African tribal religion. Likewise, James Tinney says, ‘Without the important role of blacks, there might be no Pentecostal Movement today in the United States or the world’.¹¹⁵ Cheryl Sanders seems to take ethnicity a step further in her volume, *Saints in Exile: The Holiness-Pentecostal Experience in African American Religion and Culture*. She says that not only were there Black roots to Pentecostalism, but these same persons saw themselves in ‘exile’ from their pre-slavery home.¹¹⁶ She says this understanding has a background in the Jewish exile in Babylon.

Despite its proposed Black background, Pentecostalism had its own struggles with racism. Initially, Azusa Street was marked by racial equality. Douglas Jacobsen says, ‘The leaders of the mission believed that the egalitarian nature of the gospel required Pentecostalism to be anti-racist in faith and practice . . . the privileges of race and class had

¹¹² Espinosa, *Seymour*, 23.

¹¹³ Thomas Kidd, *America’s Religious History: Faith, Politics, and the Shaping of a Nation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019).

¹¹⁴ Jon Butler, Grant Wacker, and Randall Balmer, *Religion in American Life: A Short History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 312-322.

¹¹⁵ James Tinney, quoted in Talmadge French, *Early Racial Oneness Pentecostalism: G.T Haywood and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (1901-1931)* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014), 32.

¹¹⁶ Sanders, *Saints in Exile: The Holiness-Pentecostal Experience in African American Religion and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), ix.

no place at the Azusa Street Mission'.¹¹⁷ But Wacker says that race relations within Pentecostalism were confusing.¹¹⁸ While most Pentecostals would agree that the movement was and ought to be interracial in its overall character, they are not unanimous in understanding that Pentecostalism should 'intentionally be interracial in its local social organisation'.¹¹⁹ Matthew Avery Sutton points to Aimee Semple McPherson as a case in point, saying, 'Attracting people of all racial, ethnic, and national backgrounds to the church (Angelus Temple) without stoking the prejudices of her white followers was a problem that McPherson never adequately solved'.¹²⁰ Arlene Sánchez Walsh is much more pointed: 'Pentecostalism's surrender to the racism of the time meant that as valiant a person as William J. Seymour was, his attempts at building a multiracial, multi-ethnic church never materialised'.¹²¹ She attributes this failure, in part, to America's 'entrenched racism'. However, apparently there was enough blame to go around. Speaking candidly, Sánchez Walsh says, 'Pentecostalism was divided by race for decades'.¹²² Finally, she concludes that 'American Pentecostals seem stuck between the vagueness of brotherhood and an often less satisfying call for reconciliation'.¹²³

While Pentecostalism seems to have provided a wide-open door to women's ministry, Wacker regards this understanding as suspect. He suggests that women faced theological and sociological hurdles for acceptance at ministry levels, despite notable exceptions.¹²⁴ In the Assemblies of God (AG), women could speak and testify, but they were denied ordination.

¹¹⁷ Douglas Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 2003), 260-261.

¹¹⁸ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 71. See Blaine Hamilton, 'The Spirit in Black and White: Early Twentieth-Century Pentecostals and Race Relations, 1905-1945' (PhD diss., Rice University, 2013).

¹¹⁹ Jacobsen, *Thinking*, 261.

¹²⁰ Matthew Avery Sutton, *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Resurrection of Christian America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 30.

¹²¹ Arlene M. Sánchez Walsh, *Pentecostals in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018), xxii.

¹²² Sánchez Walsh, xix.

¹²³ Sánchez Walsh, 108.

¹²⁴ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 158.

Wacker understands this to be an effort to restrict women from public authority forms.¹²⁵

Anthea Butler agrees, observing that while women were a driving force in the Church of God in Christ, women's role was unclear. Instead, there was the lingering concept of 'women's work' and the responsibility to 'comply with the wishes of men'.¹²⁶ Sánchez Walsh admits that Pentecostalism allows women a place of service but says that 'they have not become equals' with their male counterparts when it comes to leadership.¹²⁷

Pentecostalism tended to be populated with persons from lower- to middle-class economic status. For that reason, Pentecostals' view of society would be expected to be negative. No one expressed their concerns about a materialistic and self-serving structured oligarchy more passionately than Frank Bartleman. In an essay entitled 'Frank Bartleman: Pentecostal "Lone Ranger" and Social Critic', Augusts Cerillo Jr. says that Bartleman's assessment of society was based on a defined system of interpreting society:

Bartleman believed Scripture distinguished between the heavenly kingdom of God, of which believers were members and to which they owed allegiance, and the hopelessly fallen and corrupt kingdoms of this world. Christians, morally citizens of heaven, therefore, were not to participate in the affairs of the intrinsically corrupt state, except to criticise government policies on biblically-based moral and ethical grounds, vote their consciences at the ballot box, and, more radically, engage in acts of civil disobedience should the state and its leaders act in ways counter to Christian principles.¹²⁸

While Bartleman was appreciative of the downtrodden state racially, economically, and socially, Cerillo seems to offer veiled criticism of Bartleman's focus on regeneration as the sole cure for social concerns.¹²⁹ A review of secondary literature relating to the AHM and Pentecostalism as it appeared in the American culture of 1901–1919 suggests that the sacred reflected the secular.

¹²⁵ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 166.

¹²⁶ Anthea D. Butler, *Women in the Church of God in Christ: Making a Sanctified World* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 38.

¹²⁷ Sánchez Walsh, *Pentecostals*, 34.

¹²⁸ Augustus Cerillo Jr., 'Frank Bartleman: Pentecostal "Lone Ranger" and Social Critic', in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 117.

¹²⁹ Cerillo, 120.

Gap Identified

From the review of the Gilded Age and its concerns, it is apparent that neither the AHM nor Pentecostalism lived in isolation from the world around them. This, even though both would have thought their worldview to be ‘other-worldly’.¹³⁰ The realities of race, gender, and class were not disassociated from the disciplines of a holy life. While the secondary literature provides broad outlines of the interworking of both the AHM and Pentecostalism in society, it is strangely silent when discussing their confrontation between the years 1901–1919. It is this confrontation that is addressed by this thesis. In his essay, ‘Travail of a Broken Family: Radical Responses to the Emergence of Pentecostalism in America, 1906–1916’, Grant Wacker cites three realities that must be understood if the conflict between the two factions is to be appreciated.¹³¹ First, there was a great deal of overlap between the two movements. Second, both sides perceived themselves to be fighting for matters of eternal consequence. Third, Wacker believes the conflict has been primarily seen in academia through the Pentecostal lens.

Wacker seeks to correct this imbalance by introducing general contours of Wesleyan contention with Pentecostalism. While this is helpful, he does not press the discussion to specific groups/persons. Similarly, David Woods traces the parameters of the conflict and, even more precisely than Wacker, endeavours to probe details of the controversy. But since his objective is broader in timeframe, it fails to analyse the details of the dispute.¹³²

Denominational histories (e.g. Timothy Smith’s *Called Unto Holiness, Vol. 1: The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years*, Leslie Marston’s *From Age to Age a Living Witness: A*

¹³⁰ Mark Noll described this ‘other-worldly’ perception as ‘a way of adjusting to the shifting character of American religious life—or as historian Douglas Frank has recently put it, “a certain partial letting go of temporary history and a disillusionment with American history in particular” in order to seek “perfect victory centered in a subjective inner kingdom”’. Mark Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1992), 380-381.

¹³¹ Wacker, ‘Travail of a Broken Family’, 24-25.

¹³² David G. Woods, ‘Speaking in Tongues of Unity’ (Master’s thesis, Regent University, 2013).

Historical Interpretation of Free Methodism's First Century, Ira McLeister and Roy Nicholson's *History of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America*, and Wayne Caldwell, ed., *Reformers and Revivalists: History of the Wesleyan Church*) are equally silent on the specifics of this confrontation that affected both movements.¹³³

Thus, the literature reviewed, including Wacker and Woods, assumes the separation without analysing the central factors in the disagreement and without tracing the diverse results. This thesis addresses this silence by looking specifically at constituent parts of the AHM and tracing the in-house discussions to their conclusions, identifying personalities, concerns, and prevailing arguments. This thesis argues that Pentecostalism emerged from the AHM, but its adoption of glossolalia as the evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit occasioned confrontation between the two movements and, within the AHM, produced conclusions of opposition, ambivalence, or acceptance sometimes rooted in personal competition and enmity, as well as cultural factors, which were sustained by theological arguments.

The Methodology of Historiography Utilised

Ronald Nash defines the field of history as 'the attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of relevant data available in the historian's own present experience'.¹³⁴ In one sense, history is irretrievable since the historian was not present to confirm the reality of the events. Further, even if present, the historian would view the events through his or her own senses and create his or her own

¹³³ There is no official history of the NHA or the Pillar of Fire.

¹³⁴ Ronald Nash, *Christian Faith and Historical Understanding* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984), 20. For further discussion, see Edward H. Carr, *What Is History?* (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), G. R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (New York: Crowell, 1967), and R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

interpretation.¹³⁵ The designation of ‘important events’ is subjective and accepted by only a particular network of individuals who share the same intellectual concerns.

Charles Kadushin, in his volume *Understanding Social Networks*, and Stephen Borgatti et al., in *Analysing Social Networks*, have highlighted the methods of network mapping.¹³⁶ These processes offer insight into the interrelatedness of sociological constructs within all organisations. While these volumes primarily address individuals’ relationships, the methodology provides insight into group ideological/theological interrelatedness. This thesis involves two networks that co-existed in 1901, which might be described as overlapping circles.¹³⁷ One circle involves the AHM, with some of its roots in Methodism, which by 1901 presented itself as the RHM. The second is the Pentecostal Movement, with its primary (although not exclusive) identifier being the practice of glossolalia. The commonality/overlap between the two circles is related broadly to the definition and experience of Christian holiness. But it was more. They shared a common theology that understood the salvific process to occur in stages, with a dual focus on restoration to the favour of God and empowerment from God for purity and service. They shared a worldview that anticipated a future apocalyptic event, with an attending urgency for the evangelisation of the unsaved. They shared a common approach to worship, which included exuberance and demonstration. But this commonality also formed the potential for intense pain and animus, as separation relating to glossolalia as a confirmation of Christian holiness fractured personal friendships and forged a competing evangelism challenge. Kadushin is correct when he says

¹³⁵ James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works and Methods* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 35.

¹³⁶ Charles Kadushin, *Understanding Social Networks: Theories, Concepts and Findings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). Stephen Borgatti, Martin Everett, and Jeffrey Johnson, *Analysing Social Networks* (London: Sage, 2013).

¹³⁷ See Kadushin, 17, for suggestions of the components of a network.

that ‘networks . . . are constantly adapting’.¹³⁸ Perhaps the word ‘adapting’ is too mild to describe divisions amongst erstwhile friends over matters of ideology.

It is this central overlap that provides the initial focus of this thesis. By 1919 this network schema had been radically altered. The two circles could now be identified independently as the AHM, opposed to glossolalia, and the Pentecostal Movement, which had endorsed glossolalia, with an overlapping centre circle that sought to relate to both larger circles through an attitude of ambivalence about glossolalia. Post-1919, the small centre circle would disappear, leaving the two larger circles isolated from each other.

This thesis aims to analyse the significant events of the confrontation between the AHM and emerging Pentecostalism utilising a narrative methodology that selectively arranges the contributing events into a timeline sequence confirmed by available data.¹³⁹

Lawrence Stone describes the narrative method of historical interpretation: ‘It is organised chronologically; it is focused on a single coherent story . . . it is concerned with people not abstract circumstances; it deals with the particular and specific rather than the collective and statistical’.¹⁴⁰ Daniel Little adds, ‘Most generally, it [narrative history] is an account of how and why a situation or event came to be. A narrative is intended to provide an account of how a complex historical event unfolded and why.’¹⁴¹ The situation identified in the thesis is the confrontation between the AHM and emerging (at that time) Pentecostalism. Adopting Stone’s definition, this thesis utilises the narrative methodology in specific ways. It employs chronological arrangement in both the overview of the conflict and the study of

¹³⁸ Kadushin, *Understanding*, 3.

¹³⁹ For a discussion of the narrative interpretation of history, see Hayden White, ‘The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory’, *History and Theory* 23, no. 1 (February 1984): 1-33, Noel Carroll, ‘Interpretation, History, and Narrative’, *The Monist* 73, no. 2 (April 1990): 134-166, and Michael Hayes, ‘Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation’ (January 2007), https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308782294_Notes_on_Narrative_Method_in_Historical_Interpretation (accessed September 22, 2021). Social science proponents, post-modernists, and post-narrative advocates disagree with the narrative understanding of history.

¹⁴⁰ Lawrence Stone, ‘The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History’, *Past and Present* 85 (November 1979): 3-24, quote on 13.

¹⁴¹ Daniel Little, ‘Narrative History’, *Understanding Society Blog*, entry posted November 24, 2008, <https://understandingsociety.blogspot.com/search?q=narrative> (accessed September 20, 2021).

particular entities that tell the story collectively.¹⁴² It focuses on a coherent narrative as it reflects on the emergence of glossolalia and reactions to it. It is descriptive in that it employs the rhetoric of personalities/organisations to offer self-explanation of the meaning of the narrative. It is concerned with people, and it is particular rather than collective, although the collected story of accumulated entities allows the historian to proceed to the tripartite conclusion of the thesis—rejection, ambivalence, or acceptance of Pentecostalism by the AHM.

Narrative methodology of necessity places a significant emphasis on primary material. Primary evidence is ‘generally seen as evidence created in the period under discussion’.¹⁴³ Spalding and Parker caution that ‘primary materials are themselves often intrinsically biased, to the extent that the agendas of their authors’ shape them. Still, they acknowledge that ‘primary sources remain the essential materials with which the historian has to work’.¹⁴⁴ Bradley and Muller define ‘primary source’ as a document, datum, or artefact belonging to the era under examination and offering the most direct access to the person or issues being studied.¹⁴⁵ Contemporary historians sometimes project scepticism on primary documents due to the potential of bias. Bias can and does exist in primary documents, but Spalding and Parker offer a broader perspective: ‘A healthy scepticism concerning the factual quality of historical data should be balanced, however, with some confidence concerning what can be learned about the past’.¹⁴⁶

Narrative requires sources to provide the story to be narrated. Given that the printed page was the primary method for disseminating information at the time addressed in the present research, the serially produced periodical became the primary vehicle for informing

¹⁴² The thesis follows a chronological methodology utilising periodical references as a structure within each organisational entity in chapters 2, 3, and 4.

¹⁴³ Roger Spalding and Christopher Parker, *Historiography: An Introduction* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 59.

¹⁴⁴ Spalding and Parker, *Historiography*, 59-60.

¹⁴⁵ Bradley and Muller, *Church History*, 39.

¹⁴⁶ Spalding and Parker, *Historiography*, 38.

the general public of emerging Pentecostalism. With its hastily prepared commentary, this medium was subject to both fact and fiction, as well as truth and exaggeration. Later, there would be biography¹⁴⁷ and autobiography¹⁴⁸ that would provide a more studied review of the events in 1901–1919. The next century would allow historians to take all supplied information and place it in the context of both secular and sacred times.

The methodology of this thesis focuses primarily on the periodical. Little effort has been made to analyse the reporting for accuracy or to inform the discussion from a more advantaged modern perspective. Instead, the thesis chooses to investigate each group within the movements chronologically, and to perform the investigation through the rhetoric of the persons involved. When the organisation's consensus has been determined, every effort has been made to acknowledge concurrent dissent. Subsequently published biography/autobiography has been accessed to provide commentary and sort the information categorically, depending on the particular focus of the historian, e.g. gender, race, economic factors, or philosophy.

While this narrative depends on primary sources, secondary sources are valuable as interpretative tools. Secondary sources argue for the author's agenda and, as such, must be utilised carefully. Bradley and Muller offer specific cautions for the use of secondary sources:

Secondary works are of their very nature, indirect sources of information. They must be used with care in as much as they embody elements of selectivity and interpretation beyond the interpretative tendencies already present in the primary

¹⁴⁷ For definition of biography, see 'Biography—Examples and Definition of Biography as a Literary Device', <https://literarydevices.net/biography/> (accessed September 14, 2021). For importance of the genre of biography, see Richard Lofthouse, 'Books Essay: The Importance of Biography', *Financial Times* (September 24, 2004), <https://www.ft.com/content/e3bada5c-0c6b-11d9-b543-00000e2511c8> (accessed September 14, 2021), Robert Richards, 'The Role of Biography in Intellectual History', *Know* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2017): n.p., and Lawrence Goldman, 'History and Biography', *Historical Research* 89, no. 245 (August 2016): 399-411.

¹⁴⁸ For discussion of autobiography in historical research, see William Spengemann, *The Forms of Autobiography: Episodes in a Literary Genre* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), and Liz Stanley, *The Auto/Biographical I: The Theory and Practice of Feminist Auto/Biography* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992). For discussion of 'Autobiography Theory', see Susie Stanley, *Holy Boldness: Women Preachers' Autobiographies and the Sanctified Self* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2002), 23-28.

documentation. Secondary works also introduce their own errors and misconceptions into narrative accounts.¹⁴⁹

Therefore, ‘secondary . . . sources must not be used to fill gaps in one’s knowledge of the primary sources’.¹⁵⁰

The thesis understands the conflict to flow out of a quest for deeper spirituality, power, and mission. No effort has been made to determine the legitimacy of either party’s argument, and no action has been taken to discover ambiguity or hidden agendas. While objective data informs the student concerning the conflict, the nuances of the conflict cannot be understood without an appreciation for the subjective aspects of individual Christian experiences. In addition, the study requires an appreciation of supposed supernatural activity. This methodology makes the accounting of the conflict more than an analytical effort and places the thesis potentially in the position of being immune to merely empirical analysis. And yet, every effort has been made to discover contributing components of the conflict so that the ‘travail of a broken family’ may be both understood and appreciated even though the process does not result in consensus. This inductive study proceeds from the initial emergence of American Pentecostalism to definitive conclusions reached by the AHM.

Within the narrative framework is a cause-effect relationship that follows the progressive character of the narrative. Causation is defined as a happening ‘without which something will not occur’.¹⁵¹ Drawing from the narrative, this thesis understands a progressive development of thought that follows an evolving understanding and practise of Christian holiness within attending personal, social, economic, and racial networks. The ultimate goal of the narrative is to arrive at a conclusion that analyses how the AHM responded to emerging Pentecostalism.

¹⁴⁹ Bradley and Muller, *Church History*, 41.

¹⁵⁰ Bradley and Muller, 41.

¹⁵¹ Bradley and Muller, 49.

Limitations

This thesis identifies three responses to Pentecostalism from the AHM. Some groups (a majority) rejected glossolalia. A much smaller grouping regarded the practice with ambivalence, attempting to accommodate all parties involved. A third group accepted the practice and, in so doing, formed the institutional core of the emerging Pentecostal Movement. To facilitate the identification of this three-fold response, certain limitations must be acknowledged and explained. First, there is the limitation of the time period being researched. Second, there are certain personalities involved in the two decades of confrontation that are of particular importance and, as such, are highlighted in the research process. Third, since the thesis highlights a selection of groups from within the AHM, this section offers a summary basis for those selections.

The Period Studied: 1901–1919

The roots of the conflict preceded 1901 and extended beyond 1919, continuing even to the present day. The time selected for this study provides a view of the confrontation bracketed by origins at Topeka, Kansas, through Charles Parham's ministry. It concludes with eliminating the word 'Pentecostal' from the name of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene (PCN). The Nazarenes' abandonment of the term 'Pentecostal' reflected a conclusion reached in the entire AHM that equating the word 'Pentecostal' with entire sanctification was no longer applicable in the public mind. Pentecostal now meant acceptance of glossolalia.

The Persons Highlighted

The thesis requires certain persons to be identified as principal characters in the history discussed. This necessitates the limiting of personalities highlighted, although it does

not suggest that persons not mentioned are insignificant.

The two decades of confrontation under consideration allow many persons to cross the stage of the conflict. There is a historical awareness of John Wesley, John Fletcher, and Phoebe Palmer for the AHM, although they are not prominently visible. The development of the AHM into a camp meeting association can be traced to the efforts of John Inskip and his intimate contemporaries. Perhaps foremost in the evolving thought of the AHM was Martin Wells Knapp. His thinking as to both theology and ecclesiology was encapsulated in the RHM, and then in essential aspects of Pentecostalism as it emerged. Leaders who rejected Pentecostalism from the AHM include P. F. Bresee, Alma White, and W. B. Godbey. Persons advancing an ambivalent position were C. S. Hanley, A. B. Simpson, and J. M. Pike. The Pentecostal story can be told through the study of Charles Parham, William Seymour (who was also a disciple of Knapp), and William Durham. Others, such as A. T. Jennings, A. M. Hills, J. F. Washburn, J. B. Crumpler, George Otis, and Charles Price Jones, are worthy of careful consideration, but the thesis has mostly limited its discussion of the conflict to the personalities identified as primary.

Criteria for Selecting Holiness Groups and Denominations for Analysis

As stated previously, the thesis identifies three responses to Pentecostalism from within the AHM. The rationale for the selection of groups within each response merits explanation. The first response identified focuses on groups rejecting Pentecostalism. The NHA represents the authority structure within the AHM.¹⁵² The WMC represents historicity

¹⁵² The NHA initially was the unofficial custodian of the tenets of the AHM and formed the initial organisational structure. It established the norms for the conduct of official business, as well as worship forms. Adam Wallace, commenting on the responsibility for establishing norms for the camp meetings, said succinctly, 'The management is a despotism. Everybody and everything must bow to the control of one master mind'. Wallace, *A Modern Pentecost*, 29.

and theological consistency regarding Wesleyan theology, particularly the *ordo salutis*.¹⁵³ Arguably, the WMC was chronologically the oldest constituent member of the AHM, and since its inception there had been no division in the WMC related to theology. The FMC represents worship forms within the AHM with its penchant for enthusiastic and demonstrative worship. The PCN, having become the largest denomination in the AHM through mergers with holiness denominations on the Eastern Seaboard and the Deep South, represents the broadest constituency with the broadest range of worship experiences.¹⁵⁴ The Holiness Church of California (HCC) represents geographical proximity to the centre of the emerging Pentecostal Movement at Azusa Street in Los Angeles, California. Its biracial constituency offers a unique perspective considering the African American population of the initial Azusa Street meetings.¹⁵⁵ The Pillar of Fire, under the leadership of Alma White, provides a view of gender and, through its extensive rescue mission work, provides a window to access Pentecostalism through the lens of evangelistic outreach.¹⁵⁶ God's Bible School (GBS) embodied the Radical Holiness theology that would be the face of the movement as it confronted Pentecostalism.¹⁵⁷

Evaluating the adverse reaction to glossolalia through the lens of the particular entity with its uniqueness offers a comprehensive view of how each arrived at its conclusions. And looking at it collectively provides an opportunity to evaluate the rationale for the general rejection of the practice of glossolalia in the AHM.

¹⁵³ For the history of the Wesleyan Church, see Robert Black and Keith Drury, *The Story of the Wesleyan Church* (Indianapolis, IN: Wesleyan, 2012).

¹⁵⁴ For the history of the CN, see Floyd Cunningham, ed., *Our Watchword and Song: The Centennial History of the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 2009).

¹⁵⁵ For discussion of the HCC, see Josephine Washburn, *History and Reminiscences of the Holiness Church Work in Southern California and Arizona* (South Pasadena, CA: Record, 1912).

¹⁵⁶ For biographical data for Alma White and history of the Pillar of Fire, see Susie Cunningham Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire*.

¹⁵⁷ For the history of GBS, which encompasses biographical information on Martin Wells Knapp and W. B. Godbey, see Larry Smith, *A Century on the Mount of Blessings: The Story of God's Bible School* (Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist, 2016).

Other groups within the AHM reacted negatively to Pentecostalism but are not examined in this thesis. There are specific reasons why they were not chosen for examination. The Pentecostal Mission objected to glossolalia; however, in 1915, it merged with the PCN.¹⁵⁸ Its rationale for rejecting Pentecostalism is consistent with the objections of the Nazarenes.

While a strong advocate of a second work of grace, The Salvation Army did not take an official stance on glossolalia. Glenn Horridge comments, 'The Army's official position on charismatic meetings remained ambiguous'.¹⁵⁹ But this statement is a bit misleading since it references only ecstatic practices and predates the modern Pentecostal Movement. While some Salvation Army officers took a strong stand against glossolalia (e.g. Samuel Logan Brengle), there was no official position.¹⁶⁰ Unofficially, Harley says the position of The Salvation Army was 'seek not, forbid not'.¹⁶¹

From its earliest days, the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) (COGA) espoused the doctrine of a second work of grace. Founder D. S. Warner made this clear in his volume, *Bible Proofs of the Second Work of Grace*.¹⁶² But the position of the COGA concerning glossolalia is not conclusive.¹⁶³ As the Pentecostal Movement moved away from identifying glossolalia

¹⁵⁸ For history of the Pentecostal Mission, see John Benson, *A History 1898 - 1915 of the Pentecostal Mission, Inc.*, Nashville, Tennessee (Nashville: Trevecca, 1977), and 'The Pentecostal Mission in Tennessee, 1898-1915', in Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 180-204.

¹⁵⁹ Glenn Horridge, *The Salvation Army: Origins and Early Days, 1865-1900* (Godalming, Surrey: Ammonite, 1993), 99. Maxwell Ryan says, 'As the Army began to turn away from these signs and wonders, it lost a number of Salvationists who later became pioneers in Pentecostal and revival movements'. Ryan, 'Signs and Wonders and the Salvation Army', *Journal of Aggressive Christianity* 11 (February-March 2001): 1-8.

¹⁶⁰ Clarence Hall, *Samuel Logan Brengle: Portrait of a Prophet* (New York: National Headquarters Salvation Army, 1933), 232-246.

¹⁶¹ Alan Harley, 'Are We Really a Holiness Movement?', *Journal of Aggressive Christianity* 60 (April-May, 2009): 33 n.iii. For discussion of The Salvation Army and Pentecostalism, see Harold Hill, *Saved to Save and Saved to Serve: Perspectives on Salvation Army History* (Eugene, OR: Resource, 2017), 215-230.

¹⁶² See D. S. Warner, *Bible Proofs of a Second Work of Grace* (Goshen, IN: E.U. Mennonite, 1880).

¹⁶³ John W. V. Smith, *The Quest for Holiness and Unity: A Centennial History of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)* (Anderson, IN: Warner, 1980). See also James Lewis, 'The Phenomena of the Spirit' (presentation, 119th North American Convention of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), June 29, 2005), <https://anderson.edu/uploads/sot/phenomena-of-the-spirit.pdf> (accessed September 27, 2021), and Kenneth R. Tippin, ed., 'The Early Tongues Story', in *Powerful Words: Selected Radical Writings by Pioneers of the Church of God Reformation Movement* (Sturgis, MI: Douglas Carr, Gateway River of Life Ministries, 2001), 399-427.

with missionary tongues, it is unclear if the COGA understanding of glossolalia transitioned to the altered understanding. The COGA generally understood ‘tongues’ to be foreign languages.¹⁶⁴ But some allowed for the private use of glossolalia. Russell Byrum represents this understanding, saying that a secondary benefit from speaking in tongues is the edification of the one who speaks (see 1 Cor 14:4): ‘This edification is not like intellectual enlightenment but an emotional experience’.¹⁶⁵ F. G. Smith allowed for private glossolalia, which he called the ‘private phase’.¹⁶⁶ He described it as follows:

the Personal Phase is governed by the Holy Spirit and offered to God (14:2). It is not understood by humans (vs 2, 28), and even the speaker does not understand (v. 14). However, one could receive the interpretation by prayer (v. 13). Smith further indicates that the objective of this private tongue-speaking is to edify the individual (v. 4).¹⁶⁷

Smith then identified a ‘public phase’, which he understood to be an actual human language and required an interpreter. The COGA never endorsed the Pentecostal Movement. The absence of official condemnation of glossolalia, coupled with a partial inclusion of private glossolalia from prominent movement theologians, sets it outside the traditions of the AHM, and consequently, the COGA is not included in the segment of the thesis that examines the negative response of the AHM to emerging Pentecostalism.

The Church of God (Holiness) advocated a second work of grace.¹⁶⁸ However, it was distracted during 1897–1922 by debate concerning the independent local church and local church governance.¹⁶⁹ While it was opposed to glossolalia, and occasional articles supporting its opposition to glossolalia appeared in *The Church Advocate and Holiness Banner*, the

¹⁶⁴ Lewis notes, ‘For the most part, many of the [early] writers understood tongues as being intelligible human languages [J.W. Byers, and J.M. Nichols-Roy]’. Lewis, ‘Phenomena of the Spirit’, 8. But not all agreed with this assessment. Russell Byrum objected, saying, ‘The gift of tongues is not, as many have supposed, primarily for the purpose of preaching the gospel by missionaries to people speaking a foreign language’. Byrum, *Christian Theology* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet, 1925), 386.

¹⁶⁵ Byrum, *Christian Theology*, 478-480.

¹⁶⁶ For F. G. Smith, see Merle Strege, ‘Frederick G. Smith’, in Kostlevy, *Holiness Dictionary*, 274.

¹⁶⁷ F. G. Smith, *The Gift of Tongues: What It Is and What It Is Not* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet, [1920?]).

¹⁶⁸ For a history, see C. E. Cowan, ‘A History of the Church of God (Holiness)’ (PhD diss., University of Missouri, 1948).

¹⁶⁹ Jones describes this conflict as a ‘seemingly unresolvable dispute over clerical authority and local church autonomy’. Charles Jones, ‘Church of God Holiness’, in Kostlevy, *Holiness Dictionary*, 58-59.

movement was not sufficiently engaged in the confrontation between the AHM and Pentecostalism to be included in the groups on the forefront of opposition to Pentecostalism. The group was omitted from this discussion due to a general disassociation with the conflict.

In 1894, the Metropolitan Church Association (known as the Burning Bush) was founded as a Methodist Episcopal Church.¹⁷⁰ In 1899, the church withdrew from the MEC to form what they considered to be an authentic holiness church. Its *Burning Bush* publication specialised in ‘muckraking journalism using caricature and publication of private correspondence’ to assail anyone who failed to meet its approval.¹⁷¹ Given the consistent pattern of misrepresentations of men and movements in both the AHM and Pentecostalism, this thesis elects to not include the Metropolitan Church Association (MCA) as an entity offering opposition to Pentecostalism.

The International Holiness Union and Prayer League (later the International Apostolic Holiness Union) was formed on the GBS campus in 1897 by Martin Wells Knapp and Seth Rees. In 1922 it became the Pilgrim Holiness Church.¹⁷² The history and theology of this organisation are interwoven with that of GBS and recorded in the *God’s Revivalist*, as discussed in chapter one.

Criteria for selected groups adopting the ambivalent and adoption responses are provided straightforwardly within their own literature, and research does not identify other entities that identify with these responses. The thesis understands that this compilation of groups might be modified as further information of identities comes to light.

Developing the Argument: Chapter Content

¹⁷⁰ For the history of the MCA, see William Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*.

¹⁷¹ William Kostlevy, ‘Metropolitan Church Association’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 203.

¹⁷² For history of the International Apostolic Holiness Union (subsequently known as the Pilgrim Holiness Church), see Paul Westphal Thomas and Paul William Thomas, *The Days of Our Pilgrimage: The History of the Pilgrim Holiness Church* (Marion, IN: Wesley, 1976).

The confrontation between the AHM and emerging Pentecostalism is examined in four chapters following this Introduction. The chapters begin by identifying the origins of the AHM and Pentecostalism and then examine the tripartite response of entities within the AHM that rejected glossolalia, entities within the AHM that regard glossolalia with ambivalence, and finally groups that adopted glossolalia. The discussion within each entity is examined chronologically, tracing the development from the earliest response to Pentecostalism to the conclusion of each group.

Chapter One

Chapter one acknowledges the debt of the AHM to John Wesley and the evolution of his understanding of Christian holiness in the teaching of Phoebe Palmer. At the time of the emergence of global Pentecostalism via Topeka/Parham and Azusa Street Mission/William Seymour, the thought content of the AHM mirrored the ministry of Martin Wells Knapp. His emphasis upon premillennialism, divine healing, city missions, enthusiastic worship, and associational church government versus organised religion was adopted by multiple regional centres, forming what has come to be known as the Radical Holiness Movement. The RHM is then placed in juxtaposition with the emergence of Pentecostalism through the groundbreaking understanding of Charles Parham regarding glossolalia and the inaugural revival at the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles, California. The chapter concludes with the two movements in the initial stages of confrontation.

Chapter Two

Chapter two analyses negative responses to glossolalia by separate groups within the AHM, beginning with the NHA and then proceeding to holiness denominations, for example, WMC, FM, and PCN. The investigation then considers the response of ‘come-out’ groups, for example, Pillar of Fire and HCC. Finally, it examines a primary educational institution

and influential periodical, GBS and *The Revivalist*, edited by Martin Wells Knapp. While the motivating reasons for rejecting glossolalia vary with each group, the consensus of the groups in chapter two is a rejection of glossolalia.

Chapter Three

While most of the AHM rejected glossolalia, a segment was ambivalent about the practice. The World Faith Missionary Association (WFMA), led by C. S. Hanley, the Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA), led by A. B. Simpson, and the ministry of John M. Pike through the periodical, *The Way of Faith*, were all sympathetic to the practice. However, none of the principal leaders of these groups was known to practise glossolalia personally. Nevertheless, in their reluctance to reject Pentecostalism, each became a bridge to the emerging understanding, losing significant personnel to Pentecostalism.

Chapter Four

Pentecostalism found reception in a specific segment of the AHM, particularly in Southern groups influenced by the three works of grace emphasis of B. H. Irwin and the Fire Baptized Church. Other Pentecostal groups emerged from the Holiness Baptists of Georgia and the Holiness Baptist Church of southwestern Arkansas.¹⁷³ In the deeper South, COGIC was impacted by the Azusa Street Revival. Finally, the Christian Workers' Union (CWU) in New England found the more radical understanding of Christian holiness attractive. All adopted glossolalia as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism.

Summary

¹⁷³ See Charles Walker, *A History of the Holiness Baptist Association of Georgia* (Jasper, GA: author, 1968). See Glenn Gohr, 'William Jethro Walthall and the Holiness Baptist Churches of Southwestern Arkansas', *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Fall 1992): 15-20.

This Introduction has set forward the investigative purpose of the thesis, which is to identify and analyse the conflict between the AHM and the emerging Pentecostal Movement. The origins of both movements were traced, establishing their historical relationship to each other. Literature evaluating the Gilded Age established commonalities that confronted both movements socially. It was determined that both movements existed in a social network that distinguished them from contemporary society but overlapped each other in certain basic understandings regarding Scripture, theology, and evangelism. The methodology adopted for analysing the conflict was presented as historical narrative, identifying personalities and concepts as they appeared chronologically within the two decades under consideration. The primary players in the AHM were identified, with rationale offered for groups excluded from the study. Research parameters for this information focused primarily on original documents such as periodicals, denominational histories, and biographical/autobiographical material, with assessment from contemporary scholars. Finally, the content of the four thesis chapters was presented in summary form.

CHAPTER ONE

THE STATUS OF THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT AND EMERGING PENTECOSTALISM IN 1901

1.1 Introduction

The first chapter identifies the American Holiness Movement and the Pentecostal Movement, establishing their common origins in the Wesleyan tradition as to both theology and experience. This chapter will show the primary point of discussion between the two movements, laying the foundation for the emergence of three general reactions to glossolalia—antagonism, ambivalence, and acceptance.

The AHM emerged as an organisational entity at a camp meeting in Vineland, New Jersey, which was organised for the specific purpose ‘of promoting the experience of entire sanctification’.¹ The name adopted for this organisation was the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness.² Drawing from the theology of John Wesley as nuanced by John Fletcher and Adam Clarke, these proponents of the Methodist doctrine of Christian perfection came from within the MEC, where they had laboured as a self-perceived revival movement. Many (but not all), sensing that they were unwelcome in their natal beginnings, reached beyond their origins to the broader American religious milieu, diversifying in organisation, worship styles, and further modification of Wesley’s concepts

¹ See Samuel John Avery-Quinn, ‘From Parlor to Forest Temple: An Historical Anthropology of the Early Landscapes of National Camp-Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness, 1867-1871’ (PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2011), xii.

² The National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness was generally known as ‘The National Association’. In 1899 the name changed to the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness. In 1971 the name changed to the Christian Holiness Association. In 1998 the name changed to Christian Holiness Partnership. It is presently inactive. See Kenneth Brown, ‘Christian Holiness Partnership’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 48-50.

primarily realised through the thought and influence of Phoebe Palmer.³ By 1901 the AHM had morphed into what contemporary scholars call the Radical Holiness Movement, as realised in the ministry of Martin Wells Knapp.

1.2 The Ministry and Impact of Martin Wells Knapp

Martin Wells Knapp died in 1901, the very year that the ministry of Charles Parham would inaugurate the modern awareness of glossolalia.⁴ Looking forward, Vinson Synan would designate that new century as the ‘Century of the Holy Spirit’.⁵ Looking backward, the nineteenth century had seen the blossoming of the Wesleyan emphasis on Christian holiness, but with significant American modification. Knapp seemed to embody those significant changes.

In 1882 Knapp professed entire sanctification, and in 1888 he began publication of the *God’s Revivalist*, a periodical dedicated to holiness evangelism. In 1892 he moved his ministry from Michigan to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he began a ministerial training school called God’s Bible School. Knapp adopted the Day of Pentecost as the paradigm for the second work of grace and understood the events of Acts 2 to provide the biblical model for the New Testament Church. Sensing that the church had failed to replicate that model, he adopted a restorationist motif incorporating supernaturalism, social ministry, and emotion. Breaking from his Methodist tradition, he adopted belief in the premillennial return of Christ and divine healing. His publishing interests were a primary outlet for holiness materials, and

³ For biographical information on Phoebe Palmer, see Richard Wheatley, *The Life and Letters of Mrs. Phoebe Palmer* (New York: W.C. Palmer Jr., 1876), Charles E. White, *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist and Humanitarian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury, 1986), and Harold Raser, *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1987).

⁴ For biographical information on Martin Wells Knapp, see A. M. Hills, *A Hero of Faith and Prayer, or, Life of Martin Wells Knapp* (Cincinnati, OH: Mrs. M.W. Knapp, 1902), Wallace Thornton Jr., *When The Fire Fell: Martin Wells Knapp’s Vision of Pentecost and the Beginning of God’s Bible School* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2014), and David Bundy, ‘Religion for Modernity: Martin Wells Knapp and the Radical Holiness Network for the American Progressive Era’, 43-79.

⁵ Vinson Synan, *Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Revival, 1901-2000* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001).

his own writings projected an increasingly focused message on entire sanctification as understood in Pentecostal imagery and language. His co-worker, Seth Rees, insisted that it was Knapp who had discovered that ‘Whatever Pentecost did for people two thousand years ago is what it will do for us if we really get it’.⁶ Consequently, he was comfortable being identified with the term ‘Pentecostal’. Wallace Thornton sets the term in context:

At the turn of the century, Knapp and many other holiness advocates embraced this label and such related terms as “apostolic faith” and “full gospel.” However, after modern Pentecostalism developed . . . the term came to identify those who taught that glossolalia (tongues speaking) was the evidence of Spirit baptism.⁷

He was in the vanguard of what William Kostlevy calls ‘the radical holiness movement’.⁸

On January 1, 1901, he announced his withdrawal from the MEC, but he was not happy with the NHA either.⁹ Rather, he identified with an emerging Holiness Movement constituency who either ideologically or pragmatically found their spiritual home in smaller ecclesiastical locales, including rescue missions, storefront churches, and small, independent fellowships.¹⁰

For Knapp and the RHM, entire sanctification was a second work of grace received by faith as a crisis experience after conversion, and as such, it was a minimum requirement for eternal salvation.¹¹ While the work of Christ was not to be marginalised, the dispensation of the Holy Spirit was the driving energy of the church, and seeking the power of the Spirit was the quest of the church as it sought to restore Pentecostal purity to its life and message. The result was an energetic movement that had found new freedom in a spiritual experience, which they envisioned would deliver them from sin and partner them with the New

⁶ Seth Rees, ‘Pentecost’, *The God’s Revivalist* (January 23, 1902), 2.

⁷ Thornton, *When the Fire Fell*, 25. Note the titles of books written by Martin Wells Knapp: *Pentecostal Messengers* (Cincinnati: M.W. Knapp, 1898), *Pentecostal Wine from Bible Grapes* (Cincinnati: M.W. Knapp, 1897), *Flashes from Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies, or, Devices of the Devil Unmasked*.

⁸ Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*, 17.

⁹ Martin Wells Knapp, ‘Why I Withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church’, *God’s Revivalist* (January 17, 1901), 8.

¹⁰ After having opposed the ‘comeout’ movement, Knapp himself left the Methodist Church and complained because others of his mind had not done so.

¹¹ Writing about the Pentecostal baptism, Knapp said, ‘It is essential to final glorification’. Knapp, *Lightning Bolts*, 23. Similarly, Knapp’s close friend, W. B. Godbey, said, ‘God requires all Christians to be sanctified’. Godbey, *Holiness or Hell* (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1899), 142.

Testament church, complete with the gifts of the Spirit. It was a new day, with Knapp being the embodiment of the new emphasis. Dieter seeks to assign such changes to ‘All that was America in the nineteenth century’, but the AHM would be more likely to attribute whatever contrasts existed to the dynamic of Pentecost.¹² Kostlevy observes, ‘In his decision to equate “the Baptism of the Holy Ghost” with entire sanctification . . . Knapp was within a whisker of Pentecostalism’s later insistence that glossolalia was the initial evidence of the “the Baptism of the Holy Ghost”’.¹³ Perhaps Knapp was only a reflection of the evolution of thought in the AHM. Wesley’s *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, modified by Fletcher and Clarke, had morphed into Knapp’s *Pentecostal Aggressiveness*, while incorporating Phoebe Palmer’s *Way of Holiness*.¹⁴ The result was a seedbed from which Pentecostalism could spring.

1.3 Third Work of Grace in the Thought of the American Holiness Movement

The understanding of the AHM regarding entire sanctification was not static. The adoption of the Pentecostal (Acts 2) paradigm for the experience posed tremendous possibilities for spiritual purity and power, but it also raised lofty expectations. Melvin Dieter comments,

In the holiness movement, the gap which frequently prevailed between such high spiritual expectations and subsequent spiritual results created questions of the relationship of the sanctifying experience to the power imparted by the sanctifying Spirit. At all periods in the history of the movement an undertone of tension at this point consistently parallels the reports of the advances the movement seemed to be making.¹⁵

As it became apparent that the realised experience did not seem to be accompanied by the results of the early chapters of Acts, ardent supporters of the adopted experiential model

¹² Melvin Dieter, *Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1980), 20.

¹³ William Kostlevy, ‘Nor Silver, Nor Gold: The Burning Bush Movement and the Communitarian Holiness Vision’ (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1996), 41.

¹⁴ Martin Wells Knapp, *Pentecostal Aggressiveness, or, Why I Conducted Meetings of the Chesapeake Holiness Union at Bowens, Maryland* (Cincinnati, OH: M.W. Knapp, 1899). Phoebe Palmer, *Way of Holiness* (New York: W.C. Palmer Jr., 1871).

¹⁵ Dieter, ‘Wesleyan-Holiness Aspects’, in Synan, *Aspects*, 69-70.

began to offer solutions concerning the deficiency. As early as 1879, Asbury Lowrey raised the question, ‘Is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost a Third Blessing?’¹⁶ Lowrey proceeded to explain his understanding of the third blessing:

The work of the Holy Spirit, up to the point of entire sanctification, is *renovating*, the baptism is *qualifying*. The first purges and refines, the second empowers. The first works in, and restores the image of God in the heart; the second works out, and touching society, hallows the world.¹⁷

While the question raised by Lowrey did not engender theological change in the NHA, it did reflect an underlying inquiry. By 1893 the concept of a third work had been presented by Methodist S. P. Jacobs, president of the Southwestern Holiness Association.¹⁸ Jacobs separated cleansing from inbred sin from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.¹⁹ Jacobs reasoned, ‘(The) indwelling of the Holy Ghost, or the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and perfect heart-purity are neither identical nor inseparably connected. It follows, then, that one being cleansed from all sin (I John 1:7) is not thereby necessarily baptized with the Holy Ghost’.²⁰ Dayton suggests that holiness proponents G. D. Watson and John Pike were similarly agitated with the question of a third work of grace, particularly as it related to the need for spiritual power.²¹ Perhaps the most Wesleyan attempt to articulate the third work of grace was from

¹⁶ Asbury Lowrey, ‘Is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost a Third Blessing?’, *Divine Life* (September 1879), 47. Dieter says that Lowrey’s answer is ‘both yes and no, but definitely tended to separate the cleansing and empowering work of the Holy Ghost in the believer’s life’. Dieter, ‘Wesleyan-Holiness Aspects’, in Synan, *Aspects*, 71. Lowrey’s interest in this subject is significant due to the prominence he held in the NHA. For biographical information on Lowrey, see Asbury Lowrey, *Possibilities of Grace* (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1884), 454-468, and William Kostlevy, ‘Asbury Lowrey’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 186-187.

¹⁷ Lowrey, ‘Is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost’, 47. For discussion of the third blessing, see Gilbertson, *The Baptism of the Holy Spirit*, 148-151.

¹⁸ Simon Peter Jacobs was a Methodist minister elected president of the Southwestern Holiness Association. This organisation would eventually affiliate with the Church of God (Holiness). See Clarence Eugene Cowen, *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)* (Overland Park, KS: Herald and Banner, 1949).

¹⁹ S. P. Jacobs, ‘Receiving the Holy Spirit’, *The Canadian Methodist and Holiness Era 2* (September 13, 1893), 146.

²⁰ Jacobs, ‘Receiving’, 146. See S. P. Jacobs, *The Real Christian* (Bedford, MI: author, 1899), 182. Jacobs presented a copy of *The Real Christian* to A. H. Argue, editor of *The Apostolic Messenger*, for review. He offered the substance of the book as an antidote to the ‘Finished Work’ understanding. See ‘From Brother S.P. Jacobs’, *The Apostolic Messenger* (February–March, 1908), 1.

²¹ Dayton, *Theological Roots*, 95-100.

Canadian Methodist, Ralph C. Horner.²² Horner read widely in the works of John Wesley, and he maintained that Wesley had not accepted the interpretation of Acts 2 as a scriptural basis for a second work of grace.²³ Horner felt the work of salvation to be a three-step process,²⁴ which he believed he had realised in his own life.²⁵ At stake was the issue of power, not for spiritual purity but for Christian service.²⁶

The idea of a third work of grace prompted concerns throughout the holiness constituency. S. B. Shaw noted with concern, ‘Of late it is common to find professors of heart

²² For biographical information on Ralph C. Horner, see Horner, *Ralph C. Horner, Evangelist: Reminiscences from His own Pen, also Reports of Five Typical Sermons* (Brockville, ON: Standard Church Bookroom, 1926), and Laurence and Mark Crosswell, *Lift Up a Standard: Life and Legacy of Ralph C. Horner* (Indianapolis, IN: Wesleyan, 2012).

²³ Ralph C. Horner, *Pentecost* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1891), 138.

²⁴ Horner’s theology is presented in a two-volume publication called *Bible Doctrines*, and a collection of essays published as *From the Altar to the Upper Room in Four Parts* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1891). *The Apostolic Faith* carried a note that begs explanation: ‘Word comes that Bishop Horner of the Holiness movement of Canada has been baptized with the Holy Ghost as on the day of Pentecost. He had been claiming his baptism for twenty years and he says this is the greatest baptism he ever had’. *The Apostolic Faith* (May 1908), 2. The significance of this statement is yet to be fully determined. James Craig insists that, based upon Horner’s rejection of the emphasis of R. E. McAlister, Horner did not participate in glossolalia, and that the practice was optional for others. Craig, “‘Out and Out for the Lord’: James Eustace Purdie, an Early Anglican Pentecostal” (Master’s thesis, University of St. Michael’s College, 1995), 86. According to Crosswell, oral tradition supplied by Elnora Burns, an early follower of Horner, says Horner ‘spoke in tongues personally’. Laurence Crosswell, email to the author, August 18, 2021. The whole matter is complicated by Horner’s insistence on a third work of grace, which he called ‘the baptism of the Holy Spirit’. Historiography from Canadian Pentecostalism says that many of the Horner followers became Pentecostals, and Dayton says, ‘Horner is a key figure . . . as a bridge to Pentecostalism’. Donald Dayton, ‘John Fletcher as John Wesley’s Vindicator and Designated Successor? A Response to Laurence W. Wood’, *Pneuma* 26, no. 2 (January 2004): 359. For a discussion of Horner’s third work theology, see Wilfred Flower, *The Promise of the Father, or, The Theology of the Third Blessing* (Brockville, CA: Christian Standard, 1906), and Frank Goff, *The Promised Enduement, or, the Baptism of the Holy Ghost* (Clarksburg, ON: Bulletin, 1921). Flower presented his argument to Pentecostals, opposing their understanding of the day of Pentecost, in ‘The Promise of the Father’, *The Apostolic Messenger* (February–March, 1908), 4.

²⁵ R. C. Horner, *Bible Doctrines* (Ottawa, ON: Holiness Movement, 1908), 14. In 1889, J. M. Boland published a volume entitled *The Problem of Methodism: Being a Review of the Residue Theory of Regeneration and the Second Change Theory of Sanctification, and the Philosophy of Christian Perfection* (Nashville, TN: Publishing House of the M.E. Church South, 1888). Boland concluded that ‘Regeneration is a complete work in its nature, and includes sanctification, or moral purity, while Christian perfection is a state of freedom from sin, and includes a maturity of the Christian graces’. Boland, *Problem of Methodism*, 28 (author’s italics). He understood that ‘as Mr. Wesley had cut this objectionable clause (ninth article of the Church of England) out of the Articles of Faith which he prepared for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America’, it was to be argued that he had abandoned the ‘residue doctrine’. Boland, 29-30. In 1893 Horner published *Notes on Boland, or, Mr. Wesley and the Second Work of Grace* (Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1893), in which he sought to ‘unmask Mr. Boland’s shrewd, unscrupulous attempt to make it appear that Mr. Wesley gave up the doctrine of entire sanctification as taught by him throughout his writings and sermons’. Horner, *Notes on Boland*, 3.

²⁶ The matter of a third work of grace circulated in the MEC. C. W. Rishell suggested the possibility of a third work of grace comparable to the second: ‘It is entirely possible that a third crisis might come, and a third blessing comparable of a similar nature to the second be received’. Rishell, ‘The Doctrine of Sanctification Psychologically Developed’, *The Methodist Review* 8, no. 5 (July 1892): 528. While Rishell did not elaborate, it is significant that the idea of a third work of grace was circulating in both Wesleyan/Holiness and Methodist circles contemporarily with the theology of B. H. Irwin.

purity bemoaning the lack of fullness . . . that anyone should think we may be entirely sanctified . . . and not possess the fullness of the *Spirit of Grace* is certainly very strange indeed'.²⁷

1.4 Benjamin Hardin Irwin and the Third Work of Grace

Into this perceived shortfall of spiritual power came the message of the baptism of fire taught by Benjamin Hardin Irwin. Its origins were found in Irwin's personal entire sanctification experience, and mention of the doctrine as such largely disappeared from public view with the demise of Irwin himself. The time of its prominence (1895–1900) belies its measure of influence. The constituency affected was the AHM, and its legacy would morph into acceptance of Pentecostalism by some Radical Holiness advocates.²⁸

Benjamin Hardin Irwin was converted in 1879, and later studied for the ministry while serving as pastor of a Primitive Baptist congregation.²⁹ In 1891 he professed sanctification and subsequently joined the WMC.³⁰ He read avidly from Wesleyan literature, being particularly impressed with the writings of John Fletcher and his referencing a 'baptism

²⁷ S. B. Shaw, *Michigan Holiness Record* (May 1884), 10 (author's italics). For biographical information, see William Kostlevy, 'Solomon Benjamin Shaw', in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 229-230.

²⁸ William T. Purinton says Irwin reflected the constituency of the 'Radical' Holiness Movement. The tension that existed between the mainline Eastern Seaboard holiness proponents and the disaffected Midwestern radicals was exacerbated by what Purinton calls Irwin's 'often virulent language'. Irwin's feelings were reflected in an editorial entitled 'The Old Man', where he described the mainline as the 'old man' who 'hates practical, fire-baptized holiness, and yet sometimes professes to be sanctified, pleads for questionable amusement, insists that all our meetings are holiness meetings, does not believe in such radical preaching, that we had better preach holiness in a milder way, and not do so much currying nor make people mad'. B. H. Irwin, *The Old Man* (Columbia, SC: Way of Faith, 1896), 10-11. For Purinton's comments, see William T. Purinton, "'Red Hot-Holiness': B.H. Irwin and the Fire Baptized Holiness Tradition' (presentation, 27th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Cleveland, TN, March 12-14, 1998).

²⁹ For biographical information on Irwin, see Vinson Synan and Daniel Woods, *Fire-Baptized*. Additional biographical information is provided in, 'The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Rev. Benjamin Hardin Irwin', *Brethren in Christ, History and Life* 4, no. 1 (June 1981): 3-29.

³⁰ Irwin severed connections with the WMC in 1896, although he did spend time in the South Carolina and Georgia Conferences. Black comments, 'When Irwin preached this doctrine of a third work of grace in Wesleyan Churches in South Carolina and Georgia . . . several of those congregations disbanded and reorganized under his (Irwin's) leadership as part of his newly organized Fire-Baptized Holiness Church'. Black and Drury, *The Story of the Wesleyan Church*, 130. For specific information on the conflict in the South Carolina Conference, see James B. Hilson, *History of the South Carolina Conference, Wesleyan Methodist Church of America: Fifty-Five Years of Wesleyan Methodism in South Carolina* (Winona Lake, IN: Light and Life, 1950), 45.

of fire’ and multiple spiritual experiences.³¹ Irwin found in Fletcher both the nature and the method outlined for a more powerful operation of the Spirit within the heart. He was confident that the matter of sin was dealt with in the first two works, but there remained an empowerment for Christian service and intimacy with God that held the potential for infinitely more intense experiential reality. Whether or not Fletcher would have recognised (or condoned) this application of his thought, it remains that Irwin perceived himself to be within the Wesleyan tradition.³² William Purinton objects to a historical basis for Irwin’s experiential thesis: ‘It was Irwin’s renewal of experience, not a rereading of Fletcher or Wesley that was a basis for Irwin’s thought’.³³

Irwin’s experience-oriented theology modified the accepted Wesleyan *ordo salutis* by adding a post-entire sanctification crisis experience. On October 25, 1895, in Enid, Oklahoma, Irwin professed to experience his life-changing ‘baptism of fire’:

I saw in the room above me a cross of pure, transparent fire. It was all fire. But as yet there was no sense of heat connected with it, not until the night of the 25th, when on the train, en route from Enid, all at once I became conscious of the fact that I was literally on fire.³⁴

Irwin himself did not refer to this experience as an additional work of grace. Parham sought to clarify Irwin’s meaning of ‘baptism of fire’:

The baptism of fire has never been called a third work by any of its advocates. We call it what God calls it in his Word—“the baptism of fire”—though there is nothing

³¹ Irwin often referred to his reading of Wesleyan literature and his appreciation for John Fletcher. See Irwin, ‘Editorial Correspondence’, *Live Coals* (October 20, 1899), 1, and ‘The Third Blessing’, *Live Coals*, 5.

³² Geordan Hammond suggests that Wesley himself envisioned a third work of grace called ‘the sanctification of the mind . . . said to have enabled uninterrupted focus on God free from thoughts that may wander, even towards lesser, albeit innocent, subjects’. He suggests, ‘Perhaps there is some sense in which the third blessing in early Methodism can be seen in a genealogy of radical doctrine leading to the doctrine of baptism in the Holy Spirit in the Holiness Movement, and that doctrine’s transformation into the manifestation of that baptism issuing in glossolalia in the Pentecostal movement’. Geordan Hammond, ‘The Third Blessing: John Wesley and the Sanctification of the Mind’ (presentation, Nazarene Theological College Research Seminar, Manchester, England, September 30, 2020).

³³ Purinton, ‘Red Hot Holiness’.

³⁴ B. H. Irwin, ‘The Baptism of Fire Experience’, *The Way of Faith* (November 18, 1895), 2. Schrag insists the emphasis upon fire was extant in the broader Holiness Movement. He cites George Hughes, ed., *The Guide to Holiness and Pentecostal Life*, as a primary source for the emphasis, and also the pen of W. B. Godbey. Schrag, ‘Spiritual Pilgrimage’, 4-5.

in the Word of God, nor in the teachings of Methodism forbidding the use of the expression, “third experience.” We prefer the scriptural term.³⁵

The *Christian Witness*, the periodical for the NHA, understood the proposed state of grace differently:

Today how many who call themselves Christians, hanker after noise, ocular demonstration, shouting, trances and bodily healing, and what they call “fire,” and see more in these things than they do in the refining of the Holy Ghost and the human spirit sweetened by grace, softened by love, quieted by the peace of God, and sitting clothed and in its right mind.³⁶

Rejected by traditional holiness leaders, Irwin organised his followers into the Iowa Fire Baptized Association,³⁷ and over the next two years, similar associations were organised in Iowa and beyond, including the broader Midwest, the South, and Pennsylvania, before extending to Winnipeg and Manitoba, Canada.³⁸ On August 5, 1898, at a called conference in Anderson, South Carolina, Irwin’s Fire Baptized followers were organised into a national organisation, with Irwin named overseer for life with the power to appoint overseers. The discipline offered a formal statement of Irwin’s understanding of the baptism of fire:

We believe that the baptism in the Holy Ghost is obtainable by a definite act of appropriating faith on the part of the fully cleansed believer. We believe also that the baptism with fire is a definite scriptural experience, obtainable by faith on the part of the Spirit-filled believer.³⁹

In 1899, Irwin added a ‘baptism of dynamite’ as a fourth blessing that everyone was expected to believe and experience. While the biblical support for the ‘fire baptism’ had been

³⁵ Discipline statement quoted from B. H. Irwin, ‘Pyrophobia’, *The Way of Faith* (October 28, 1896), 2. The article was later published as a tract by J. M. Pike and *The Way of Faith*.

³⁶ ‘Earthquakes, Cyclones and Fires in Which the Lord is Not’, *Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness* (November 9, 1898), 3.

³⁷ For the history of the Fire Baptized Holiness Association, see Joseph Campbell, *The Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1898-1948: Its Background and History* (Franklin Springs, GA: Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951), 192-253, Vinson Synan, *The Old Time Power: A Centennial History of the International Pentecostal Holiness Church* (Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1986), 81-101, and Dillard Wood and William Preskitt Jr., *Baptized with Fire: A History of the Pentecostal Fire-Baptized Holiness Church* (Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1982).

³⁸ Irwin’s activity in Pennsylvania was amongst the Brethren in Christ. He previously ministered with this church in Kansas. See Schrag, ‘Spiritual Pilgrimage’, 3-29. For an additional record of his activity in the Brethren in Christ Church, see Carlton Wittlinger, *Quest for Piety and Obedience: The Story of the Brethren in Christ* (Nappanee, IN: Evangel, 1978), 238-240.

³⁹ *Constitution and General Rules of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church* (Royston, GA, 1905), 82-83, as quoted by Wood and Preskitt, *Baptized with Fire*, 16. Irwin used Matthew 3:11 as a biblical foundation for the ‘baptism of fire’.

relatively weak, Irwin found the Greek word *dunamis*, generally translated ‘power’, to be a root word for dynamite. Based on his understanding of Acts 1:8, Romans 1:16, Ephesians 3:20, and Colossians 1:11, Irwin was biblically armed to present this phase of the Spirit’s work. In the February 23, 1900, issue of *Live Coals*, Irwin introduced ‘the baptism of heavenly lyddite’, and subsequently ‘the baptism of selenite’, and later ‘oxydite’.⁴⁰ The meteoric rise of Benjamin Hardin Irwin ended in the spring of 1900, when it was reported that he suffered a moral failure.⁴¹

Benjamin Hardin Irwin can be considered a proto-Pentecostal. There is no record that he ever spoke in tongues,⁴² nor did he ever teach glossolalia during his ministry in the Fire Baptized Church, although Hunter contends that glossolalia occurred in the Fire Baptized Holiness Church (FBHC).⁴³ The contribution of Irwin was his introduction of a three-crisis sequence into the anticipation of mainline holiness proponents, who had been taught a ‘two crisis sequence’. Synan concludes, ‘Irwin’s fire-baptized movement was an important bridge to Pentecostalism in that attention was given to the unique empowered action of the Holy

⁴⁰ For a discussion of the additional experiences in Irwin’s thought, see Wade H. Phillips, *Quest to Restore God’s House: A Theological History of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee): Vol. 1 (1886-1923)* (Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2014), 125-136, and the testimony of Albert E. Robinson in B. H. Irwin, ‘Editorial Correspondence’, *Live Coals* (March 9, 1900), 1.

⁴¹ Irwin was seen on the streets of Omaha, Nebraska, in a drunken state and smoking a cigar. The story was published by H. C. Morrison in the *Pentecostal Herald*, headlined ‘A Sad Duty’. H. C. Morrison, *The Pentecostal Herald* (June 20, 1900), 8. It was subsequently published in the *Christian Witness*, headlined ‘Whisky Baptized’, *Christian Witness* (July 5, 1900), 5. *The Burning Bush* said he attempted to bribe the persons who discovered his misconduct. See ‘Is There a Third Blessing’, *The Burning Bush* (June 18, 1903), 8. *The Burning Bush* was the periodical of the Metropolitan Church Association.

⁴² In 1906 Irwin reappeared, associated with a Pentecostal mission in Salem, Oregon. In a submitted article to Carrie Judd Montgomery’s *Triumphs of Faith*, Irwin wrote that he received the gift of tongues on Christmas Eve, 1906. See B. H. Irwin, ‘My Pentecostal Baptism—A Christmas Gift’, *Triumphs of Faith* (May 1907), 114-117. An Irwin letter sent from Azusa Street to European Pentecostal leader T. B. Barrett has been republished by David Bundy in ‘Spiritual Advice to a Seeker: Letters to T.B. Barrett from Azusa St, 1906’, *Pneuma* 14, no. 2 (Fall 1992): 160. Irwin died in 1926 amongst predestination Two-Seed Baptists, with his obituary describing him as an ‘uncompromising Baptist’. His obituary was carried in the *Signs of the Times* (March 1926), 71, an Old School (Primitive) Baptist periodical.

⁴³ See Harold Hunter, ‘Beniah at the Apostolic Crossroads: Little Noticed Crosscurrents of B.H. Irwin, Charles Fox Parham, Frank Sandford, A.J. Tomlinson’, file:///C:/Users/17723/Downloads/Beniah_At_The_Apostolic_Crossroads.pdf (accessed June 22, 2021). Phillips cites a letter from Stewart Irwin to indicate that glossolalia was present at Beniah, and raises the possibility of Pentecostal origins associated with this early Fire Baptized camp meeting. Phillips, *Quest to Restore*, 138.

Spirit separate from the cleansing work of the Spirit in sanctification'.⁴⁴ Pentecostalism simply set aside Irwin's baptism by fire and substituted the baptism of the Holy Spirit accompanied by glossolalia. Doug Beacham concludes, 'Irwin's contribution to the pre-Azusa holiness matrix was that he argued for more experiences beyond the "second" work of traditional Wesleyan sanctification'.⁴⁵

Irwin's primary authority source was Christian experience, particularly his own. Popular acceptance of his message was, however, achieved through a charismatic personality and an uncanny ability to energise his followers. These skills granted him uncommon acceptance amongst professors of entire sanctification, both theologically and personally. His unwillingness to accept accountability to others (he appointed himself lifetime leader of the FBHC) allowed him to become his own worst enemy. His untimely demise proved to be almost fatal to the organisation that survived him. But the third work of grace that he sought to insert into the Pentecostal *ordo salutis* remained an integral part of the thinking of subsequent Pentecostals in general. More specifically, it would influence Charles Parham, allowing him to be placed amongst the pioneers of the movement.⁴⁶ As Randall Stephens says, '(Parham) was a religious adventurer, always looking for new signs of the Spirit. Irwin's Fire-Baptized saints in Kansas inspired awe in Parham, who adopted their "third work" doctrine'.⁴⁷

1.5 The Emergence of the Pentecostal Movement

William Menzies has defined Pentecostalism as

That group of sects within the Christian Church which is characterized by the belief that the occurrence mentioned in Acts 2 on the Day of Pentecost not only signaled the birth of the Church, but described an experience available to believers in all ages. The experience of an enduement with power, called the "baptism of the Holy Spirit," is

⁴⁴ Vinson Synan, *Century of the Holy Spirit*, 35.

⁴⁵ Beacham, *Azusa East*, 75.

⁴⁶ See Goff, *Fields White*, 54-57, and Hunter, 'Beniah at the Apostolic Crossroads'.

⁴⁷ Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 188.

believed to be evidenced by the accompanying sign of “speaking with tongues as the Spirit gave utterance.” The experience is to be distinguished from the traditional holiness teaching of a “second blessing”.⁴⁸

The primary (though not exclusive) distinction between Pentecostalism and the AHM was glossolalia. Howard Carter comments, ‘The chief, and perhaps only justification that the Pentecostal Movement has for its separate existence from the other denominations, is the claim to possess the like gift (glossolalia) as at the beginning of the [Apostolic era]’.⁴⁹ James Robinson concurs, saying, ‘The only distinctively new teaching of the early Pentecostals, the one that most nettled their fellow evangelicals and completely baffled outsiders, was . . . the speech-act of speaking in tongues’.⁵⁰ The practice was not new.⁵¹ Church history provides a record of glossolalia in varying places of the world at varying times. Ecstatic speech occurred in the late second century with the followers of Montanus,⁵² and reappeared with the Camisards and Jansenists of the seventeenth century.⁵³ In the mid-1800s an outburst of glossolalia occurred under the ministry of Edward Irving at Regent Square Church in

⁴⁸ William Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1971), 9-10.

⁴⁹ Howard Carter, ‘The Pentecostal Movement’, *Pentecostal Evangel* (May 18, 1946), 3.

⁵⁰ James Robinson, *Pentecostal Origins: Early Pentecostalism in Ireland in the Context of the British Isles*, Studies in Evangelical History and Thought (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 1. Carl Brumback agrees with this assessment, in *What Meaneth This?* (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1947), 99, as does John Thomas Nichols, in *Pentecostalism: The Story of Growth and Development of a Vital New Force in American Protestantism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 9. Wacker disagrees and expands the distinctives of Pentecostalism. See Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 40-44. Gordon Anderson says that ‘Pentecostals Believe in More than Tongues’, but the additional distinctives he suggests are not unique to Pentecostals. See Gordon Anderson, ‘Pentecostals Believe in More Than Tongues’, in Harold B. Smith, ed., *Pentecostals from the Inside Out* (Wheaton, IL: Victor, 1990), 53-64.

⁵¹ William Menzies says, ‘The Pentecostal revival did not add new doctrines; it called the Church back to historic truth’. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 17.

⁵² See Stanley Burgess, *The Holy Spirit: Medieval Roman Catholic and Reformation Traditions* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), and Stanley Burgess, ‘Montanist and Patristic Perfectionism’, in Burgess, ed., *Reaching Beyond: Chapters in the History of Perfectionism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986), 120-125, and R. F. Spittler, ‘Glossolalia’, in Stanley Burgess and Gary McGee, eds., *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988), 339. For further discussion of the relationship of Montanus to Pentecostalism, see Charles Sullivan, ‘A Critical Look at Tongues and Montanism’, The Charles A. Sullivan Blog, entry posted January 2, 2012, updated August 9, 2020, <https://charlesasullivan.com/2660/a-critical-look-at-tongues-and-montanism/> (accessed June 22, 2021).

⁵³ Alexander Mackie, *The Gift of Tongues: A Study in Pathological Aspects of Christianity* (New York: George Doran, 1921), 70-81.

London.⁵⁴ Even in the United States, glossolalia occurred in widely separated groups/persons such as the Shakers,⁵⁵ the Mormons,⁵⁶ Frank Sandford in Maine,⁵⁷ in eastern Tennessee/western North Carolina amongst pre-Church of God (Cleveland) representatives,⁵⁸ Lutheran Pietists in the upper Midwest,⁵⁹ and the followers of B. H. Irwin.⁶⁰ Isolated expressions, however, do not constitute a movement.⁶¹

The beginning of the modern Pentecostal Movement may be dated from the thought and practice of Charles Parham, which reproduces itself in the ministry of William J. Seymour at Azusa Street, Los Angeles, California. It is not claimed that Parham's followers in Topeka, Kansas, were the first in church history to speak in tongues. Rather, Topeka and subsequently Azusa Street are understood to be the beginning of a movement that has now

⁵⁴ See Arnold Dallimore, *Forerunner of the Charismatic Movement: The Life of Edward Irving* (Chicago: Moody, 1983), 115-160, A. L. Drummond, *Edward Irving and His Circle: Including Some Consideration of the 'Tongues' Movement in the Light of Modern Psychology* (London: James Clarke, 1937), 152-207, Margaret Oliphant, *The Life of Edward Irving, Minister of the National Scotch Church, London* vol. 2, 2nd ed. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1862), 167-230, and Mackie, *Tongues*, 129-197.

⁵⁵ Mackie, *Tongues*, 82-128.

⁵⁶ Dan Vogel and Scott Dunn, "'The Tongue of Angels': Glossolalia among Mormonism's Founders', *Journal of Mormon History* 19, no. 2 (1993): 1-34.

⁵⁷ See Harold Hunter, 'Beniah at the Apostolic Crossroads'. For biographical information on Frank Sandford, see Shirley Nelson, *Fair, Clear and Terrible: The Story of Shiloh, Maine* (Latham, NY: British American, 1989).

⁵⁸ C. T. Davidson, *Upon This Rock*, vol. 1 (Cleveland, TN: White Wing, 1973), 297-298.

⁵⁹ See Darrin Rodgers, *Northern Harvest: Pentecostalism in North Dakota* (Bismarck, ND: North Dakota Council Assemblies of God, 2003).

⁶⁰ Vinson Synan and Daniel Woods, *Fire Baptized*.

⁶¹ Discussion of Pentecostal origins is debated amongst Pentecostal scholars. Allan Anderson has complained of a 'made in America' understanding. Allen Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 8. Robin Johnston calls the acceptance of American origins for Pentecostalism 'historical myopia'. Robin Johnston, *Howard A. Goss: A Pentecostal Life* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame, 2010), 159n3. Johnston acknowledges, however, that early Pentecostals (e.g. Howard Goss) would have accepted the historical understanding rooted in the Topeka, KS /Azusa Street narrative. Joe Creech writes against the importance of Azusa Street, in 'Visions of Glory: The Place of the Azusa Street Revival in Pentecostal History', *Church History* 65, no. 3 (September 1996): 405-424. Gastón Espinosa takes a middle ground, favouring the Azusa Street narrative: 'So in all fairness, just as some scholars have in fact overstated the influence of America and Azusa on global Pentecostal origins, it appears that some other scholars have swung the pendulum too far in the opposite direction . . . I am convinced there's compelling evidence to argue for Seymour and Azusa's primal and primary, though not exclusive or total, influence on American and global Pentecostal origins from 1906-1912 . . . though not for the movement's later development (an important distinction) and origins in others places'. Espinosa, *Seymour*, 23.

encircled the world. William Faupel concludes, ‘More than any other person, he [Parham] should be understood as the father of American Pentecostalism’.⁶²

1.6 Charles Parham and Topeka, Kansas

Glossolalia Experience

Douglas Jacobsen insists that ‘It is impossible to trace the modern Pentecostal Movement to any one individual or event’.⁶³ Similarly, Carl Brumback comments, ‘Pentecost can “call no man . . . Father.” To find the “Father of twentieth-century Pentecost,” one must look beyond the merely human to the divine, even as one must look beyond the Apostles to find the “Father of the first-century Pentecost”’.⁶⁴

Jacobsen’s assessment concerning Pentecostal origins may be correct. However, historically it would appear that the understanding could be more precise. Although instances of glossolalia appear in church history over a broad period, the initiation of the modern Pentecostal Movement appears to be a singular moment in Topeka, Kansas, when Agnes Ozman⁶⁵ spoke in tongues under the ministry of Charles F. Parham.⁶⁶

Charles Fox Parham was a Methodist minister from the American Midwest. As a child, he was plagued with physical maladies until he experienced healing in 1898. He

⁶² Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 185. Estrelida Alexander understands the assignment of credit for Pentecostal origins as being racially generated: ‘The racial birthright of American Pentecostalism has long been hotly contested among African American and white Pentecostal leaders and scholars, who place its beginning invariably at either New Year’s Day 1901 in Topeka, Kansas, under the leadership of white evangelist Charles Fox Parham, or April 1906 in Los Angeles, under the leadership of African American William Joseph Seymour. A third group attempts to meditate this impasse by suggesting that the upstart of the movement was completely a work of the Holy Spirit that essentially owes no allegiance to any human source but sprang up more or less spontaneously’. Estrelida Y. Alexander, *Black Fire: One Hundred Years of African American Pentecostalism* (Downer’s Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), 17.

⁶³ Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 16.

⁶⁴ Brumback, *Suddenly*, 48.

⁶⁵ See Agnes N. O. LaBarge, *What God Hath Wrought* (Chicago: Herald, 1921). Brumback points out that ‘She was the first known person to have received such an experience as a result of specifically seeking a baptism in the Holy Spirit and the expectation of speaking in tongues’. Brumback, *Suddenly*, 48.

⁶⁶ For biographical information on Charles F. Parham, see Sarah E. Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement* (Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Church, 1930), and James Goff, *Fields White*. For a discussion of the ‘Topeka Outpouring’, see Larry Martin, *The Topeka Outpouring of 1901* (Joplin, MO: Christian Life, 2000).

reported his conversion as no less dramatic: ‘There flashed from the Heaven, a light above the brightness of the sun; like a stroke of lightning, it penetrated every tissue and fiber of our being, knowing by experimental knowledge what Peter knew of old, that he was the Christ the Son of the Living God’.⁶⁷ He espoused the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection, incorporating both the crisis experience of cleansing and the progressive element of human foibles: ‘Sanctification destroys the sinful desires of the flesh, but the natural, human desires of the flesh we must die daily to, until we can say with Paul, “I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live; yet not I but Christ liveth in me” (Gal. 2:20)’.⁶⁸

But Parham was ‘ultimately influenced’ by B. H. Irwin ‘far more than any of the national holiness figures’.⁶⁹ By the time Parham was prepared to open his Bible school work in 1900, he would summarise his beliefs about the Christian life as, ‘Salvation by faith, healing by faith, laying on of hands and prayer; sanctification by faith; coming (pre-millennium) of Christ; [and] the baptism of the Holy Ghost and Fire, which seals the Bride and bestows the gifts’.⁷⁰

Disappointed with the stand of the Methodist Church concerning divine healing, and annoyed by what he felt was denominationalism, Parham left the MEC in 1895 to assume a career in independent ministry. In 1900 he embarked on a tour of holiness religious centres, being especially intrigued with the ministry of Frank Sandford and the communal experience in Shiloh, Maine. There, Parham was introduced to the idea of xenolalia glossolalia, or

⁶⁷ James Goff Jr., ‘Charles Parham and His Role in the Development of the Pentecostal Movement: A Reevaluation’, *Kansas History* 7, no. 3 (Autumn 1984): 227.

⁶⁸ Sarah Parham, *Life*, 22. While Leslie Callahan assesses Parham ‘as not entirely consistent’ in his understanding of entire sanctification, perhaps Parham was seeking to apply the Wesleyan understanding of instantaneous and progressive, making him more Wesleyan than Callahan might grant him credit. See Leslie Callahan, ‘Charles Parham: Progenitor of Pentecostalism’, in Knight, *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street*, 215.

⁶⁸ Goff, *Fields White*, 215.

⁶⁹ Goff, 54, and Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 165.

⁷⁰ *The Apostolic Faith* (January 1, 1900), 7, as quoted in Goff, ‘Parham: A Reevaluation’, 229.

speaking in an identifiable language that is unknown to the speaker.⁷¹ Identifying this practice with Pentecost and associating this possibility with facilitating a world-ending revival, Parham was more than intrigued. He returned to Topeka, Kansas, to establish a faith-supported Bible school. Surrounded by a small group of spiritually zealous students, Parham encouraged them to search Acts 2 specifically, and the Book of Acts in general, for the defining evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit. He recalled that, upon questioning the students as to the results of their study, ‘To my astonishment they all had the same story, that while there were different things (which) occurred when the Pentecostal blessing fell, that the indisputable proof on each occasion was that they spake with other tongues’.⁷²

On December 31, 1900, Parham convened a watch-night service. Parham recounts the events of the evening:

Sister Agnes N. Ozman (now LaBerge) asked that hands might be laid upon her to receive the Holy Spirit as she hoped to go to foreign fields. I laid my hand upon her head and prayed. I had scarcely repeated three dozen sentences when a glory fell upon her, a halo seemed to surround her head and face, and she began speaking in the Chinese language, and was unable to speak English for three days.⁷³

Parham’s own experience would follow days thereafter.⁷⁴ With these and similar replicating experiences as evidential background, Parham adopted and subsequently preached the reception of actual tongues/languages as ‘the initial evidence’ for receiving the Holy Spirit.⁷⁵

⁷¹ See Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 189. For information on Frank Sandford and his ministry in Maine, see Shirley Nelson, *Fair, Clear and Terrible*, and Frank Murray, *The Sublimity of Faith Life and Work of Frank W. Sandford* (Amherst, NH: Kingdom, 1981).

⁷² Parham, *Life*, 52. Perhaps Parham is disingenuous on this point. Based upon his prior experience with Sandford, perhaps Parham was shaping the thought processes of these students to arrive at what for him was a predetermined conclusion. Parham said after his visit to Sandford that ‘I returned home fully convinced that while many had obtained real experience in sanctification and the full anointing that abideth, there still remained a great outpouring of power for the Christians who were to close this age’. Parham, 48. Robert Maples Anderson views ‘The whole episode at Bethel [as] too pat to be true’, and refers to the events at Bethel as ‘Pentecostal mythology’. Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992) 54-55. For a slightly different narrative of the Topeka Experience, see the article by Parham’s sister-in-law, Lillian Thistlewaite, ‘The Wonderful History of the Latter Rain’, in James Tyson, *The Early Pentecostal Revival: History of the Twentieth-Century Pentecostals and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, 1901-30* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame, 1992), 49-58.

⁷³ Parham, *Life*, 52.

⁷⁴ Parham, 54.

⁷⁵ Pentecostals maintained that a Holy Spirit baptism, validated and evidenced by ‘speaking in tongues’, was a normative post-salvation religious experience that was available to all Christians. For a discussion of initial

This doctrinal tenet became the distinguishing mark of early Pentecostal theology and made the pursuit and practice of glossolalia the driving energy for the empowerment of mission. It also provided the underpinning of the emerging Pentecostal Movement. J. Roswell Flower identified this theological conclusion as ‘a momentous decision. It was this decision which made the Pentecostal Movement of the Twentieth Century’.⁷⁶

The Significance of Glossolalia for Parham

For Parham, speaking in an *unknown* tongue was a misnomer. It was, in fact, speaking a language through which the gospel could be conveyed to someone, somewhere. While glossolalia was in his thought the necessary evidence for the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit, it was at the same time a necessary component of his eschatological scheme. He was convinced of the ‘any moment’ return of Christ, and that this event would be preceded by a worldwide revival that would be facilitated in part by breaking the barriers of non-communication. Glossolalia was ‘an eschatological empowerment for mission’.⁷⁷ He would retain this understanding throughout his life, prompting him to protest what he felt to be the confusion at Azusa Street. He observed that some were ‘chattering, jabbering and sputtering, speaking in no language at all’.⁷⁸ Such an understanding of the practice of glossolalia was anathema to Parham.

While Parham (and subsequently Seymour) was convinced of the miraculous nature of glossolalia allowing for immediate communication in a language unknown to the speaker,

evidence, see Gary McGee, *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), and Kenneth Richard Walters Jr., *Why Tongues? The Initial Evidence Doctrine in North American Pentecostal Churches* (Dorset, England: Deo, 2016).

⁷⁶ J. Roswell Flower, ‘Birth of the Pentecostal Movement’, *Pentecostal Evangel* (November 26, 1950), 3. For biographical information on J. Roswell Flower, see Gary McGee, ‘Joseph Reynolds Flower’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 311-313, and David Ringer, *J. Roswell Flower: A Brief Biography* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016).

⁷⁷ Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 49. Parham remained convinced of the xenolalic nature of glossolalia until his death. Seymour seems to have become less convinced given the failed missionary experiences of Azusa Street missionaries.

⁷⁸ Parham, *Life*, 163. For Parham’s record of his visit to Azusa Street, see Parham, 161-170.

others were not so convinced. Pentecostal literature regularly cited confirmation of the presence of literal languages, but such was usually word of mouth. Missionaries possessing glossolalia found themselves unsuccessful in communicating with others. Alfred Garr was one example. Garr professed his Pentecost and, within three weeks, felt called to be a missionary to India. Upon arrival, he discovered he was unable to communicate with the Indian people. This called for a critical re-evaluation of the meaning of glossolalia. Garr concluded that the disciples had languages on the Day of Pentecost, but this ability did not continue with them throughout their lives. He discovered Bible passages relating glossolalia to speaking mysteries (1 Corinthians 14:2); edifying oneself (1 Corinthians 14:4); and building oneself in the faith through praying in tongues (Jude 20).⁷⁹ Gary McGee credits Garr with ‘formulating the classical Pentecostal position on the purpose of glossolalia in the believer’s life’.⁸⁰

For Parham, however, the results were conclusive. Agnes Ozman had been enabled through the power of the Holy Spirit to replicate the communications miracle of the Day of Pentecost, and in so doing, provided positive proof that God was working in the last days to confirm the final parameters of his kingdom on earth.⁸¹

Parham’s Post-Topeka Ministry

Parham began to proclaim his message, preaching on January 3, 1901, in a Free Methodist Church in Topeka, Kansas, and subsequently throughout the general area.⁸² In 1905 Parham took his message to Texas, establishing a Bible school in Houston. Among his students was William Seymour, a young Black evangelist with a specific yearning for God,

⁷⁹ Garr published his findings in a pamphlet entitled ‘Tongues: Bible Evidence to the Witness of the Spirit’, *Pentecostal Power* (March 1907), 3.

⁸⁰ Steve Thompson, *A 20th Century Apostle: Life of Alfred Garr* (Wilkesboro, NC: MorningStar, 2003), 87-88.

⁸¹ For discussion of glossolalia as it relates to language, see James K. A. Smith, ‘Tongues and Philosophy of Language: Conceptual Production at the Limits of Speech’ (presentation, 35th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Pasadena, CA, March 2006).

⁸² Parham, *Life*, 53.

who would become the catalyst for the revival at the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles, California.⁸³ In the first issue of *The Apostolic Faith*, the literary voice of Azusa Street, Parham is referenced as ‘God’s leader in the Apostolic Faith Movement’.⁸⁴ Parham’s ministry was ultimately hampered by division⁸⁵ and scandal.⁸⁶ He died January 29, 1929, in Baxter Springs, Kansas, surrounded by friends but largely disregarded by the broader world of Pentecostals themselves, due to alleged moral failure and accusation of misuse of funds.⁸⁷ But his understanding and proclamation of glossolalia in an eschatological context would be regarded by many as the inaugural moment and message of Pentecostalism, to be fleshed out in the Azusa Street Revival.

Summary

While the career of Parham was meteoric, his contributions were lasting. First, Parham was able to place a most controversial practice in the *ordo salutis* of an emerging segment of Protestant thought. He did so as an extension of accepted Wesleyan Arminian

⁸³ Pentecostal historiography says that due to segregation laws in the state of Texas, Seymour was relegated to a seat outside the classroom. In more recent times this understanding has been questioned. See Cecil Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission and Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2006), 46-48. For a discussion of the relationship between Parham and Seymour as relates to this story, see Glenn W. Gohr, ‘Charles F. Parham: Interacting with Culture in the Context of His Belief System’ (presentation, 45th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, San Dimas, CA, March 10-12, 2016), Johnson, *Howard A. Goss*, 36-37, and Larry Martin, ‘The Divine Appointment: Parham and Seymour’, in Martin, *Seymour*, 87-118.

⁸⁴ *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), 1.

⁸⁵ Parham was involved in power struggles at Azusa Street, Los Angeles; Zion City, Illinois; and later in Texas. For information regarding Zion City, see Judith Cook, *Zion City, Illinois: Twentieth Century Utopia, Utopianism and Communitarianism* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1996), and Gordon Lindsay, *John Alexander Dowie: Life Story of Trials, Tragedies and Triumphs* (Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, 1980).

⁸⁶ On Friday, July 19, 1907, Parham was arrested in San Antonio, Texas, for the crime of ‘sodomy’. The charges were later dropped. Goff concludes, ‘In the final analysis the Parham scandal remains a mystery. There is neither enough hard evidence to condemn him nor enough doubt to sufficiently explain the preponderance of rumor which circulated during his lifetime’. Goff, *Fields White*, 141.

⁸⁷ Robert Anderson observes that ‘Parham . . . “fell from grace” in the eyes of all but a few of his followers while the Los Angeles revival of 1906-1907 was still in progress, and his role in the origin of the Pentecostal movement was all but completely obscured for nearly fifty years. Parham’s name does not appear in any Pentecostal history of the movement before that of Klaude Kendrick’. Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 252-253n1. Kendrick’s volume, *The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement* (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1961), was published in 1961. Subsequent rejection of Parham by Pentecostalism relates, in part, to his opinions regarding race. See Allan Anderson, ‘The Dubious Legacy of Charles Parham: Racism and Cultural Insensitivities among Pentecostals’, *Pneuma* 27, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 51-64.

Holiness thought.⁸⁸ Second, Parham placed Pentecostalism in a flow of history that was prompted by eschatological thought. Broader than a mere emotional experience, he understood the practice of glossolalia to be missional in the broad programme of God for the evangelisation of the world, sometimes referred to as the Latter Rain. Later Pentecostals would drop this evangelism motif for glossolalia, understanding rather its purpose to be for worship. Third, Parham's understanding of glossolalia as the initial evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit became a norm in early Pentecostal theology. Fourth, Parham not only experienced glossolalia, but he sought to export the practice through emissaries serving that specific purpose. As Bloch-Hoell notes, 'the first Pentecostal witnesses who went out preaching were his pupils'.⁸⁹ Fifth, Parham instructed William Seymour, who would become a central figure in the Azusa Street Revival, which led to an even greater awareness of glossolalia, if not xenolical glossolalia. Faupel insists that 'the one who contributed most directly in giving final shape to a Pentecostal theology is Charles Fox Parham'.⁹⁰

1.7 William Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival

The headline of *The Apostolic Faith*, the organ of the Azusa Street Revival, read 'Pentecost Has Come—Los Angeles Being Visited by a Revival of Bible Salvation and Pentecost as Recorded in the Book of Acts'.⁹¹ The *Los Angeles Herald* provided a sceptical overview of the event:

All classes of people gathered in the temple last night. There were big Negroes looking for a fight, there were little fairies dressed in dainty chiffon who stood on the benches and looked on with questioning wonder in their baby blue eyes. There were cappers from North Alameda Street, and sedate dames from West Adams Street.

⁸⁸ 'The Pentecostal message had developed in the womb of Perfectionism for sixty years before it burst forth as a movement with its own identity'. Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 19.

⁸⁹ Nils Bloch-Hoell, *The Pentecostal Movement: Its Origin, Development, and Distinctive Character* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1964), 20.

⁹⁰ Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 158.

⁹¹ *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), 1.

There were all ages, sexes, colors, nationalities and previous conditions of servitude. It was evident that nine out of every ten persons present were there for the purpose of new thrills. This was a new kind of show in which the admission was free—they don't even pass the hat at the Holy Rollers' meeting—and they wanted to see every act to the drop of the curtain. They stood on benches to do it. When a bench wasn't handy they stood on each other's feet.⁹²

Cecil Robeck sees the events at 312 Azusa Street, Los Angeles, as 'the birth of the global Pentecostal Movement'.⁹³ The events of a three-year revival in a battered mission house in a depressed section of burgeoning Los Angeles would provide a lasting impact upon the national and international religious scene.

The Ministry of William J. Seymour

Cecil Robeck has observed that 'the story of the Azusa Street Mission must begin with the story of its pastor, William Joseph Seymour'.⁹⁴ Seymour was born in Louisiana and raised in the Catholic Church. Needing work, he relocated to Indianapolis, Indiana, where he came into contact with the followers of D. S. Warner and the Evening Light Saints (later Church of God, Anderson). There, he encountered the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection as realised in a second work of grace, non-denominationalism, and an intense interracial worship environment.⁹⁵

Sometime in 1900, Seymour found his home in Cincinnati amongst the followers of Martin Wells Knapp and his Revivalist movement.⁹⁶ Exactly what the nature of his involvement was is uncertain. His tenure there seems to have been slightly before the formal

⁹² *Los Angeles Herald* (September 10, 1906), 7.

⁹³ Robeck, *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement*, book title.

⁹⁴ Robeck, 17.

⁹⁵ Thomas says that Seymour became a licensed minister with the Church of God (Anderson, IN). Thomas, *Perfect Harmony*, 5.

⁹⁶ See A. M. Hills, *A Hero of Faith and Prayer, or, Life of Rev. Martin Wells Knapp* (Cincinnati, OH: Mrs. Martin Wells Knapp, 1902), and Wallace Thornton Jr., 'God's Trustee: Martin Wells Knapp and Radical Holiness', in Knight, *From Aldersgate to Azusa*, 148-157. For the history of GBS and the Revivalist Ministries initiated by Knapp, see Wallace Thornton Jr., *When the Fire Fell: Martin Wells Knapp's Vision of Pentecost and the Beginning of God's Bible School* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2014), Kevin Moser and Larry Smith, *God's Clock Keeps Perfect Time: God's Bible School's First 100 Years, 1900-2000* (Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist, 2000), and Larry Smith, *A Century on the Mount of Blessing: The Story of God's Bible School* (Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist, 2016).

opening of GBS. Authorities there insist that there is no record of his enrolment. Perhaps the suggestion of Wallace Thornton Jr. best explains any interaction Seymour would have had with GBS. Thornton says, ‘My thought is that he probably “participated in” classes at Revivalist Chapel, actually predating the founding of GBS’.⁹⁷ Robeck suggests Seymour would have been attracted to the campus for three possible reasons: ‘First, the school was racially inclusive . . . second, Knapp was an avowed premillennialist . . . third, Knapp took “special revelation” seriously’.⁹⁸ He would certainly have been instructed in the Wesleyan salvation model of two distinct works of grace, which he maintained throughout his ministry.

From Cincinnati, Seymour felt providentially led to Jackson, Mississippi, where he came into contact with either holiness leader Charles Price Jones or Charles H. Mason.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Wallace Thornton Jr., email to the author, November 16, 2017. Kevin Moser, researcher for *The God’s Revivalist* campus publication, says, ‘Having had access to all of the early student enrolment registers at God’s Bible School and having thoroughly examined them, I can say that William Seymour is not listed as ever having attended the college’. Kevin Moser, email to the author, November 16, 2017. Larry Smith reaches the same conclusion in his official history of GBS, *A Century on the Mount of Blessings*. David Bundy collected information from oral tradition in the Indianapolis area, with the conclusion that Seymour did attend classes from Knapp at GBS. See Thornton, *When the Fire Fell*, 167n160. Stephens says that, according to ‘oral tradition’, Seymour took classes at GBS. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 199. Borlase says that Seymour was a part-time student at GBS. Borlase, *Seymour*, 55.

⁹⁸ Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 33. Martin Wells Knapp and the Revivalist community were racially inclusive, which is not to say the Church of God (Anderson) was not. The Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) was/is amillennial in prophetic interpretation. ‘Special revelation’ was a point of emphasis with the Revivalist community. Special revelation involved divinely given instructions that were highly personalised and were beyond, although not inconsistent with, written revelation. The AHM, and subsequently Pentecostalism, prized such instructions. So significant was Knapp’s interest in spiritual intuition that he published a volume entitled *Impressions*, giving counsel for discerning the true and the false. Robeck further says that Seymour would have found this attractive given his background in the African American community where ‘slaves talked about receiving guidance through visions and dreams, hearing voices, and experiencing different states of altered consciousness such as trances’. Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 33.

⁹⁹ Gastón Espinosa says, ‘In the winter of 1904-1905 [Seymour] was led by special revelation to Jackson, Mississippi where he visited the famous black Holiness leader Charles Price Jones and possibly saw Charles Mason’. Espinosa, *Seymour*, 49. Robeck suggests the possibilities of Jones or Mason. Both were holiness advocates. Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 35-39. Dale Irvin says the evidence for a meeting of Seymour and Jones is ‘slim’. Dale Irvin, ‘Charles Price Jones: Image of Holiness’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 41. Perhaps the initial suggestion for a Seymour/Jones meeting is derived from a footnote in a thesis written by Douglas J. Nelson, ‘For Such a Time as This: The Story of Bishop William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival’ (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 1981). For information on Mason, see Ithiel C. Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason and the Roots of the Church of God in Christ* (Bakersfield, CA: Pneuma Life, 1996). For a study of Charles Price Jones, see Dale T. Irvin, ‘Charles Price Jones: Image of Holiness’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 37-50, and Otho B. Cobbin, ed., *History of Church of Christ (Holiness), U.S.A., 1895-1965* (New York: Vantage, 1966), 17-44. For a discussion of a possible meeting between Seymour and Charles Price Jones, see Synan and Fox, *Seymour*, 51-56, and Martin, *Seymour*, 87-88.

From there he moved to Houston, Texas, where he was introduced to glossolalia under the instruction of Charles Parham. Seymour was viewed by the local congregational leaders as a promising minister but with limited usefulness in immediate ministry because he had not experienced his Holy Ghost baptism with signs following. Meanwhile, Seymour was invited to pastor a small congregation in the Los Angeles, California, area that was associated with the HCC. Upon his arrival and presentation of his understanding of glossolalia as the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit, Seymour was rejected as pastor. Needing a place to stay, he took residence with Edward Lee and a group of African Americans where, on April 9, 1906, Seymour received his Pentecost confirmation by speaking in tongues. Subsequent meetings saw the group increase until a larger meeting place was required. Seymour was able to secure a lease on an abandoned African Methodist meetinghouse at the now-familiar address of 312 Azusa Street. The revival had begun.

The Theology of the Azusa Street Revival

The Azusa Street Revival was an uneasy merging of theology and experience. The effects of German rationalism on mainline American churches left the emerging Pentecostals very leery of formal theological thought. This seems to have been the reasoning behind an article addressed ‘To the Baptized Saints’, printed in *The Apostolic Faith*:

When we received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the power came down in such a mighty way, and after a time people began to consider and got us to taking thought. But what are we that we will put straps and bands on the Holy Ghost, when the Lord comes and finds and thrills us with the Holy Ghost? Just because it is not our power shall we quench it and hold it down? Let us be free in the Holy Ghost and let Him have right of way.¹⁰⁰

These intensely held feelings did not, however, equate to a total denial of propositional doctrinal thought. There appeared to be no debate concerning such matters as the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of Christ, the role of miracles, the

¹⁰⁰ *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1907), 3.

substitutionary atonement of Christ, or his second coming. Only glossolalia was viewed as a ‘new thought’. John Sims states the case:

They (Pentecostals) earnestly believed they were part of a special spiritual breakthrough—a *kairos*—ordained by God for an end-time purpose. But participation in a *kairos* event does not mean one does not have *chronos* (or historical) heritage as well. Sacred events and movements are not historyless . . . they take place in social and historical circumstances where patterns can be discerned, historical connections drawn, and traditions identified and celebrated.¹⁰¹

The *ordo salutis* as taught at Azusa Street maintained ‘the first work of grace’ to be justification, defining it as ‘that act of God’s free grace by which we receive remission of sins’.¹⁰² As such, the movement identified with the historic Protestant Reformation theme. The second step in the spiritual journey of the believer was sanctification, which was identified as a second work of grace. Sanctification is ‘that act of God’s free grace by which he makes us holy’.¹⁰³ Azusa Street identified the Baptism of the Holy Ghost as a third work of the Holy Spirit, characterised by a ‘gift of power upon the sanctified life so when we get it, we have the same evidence as the Disciples received on the Day of Pentecost . . . in speaking in new tongues’.¹⁰⁴ It was on this basic theological understanding that the Azusa Street Mission and Pastor William Seymour functioned, and it was this message that was preached. Further, it could be argued that this was the theological norm of emerging Pentecostalism until William H. Durham presented his understanding of ‘The Finished Work of Christ’.

The National Influence of Azusa Street

¹⁰¹ John A. Sims, *Our Pentecostal Heritage* (Cleveland, TN: Pathway, 1995), 62.

¹⁰² Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 120.

¹⁰³ ‘Second Work—Sanctification is the Second Work of Grace’, *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), 2.

¹⁰⁴ *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), 1. The advertisement for Azusa Street also included ‘seeking healing’. See Kimberly Ervin Alexander, ‘Pentecostal Healing at the Mission’, in Harold Hunter and Cecil Robeck Jr., eds., *The Azusa Street Revival and Its Legacy* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009), 79-92. The premillennial return of Christ was not mentioned, although it was fundamental to the eschatological understanding that empowered evangelism. The absence of reference to prophecy at Azusa Street is puzzling. Jacobsen comments, ‘Despite the grassroots eschatological fervor (in Pentecostalism at large), Seymour and the leaders of the Azusa Mission actually devoted very little time to theological speculation regarding the details of what might take place in the days and years ahead. Only a few articles in *The Apostolic Faith* explicitly addressed the topic at all. When Seymour later pieced together his book of *Doctrines and Discipline* for the mission, he remained absolutely silent on eschatological issues’. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 81.

The Azusa Street Revival reached the continental United States with amazing quickness.¹⁰⁵ Robeck describes it as ‘a fire lit in dry tinder when nobody was looking’.¹⁰⁶ In the established churches and emerging missions of the Los Angeles area, the effect was immediate. Following the transportation patterns provided by the streetcar lines, emissaries from the mission spread immediately through testimony, street meetings, and pulpit presentations. Some operated as freelance presenters, and others were licensed and commissioned by the mission itself. Florence Crawford¹⁰⁷ and Clara Lum¹⁰⁸ would take the message to the great Northwest. William Durham would come from Chicago, returning to promote the new understanding.¹⁰⁹ Glenn Cook¹¹⁰ found fertile soil for growing the message in Indianapolis and Memphis, and Ivy Campbell¹¹¹ returned to northeastern Ohio. Thomas Hezmalhalch headed to Denver, Colorado, while F. W. Williams went to South Alabama.¹¹² Elsie Robinson was instrumental in spreading the message in Michigan, while Rachel Sizelove went to Springfield, Missouri.¹¹³ Mable Smith left Azusa Street for Chelsea, Massachusetts, and Charles Mason became an apostle of the Pentecostal understanding to the African American community served by the Church of God in Christ.¹¹⁴ Carrie Judd

¹⁰⁵ Since this thesis addresses the confrontation of the Pentecostal Movement with the AHM, we will examine only persons and their influence in the United States.

¹⁰⁶ Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 187.

¹⁰⁷ For information on Florence Crawford and her ministry in Portland, Oregon, see *A Historical Account of the Apostolic Faith* (Portland, OR: Apostolic Faith, 1965), and Cecil Robeck Jr., ‘Florence Crawford’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 219-236.

¹⁰⁸ See Cecil Robeck Jr., ‘Clara Lum’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 561, and Estrela Alexander, *Women of Azusa Street* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim, 2005), 47-56. See chapter 3 of this thesis.

¹⁰⁹ See R. M. Riss, ‘William H. Durham’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 255-256, and Edith L. Blumhofer, ‘William H. Durham: Years of Creativity, Years of Dissent’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 123-142. See discussion in this thesis, chapter 3, on the WFMA.

¹¹⁰ See R. M. Riss, ‘Glenn A. Cook’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 224-225.

¹¹¹ See Gary McGee, ‘Ivy Glenshaw Campbell’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 106-107, and Alexander, *Women of Azusa*, 139-150.

¹¹² See Wayne Warner, ‘Thomas Hezmalhalch’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 389.

¹¹³ See Charles Jones, ‘Rachel Artamissie Sizelove’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 789, and Alexander, *The Women of Azusa*, 168-178. See discussion in chapter 2 of this thesis, on the FMC.

¹¹⁴ See Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason*, and Mary Mason, *The History and Life Work of Elder C.H. Mason, Chief Apostle, and His Co-laborers* (Memphis, TN: Church of God in Christ, 1934).

Montgomery,¹¹⁵ a well-known healing evangelist, found her ‘Pentecost’ at Azusa Street and spread the message nationally through her pulpit ministry, and Frank W. Bartleman,¹¹⁶ through pen and pulpit, represented Azusa Street in multiple venues.

No one was more energetic in the spreading of Pentecostalism than Gaston Barnabas (G. B.) Cashwell, who came to Azusa Street from North Carolina and returned to convince four denominations of the truth of Pentecostalism.¹¹⁷ His story is told simply in an obituary from March 18, 1916, which appeared in the *Church of God Evangel*, presumably written by A. J. Tomlinson:

As we go to press, we have just learned of the death of brother G. B. Cashwell of Dunn, North Carolina . . . to brother Cashwell is due the honor of carrying the Pentecostal message, first to many of us in the southeastern states eight years ago. Though his career as a Pentecostal preacher was of short duration, he set the match to the prepared material, and the fire he started is still blazing higher and spreading flame.¹¹⁸

G. B. Cashwell has been called ‘the apostle of Pentecost to the South’.¹¹⁹ Born in Dunn, North Carolina, on April 5, 1862, Cashwell was raised in a religious family, perhaps attending the MEC, South (MECS). Little is known of his religious experience except a brief testimony to experiences of both initial and entire sanctification:

I thank God, all the mule and goat are taken out of me. When I was converted, I thought I had all God could ever do for me; but the preacher said I was not sanctified. I said if God showed me I was not I would seek it with all my heart; and the Lord showed me in His word and by the Holy Ghost that I was not, and I asked Him for sanctification, not having any opinion of mine. I just believed His word and He gave

¹¹⁵ See Jennifer A. Miskov, *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery (1858-1946)* (Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2012).

¹¹⁶ See Robeck, ‘Frank Bartleman’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 50-51, and Augustus Cerillo Jr., ‘Frank Bartleman: Pentecostal “Lone Ranger” and Social Critic’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 105-122.

¹¹⁷ For G. B. Cashwell, see Beacham, *Azusa East*, Michael Thornton, *Fire in the Carolinas: The Revival Legacy of G. B. Cashwell and A. B. Crumpler* (Lake Mary, FL: Creation House, 2014), and David Roebuck, ‘From Azusa to Cleveland: The Amazing Journey of G.B. Cashwell and the Spread of Pentecostalism’, in Hunter and Robeck, *The Azusa Street Revival*, 111-126.

¹¹⁸ A. J. Tomlinson, ‘G.B. Cashwell Passes Over’, *Church of God Evangel* (March 18, 1916), 2. In 1909 Cashwell inexplicably withdrew from organized Pentecostalism after three years of effective Pentecostal ministry. For a discussion about his later years, including suggestions for his retiring from active ministry, see Beacham, *Azusa East*, 194-217. While Beacham searches for plausible reasons, Campbell says that Cashwell ‘did grievously fail God and bring reproach upon the full gospel of Pentecostal Holiness’. Campbell, *Pentecostal Holiness Church*, 241. Alexander concurs, saying his name should be included amongst other ‘devastating defections’. Alexander, *Black Fire*, 141.

¹¹⁹ Beacham, *Azusa East*, 13.

the blessed cleansing flood, and the Holy Ghost witnessed to it, and I said amen, and thought I had the baptism of the Holy Ghost.¹²⁰

In 1903 Cashwell joined the Pentecostal Holiness Church of North Carolina (PHCNC) as an ordained elder, perhaps transferring from the MECS. Cashwell appears to have been a very zealous minister possessed of capable gifts, although it appears that, due to his temperament, he could on occasion annoy his fellow ministers.¹²¹ Reports of the Azusa Street Revival reached the Southeastern United States primarily through the pages of *The Way of Faith*, a holiness periodical from Columbia, South Carolina, edited by J. M. Pike. The issue of the third work of grace was familiar since the area had been heavily influenced by the Fire Baptized movement and B. H. Irwin. There was, however, some confusion about the Baptism of the Holy Spirit since all believed they had received the Holy Spirit when they were entirely sanctified. And yet, there was a consensus to seek all that was experientially available to them through divine grace. Joseph Campbell explains, ‘It did not seem to occur to any of the Holiness Church constituency that the experience which people were receiving in the California revival would in any way be at variance with what they believed and taught (respecting the doctrine of entire sanctification)’.¹²²

Cashwell arrived in Los Angeles via train in November 1906, and upon reaching the mission at ‘the first altar call I went forward in earnest for my Pentecost’.¹²³ The ‘seeking’ extended from Sunday until Thursday, with Cashwell saying, ‘a new crucifixion began in my life to many things’.¹²⁴ Synan says a major obstacle was racial prejudice.¹²⁵ Cashwell later testified that

¹²⁰ *Bridegroom Messenger* (February 15, 1908), 1.

¹²¹ Beacham describes him as ‘strong-willed, determined and able to shape the lives of others’. Beacham, *Azusa East*, 29. Joseph Campbell describes him as ‘a talented man with many good qualities although he also had his faults, the chief of which was that he was temperamental. It is to his credit, however, that he was willing to apologize and was earnestly endeavoring to remove everything that might hinder his faith and prevent him from receiving the Pentecostal experience’. Campbell, *Pentecostal Holiness Church*, 240.

¹²² Campbell, *Pentecostal Holiness Church*, 240.

¹²³ G. B. Cashwell, letter in *The Apostolic Faith* (December 1906), 3.

¹²⁴ Cashwell, letter in *Apostolic Faith*, 3.

While seeking in an upstairs room in the Mission, the Lord opened up the windows of heaven and the light of God began to flow over me in such power as never before. I then went into the room where the service was held, and while Sister Lum was reading of how the Holy Ghost was falling in other places, before I knew it, I began to speak in tongues and praised God.¹²⁶

Cashwell returned to North Carolina, rented a tobacco barn in Dunn, and on December 31, 1906, he began services where he told of his experience and encouraged others to seek as well.¹²⁷ Crowds came and results culminated in what Daniel Woods calls ‘Azusa East’.¹²⁸ The services themselves were reminiscent of Azusa Street, Los Angeles. One participant described them:

The warehouse was overcrowded with people . . . Cashwell sat in a chair in the middle of the rostrum facing the congregation . . . rather than a single dominant sermon by Cashwell, the service consisted of “short speeches” made by different ones. Cashwell, however, remained the center of attention as “whatever he said, they observed those things.” The congregation waited quietly, obviously waiting to see some demonstration by the Holy Spirit. A woman . . . rose to speak [and] started to give a testimony then abruptly stopped. When she started to speak again, she spoke in other tongues . . .¹²⁹

Fourteen years later, G. F. Taylor remembered the event as a time when the holiness people of that area

went to Dunn by the dozens, went down for the Baptism with all the earnestness they could command, and were soon happy in the experience, speaking in tongues, shouting, leaping, dancing, and praising God. They returned to the respective homes to scatter fire. Great Pentecostal revivals broke out in practically all the churches. A great revival had come and no one was able to stop it.¹³⁰

¹²⁵ ‘One of the major problems necessary for him to overcome was his ingrained racial prejudice. It was unsettling to this Tarheel visitor to sit under the preaching of Seymour, but to have blacks lay hands on his head and pray for his baptism was almost more than he could bear’. Synan, *The Old Time Power*, 98

¹²⁶ Cashwell, letter in *Apostolic Faith*, 3.

¹²⁷ The tobacco warehouse was apparently located at the corner of Wilson and East Pope Streets adjoining the railroad. The building has been destroyed and, unfortunately, a fire destroyed all copies of the Dunn newspaper covering this time period.

¹²⁸ Daniel Woods, ‘Failure and Success in the Ministry of T.J. McIntosh, the First Pentecostal Missionary to China’, *CyberJournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 12 (June 2003), <http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyber12.html> (accessed January 4, 2018).

¹²⁹ James R. Goff Jr., ‘The Pentecostal Catalyst to the South: G.B. Cashwell (1906-1909)’ (Unpublished manuscript, 1980), 4-5.

¹³⁰ G. F. Taylor, *Pentecostal Holiness Advocate* (March 17, 1921), 8. For biographical information on G. F. Taylor, see H. Stanley York, *George Floyd Taylor: The Life of an Early Southern Pentecostal Leader* (Maitland, FL: Xulon, 2013).

The influence of Cashwell's ministry as an extension of Seymour's and Azusa Street was widespread throughout the Southeastern United States, reaching the FBHC,¹³¹ the Pentecostal Free Will Baptist Church (Cape Fear Conference),¹³² the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee),¹³³ and the PHCNC. Cashwell represents the large number of people who extended the Azusa Street message around the United States and ultimately around the world.

1.8 Conclusion

Crucial to the theological origins of both the AHM and the Pentecostal Movement were the Holiness and Radical Holiness leaders and their understanding of John Wesley's and John Fletcher's concept of Christian perfection as a second Christian experience.¹³⁴ The experiential roots of Pentecostalism can be found in the fervour of Methodist/Holiness camp meetings. Combining these two influences, perhaps there is confirmation of an assessment by Bernie Van De Walle: 'Twins, perhaps, but not identical'.¹³⁵ Others might prefer the 'father-son' analogy. Whatever the organic connection, the Pentecostal Movement created a theological and experiential challenge to the established AHM, confronting them in

¹³¹ For discussion of the Fire Baptized Church and the adoption of the Pentecostal view of tongues, see chapter 4 of this thesis. For further discussion of the Fire Baptized Church, see H. V. Synan, 'Fire Baptized Holiness Church', in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 309, Cecelia Luelf Douglas and Ruth Smith Taylor, *The History of the Bible Holiness Church* (Shoals, IN: Whispering Pines, 2011), and Nathaniel Paul Labadorf, 'Oh Glory! I Feel the Fire! The Theology of the Fire Baptized Holiness Church' (paper, Bob Jones University, 2019) https://www.academia.edu/38545936/O_Glory_I_Feel_the_Fire_The_Theology_of_the_Fire_Baptized_Holiness_Church?email_work_card=view-paper (accessed August 2, 2021). The Bible Holiness Church is a direct successor to the FBHC.

¹³² Amongst those influenced for glossolalia was H. H. Goff. See Florence Goff, *Fifty Years on the Battlefield for God: Being a Sketch of the Life of Rev. J. A. Hodges, Coupled with Some of the Lord's Dealings with H.H. Goff and Wife, Evangelists of the Cape Fear Conference of the Free-Will Baptist Church* (Falcon, NC: author, 1948). The specific account of the Goff search for glossolalia is recorded in Beacham, *Azusa East*, 63-69. For a historical statement on the Pentecostal Free Will Baptist Church, see Preston Heath et al., 'History of the Pentecostal Free Will Baptist Church', <https://pfbw.org/about/history/> (accessed December 16, 2017).

¹³³ For the history of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), see Charles Conn, *Like a Mighty Army: A History of the Church of God* (Cleveland, TN: Pathway, 1955), and Wade H. Phillips, *Quest to Restore God's House: A Theological History of the Church of God*, vol. 1 (Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2014).

¹³⁴ John A. Knight, 'John Fletcher's Influence on the Development of Wesleyan Theology in America', *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (Spring 1978): 13-33.

¹³⁵ Bernie Van De Walle, 'The Radical Holiness Movement and the Christian Missionary Alliance: Twins, Perhaps, but Not Identical', <http://bavdw.com/index.php/papers-presentations/fourfold-on-gospel-papers/15-the-radical-holiness-movement-and-the-christian-and-missionary-alliance-twins-perhaps-but-not-identical> (accessed November 14, 2018).

denominational settings, camp meetings, and educational institutions. Their common background in Wesleyan thought and their shared intense passion for experiential religion brought them near to each other. The premillennial motif, new to the Holiness Movement, was adopted by the Pentecostals and created an almost frenetic impulse for evangelism. But glossolalia and its implications for theology, worship practices, and personal testimony would drive them apart. There would be no grounds for compromise.

The period of 1901–1919 would be filled with accusations, suspicion, and broken fellowship. Sometimes, in the passion of emotion, there were even acts of violence against each other. Certainly the verbal attacks were sharp and intense, challenging the profession of ‘perfect love’ by the combatants and their followers. The movement, which Carl Brumback describes as coming ‘suddenly from heaven’, provided a formidable challenge to the norms of Wesleyan/Holiness thought as the two confronted each other at grassroots levels of worship and evangelism.¹³⁶ The AHM would question the heavenly origins theory, convinced by what they considered to be empirical evidence that the practice of glossolalia and its network of supporters were of more dubious origins.

In chapter one, both the American Holiness Movement and Pentecostalism have been analysed and placed in juxtaposition to each other. Preparation has been made to examine the response of the AHM to Pentecostalism. Chapter two will examine the negative response, noting the reasons for the opposition and the personalities who shaped the antagonistic reaction.

¹³⁶ Brumback, *Suddenly . . . From Heaven*, book title.

CHAPTER TWO

OPPOSITION TO PENTECOSTALISM FROM THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT

2.1 Introduction

The present research has traced the emergence of Pentecostalism from within the American Holiness Movement. Both Parham and Seymour had Methodist¹ and radical Wesleyan/Holiness Movement backgrounds, and their constituency was from amongst persons of Wesleyan/Holiness Movement backgrounds. Consequently, the AHM and RHM were the first to feel the presence of the new understanding and the first object of Pentecostal evangelistic efforts.²

The AHM/RHM critique of Pentecostalism was based on empirical evidence. An initial moving force behind Pentecostalism was the claim of missionary tongues to advance evangelism in the light of the imminent return of Christ. The lack of evidence that the speech

¹ Espinosa, *Seymour*, 49.

² C. J. Branstetter comments, 'Many of the holiness and the "tongues" people were, at least for a few years of the twentieth century, the same people'. C. J. Branstetter, *Purity, Power, and Pentecostal Light: The Revivalist Doctrine and Means of Aaron Merritt Hills* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012), 232. Pentecostal publications took special note of persons from mainline holiness churches who accepted Pentecostalism. See the sampling below. Wesleyan Methodist Church: *Church of God Evangel* (July 31, 1915), 2, and *Pentecostal Holiness Advocate* (March 20, 1919), 6. Free Methodist Church: *The Apostolic Faith* (January 1907), 1, *The Apostolic Faith* (April 1907), 1, *Bridegroom's Messenger* (November 15, 1908), 4, *Bridegroom's Messenger* (April 15, 1911), 4, *Bridegroom's Messenger* (September 1, 1914), 2, *Latter Rain Evangel* (April 1912), 7, *Church of God Evangel* (January 9, 1915), 4, *Church of God Evangel* (February 3, 1917), 2. Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene: *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), 1, *The Apostolic Faith* (October 1906), 2, *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1907), 1. This practice continued beyond the time period under consideration in this thesis: 'You will be glad to learn that the Lord is working in a wonderful way here in southern California among the Nazarene people. Many of their leading ministers and laymen are attending tarrying meetings for the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. Several have already received the fulness of the Spirit to the consternation of their other leaders who are opposed to what they call the "Tongues Movement"'. L. F. Turnbull, 'Nazarene Preacher Receives Pentecost is Open for Meetings', *Pentecost Evangel* (December 6, 1924), 12. For similar comments about Free Methodist minister F. N. Ahern from Sargent, Nebraska, who received the Pentecostal baptism, see 'Free Methodist Minister Receives the Baptism', *The Pentecostal Evangel* (July 18, 1925), 9.

The conflict was not one-sided, however. Devotees to the AHM were equally quick to highlight conflict with Pentecostal advocates and to point to their successful refutation of the same. For a sampling of such successful confrontation, see John Clement, *The Experiences of a Blue Ridge Evangelist* (High Point, NC: author, 1936), 72, John Harris, *Tears and Triumphs: The Life Story of a Pastor-Evangelist* (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1948), 333-340, Edna Wells Hoke, *He Faileth Not, or, The Triumphs of Faith* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1927), 147, Hall, *Samuel Logan Brengle*, 232-246, C. B. Jernigan, *From the Prairie Schooner to a City Flat* (Brooklyn, NY: author, 1926), 84, and D. S. Reed, *The Circuit Rider* (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, n. d.), 91.

being utilised was a literal and identifiable language gave the AHM/RHM reason to be suspicious if not critical. With the genuineness of glossolalia in question, there was reason to object to substituting glossolalia for the witness of the Spirit. Certainly, the AHM/RHM rejected the invalidating of their own spiritual experience because of the absence of an experience of glossolalia. The burden of proof rested with Pentecostalism, and in the view of a large portion of the AHM/RHM it had failed to provide the necessary confirming evidence.

But the conflict between the two movements did not emerge immediately. Wacker points out that the conflict was slow to develop:

One of the more intriguing features [of the conflict between the AHM and Pentecostalism] is how long it took for radical evangelical leaders to notice that anything was amiss in their ranks. They appeared unaware of the revival's existence until late fall 1906.³

When the AHM became cognizant of the emerging movement, the confrontation was often unpleasant. Wacker offers three reasons for the intensity of feeling between the two movements:

The first is the remarkable degree of overlap between the two factions. On all important cultural, religious, and theological questions the two groups held identical views. To outsiders their area of disagreement appeared so small as to be laughable. Yet that was precisely the point. The fight lasted as long as it did and hurt as much as it did because the antagonists poured so much combative energy into such a tiny patch of theological space. The second . . . is that both sides believed that they were grappling over matters of eternal and ultimate consequence. It was not a disinterested discussion about styles or opinions but a brawl fought with rules, in the mud, with every rhetorical weapon available. Civility remained out of the question. Both sides knew one thing for sure: politeness was the reserve of denominational preachers who imagined that correct belief was a negotiable matter. The third . . . is that scholars will have difficulty understanding any controversy, including this one, if they read only one side of the data . . . yet historians have largely missed the emotional intensity of this battle because they have relied too much on Pentecostal data alone.⁴

Efforts have been made to quantify the conflict, but they are not especially instructive.

Charles Jones provides statistical information concerning the growth (or decline) of selected

³ Wacker, 'Travail', 27.

⁴ Wacker, 24.

Holiness and Methodist Churches by denomination for the period of 1906–1916.⁵ During this time period all denominations examined in this thesis showed numerical growth. Jones also offers statistics for growth in specified cities of the United States for the same period. Here the pattern of growth is mixed. But the tables do not provide circumstantial background for the patterns they demonstrate.

The research will now examine the negative response of the AHM to Pentecostalism, noting first the unofficial parent organisation, the National Holiness Association, and subsequently the groups that formed the constituency of the national organisation. A review of organisational periodicals provides reasons for opposition and also a graphic portrayal of this conflict as it played out in the actual confrontations amongst the constituency.

2.2 National Holiness Association

The National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness (later known as the National Holiness Association) was formed on the second Wednesday of July 1868, in the wake of the first holiness camp meeting held at Vineland, New Jersey. John Inskip⁶ was elected the first president and was succeeded by Methodist, William McDonald.⁷ The association had earlier sensed the need for publishing a monthly magazine to correct the many public misrepresentations of the views of the National Association. Accordingly, *The Advocate for Christian Holiness* (later *The Christian Witness*) was published with McDonald as editor, and with him in that capacity the paper ‘became something of a watchdog for the

⁵ Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 210 table 14.

⁶ See William McDonald and J. E. Searles, *The Life of John S. Inskip* (Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1885), and E. I. D. Pepper, ed., *Memorial of Rev. John S. Inskip* (Philadelphia: National Publishing Association for the Promotion of Holiness, 1884).

⁷ For a review of the life of William McDonald, see ‘The Life and Work of William McDonald’, in Brown, *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler*, 213-242.

National Association'.⁸ McDonald wrote, 'It has been everywhere recognized as the uncompromising defender of the doctrine of entire sanctification'.⁹

Initial Reaction to the 'Tongue Movement'

It was in this role as a protector that the first notice of the 'Tongue Movement' appeared on November 15, 1906, in the *Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness*.¹⁰ The article explained, 'We do not write this either to censure or argue with those who are taking up this new fanaticism. They are sincere—no doubt about that'.¹¹ However, 'there is nothing better than perfect love, except more of it'.¹² In the eyes of the Holiness Movement, the doctrine of entire sanctification needed to be protected from the newly discovered grace. The editor concluded that the movement 'will in a short time have its run and lie a curiosity in the museum of ten thousand dead follies of the past'.¹³

In the November 29, 1906, issue, the editors returned to the theme of the primacy of entire sanctification and holy living:

There are people who, by their emphasis and running after "Tongues," discount the greatest proof there is of holy living—a sanctified tongue. A fad has started that proclaims that we are not really sanctified until we have the gift of tongues. This is the proof they say of sanctification. All from the day of Wesley down were, after all, mistaken in their profession of holiness.¹⁴

The National Association for the Promotion of Holiness was clearly taking an initially negative position regarding the tongue-speaking events of Azusa Street.

⁸ Brown, *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler*, 227.

⁹ Brown, 227. For origin and development of the *The Advocate of for Christian Holiness* first published in 1870 and its subsequent mergers until it became *The Christian Witness* see Brown, 98-100.

¹⁰ 'The Tongue Movement', *Christian Witness* (November 15, 1906), 8.

¹¹ 'Tongue Movement', 8.

¹² 'Tongue Movement', 8.

¹³ 'Tongue Movement', 8. Similar comments concerning the expected demise of Pentecostalism were made by J. W. Hill, in 'St. Paul on Tongues', *Christian Witness* (February 21, 1907), 3.

¹⁴ 'Sanctified Tongues Versus "Tongues"', *Christian Witness* (November 29, 1906).

Concern about Defending Wesleyan Theology/Experience

Charles J. Fowler,¹⁵ later the third president of the NHA, spoke for most (if not all) Association members: ‘The latest fad among us—this gift of tongues matter—is bound to cause much harm, in that it will beguile certain “unstable souls” and some will never be recovered from their deception’.¹⁶ Fowler then identified biblical glossolalia as ‘a power to speak in a language one had never before known and never learned’.¹⁷ He observed further that it was ‘in addition’ to ‘heart purity’, for the ‘gift of the Holy Spirit secured to one, primarily and essentially, entire sanctification or purity of heart’.¹⁸ Fowler then proceeded to draw conclusions that would be consistent with the position of the NHA:

1. The gift of tongues is not needed, as the opportunity of obtaining a knowledge of language is with all. 2. It is not needed to demonstrate the Divine presence, for we have the greater miracle *in the genuine salvation of men*. (See John 14:12) 3. Were it with us now, it would be used unto some purpose other than display. 4. The tests of this are simple: (1) Compare with the marks we have indicated in the scriptures; (2) Let the foreigner determine whether this is his tongue. 5. If no one understands it, it is an unknown tongue indeed!¹⁹

¹⁵ Fowler served as president of the NHA from 1884 to 1919. For a sketch of his life, see Brown, *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler*, 243-258, and Kenneth Brown, ‘Charles Joseph Fowler’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 119-120.

¹⁶ Charles J. Fowler, ‘Tongues’, *Christian Witness* (December 6, 1906), 4.

¹⁷ Fowler, 4. The NHA took the position that the biblical reference to tongues was to known languages. See editorial, ‘Tongues V’, *Christian Witness* (January 28, 1909), 8. G. W. Heins sought to clarify the italicized ‘unknown’ in the King James Bible by saying, ‘Look in your Bible and you will notice that the word “unknown” is written in italics, and therefore is not in the original’. *Christian Witness* (August 21, 1913). See also Beverly Carradine, ‘The Upper Room and Tongues’, *Christian Witness* (February 13, 1908), 2.

¹⁸ Fowler, 4.

¹⁹ Fowler, 4. *The Christian Witness* carried several lengthy articles discussing tongues in the years between 1906-1919: See J. W. Hill, ‘St. Paul on Tongues’ (February 21, 1907), 3, ‘The Gift of Tongues’ (June 20, 1907), 4, 9, Daniel Steele, ‘Tongues Shall Cease—Love Never Faileth’ (August 8, 1907), 8, B. D. Aiden, ‘The Gift of Tongues’ (September 19, 1907), 4, ‘The Tongues Movement’ (December 31, 1908), 8, ‘The Tongues Movement II’ (January 7, 1909), 8, ‘The Tongues Movement III’ (January 14, 1909), 8, ‘The Tongues Movement IV’ (January 21, 1909), 8, ‘The Tongues Movement V’ (January 28, 1909), 8, ‘The Tongues Movement’ (February 4, 1909), 8, C. E. Cowman, ‘The “Tongues” Movement (So-Called)’ (April 1, 1909), 11, 15, C. W. Ruth, ‘The Gift of Tongues’ (February 3, 1910), 3, ‘The Gift of Tongues, Reprinted by Request’ (May 19, 1910), 3-4, reprinted again (March 1912), and G. W. Heins, ‘Are Tongues for a Sign’ (April 21, 1913). The McLaughlin, Martin, and Steele articles were combined into a single publication and published by the Christian Witness Company in 1907. Holiness movement advocate turned Pentecost editor, William F. Manley, reviewed the McLaughlin article and published his thoughts in ‘The Gift of Tongues by G.A. McLaughlin Reviewed by W.F. Manley’, *The Household of Faith* (March 1909), 13-15.

On November 6, 1906, C. E. Cornell²⁰ synthesised the errors of Pentecostalism as it appeared at that time:

First, the disciples were sanctified before Pentecost; second, that Pentecost does not mean purity; third, that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is subsequent to entire sanctification; fourth, that all who are baptized with the Holy Ghost in the Pentecostal sense, have the gift of tongues.²¹

As the years passed, the Association did not lessen its concern about Pentecostalism and its challenge to Wesleyan theology. Joseph Smith²² spoke to this point stridently: ‘The Tongues movement repudiates the Wesleyan doctrine of Entire Sanctification . . . it is not even at its best any part of the Holiness Movement, but is rejected and disapproved by our holiness evangelists and schools’.²³

Objections to Excessive Emotionalism in Worship

The AHM certainly did not object to emotional aspects of worship, including physical demonstration. G. A. McLaughlin²⁴ spoke for the movement when he editorialised,

Our thought is that there are countless thousands of people in our churches dying of suppressed emotion. They have so gotten in the habit of taking religious matters with such coolness and superb self-control that emotions of joy, satisfaction, gratification, thanksgiving, and praise are never known or expressed and they are dying or dead in their souls as a consequence of it.²⁵

²⁰ C. E. Cornell had been a Friends minister who joined the PCN. He pastored strong Nazarene churches in Chicago and Los Angeles.

²¹ ‘Chicago’, *Christian Witness* (December 6, 1906), 9. The usage of the term ‘Pentecostal’, which had been familiar in radical holiness circles, is seen already evolving into an identification for peoples who endorsed glossolalia. *The Christian Witness* identified the term as ‘another name for Early Christianity’. See *Christian Witness* (February 14, 1907), 1.

²² For biographical information of Joseph Smith, see Kenneth Brown, ‘Joseph Henry Smith’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 277-278.

²³ Joseph Smith, ‘Rev. Joseph Smith on the Tongues Question’, *Christian Witness* (May 27, 1915).

²⁴ For biographical information on G. A. McLaughlin, see G. A. McLaughlin, *Autobiography of George Asbury McLaughlin* (Chicago: Christian Witness, 1933), and William Kostlevy, ‘George Asbury McLaughlin’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 197-198.

²⁵ G. A. McLaughlin, ‘The Loss of Religious Emotion’, *Christian Witness* (December 17, 1914), 3. For further discussion of the relation of emotion to religion, see M. L. Haney, ‘Relations of Emotional and Thinking Men to the Work of God’, *Christian Witness* (June 1, 1905), 4, and *Christian Witness* (July 13, 1905). For biographical information on M. L. Haney, see Kenneth Brown, ‘Milton Lorenzo Haney’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 139-140, and M. L. Haney, *The Story of My Life: An Autobiography* (Normal, IL: author, 1904).

But the editor cautioned that ‘there is a great danger of putting our trust in them (emotions) instead of trusting the word of God’.²⁶ What was understood to be the emotional excesses of Pentecostalism seemed to fit that description. Charles Bauerle described his experience at a tongues meeting:

The object of the swift music seemed to be to work up as much excitement as possible . . . most of the [testimonies] would talk and work themselves up to a great pitch of excitement until they would get under the power as they said and would fall in the straw and begin to jabber or sing in tongues. This seemed to be the goal each one tried to reach before they were satisfied.²⁷

The AHM was quite familiar with joyous emotional expression for sins forgiven and hearts cleansed, but what appeared to be emotion and noise for the sake of emotion and noise did not fit the norm of a national camp meeting, and neither was it condoned or appreciated.

Relationship to B. H. Irwin and the Fire Baptized Movement

The impact of the ministry of B. H. Irwin and his emphasis on a third work, fire baptised experience was not lost to the leaders of the National Association:

So far as we have been able to discover, the largest following in this movement is from what has been known as the “third blessing” people; in fact, this movement (Pentecostalism) is a revival of that broken-down error and one that turned out so seriously with not a few misguided souls.²⁸

The editors concluded that the then-current rage was ‘virtually the “third blessing” revamped’.²⁹ Thus, the transitional linkage between Irwin and Pentecostalism was recognised and cited as a negative recommendation for the emerging movement. The AHM specifically objected to the lack of a scriptural basis for the third work, the adjustment to the Wesleyan *ordo salutis* by adding a specific experience to be sought, and the disruption to worship patterns by what they regarded as extreme emotionalism.

²⁶ ‘Extraordinary Manifestations’, *Christian Witness* (July 17, 1919), 1.

²⁷ Charles Bauerle, ‘Our Experience at a Tongues Meeting’, *Christian Witness* (February 24, 1916), 11.

²⁸ ‘The Tongue’s Movement’, *Christian Witness* (December 31, 1908), 8.

²⁹ ‘The Gift of Tongues’, *Christian Witness* (June 20, 1907), 4.

History of Tongues Speaking

Not only was there a linkage with Irwin, but the editors sought to educate the readers on a broader history of glossolalia. In the July 1907 issue of the *Christian Witness*, I. G. Martin offered ‘A Brief History of the “Tongues”’.³⁰ Martin cited references in Eusebius, although he said the references were ‘vague and uncertain’. He further related events at Azusa Street Mission to the experiences of Edward Irving and the Mormons. In a five-part article on ‘The Tongues Movement’, editor McLaughlin highlighted the followers of Edward Irving who, though typically of the higher class of English people, became ‘dupes of “seducing spirits and doctrines of devils”’, as they afterward discovered and confessed.³¹ Similarly, Charles Cowman, a missionary to Japan, exhorted readers to consider the failed history of the movement, again citing the Irvingite Church.³² The accumulated lessons from history were designed both to instruct and warn what otherwise might be an uninformed audience. Interest in the doctrine of holiness was rising, and the editors sought to deflect any unnecessary hindrances that might occur through excesses attractive to sincere but misinformed people.

Assessment of Pentecostalism

By 1908 the projection that the tongues movement would be short-lived had faded. The frank admission was that ‘the movement has spread somewhat widely and rapidly’.³³ Early accommodating statements concerning motive and sincerity had disappeared as well. While more genial personalities endeavoured to be patient with the emerging movement, Beverly Carradine drew more critical conclusions, placing Pentecostals in dubious company

³⁰ Isaiah Guyman Martin, ‘A Brief History of the “Tongues”’, *Christian Witness* (June 27, 1907), 3-4.

³¹ ‘The Tongues Movement’, *Christian Witness* (February 4, 1909), 8.

³² Cowman, ‘The “Tongues” Movement (So-Called)’, *Christian Witness* (April 1, 1909), 11-12.

³³ ‘The Tongue’s Movement’, *Christian Witness* (December 31, 1908), 8.

with ‘Christian Science, Theosophy, Eddyism, Dowieism, Sandfordism, Irwinism, Wild Fire, Tongues, anything and everything meeting with their favor and acceptance’.³⁴

But opposition to glossolalia was also based upon what was perceived to be a failure of Pentecostalism to achieve its announced goals. First, it had not brought Pentecost to the Los Angeles area but, rather, hindered it. Joseph Smale,³⁵ who had watched the emergence of the Azusa Street Revival from his position as pastor of Los Angeles First Baptist Church, and who was a strong promoter of revival, offered his assessment:

The effect, in the main, of the tongues in our city, instead of precipitating Pentecost, as we had hoped, has been to remove what hopeful signs of Pentecost were known during the fall of last year and early spring of this year. It broke the unity of the Lord’s intercessors. It took the minds of many from the supreme work of the conversion of souls. It engendered strife, the fanatical spirit and division, and opened the door to fanaticism, hypnotism and spiritualism.³⁶

Second, not only had it failed in the ambitious task of a renewal of a literal Pentecost in the twentieth century, it had failed in the eyes of the AHM to engender revival at all, either in the United States or elsewhere in the world.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, the announced missionary enhancement of speaking in foreign languages without training had proved a failure:

Let it be understood that there is not an authentic case of any real language being spoken by anyone having the “tongues;” it is therefore a travesty on the Pentecostal gift of tongues when nearly a score of nationalities said, “Are not all of these that speak Galileans? and how hear we in our own language where we were born?” . . . Therefore this present craze is not the gift of tongues from the Holy Spirit. Just what it is, is difficult to say; but that it is not of God, and that it is disastrous to spirituality, is quite clear.³⁷

³⁴ Beverly Carradine, ‘The Wedlock of Sweetness and Firmness’, *Christian Witness* (May 2, 1907), 1.

³⁵ See Tim Welch, *Joseph Smale: God’s “Moses” for Pentecostalism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2014).

³⁶ Joseph Smale, quoted in I. G. Martin, ‘The Los Angeles Letter’, *The Christian Witness* (December 13, 1906), 13.

³⁷ ‘Fanaticism’, *Christian Witness* (March 23, 1916), 8.

Summary

By 1916 *The Christian Witness* was including the tongues movement in the category of fanaticism.³⁸ While always sceptical, the scepticism had become a conviction.

Theologically, glossolalia experienced as a third work of grace was antagonistic to its theology. Experientially, it left its Christian experience as sub-standard to what Pentecostals regarded as authentic Pentecost. The Azusa Street Revival and attending tongues speaking had not produced partners in the effort to extend the message of Christian holiness, either in precept or experience. Instead, AHM constituents needed to be warned with the utmost urgency lest 'they be led off into wild and strange doctrines and foolish movements'.³⁹

2.3 Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America

Having looked at the unofficial parent body, this research will now examine the reaction of specific denominations and groups. The Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America⁴⁰ was organised on May 31, 1843, in Utica, New York, after a conflict with the MEC concerning slavery.⁴¹ Led by Rev Orange Scott, the new fellowship was militantly abolitionist.⁴² At the close of the Civil War and the emancipation of the slaves, the denomination struggled for focus and direction, with some leaders returning to the mother

³⁸ 'Fanaticism', *Christian Witness* (January 9, 1916), 2. For a discussion of 'Fanaticism', see A. H. Kaufman, *Fanaticism Explained: Symptoms, Cause and Cure*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: A.H. Kaufman, 1906).

³⁸ 'Fanaticism', *Christian Witness* (March 23, 1916), 8.

³⁹ 'Fanaticism', (March 23, 1916), 8.

⁴⁰ The name of the organisation was changed in 1891 to The Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church), and in 1947 to The Wesleyan Methodist Church. With the merger of the WMC with the Pilgrim Holiness Church in 1968, it became known as The Wesleyan Church. For information on the WMC origins, see Orange Scott, *The Grounds of Secession from the M.E. Church* (New York: L.C. Matlack, 1849), and A. T. Jennings, *American Wesleyan Methodism* (Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1902).

⁴¹ For discussion of the WMC and slavery, see Luther Lee, *Slavery Examined in the Light of the Bible* (Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1855), and Lucius Matlack, *The Anti-Slavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1881).

⁴² See Lucius Matlack, *The Life of Rev. Orange Scott: In Two Parts* (New York: C. Prindle and L.C. Matlack, 1851). Later scholars of the WMC concur with this assessment. See Black and Drury, *Wesleyan Church*, 27-32, 78-80, Lee Haines and Paul William Thomas, *An Outline History of the Wesleyan Church*, 3rd ed. (Marion, IN: Wesley, 1985), 56-59, 72, and Dieter, *The Holiness Revival*, 25, 124-125.

church.⁴³ Under the leadership of Adam Crooks,⁴⁴ the focus shifted from a societal motivation to an emphasis upon the doctrine of Christian perfection as had been taught in the Methodist Church. Being implicitly Methodist in theology, the doctrine had always been a part of the essential doctrines of the church, but in 1887 a special focus was adopted:

Resolved, that we as a general conference enjoin upon all our ministry the duty of faithful presentation of the great doctrine of entire sanctification and greatly desire that all our people may receive the blessing and thereby be prepared the more fully for growth, maturity and heaven.⁴⁵

The 1887 General Conference adopted new articles of religion on regeneration and entire sanctification, placing the WMC clearly in the mainstream of the AHM.⁴⁶

But an interruption came, as has been previously addressed: In 1895, a Wesleyan Methodist minister named B. H. Irwin⁴⁷ began preaching a third work of grace, which he called ‘baptism of fire’.⁴⁸ While he did not advocate glossolalia, his concept of a third work of grace created a favourable theological environment for its acceptance. The influence of Irwin was particularly felt amongst Wesleyan Methodist churches and ministers in the Southeastern United States.⁴⁹ The 1899 General Conference of the WMC issued a statement of repudiation for what it deemed a ‘heresy’:

We utterly repudiate and denounce the heresy which has found place within our Connection, if but only in a small degree, sometimes under one name and again under another, but commonly known as the baptism of fire, and by some taught to be a third experience . . . which we believe to be a most damaging heresy.⁵⁰

⁴³ For biographical information on Lee, see *Autobiography of the Rev. Luther Lee* (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1883), and Paul Leslie Kaufman, “Logical” *Luther Lee and the Methodist War Against Slavery* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2000).

⁴⁴ See Mrs. E. W. Crooks, *Life of Rev. A. Crooks* (Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1875).

⁴⁵ Haines and Thomas place this event in a time of ‘holiness revival’. Haines and Thomas, *Outline History*, 72.

⁴⁶ A. T. Jennings called the adoption of new articles of regeneration and entire sanctification the work of ‘aggressive holiness advocates’. Jennings, *American Wesleyan Methodism*, 122.

⁴⁷ See B. H. Irwin, ‘The Whole Armor’, *Live Coals* (March 9, 1900), 5.

⁴⁸ See chapter 1 of this thesis.

⁴⁹ Richard Baxter (R. B.) Hayes is an example of this process. Saved in a ‘holiness meeting’, Hayes left the Baptist Church to join the WMC at Seneca, South Carolina, in 1893. By 1898 he had associated with B. H. Irwin and his Fire Baptized Church, and in 1907 he received the gift of tongues. See W. M. Hayes, *Memoirs of Richard Baxter Hayes* (Greer, SC: Dunlap, 1945).

⁵⁰ *Minutes of the Fifteenth Quadrennial Session of the General Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America held at Sheridan, Ind., October 18-25, 1899* (Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1899), 27.

As has also been examined previously, another Wesleyan Methodist, Charles H. Parham, was influenced by Irwin. The pages of *The Wesleyan Methodist* did not take note of events in Topeka, Kansas, involving Parham, and an article entitled ‘Holiness in 1902’ that mentioned several menaces threatening the church did not mention glossolalia.⁵¹ But the Azusa Street Revival, with its emphasis on glossolalia, did not escape the notice of *The Wesleyan Methodist*, the official organ of the church.⁵² In August of 1906, the editor, A. T. Jennings,⁵³ offered the following assessment:

There is a decidedly morbid condition among emotional religious people, a sort of sensationalism, looking for the marvelous and strange, and this has gone so far with some persons that realities are of no account to them. They are in a religious sense like the read of fiction in an intellectual sense, the ordinary and real no longer satisfies, they must now have the blood and thunder type, and after a time, unless held in check, nothing short of the lunatic asylum will be equal to the demands of the case.⁵⁴

The year 1907 brought to the pages of *The Wesleyan Methodist* multiple articles negatively addressing the emerging Pentecostal matter. H. T. Besse offered a three-part series, and P. B. Campbell, president of the Allegheny Conference, offered a six-part tutorial opposing the doctrine of tongues.⁵⁵ As a statement of church policy, the 1907 Wesleyan Methodist General Conference issued a statement of condemnation of the Pentecostal Movement in general. In an assessment of challenges to the church, the following was adopted by the General Conference:

The last innovation in the religious circles of the country is that popularly known as the “Gift of Tongues.” In some places . . . this movement has brought an element of discord among us. We cannot accept these teachings as of divine origin because it is taught that the possession of this gift is the infallible and necessary evidence of the possession of the gift of the Holy Spirit . . . We must discourage our people from

⁵¹ ‘Holiness in 1902’, *The Wesleyan Methodist* (December 25, 1902), 1.

⁵² Frank Bartleman was present at Azusa Street and provided progress reports to periodicals throughout the country, including *The Wesleyan Methodist*. For Bartleman’s association with the WMC, see Frank Bartleman, *From the Plow to the Pulpit* (Los Angeles: author, 1924), 64-89.

⁵³ For biographical information on A. T. Jennings, see William Kostlevy, ‘Arthur T. Jennings’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 163.

⁵⁴ ‘Decently and in Order’, *The Wesleyan Methodist* (August 15, 1906), 8.

⁵⁵ See Charles Jones, ‘H.T. Besse’, in *The Wesleyan Holiness Movement: A Comprehensive Guide*, vol. 2 (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2005), 927. See also Jones, ‘P.B. Campbell’, *Wesleyan Holiness*, vol. 2, 985.

accepting this error as truth for it is contrary both to sound reason and the teaching of God's Word.⁵⁶

Evidence of the encroachment of Pentecostalism was noted in conference minutes. The South Carolina Conference reported, 'We have had hindrances the past year, both among ourselves and from the outside. The "Pentecostal" or "Tongue Movement" has come among us, and some good honest souls have gone after the "tongues"'.⁵⁷ The North Georgia Conference reported,

Tongues got into our midst and hurt some of our churches. Some of the pastors were afraid to take a stand against it seeing it was among the gifts of the Spirit, and failing to see that the advocates of this were not Scriptural they let some of our good people run off after this and some left the church.⁵⁸

The North Carolina Conference reported, 'They (Gastonia, NC) have been unfortunate in having a division in their midst over the tongue movement; the tongue people taking very extreme and un-Biblical ground. The Lord held us to keep clear of such'.⁵⁹

The South Carolina Conference is prototypical of the Pentecostal influence in Wesleyan Methodist Churches of the Southeastern United States. After dealing with the third blessing controversy, Wesleyans were reluctant to accept traditional 'holiness' teaching:

The people at Belton were so disgusted with the fire-baptized and tongues groups that at first they would hardly attend . . . as they thought everything under the name of holiness was like these groups. Much of the opposition and persecution which the Wesleyans received at this time can be traced to the fact that the public considered everything under the name of holiness was the same as these groups.⁶⁰

By 1909 James Hilson reported,

The tongues movement had again become flourishing in this section and was creating great problems for the leaders of the Wesleyan work. This resulted in many becoming dissatisfied with the Wesleyan Church and leaving the conference . . . though the

⁵⁶ *Minutes of the Seventeenth Quadrennial Session of the General Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America held at Fairmount, Indiana, October 16-22, 1907* (Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1907), 85.

⁵⁷ *Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Session of the South Carolina Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, or Church of America held at Landrum, S.C., November 18-22, 1908* (Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1908), 11. Stephens speaks to the Pentecostal-inspired exodus from WMC churches in the South. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 226-227.

⁵⁸ H. S. Dixon, 'The Work in Georgia', *The Wesleyan Methodist* (October 14, 1908).

⁵⁹ *The Wesleyan Methodist* (October 16, 1907), 5.

⁶⁰ Hilson, *History*, 83.

work was to suffer great loss during the next few years, it was to establish itself definitely as not being a part of the tongues movement.⁶¹

The pages of the *Wesleyan Methodist* continued to warn the constituency. In an article entitled 'The Tongue Movement', the editor cautioned,

Among Christians everywhere there is a painful consciousness of a lack of the degree of power which they believe was displayed on the day of Pentecost and by some of the apostles and by some of the great religious teachers and preachers of subsequent years. It is because of this recognized fact that persons who have so much to say about power and who can exhibit anything that is out of the ordinary attract so much attention. Among the people who have attached themselves to the company who claimed to speak with tongues and who claim that such ability is the supreme evidence of the Holy Spirit are some thoroughly honest people who greatly desire to obtain the power they think the apostles had and which will be sufficient to meet the demands of this age.⁶²

Still, the problem of glossolalia did not go away. Editor Jennings, writing in *The Wesleyan Methodist* in 1911, would again warn the constituency:

The people who persist in declaring that speaking with unknown tongues is a sign that one has received the Holy Spirit are making a big mistake. When they claim that they have the Holy Spirit and give speaking in tongues as a sign or evidence they are putting the sign in place of the Holy Spirit.⁶³

Perhaps by 1913 the issue had begun to lose significance in the minds of the majority of Wesleyan Methodists. D. T. Perrine presented a paper before the Michigan Ministerial Association in which he addressed the issues facing the church. He listed spiritualism, Romanism, secret societies, and Russellism, but he did not mention Pentecostalism.⁶⁴ By 1919 the issue of 'tongues speaking' had become largely a matter of general opposition without immediate threat to the stability of the church.

Summary

⁶¹ Hilson, *History*, 85.

⁶² *The Wesleyan Methodist* (November 16, 1910), 1.

⁶³ 'Foolish Seeking for Signs', *The Wesleyan Methodist* (October 11, 1911), 1. The initial response to Pentecostalism in many areas of the RHM was moderate. The leaders of the RHM did not want to be found opposing a genuine work of God and they did not want to be unduly critical of a movement whose members were supporters of a second work of grace. This response was part of the 'proximity' involved in the confrontation.

⁶⁴ Reported in *The Wesleyan Methodist* (July 30, 1913), 2-3.

The negative reaction of the WMC to glossolalia emerged from what was to the WMC a problematic theology of B. H. Irwin and its subsequent divisive influence in the denomination. Pentecostalism was seen as a continuation of Irwin's theology. While major denominational leaders did not succumb to the perceived threat, references in denominational publications and from Pentecostal sources indicate that there were numeric losses that culminated in congregations being disbanded. It was a stressful time for the denominational leadership, although probably the majority of rank and file members did not feel the impact and remained untouched. Wesleyan Methodist theology remained intact, and tongues speaking did not become an accepted practice.

2.4 The Free Methodist Church

The Free Methodist Church resulted from a separation from the MEC.⁶⁵ It was organised in Pekin, New York, on August 23, 1860, with Rev Benjamin Titus (B. T.) Roberts elected General Superintendent.⁶⁶ The contributing causes for the separation can be understood by the specification of Free in the chosen denominational name. Bishop W. T. Hogue explained the emphasis on free to include 'The freedom of the Spirit in personal experience, accompanied by freedom on the part of all, in public worship of God, to give such outward expression to deep religious emotions as the Holy Spirit might inspire or

⁶⁵ For an explanation for the division, see B. T. Roberts, *Why Another Sect: Containing a Review of Articles by Bishop Simpson and Others on the Free Methodist Church* (Rochester, NY: Earnest Christian, 1879).

⁶⁶ For biographical information on B. T. Roberts, see Benson Howard Roberts, *Benjamin Titus Roberts, Late General Superintendent of the Free Methodist Church: A Biography* (North Chili, NY: Earnest Christian, 1900), and Howard Snyder, *Populist Saints: B.T. and Ellen Roberts and the First Free Methodists* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2006). While the organisation was effected primarily in western New York state, a contingent from Michigan and Illinois joined the group. They were influenced by Dr John Wesley Redfield. See J. G. Terrill, *The Life of John Wesley Redfield, M.D.* (Chicago: Free Methodist, 1899), and Howard Snyder, ed., *Live While You Preach: The Autobiography of Methodist Revivalist and Abolitionist John Wesley Redfield, 1810-1863* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2006).

prompt'.⁶⁷ Emotional worship became a characteristic of the FMC. Roberts struggled to hold it in bounds while adamant that it not be suppressed to the point of extinction:

We do not fear any of the manifestations of the Spirit of God. But let the emotions you manifest be an effect produced by the Divine Spirit . . . What we want is not noisy meetings, not still meetings—but the *spirit of the living God* in all our worshipping assemblies.⁶⁸

Bishop E. P. Hart suggested that the 'steading the ark' method was not always successful.⁶⁹

Hart commented on his first visit to St Charles Camp meeting that there was much of divine power manifested no one could question, and that there was a good deal of the rankest fanaticism no one in his right senses could deny.⁷⁰ The pattern of emotional religion, which included shouting, dancing in the Spirit, running the aisles, and being 'slain in the Spirit', was widespread. With the rise of Pentecostalism, tendencies appeared that, though not uniform practice in Free Methodist circles, clearly demonstrated susceptibility to the new emphasis.

Confrontation with Pentecostalism

A news article was submitted to *The Free Methodist* by M. F. Childs on September 2, 1902, entitled 'Pentecost at Moonlight, Kansas'. Describing an evening service, Childs

⁶⁷ Wilson Hogue, *History of the Free Methodist Church of North America*, vol.1 (Winona Lake, IN: Free Methodist, 1915), 325.

⁶⁸ B. T. Roberts, *Earnest Christian*, vol. 2 (July 1861), 236, as quoted in Marston, *From Age to Age*, 332. Howard Snyder says Roberts would have rejected the initial evidence theory, but suggests that it is 'at least plausible' that Roberts might have embraced the idea of 'glossolalia as a legitimate but not the most important gift of the Spirit'. Snyder, *Populist Saints*, 906.

⁶⁹ For biographical information, see Jon S. Kulaga, *Edward Payson Hart: The Second Man of Free Methodism* (Spring Arbor, MI: Spring Arbor University Press, 2007).

⁷⁰ E. P. Hart, *Reminiscences of Early Free Methodism* (Chicago: Free Methodist, 1903), 45. For the history of the St Charles camp meeting, see Albert W. Perry, *The St. Charles Camp Meeting of 1885* (Chicago: T. B. Arnold, 1885). Emotional worship in Free Methodist circles, and in American religion in general, was a continuing discussion into the 1900s. Commenting in *The Free Methodist*, the editor said, 'There is a manifest disposition in religious circles in these days to eliminate the emotional from religious life. Nothing can well be more destructive of vital piety than this'. *The Free Methodist* (March 1912), 6. *The Free Methodist* published an article by Rev Milton A. Parker entitled 'Demonstrations', *The Free Methodist* (December 23, 1913). The author sought to find balance, saying, 'We are responsible for the expression of our emotions, but we are not at liberty to *suppress them*. If we are controlled by them, we will become fanatics. If we suppress them they will die. But if we control them, and give them the most intelligent expression we can command, God will be pleased and glorified, others will be helped and encouraged, and we will be blessed in our own souls'. Bishop Leslie Marston provides an entire chapter on 'Freedom of the Spirit in Worship', in Marston, *From Age to Age*, 229-358, but does not mention Pentecostalism. For an overview of issues relating to emotionalism in the AHM, see Melvin Dieter, 'Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal Movements: Commonalities, Confrontation, and Dialogue', *Pneuma* 12, no. 1 (1990): 10-11.

reported, ‘One night there were fourteen or fifteen prostrate under the power of God, twelve at one time. As on the day of Pentecost they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and spake as the Spirit gave them utterance’.⁷¹ By 1906 the matter of speaking in tongues became a point of concern. In the July issue of *The Free Methodist*, the editor submitted an editorial entitled ‘Speaking with Tongues’:

Some of our readers may possibly be inclined to ask, “Why this article on the subject of ‘tongues’?” We would reply that in some sections of our work intense interest in this question has arisen over the fact of certain persons who teach that it is possible and also necessary after having been converted and also sanctified wholly that one should also be baptized with the Holy Spirit and fire that one of the evidences of this is “the gift of tongues,” which some claim to have received and others are looking for.⁷²

The response of the editor was restrained and cautionary:

We would say to our brethren . . . do not allow yourselves to be disturbed by these queer and strange teachings and manifestations. Do not run after them; do not fight them. “In patience possess your souls.” “If it be of God ye cannot overthrow it, and if it be of man it will come to naught.”⁷³

By November 1906 an editorial appeared acknowledging events of Azusa Street. Editor Charles B. Ebey wrote concerning ‘The Tongues Excitement’,

Some months ago there occurred in the city of Los Angeles, California, a strange excitement over the fact of a number of people, mostly colored,⁷⁴ under the leadership of one Seymour, a colored preacher, who had recently reached there from Texas, professedly acquiring as demonstrated in the Bible, “The gift of Tongues.”⁷⁵

⁷¹ M. F. Childs, ‘Pentecost at Moonlight, Kansas’, *The Free Methodist* (September 2, 1902), 5. This appears to have been an interaction with the Fire Baptized Association. While Free Methodist periodicals do not mention B. H. Irwin and the baptism of fire, Free Methodist evangelist E. E. Shelhamer addressed the matter. See E. E. Shelhamer, ‘The Baptism of Fire’, in *Popular and Radical Holiness Contrasted* (Atlanta, GA: n. p., 1906), 87-109. Irwin is not mentioned by name.

⁷² *The Free Methodist* (July 31, 1906), 8.

⁷³ *The Free Methodist* (July 31, 1906), 8-9.

⁷⁴ The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines ‘colored’, referring to skin colour, as ‘first recorded in the early 17th century and adopted in the US by emancipated slaves as a term of racial pride after the end of the American Civil War. In the US and Britain, it was the accepted term until the 1960s when it was superseded by black’. Oxford University Press, ‘Definition of colored’, Lexico.com (2021), <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/colored> (accessed February 28, 2022). In 1870 former slaves in the southern United States formed their own religious denomination which they identified as the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1909 an organisation formed to support the interests of African Americans, self-identified as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), a name it retains in 2022. The term as used by Ebey should be placed in this timeline.

⁷⁵ Charles Ebey, ‘The Tongues Excitement’, *The Free Methodist* (November 6, 1906), 8.

Acknowledging that the gift of tongues was mentioned in 1 Corinthians, the editor deemed the making of ‘tongues’ to be evidence of the possession of the Holy Ghost ‘a most grievous error’.⁷⁶ Appearing in the same issue was an article taken from *The Pentecost*, a holiness periodical originating in Los Angeles, entitled ‘Effect of Tongues Speaking’. The article provided the first mention of Charles Parham in the pages of *The Free Methodist* and concluded with an exhortation: ‘O beloved, beware!’⁷⁷

Pursuing a pattern of caution, the December 11, 1906, issue of *The Free Methodist* sought to educate the readers concerning the Baptism of the Holy Spirit while implicitly including a remonstrance. A lengthy article by F. H. Horton, entitled ‘What is Included in the Pentecostal Baptism with the Holy Ghost’, was printed. Horton observed,

It is undoubtedly true that as people walk out in the light of these truths there will always be an increase in the manifestation of divine healings and perhaps other miraculous gifts, but the real work of the Holy Spirit in the soul will be so supremely precious . . . that we will not be seeking signs and wonders and running after every new kind of religion that comes along.⁷⁸

Further instruction was provided in an article entitled ‘The True Doctrine of Tongues’.⁷⁹

Interest in the subject was increasing throughout the FMC. Cautionary instruction had not satisfied the desire for information and perhaps explanation. In the May 7, 1907, issue of *The Free Methodist*, editor Ebey offered an assessment based on his personal observation:

We have been requested by a number of our people in different sections of the church to make a personal visit, or visits, to the “Tongues” meetings while in Los Angeles and through the columns of *The Free Methodist* publish an account of what we saw and heard there, and also to give our opinion of the movement.⁸⁰

Ebey was unimpressed with the alleged tongues being spoken and disappointed with the ‘spiritual atmosphere’ of the meetings.⁸¹ He commented that ‘aside from the strange,

⁷⁶ Ebey, ‘Tongues Excitement’, 8.

⁷⁷ Ebey, 8.

⁷⁸ F. H. Horton, ‘What Is Included in the Pentecostal Baptism with the Holy Ghost’, *The Free Methodist* (December 11, 1906), 6-7, taken from the *Pacific Free Methodist*. See Hogue, *Free Methodist Church*, vol. 2, 140, 141, 146-147.

⁷⁹ ‘The True Doctrine of Tongues’, *The Free Methodist* (March 5, 1907), 2.

⁸⁰ Ebey, ‘Tongues Mission, Azusa Street, Los Angeles, California’, *The Free Methodist* (May 7, 1907), 8.

unintelligible sounds and the professed speaking in tongues, the services were quite commonplace'.⁸² He compared the meetings of Azusa Street with Free Methodist camp meetings 'back East', and suggested that attendees of the camp meetings would have responded, 'What is the chaff to the wheat?'⁸³ Ebey offered advice to his readers:

Our churches and pastors do not endorse it (the Tongues Movement), but they are treating those who have been ensnared in it with kindness and true Christian courtesy. As we said in our first article of the subject, "Do not run after it, do not fight it, let it alone. It will soon run its race and pass away."⁸⁴

Despite downplaying the future of the Tongues Movement, the pages of *The Free Methodist* continued to keep the matter before its readers by way of instruction and critical assessment. The editor acknowledged that 'We are frequently requested to publish articles against the Tongues Movement. Much has already been published on this subject in our paper'.⁸⁵ Published articles included A. T. Pierson's 'Speaking with Tongues',⁸⁶ an editorial entitled 'The New Gospel of Tongues',⁸⁷ 'The Tongues Delusion' by G. G. Keibel, 'The Tongues Earthquake Scare in Ceylon' by Kittie Wood Kumarakulasinghe,⁸⁸ 'The Upper Room and Tongues' by Beverly Carradine,⁸⁹ and 'The Tongues Movement' by Free Methodist minister W. B. Olmstead.⁹⁰ S. K. Wheatlake, a Free Methodist minister and author, presented an article entitled 'Is the Modern Tongues Movement Scriptural', on October 10,

⁸¹ Ebey, 'Tongues Mission', 8.

⁸² Ebey, 8.

⁸³ Ebey, 8.

⁸⁴ Ebey, 9.

⁸⁵ *The Free Methodist* (December 22, 1914), 1.

⁸⁶ A. T. Pierson, 'Speaking in Tongues', *The Free Methodist* (August 6, 1907), 6-7, taken from *Missionary Review of the World*. For biographical information on A. T. Pierson, see Dana Robert, "Occupy Till I Come": *A.T. Pierson and the Evangelism of the World* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2003). Pierson rejected tongues, suggesting it was a demonic imitation of the work of the Holy Spirit. But Dana Robert comments, 'By his promotion of Keswick theology, the Welsh Revival, and even faith healing, A.T. Pierson made an important contribution to the origins of Pentecostalism, even as he repudiated the Pentecostals' claim that glossolalia was the "sign" of Holy Spirit baptism'. Robert, *Occupy*, 264.

⁸⁷ *The Free Methodist* (October 6, 1907), 9.

⁸⁸ *The Free Methodist* (December 17, 1907), 11.

⁸⁹ Carradine, 'The Upper Room and Tongues', *The Free Methodist* (March 3, 1908), 6. The article was taken from *The Christian Witness* (February 13, 1908). The editor acknowledged that it was only a portion of what Carradine had written for *The Christian Witness*.

⁹⁰ W. B. Olmstead, 'The Tongues Movement', *The Free Methodist* (May 5, 1908), 3. For biographical information on Olmstead, see Jones, 'W. B. Olmstead', *Wesleyan Holiness Movement*, vol. 2, 1425.

1916,⁹¹ and in December 1916, Sam Polovina shared an experience with glossolalia advocates attempting to demonstrate their fraudulent claims of linguistic capability.⁹²

Defections to Pentecostalism

While the FMC generally reacted negatively to Pentecostalism, there was dissent within their fellowship.⁹³ Some disagreed with their denomination, finding the practice of glossolalia to be desirable. The defections illustrate the conflict within the rank and file of the AHM concerning the practice, resulting in breaches in fellowship. Wacker's designation of the 'broken family' is illustrated in the FMC and will be seen in subsequent groups as discussed in chapter 1 of this thesis.

In 1892 Rachel Sizelove and her husband were appointed by the FMC to serve a circuit of churches encompassing eastern Kansas and a large portion of Oklahoma.⁹⁴ They were experienced in divine healings, emotional demonstrations of worship, and the practice of being 'slain by the Spirit'. In 1895 the Sizeloves moved to Hermon, California, to place their children in the Free Methodist Seminary. The nearby revival in progress at the Azusa

⁹¹ *The Free Methodist* (October 10, 1916), 6-7. For biographical information on S. K. Wheatlake, see Jones, *Wesleyan Holiness Movement*, vol. 2, 1671.

⁹² *The Free Methodist* (December 5, 1916), 3. For information on Sam Polovina, see Sam Polovina, *From Heathenism to Christ: Life Story of Samuel Polovina, the Converted Austrian* (Cleveland, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1920).

⁹³ J. M. Humphrey, Free Methodist evangelist, testified he once received the gift of tongues but became concerned about its validity as a Christian expression and 'gave it up'. This story was told by E. E. Shelhamer in 'The Sweets of Satan', as found in Jennie Jolley, *As An Angel of Light, or, Bible Tongues and Holiness and Their Counterfeits* (New York: Vantage Press, 1964), 53. The story appears to be confirmed by Humphrey himself in *Select Fruits from the Highlands of Beulah* (Lima, OH: Gospel Grain, 1913), 177, 213. There is an interesting note in *New Acts*, a Pentecostal publication from Alliance, Ohio, which says, 'We learn that a meeting surpassing all former occasions of power was held in Pittsburgh by the Christian Alliance with Evangelist J.M. Humphrey as preacher. Four hundred at their altars seeking salvation, sanctification, or the baptism with the Holy Ghost'. 'Great Power in Pittsburgh', *New Acts* (June 1907), 12. In contrast to Humphrey, E. E. Shelhamer, a Free Methodist evangelist, wrote *Five Reasons Why I Do Not Seek the Gift of Tongues* (Atlanta, GA: Repairer, n.d.).

⁹⁴ For biographical information on Rachel Sizelove, see 'A Sparking Fountain of the Whole Earth', *Word and Work* (June 1934), 1-2, 'Azusa's First Camp-Meeting', *Word and the Work* (January 1936), 1, and Alexander, *The Women of Azusa Street*, 168-178. Charles Barfoot traces the history of the camp, the conflict with the Free Methodists, and the community conflicts concerning raucous worship, the Free Methodists, and race relations. Charles H. Barfoot, *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Making of Modern Pentecostalism, 1890-1926* (London: Equinox, 2011), 148-152. For a Pentecostal assessment of the Hermon area and experience, see 'Hermon', *Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), 3. In 1925 Sizelove wrote a 200-page unpublished autobiography, which is housed at the Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, Springfield, MO.

Street Mission offered little attraction. First, Rachel was a Free Methodist and commented that she ‘loved the Free Methodist discipline and thought I would live and die in the Free Methodist Church’.⁹⁵ Second, her familiarity with Free Methodist worship left her unimpressed with the practices of the mission. It was not until June 1906 that Rachel attended. Challenged by the presence of God, she returned home to study and pray. In July 1906 she received her ‘baptism with the Spirit’. Sizelove became part of the inner circle at Azusa Street, serving on the credentials committee.

In May 1907 she returned to her family in Springfield, Missouri, to take the message of the newly found experience. At that time she rejected her FMC preaching license since ‘they now rejected Pentecost’.⁹⁶ She accepted credentials issued by the Azusa Street Mission, explaining, ‘I had to die out to my own church, the Free Methodist Church’.⁹⁷ But the FMC was not forgotten. In a dream, Sizelove saw the possibilities of a Pentecostal camp at Arroyo Seco near Hermon, California, which was home to the Free Methodist Seminary. The camp was advertised as being in a secluded area where there could be freedom of worship. Sizelove was delighted to discover an opportunity to minister to her former associates concerning the light she had received on Pentecost and the Baptism of the Holy Spirit: ‘Oh, Jesus! Can it be possible You will let us have a camp meeting right here near my own people, the Free Methodist Colony?’⁹⁸ While the camp did not promote harmonious relationships, it did demonstrate the nature of the contention between the two understandings in Southern California and across the United States.

⁹⁵ ‘A Sparkling Fountain’, *Word and Work* (June 1934), 1.

⁹⁶ ‘Sparkling Fountain’, 12.

⁹⁷ ‘Sparkling Fountain’, 12.

⁹⁸ ‘Azusa’s Fire Camp Meeting’, *Word and Work* (January 1936), 1. While Sizelove was instrumental in the planning stage of the Arroyo Camp Meeting, I can find no evidence of her attendance or ministry there.

Mary Weems Chapman was a Free Methodist associated with the Pentecost Bands.⁹⁹ In 1894 she was the office editor and business manager of *The Vanguard*.¹⁰⁰ In 1896 she authored a biography of Eunice Parsons Cobb, a holiness advocate and Free Methodist lay worker known as ‘Mother Cobb’.¹⁰¹ Chapman was the founding editor of *Missionary Tidings*, published by the FMC. In 1889 she and her husband, George, founded the Free Methodist mission work in Monrovia, Liberia, in West Africa.

After the death of her husband, there were two distinct changes in Chapman’s life. First, in 1904 she professed Spirit baptism with glossolalia.¹⁰² And second, she became a missionary to India. In January 1911 an article appeared in *The Latter Rain Evangel* by Chapman entitled ‘The Most Needy: Rescue Work in India’, in which she commented, ‘I have often been asked, “What is the most needy phase of the Pentecostal Work in India?”’¹⁰³ In March 1914 she remarked, ‘God’s children are encouraged to press on for Pentecostal power and victory’.¹⁰⁴

In the same year, she attended the organisational meeting for the Assemblies of God in Hot Springs, Arkansas.¹⁰⁵ In September 1916 she identified herself as being with ‘fifteen

⁹⁹ For the history of the Pentecostal Bands, see Howard Snyder, ‘Vivian Dake and the Pentecostal Bands’, in William Kostlevy and Wallace Thornton Jr., eds., *The Radical Holiness Movement in the Christian Tradition* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2016), 69-84.

¹⁰⁰ *The Vanguard* was a periodical published by C. W. Sherman in St. Louis, Missouri, with semi-official relations with the FMC. The records of *The Vanguard* were destroyed by Pentecostals, and the periodical name changed to *The Banner*. See Harris, *Tears and Triumphs*, 333-340. A quizzical article appeared in *The Church Advocate and Holiness Banner* entitled ‘The Vanguard Is No More’. The editor of the *Vanguard*, Anna Abrams, and the owner, C. W. Sherman, announced that the periodical had ceased publication ‘not because of financial embarrassment, but the Lord stopped the paper until it could be sent forth as the Holy Ghost would have it’. This is followed by a confession from editor and owner of spiritual deficiency. A new publication was announced called *The Banner of Truth*, with Abrams and S. D. Kinne as editors. *The Church Advocate and Holiness Banner* described Kinne as ‘a tongues prophet’ and says that he [Kinne] ‘captured them, Vanguard and all, for the Tongues Movement’. *The Church Advocate and Holiness Banner* (May 4, 1907). For biographical information on Kinne, see Larry Martin, *Holy Ghost Revival On Azusa Street: Chosen Vessels* (Joplin, MO: Christian Life, 2010), 37-41.

¹⁰¹ Mary Weems Chapman, *Mother Cobb, or, Sixty Years’ Walk with God* (Chicago: T.B. Arnold, 1896).

¹⁰² Paominlen Kipgen, ‘History and Theology of the Pentecostal Movement’, <https://trinitycollegeandseminary.academia.edu/PaominlenKipgen> (accessed July 27, 2021). No details are offered. If this date is correct, her experience occurs under the influence, if not the ministry, of Charles Parham.

¹⁰³ Mary W. Chapman, ‘The Most Needy: Rescue Work in India’, *The Latter Rain Evangel* (January, 1911), 21.

¹⁰⁴ Mary W. Chapman, ‘Victory in Plymouth’, *The Christian Evangel* (March 28, 1914), 8.

¹⁰⁵ Compiled by Glenn Gohr in ‘Known Persons Who Were at Hot Springs’, *Assemblies of God Heritage* 24, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 122.

other Pentecostal missionaries'. In December she reported, 'Two or three were baptized in the Holy Spirit and received a new tongue'. In 1917 she officially associated with the AG.¹⁰⁶ Any question about her acceptance of tongues speaking was erased in an August 24, 1918, report to the *Christian Evangel* where she commented,

One young woman who has come to us for rest was almost immediately convicted for the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and God has gloriously baptized her. She is filled with joy, speaking in tongues and singing in the Spirit just as at the beginning (Day of Pentecost) . . .¹⁰⁷

In the December 17, 1927, issue of *The Pentecostal Evangel*, the editor advised that a cable had been received from India simply saying, 'Mrs. Mary Chapman with the Lord. Passed away November 27th after a brief illness'. A summary of her life in India was offered by a native worker: 'I found Sister Chapman to be a most devoted and spiritual missionary. She stood not just for the Pentecostal experience, but emphasized the need for a deeply spiritual, sanctified life in those who have the Pentecostal experience'.¹⁰⁸

John Thomas (J. T.) Boddy was ordained a Free Methodist minister on April 7, 1901, in Seattle, Washington.¹⁰⁹ By 1905 he was pastoring a Christian and Missionary Alliance Church near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where he first heard of Pentecostalism. In January 1907 he attended a Pentecostal revival directed by C. A. McKinney.¹¹⁰ He testified,

While kneeling before the Lord I was gently prostrated . . . after a time, without movement or a tremor of my body, out of a most profound silence I suddenly burst forth in a volume of unknown tongues . . . I was more or less intoxicated in the Spirit and flooded with tongues without number, expressed in messages, poetry, prayer and songs in the Spirit.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁶ Darrin Rodgers, 'Mary Weems Chapman: Called to the Prostitutes and Untouchables of South India', *This Week in Assemblies of God History* (April 18, 2019).

¹⁰⁷ *The Christian Evangel* (August 24, 1918), 10.

¹⁰⁸ 'A Native's Tribute', *The Pentecostal Evangel* (March 17, 1928), 10.

¹⁰⁹ Information from Boddy's application for ordination in the AG. His association with the FMC is also referenced by Edith Blumhofer in *The Assemblies of God: A Chapter in the Story of American Pentecostalism*, vol. 1 (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1989), 282, 315. While AG sources list Boddy as ordained in the FMC, Free Methodist sources indicate that he was not ordained to eldership but rather as a local deacon. Cathy Robling, director of Marston Historical Center, Indianapolis, Indiana, email to the author, July 13, 2021.

¹¹⁰ For biographical information on C. A. McKinney, see G. W. Gohr, 'Claude Adams McKinney', in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 567-568.

¹¹¹ Stanley Frodsham, 'Former Editor of *Evangel* with the Lord', *The Pentecostal Evangel* (November 21, 1931), 7.

He was issued an ordination certificate by the AG on January 13, 1917, and in 1919 he was elected editor of *The Evangel*. He would hold this position until 1921, when his health began to fail. He died on November 6, 1931. Frodsham referred to Boddy as ‘one of the pioneers of the Pentecostal Movement’.¹¹²

Summary

The defection to Pentecostalism of the persons discussed above was quite visible in the Free Methodist Church, but they were minority defections. There were no losses at high level leadership positions and no alterations to Free Methodist theology or worship practices but there was conflict.¹¹³ Robins insists that the Free Methodists ‘suffered major defections or outright breaches’, but despite the losses, the broad outlines of the FMC identity remained the same.¹¹⁴ Free Methodist theology also remained the same, although the church sought to clarify the meaning of ‘the baptism of the Spirit’. The denominational characteristic of emotional worship came under review, but there is no evidence that the confrontation with Pentecostalism brought any changes in the FMC’s worship practices.

2.5 Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene

The Church of the Nazarene was organised as a local congregation in Los Angeles, California, on October 20, 1895,¹¹⁵ under the primary leadership of Rev Phineas F. Bresee.¹¹⁶ In the years between 1895 and 1907, the local church in Los Angeles expanded to become

¹¹² Frodsham, ‘Former Editor’, 7.

¹¹³ Opposition to Pentecostalism in the Free Methodist Church was expressed in the denominational periodical and publications from Free Methodist ministers rather than in the conference journals as was the case in the Wesleyan Methodist Connection.

¹¹⁴ Robins, *Pentecostalism*, 33. He offers no specific examples to prove this statement.

¹¹⁵ For discussion of Bresee and the (local) CN, see Smith, *Called unto Holiness*, 91-121, and Cunningham, ed., *Our Watchword and Song*, 79-111.

¹¹⁶ See E. A. Girvin, *Phineas F. Bresee: A Prince in Israel, a Biography* (Kansas City, MO: Pentecostal Nazarene, 1916), and Carl Bangs, *Phineas F. Bresee: His Life in Methodism, the Holiness Movement and the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1995).

what Timothy Smith calls ‘A national church’, as separated, local, independent churches identified with the growing CN.¹¹⁷ Bresee understood this advancement, not in terms of expanding the church of his founding, but rather as persevering the work of holiness evangelism throughout the United States. In October 1907 the CN merged with the Association of Pentecostal Churches, with congregations throughout the eastern United States, to form the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. In April 1908 holiness groups primarily centred in the Southern United States met with representatives from the PCN to complete a merger at Pilot Point, Texas.¹¹⁸ Other accessions would follow.

Confronting Pentecostalism

As the PCN ‘mother church’ in Los Angeles began to prosper and grow locally and nationally, the ministry of Charles Parham and the message of speaking in tongues as the evidence of the Holy Spirit began to be heard in the Midwest. While Parham’s name did not appear in the editorials of Nazarene-associated periodicals, readers were introduced to this emerging movement through a field report from Herbert and Lillie Buffum. In early 1905 they advised that they ‘[had] visited Rev. C. Parham’s Bethel College. Great excitement has lately been aroused concerning this man and his followers who claim to have received “the gift of tongues” . . . It is claimed they have been understood by people of different languages’.¹¹⁹

By 1906 the Azusa Street Mission near the PCN ‘mother church’ had been opened, and reports were circulating the country concerning this ‘revival’ with the unique feature of ‘tongues-speaking’. Bresee was reticent to comment on the events of the local mission, but

¹¹⁷ Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 122-150.

¹¹⁸ For the history of the PCN/CN, see J. B. Chapman, *A History of the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1926), Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, W. T. Purkiser, *Called Unto Holiness, Vol. II: The Story of the Nazarenes: The Second Twenty-Five Years, 1933-1958* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1983), and Floyd Cunningham, *Our Watchword and Song*.

¹¹⁹ Herbert and Lillie Buffum, ‘Warsaw, Mo.’, *Nazarene Messenger*, 5.

word of the activities of the Azusa Mission was spreading.¹²⁰ The July 19, 1906, issue of the *Nazarene Messenger* carried a sermon by Rev C. V. La Fontaine on ‘The More Excellent Way’, from 1 Corinthians 12:31. La Fontaine defined tongues as ‘Not necessarily any of the languages known to mean the speaker’s own language but shaped by the Spirit into a peculiar manner or an entirely new language not generally understood nor interpreted’.¹²¹ Apparently commenting on the events of Azusa Street, he advised,

In the present excitement attendant upon the manifestation of the “tongues” at various places in our vicinity it is well to keep a cool head and a warm heart, and above all things, to refrain from criticizing or judging. The Christian attitude is the same as that of Gamaliel.¹²²

In October 1906 an article by I. G. Martin entitled ‘Gift of Tongues’ appeared. It was a cautious article seeking to establish a biblical basis for ‘tongues’ but encouraging the priority of love as the greatest gift.¹²³ Martin commented that ‘there is such a thing as the gift of tongues’ but counselled that ‘gifts will vanish but perfect love will abide forever’. In conclusion, he commented,

In all we have said we could not disparage a single gift of the Spirit. If God bestows any of the gifts of the Spirit upon you, use it to His glory, but remember that He may withdraw it from you at any time . . . love is the greatest thing in the world and the experience of perfect love is the greatest experience in the world.¹²⁴

The sermons and editorial comments of La Fontaine and Martin, respectively, were not random happenings. La Fontaine was ‘resident pastor’¹²⁵ when Bresee was away from the local church, and Martin was the song leader and ‘platform manager’ of the local

¹²⁰ Bresee’s friend and biographer, E. A. Girvin, did not mention Pentecostalism in his biography of Bresee. He did note comments in the General Superintendent’s Report of 1904: ‘The pressure from fanaticism on the outside has been especially brought to bear upon some of our churches during the last year . . .’ Girvin, *Phineas F. Bresee*, 237-238. Pentecostals would not be so gracious to Bresee. The Seattle-based periodical, *The Midnight Cry*, would refer to Bresee as ‘not quite large enough for A.M.E. Bishop but plenty large enough to take the place of Christ’. *Midnight Cry*, quoted in Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 118.

¹²¹ C. V. La Fontaine, ‘The More Excellent Way’, *Nazarene Messenger* (July 19, 1906), 10-12.

¹²² La Fontaine, ‘More Excellent’, 10-12.

¹²³ I. G. Martin, ‘Gift of Tongues’, *Nazarene Messenger* (October 25, 1906), 3. This article was repeatedly published in Nazarene periodicals and also in *The Christian Witness*. For autobiographical information, see I. G. Martin, *Leaves from Life’s Pages* (Peniel, TX: Advocate, n. d.), and *My Scrapbook* (Mansfield, IL, 1936).

¹²⁴ Martin, ‘Gift of Tongues’, 3.

¹²⁵ Bangs, *Phineas F. Bresee*, 260.

congregation.¹²⁶ Together they comprised at least a portion of the ‘inner circle’ of Bresee’s confidants and local church leaders. The subject of Pentecostalism was obviously a matter of discussion, and the efforts of La Fontaine and Martin were initial reactions from Nazarene leadership to the emerging movement.

In the December 13, 1906, issue of *The Nazarene Messenger*, Bresee broke his silence:

Some months ago, among some of the colored¹²⁷ people in this city, re-enforced after a little with some whites, there began something which was called “the gift of tongues.” The meetings were held in a large rented building on Azusa Street . . . We made no mention of it in “The Messenger” . . . we did not care to give it the prominence of public discussion . . . Locally it is of small account both in numbers and influence . . . it has had, and has now, about as much influence as a pebble thrown into the sea; but what little influence it has had seems to be harmful.¹²⁸

Six months later, Bresee would write,

We receive many letters from different parts of the country in reference to the fanaticism and humbugs which seem to find in Los Angeles so congenial a soil . . . some word seems necessary. Among these are the so-called Gift of Tongues . . . we have very largely refrained from saying anything in reference to these things, knowing that Gamaliel’s philosophy is true and that they will come to naught . . . After waiting and giving opportunity for this so-called “Tongues” Movement to show what it really is, we are convinced that it is a most foolish and dangerous fanaticism.¹²⁹

Based upon correspondence received by Nazarene-associated periodicals, the rank and file of the PCN agreed, and yet they appeared to be intrigued. John Goodwin reports a visit by Dr Godbey to his Pasadena, California, PCN congregation. Godbey asked what they wished for him to talk about, and the response was tongues.¹³⁰

Conflict with Pentecostalism

¹²⁶ Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 141.

¹²⁷ For an explanation of the usage of the term ‘colored’, see 97n76 above.

¹²⁸ Bresee, ‘The Gift of Tongues’, *Nazarene Messenger* (December 13, 1906), 6.

¹²⁹ Bresee, ‘Fanaticism and Humbugs’, *Nazarene Messenger* (June 27, 1907), 6.

¹³⁰ Asa Sanner, *Life of John Goodwin* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1945), 93.

In the January 17, 1907, issue of *The Nazarene Messenger*, ‘Bro. St. Clair’ advised, ‘I am glad you are turning the light on that “Tongue Movement.” It will lead a number of honest souls into the wilderness. It is attempting to get a hold in Santa Rosa; but I believe a Nazarene church there with a wide-awake pastor would solve their problems’.¹³¹ In the same month, from New England, a Nazarene-affiliated magazine called *The Beulah Christian* acknowledged the Los Angeles event. Drawing from an article entitled ‘Satan Transformed’, originally printed in the *King’s Highway*, another Nazarene-affiliated magazine, both information and warning were provided:

Satan imitates the power of the Holy Spirit in outward demonstrations, as we sincerely believe is the case in the recent claims of people in Los Angeles, Cal., who claim that they have received the gift of tongues. None question the sincerity of these people, but there is every evidence that they have been deceived.¹³²

On January 17, 1907, in an issue of the *Pentecostal Advocate*, a Texas-based Nazarene-affiliated periodical, H. L. Averill commented,

Having been requested by several to write my view and experiences with the Tongues People . . . I will give you the following impressions. I will say I am perfectly confident there are many good people among them, and possibly some to whom God or the devil has given power to talk with other tongues.¹³³

¹³¹ Bro. St. Clair, ‘Milton, Cal.’, *Nazarene Messenger* (January 17, 1907), 5.

¹³² From *King’s Highway*, ‘Satan Transformed’, *Beulah Christian* (January 12, 1907), 3. Nazarenes were known for their own enthusiastic worship. Co-founder of the PCN, J. P. Widney, eventually withdrew from the church due to his distaste for their noisy worship. See Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 121, and Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 36. For biographical information on J. P. Widney, see Carl W. Rand and Dorts Sanders, *Joseph Pomeroy Widney: Physician and Mystic* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1970). Things would change. At the Seventh General Assembly, a resolution sought to curb what some apparently regarded as inappropriate emotion. The motion was introduced by N. B. Herrell and signed by Nazarene leaders J. B. Chapman, E. P. Ellyson, and others. It read, ‘We as a people are a happy, joyous crowd. We believe in preserving a spirit of liberty and emotional demonstration. But our very joyousness may at times open the way for unwarranted and even unwholesome demonstration . . . we wish to offer the following: Be it resolved, That the General Assembly expresses itself as looking with disfavor upon certain expressions of approval which have been employed in our services of worship and evangelism, particularly clapping of hands, stamping of feet, etc., and hereby request that such expressions of approval cease henceforth; and further, that this action be announced in each service until it becomes practically effective’. It is impossible to determine whether or not this concern was related to the impact of Pentecostalism or the maturation of the denomination. *Proceedings of the Seventh General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City, MO, 1928), 69.

¹³³ Averill had written an earlier article for *The Holiness Evangel*, headquartered in Pilot Point, Texas, entitled ‘The Apostolic Faith Movement’. R. L. Averill, ‘The Apostolic Faith Movement’, *The Holiness Evangel* (January 1, 1907), 1.

Later, on June 29, 1907, the editor of the *Beulah Christian* quipped, ‘Tongues are for a sign—to show how easily some folks can be duped’. By September 12, 1907, John Lipscomb wrote from Humble, Texas, ‘I found here the hardest fight of my life’s ministry. The Apostolic Faith, or Tongues people, as they are called, have unquestionably done the cause much harm here, as they go under the name of holiness. All halls and church halls were closed against us’.¹³⁴

On January 16, 1908, respected Nazarene minister A. O. Hendricks wrote ‘Beware of Fanaticism’, in which he noted, ‘Much is being said these days about the Baptism of the Holy Ghost’. After dealing with the nature of Spirit baptism and the initial evidence theory, Hendricks concluded, ‘Let us abide by the Word of God, rightly divided, and we will always have a sure foundation upon which to stand’.¹³⁵ Indeed, the issue of glossolalia was an issue amongst Nazarenes.

In the February 10, 1909, issue of the *Pentecostal Advocate*, editor B. F. Haynes fumed,

In my travels I have been pained at prevailing distortions or perversions of holiness. During the year 1909 I traversed this country from ocean to ocean and then to Florida, and, in nearly every section, I find bands or coteries of people who profess to have graduated from holiness into a “higher realm” called “tongue.” In some places, where these fanaticisms have had to bear their normal fruit, the historical progress has been from lying to lust and from lust to lunacy.¹³⁶

In March 1909 Arkansas Nazarene Joseph Speakes addressed the matter, which apparently continued to plague the Nazarene faithful:

It is an abundantly demonstrated fact that the tongues has been gotten by people who professed sanctification, justification and nothing. Oh, what a mess! Holiness professors, fire and third blessingists, Mormon, Dowieites, Parhamites, adulterers and

¹³⁴ John Lipscomb, *Pentecostal Advocate* (September 12, 1907), 12.

¹³⁵ A. O. Hendricks, ‘Beware of Fanaticism’, *Nazarene Messenger* (January 16, 1908), 2.

¹³⁶ B. F. Haynes, ‘Fanaticism and Its Progeny’, *Pentecostal Advocate* (February 10, 1909), 2. For biographical information on Haynes, see ‘B. F. Haynes’, in Ivan Beals, *75 Years of Heralding Scriptural Holiness by the Editors of “The Herald of Holiness”* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1987), 7-32, and B. F. Haynes, *Tempest Tossed on Methodist Seas; or, A Sketch of My Life* (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1921).

nothings!! What a tower of Babel! My God, save us from such a confusion of tongues.¹³⁷

In April 1909 General Superintendent H. F. Reynolds reported cancellations in his travel schedule due to the inroads of Pentecostalism.¹³⁸ In the same issue of *The Holiness Evangel*, W. F. Dallas offered an article on the subject of ‘The Third Blessing or the Unknown Tongues’: ‘Beloved, I feel it my duty to call attention to this error which is being taught in our midst and which is producing discord and bringing hurt to the cause of Bible Holiness in Arkansas’.¹³⁹ From Emmett, Arkansas, E. A. Snell confided his concerns with the readers of *The Holiness Evangel*:

We found the “tongues movement” in this settlement. If you ever come face to face with this awful delusion you will be made to know there is an almost irresistible power about it that you have got to fight like fighting the Devil himself . . . it will come upon you unsought for, and there is but one way to get rid of it, and that is to fast and pray until you pray through and break the spell.¹⁴⁰

The editor of *The Holiness Evangel* concluded that ‘many have been shipwrecked by this fearful error’.¹⁴¹

On June 19, 1909, the *Beulah Christian* carried an article by respected Nazarene educator, Olive Winchester,¹⁴² entitled ‘The Gift of Tongues’, in which she commented, ‘Among the divisions which Satan has devised in these days to turn the attention of the children of the Lord from the thought of a pure, holy life, replete with simple faith, has been the desire for “the gift of tongues”’.¹⁴³

¹³⁷ Joseph N. Speakes, ‘The Bible Evidence’, *The Holiness Evangel* (March 24, 1909), 1. William F. Manley, editor of *The Household of Faith*, responded to the Speakes article in June 1909 with a rebuttal entitled ‘The Bible Evidence’. Manley offered the opinion that ‘our dear brother [Speakes] is incompetent to write on this subject’. Manley, ‘The Bible Evidence’, *The Household of Faith* (June 1909), 12.

¹³⁸ ‘Bro. Reynolds’s Letter’, *The Holiness Evangel* (April 14, 1909), 8.

¹³⁹ Dallas, ‘The Third Blessing or the Unknown Tongues’, *The Holiness Evangel* (April 14, 1909), 1.

¹⁴⁰ E. A. Snell, ‘Reports from the Field—Emmett, Arkansas’, *The Holiness Evangel* (September 15, 1909), 8.

¹⁴¹ ‘The Tongues Movement’, *The Holiness Evangel* (November 17, 1909), 1.

¹⁴² For biographical information on Olive Winchester, see R. Stanley Ingersol, ‘Olive Winchester’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 328-329.

¹⁴³ Olive Winchester, ‘The Gift of Tongues’, *Beulah Christian* (June 19, 1909), 4.

In November 1909 E. P. Ellyson,¹⁴⁴ the president of Texas Holiness University in Peniel, Texas, and later Nazarene General Superintendent, wrote in *The Pentecostal Advocate*, noting ‘with profound regret’ that the ‘work of God in some places is being marred by what is generally known as the Tongue Movement’.¹⁴⁵ From Plainview, Kansas, came word that ‘The Nazarene church is having a hard time . . . The Tongues people came in and captured some of the very best people in the holiness ranks’.¹⁴⁶ Three years later in 1914, J. T. Stanfield again addressed the matter of the ‘Unknown Tongues’ in the pages of *The Pentecostal Messenger*:

One of the worst, most hurtful, deceptive and damning heresies that the devil has brought against the holiness movement is the modern Apostolic (so-called) unknown tongue craze. When the writer first read of the movement and some wonderful manifestations, as published by the leaders . . . we were somewhat impressed with the work; but after attending their meetings and working with them and investigating thoroughly the theory, and hearing them preach, pray and testify in the so-called unknown tongues, we became thoroughly convinced that it was a delusion of Satan.¹⁴⁷

In 1917 J. C. Henson, district superintendent of the Hamlin (Texas) district, wrote,

I visited and dedicated the church at Plainfield, Texas. This is the second church building for them at that place. The first one it seems wasn’t deeded just right and the tongues folks got in there and gave them so much trouble that they pulled out and built another nice church.¹⁴⁸

Not only were the pages of periodicals replete with awareness and warning of Pentecostalism, but concerned ministers addressed the issue with specific literary efforts.

Around 1908, Benjamin Neely published *The Bible Versus the Tongues Theory*.¹⁴⁹ Two years

¹⁴⁴ For biographical information on Edgar Ellyson, see R. Stanley Ingersol, ‘Edgar Painter Ellyson’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 104.

¹⁴⁵ *Pentecostal Advocate* (November 25, 1909), 5.

¹⁴⁶ C. E. Roberts, ‘Abilene District’, *Pentecostal Advocate* (May 19, 1910), 10.

¹⁴⁷ J. T. Stanfield, ‘The Unknown Tongues’, *The Pentecostal Messenger* (July 1, 1914), 2.

¹⁴⁸ J. H. Henson, ‘Hamlin District’, *Herald of Holiness* (January 17, 1917).

¹⁴⁹ B. F. Neely, *The Bible Versus the Tongues Theory* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, n. d.).

later in 1910, A. M. Hills wrote a volume entitled *The Tongues Movement*.¹⁵⁰ In 1925 in California, Nazarene John Matthews published *Speaking in Tongues*,¹⁵¹ and in 1926, Georgia Nazarene Pascal Belew offered *Light on the Tongues Question*.¹⁵²

There was a reason Nazarene leaders continued to criticise the ‘tongues movement’ and even warn Nazarene people of what was perceived to be its error. The dictum of Bresee that the Pentecostal Movement was ‘of little note’ was hardly borne out by the evidence. The extent to which Pentecostalism affected the CN has been a matter of debate. Carl Bangs protests strongly, claiming that Nazarenes were untouched by its influence: ‘There is no real evidence that Bresee lost members to the Pentecostals or that there was any real contact between his church and their movement’.¹⁵³ Synan counters that the reason Bresee opposed Pentecostalism was that ‘it was a threat to his own congregation’.¹⁵⁴

In the widest perspective, it is clear that Nazarenes were both aware of and curious about (if not interested in) the emerging movement. References in periodicals indicate that ministers followed its progress, studied its theology, and assessed its merits and demerits. Many (perhaps most) appear to have been ultimately convinced that it was, at the least, a hindrance, with others assigning the movement to satanic influence. It would be difficult to quantify the numerical losses the CN suffered. It is known that at least two churches were lost in the greater Los Angeles area. Cecil Robeck identifies two specific congregations:

The Elysian Heights Nazarene Church sustained significant losses when it expelled those who had accepted the message of Azusa Street. Second Pentecostal Church of

¹⁵⁰ A. M. Hills, *The Tongues Movement* (Manchester, UK: Star Hall, 1910). For biographical information on Aaron Merritt Hills, see L. Paul Gresham, *Waves Against Gibraltar: A Memoir of Dr. A.M. Hills, 1848-1935* (Bethany, OK: Southern Nazarene University Press, 1992), and Branstetter, *Purity, Power*, 226-233. Branstetter speaks to what he calls Hills’s ‘disdain for the Pentecostals’. He summarises the objections of Hills to Pentecostalism to be its threat to true revival, its glossolalia-centred understanding of Spirit baptism, and its mystical epistemology. Branstetter, 46, 231.

¹⁵¹ John Matthews, *Speaking in Tongues* (Kansas City, MO: n.p., 1925).

¹⁵² Pascal Belew, *Light on the Tongues Question* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1926).

¹⁵³ Bangs, *Phineas F. Bresee*, 230.

¹⁵⁴ Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1997), 145.

the Nazarene suffered heavy damage when its pastor left with a large percentage of the congregation after they were baptized in the Spirit.¹⁵⁵

While the leaders of the PCN held steady against the encroaching doctrine, there were defections of note and influence.

*Defections to Pentecostalism*¹⁵⁶

Herbert Buffum was a well-known hymn writer and musician, having written the familiar gospel song 'He Abides'. Born in Illinois, he was converted in Kansas on January 22, 1897, and shortly after moved to Southern California.¹⁵⁷ He was given credentials by the CN and worked extensively as a song evangelist. While busy in revivals, Buffum penned a note to *The Nazarene* saying, 'He sends much love to the "dear Nazarenes"'.¹⁵⁸ Speaking of his own growth in grace, he commented, 'I am praying for more love. I have adopted a little suggestion from Wesley, "It is dangerous to pray for anything but love," no danger of

¹⁵⁵ Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 189. Robeck identifies the pastor of the Second Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene as Franklin Hill who, upon leaving the PCN, organised the Vernon Pentecostal Mission on Central Avenue in Los Angeles. Robeck also identifies a Rev and Mrs Charles Kent as former Nazarene pastors who established a mission on Fifty-First Street in Los Angeles. See Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 95. The Vernon Street Mission seems to have been directly affected as well. See *Nazarene Messenger* (August 6, 1908). A third congregation in the greater Los Angeles area withdrew from the denomination over the issue of glossolalia: 'The members of Pasadena Grace Church, a black Nazarene church, always enjoyed an emotional style of worship that was Pentecostal in tone. Eventually, the congregation and its pastor became tongues advocates and requested permission to withdraw from the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene . . . the district granted the request'. Mallalieu Wilson, *William C. Wilson: The Fifth General Superintendent* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1995), 63.

¹⁵⁶ C. E. Roberts was associated with the Rest Cottage in Pilot Point, Texas. Rest Cottage was founded in 1903 by Rev and Mrs J. P. Roberts (C. E. Roberts was a brother of J. P. Roberts) in Pilot Point, Texas. As a compassion ministry associated with the Holiness movement and later the Church of the Nazarene, Rest Cottage was established as a home for unmarried mothers and a child placement agency. Rest Cottage served thousands of 'erring' girls through 1975. See <https://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/taro/utarl/00198/arl-00198.html> (accessed August 2, 2021). C. E. Roberts and his wife, Mae Roberts, left the Church of the Nazarene over the matter of glossolalia. See L. F. Turnbull, 'Nazarene Preacher Receives Pentecost Is Open for Meetings', *Pentecost Evangel* (December 6, 1924), 12. Cunningham says that when they wished to return, they had to defend themselves by saying they had never personally spoken in tongues, that they believed glossolalia was one of the gifts of the Spirit but not the initial evidence of the baptism of the Spirit. Cunningham, *Our Watchword and Song*, 243-244. Nazarene Archives cannot confirm that they returned to the CN.

¹⁵⁷ For biographical information on Herbert Buffum, see Herbert Buffum, *From Stage to Pulpit: The Personal Experience of Evangelist Herbert Buffum* (Topeka, KS: author, 1913). For a more complete review of his life and the songs he wrote, see Wayne Warner, 'Herbert Buffum', *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6, no. 3 (Fall 1986): 11-14.

¹⁵⁸ Herbert Buffum, letter in *The Nazarene* (November 23, 1899), 4.

modification or fanaticism on that line'.¹⁵⁹ Field reports from the Buffums were frequent in *The Christian Witness*. In 1910 Buffum initiated a periodical called *Gold Tried in the Fire*.

In 1904 Buffum left the PCN and associated with the Burning Bush,¹⁶⁰ and by 1913 he had joined the Church of God in Christ (White), which consisted of a group of Pentecostal ministers in the South and Southwest.¹⁶¹ With this change came an allegiance to Pentecostalism, which was reflected in his periodical. While his allegiance had earlier been to the holiness message and the PCN, his transition prompted an intense loyalty to Pentecostalism. Reading in *The Pillar of Fire* the derisive comments of Alma White towards Pentecostalism, Buffum replied in print,

We know that her paper has published falsehoods which were never corrected even when attention was called to the error. But thank God this turkey-buzzed vomit cannot hinder the great work of God. Might as well use a small squirt-gun on a Chicago fire or dam the Niagara with tooth-picks as to stop the onward march of God's truth.¹⁶²

In 1920 his wife, Lillie, was given ministerial credentials with the AG, but there is no record of Buffum joining since he was not convinced of the doctrine of initial evidence. He died on October 9, 1939, in Long Beach, California. There is no record of Buffum personally speaking in tongues, but there is no question that he identified with the Pentecostal people.

Charles 'Charlie' Robinson of Bethany, Oklahoma, was an evangelist in the CN. By his own testimony, he held 276 revivals, pastored eight years, and built three large buildings in a period of about twenty-five years.¹⁶³ His sermon, 'David Bringing Home the Ark', was

¹⁵⁹ Buffum, letter in *The Nazarene*, 4.

¹⁶⁰ See Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*, 129, 204. There are no known reasons for his change from the Nazarenes to the Burning Bush. Buffum had been an adamant opponent of the MCA (Burning Bush), but in a letter dated December 9, 1904, he seems to have espoused a more radical frame of mind. In the letter, Buffum concludes, 'the only people as a body of holiness professors who are on the straight track are the Burning Bush and the Pillar of Fire follows'. 'From Nazarene Evangelist—Herbert Buffum's Rebuff and Confession', *The Burning Bush* (December 29, 1904), 11.

¹⁶¹ See W. E. Warner, 'Church of God in Christ (White)', in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 203-204. Buffum is listed as an ordained elder in the COGIC (White). See *Word and Witness* (December 20, 1913).

¹⁶² Herbert Buffum, *Gold Tried in the Fire* (April 1913), 7.

¹⁶³ Charles C. Robinson, *Baptism of the Holy Ghost* (Austin, TX: author, n.d.), 4.

included in *The Nazarene Pulpit*, published in 1925.¹⁶⁴ The volume contained sermons by Nazarene luminaries, including Bud Robinson,¹⁶⁵ E. P. Ellyson, J. B. Chapman,¹⁶⁶ and others. He testified, ‘I had preached all up and down the land, “You must have the Baptism of the Holy Ghost,” but the latter-day glossolalia was, to my mind, fanaticism’.¹⁶⁷

In April 1930, while pastoring the CN in Childress, Texas, he was invited to attend a Pentecostal gathering. Upon observation, he began to reassess his previous stance regarding glossolalia. In his own words, ‘My prejudice began to crumble like melting snow under a burning sun’.¹⁶⁸ Invited to the platform to lead in public prayer, Robinson began speaking in other tongues.¹⁶⁹ Robinson was aware that professing the experience would require him to leave his church home, the CN. Robinson joined the AG and spent his final forty-two years as an ordained AG minister.¹⁷⁰

J. D. ‘Jack’ Saunders was a minister in the CN.¹⁷¹ Saunders’s pulpit ministry took him to an unknown venue in California where, during the service, the area was shaken by an earthquake. Saunders observed that the Pentecostals on the ground floor of the large auditorium were not frightened but were worshipping and praising God. He determined that those were his people. Saunders moved to Canada, where he served in the Pentecostal

¹⁶⁴ *The Nazarene Pulpit* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1925), 135-141.

¹⁶⁵ For biographical information on Bud Robinson, see Bud Robinson, *Sunshine and Smiles: Life Story, Flashlights, Sayings and Sermons* (Chicago: Christian Witness, 1903), Reuben Robinson, *My Life’s Story* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1928), and J. B. Chapman, *Bud Robinson: A Brother Beloved* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1943).

¹⁶⁶ For biographical information on J. B. Chapman, see David Shelby Corlett, *Spirit-Filled: The Life of the Rev. James Blaine Chapman* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1947).

¹⁶⁷ Robinson, *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, 21-22.

¹⁶⁸ Robinson, 20.

¹⁶⁹ For his tongues conversion story, see Robinson, 22-23, and Brumback, *Suddenly*, 306.

¹⁷⁰ See Harold Paul, *Dan T. Muse: From Printer’s Devil to Bishop* (Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1976), 15.

¹⁷¹ For biographical information regarding the life and ministry of J. D. Saunders, see Thomas Miller, *Canadian Pentecostals: A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada* (Mississauga, ON: Full Gospel, 1994), 136-39, Douglas Rudd, *When the Spirit Came Upon Them: Highlights from the Early Years of the Pentecostal Movement in Canada* (Mississauga, ON: Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, 2002), 167-171, and J. D. Saunders, ‘35 Years of Ministry’, *The Pentecostal Testimony* (July 1996), 8-9, 21. The ministry of Saunders in the CN is acknowledged by Rudd, *When The Spirit Came Upon Them*, 167, and by W. E. McAlister, ‘J.D. Saunders Called Home: An Appreciation’, *The Pentecostal Testimony* (November 1962), 9. For his testimony, see Jack Saunders, ‘Out of the Mouth of Hell: Wonderful Conversion of a Prize Fighter in the British Navy’, *The Latter Rain Evangel* (November 1919), 2-8.

Association of Canada as both evangelist and pastor and was recognised as one of the ‘most colourful’ of the Pentecostal evangelists. He was known for his powerful evangelistic ministry and for remarkable healings, which accompanied his emphasis on the subject of divine healing. Upon Saunders’s death on August 31, 1962, Walter McAlister offered the following tribute:

He was a forceful personality, with firm convictions, and an unusual grasp of the great truths of the Word of God. Supernatural signs followed his preaching of the Word. Under his ministry multitudes were saved, many were healed by the power of God, and many were filled with the Holy Spirit.¹⁷²

Douglas Rudd referred to him as one of the ‘pioneers’ of Canadian Pentecostalism.¹⁷³

Effect of Pentecostalism on the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene

Admittedly, the influence of Pentecostalism did not reach the upper echelon of Nazarene ministerial or lay leadership, although persons within the denomination clearly found the new understanding attractive. Homer Tomlinson records an instructive comment from Bud Robinson. In response to the suggestion that the separating Pentecostals were ‘trash’, Robinson is said to have responded, ‘No sister, they are getting our most spiritual people’.¹⁷⁴ Statistical data is extremely difficult to evaluate because attendance numbers in conference minutes do not identify the cause for shifts in attendance. Whatever the impact of Pentecostalism numerically upon the CN, there was concern about misidentifying the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene with the Pentecostalism of ‘tongues speaking’.¹⁷⁵ At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Missionary Board held at Kansas City, October 28, 1914, the following recommendation was made:

Whereas, the word “Pentecostal” in our name is so frequently associating our Church with other movements in all lands, making it difficult for us, and sometimes

¹⁷² McAlister, ‘J. D. Saunders Called Home’, 9.

¹⁷³ Rudd, *When the Spirit Came Upon Them*, 31-221.

¹⁷⁴ Homer Tomlinson, ed., *Diary of A.J. Tomlinson*, vol. 1 (New York: Church of God World Headquarters, 1949), 71.

¹⁷⁵ See Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 319-320.

unfortunate, we suggest to the various District Assemblies to consider the propriety of their memorializing the General Assembly in reference to its elimination from our name.¹⁷⁶

The matter would not be resolved quickly or easily. There was concern that the New England-based Association of Pentecostal Churches, which had merged with the Nazarene Church at the Chicago General Assembly in 1907, might take offence. Persons loyal to the name could identify with the reasoning of Etna Goodlett, who wrote to the *Herald of Holiness* in the March 5, 1919, issue,

If we, as a church or individuals belonging to the church have the Pentecostal baptism we should not let what some term a “fanatic” or “new-fangled” doctrine cheat us out of our name. No matter what they call themselves, let us stick to what we are, really members of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. It would do the Devil a lot of good to get us scared, for fear the “tongues” movement or “Apostolic” people might injure our reputation, and cause us to lose our influence for good.¹⁷⁷

Rev C. H. Alger wrote to the *Herald of Holiness* suggesting that the change be approved, but that it be done quietly. His reasoning was

This seems a matter of little importance and also one that too much may be said about for our own good as a church. By calling the attention of the public to the name “Pentecostal” which is being used so extensively by the “tongues people” and other small radical organizations, that when the word “Pentecostal” is seen in connection with our church name our church is at once classed as a similar movement, is only to belittle our denomination in the eyes of the world.¹⁷⁸

All concerned were conscious of the increasingly prevalent Pentecostal Movement.

At the Fifth General Assembly of the PCN, the *Manual* Committee presented its report, saying in part, ‘That the name of the church be changed from “The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene” to the “Church of the Nazarene”’.¹⁷⁹ On the seventh day of the Fifth General Assembly, October 1, 1919, the *Minutes* of the General Assembly reported, ‘A motion was presented that paragraph 1, relative to change of name of the church, be adopted.

¹⁷⁶ This letter is held by the CN Archives Department.

¹⁷⁷ Etna Goodlett, ‘The Question of Our Church Name’, *Herald of Holiness* (March 5, 1919), 5-6.

¹⁷⁸ C. H. Alger, ‘Shall We Change the Name?’, *Herald of Holiness* (January 29, 1919), 5.

¹⁷⁹ ‘Standing Committee Reports No. 2 Manual’, *Minutes of the Fifth General Assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene*, 102.

After prayer by General Superintendent H. F. Reynolds,¹⁸⁰ the vote was taken and paragraph 1 was adopted'.¹⁸¹ The *Minutes* do not record the actual vote tally, but the result was that the word 'Pentecostal' had been removed from the name of what was arguably the largest holiness denomination in the AHM.

Summary

The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene was unequivocally opposed to Pentecostalism based on theology, experience, and worship practices.¹⁸² But as the two decades under review neared an end, it would appear that the pragmatic aspect of institutional health and identity became a growing concern. There is evidence of numeric loss culminating in lost congregations, and while the major denominational leadership remained committed to the denominational ethos, the growth of Pentecostalism challenged their denominational identity. While the church would remain intact, the name change indicates that the emerging Pentecostalism had aroused concern and caused a major shift in how the church would present itself to the public. The abandonment of the term 'Pentecostal' did not represent a theological adjustment but, rather, reflected concern about image and the public presentation of the doctrine/experience of entire sanctification, which was a primary theological tenet of Nazarene understanding and evangelism. As Black and Drury observe,

Since *Pentecostal* was commonly used as a synonym for *holiness* and since holiness authors and writers often employed Pentecostal terminology . . . the potential for popular confusion of the holiness movement with Pentecostal-*ism* was great.¹⁸³

Nazarenes specifically, and the AHM in general, did not want that confusion to exist.

¹⁸⁰ For biographical information on H. F. Reynolds, see R. Stanley Ingersol, 'Hiram Farnham Reynolds', in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 250-251.

¹⁸¹ *Minutes*, 33.

¹⁸² Opposition to Pentecostalism from within the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene was not expressed in conference journals as was the case with the Wesleyan Methodist Connection. Rather, it was noted in denominational periodicals, letters to editors, and publications by Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene ministers.

¹⁸³ Black and Drury, *The Wesleyan Church*, 131.

2.6 Alma White and the Pillar of Fire

The most vitriolic response to Pentecostalism from within the AHM came from Alma White, the founder and Bishop of the Pentecostal Union, later known as the Pillar of Fire.¹⁸⁴ White was born June 16, 1862, in Lewis County, Kentucky.¹⁸⁵ As a child she knew a Methodist upbringing and testified to conversion as a teenager under the ministry of Dr W. B. Godbey. Moving west to teach school, she met and married Kent White, a Methodist minister, on December 21, 1887, but the union was not a happy one. By 1909 the relationship would be severed by separation, never to be united again.¹⁸⁶ During this period Alma had realised her teenage ambition to become a minister. Working outside the bounds of the Methodist Church, she organised the fruit of her evangelistic efforts under the name Pentecostal Union and subsequently was ordained in 1918 by Dr W. B. Godbey, becoming the first woman bishop of any ecclesiastical organisation in North America.¹⁸⁷

Stern in temperament and strong in action, her disposition to see issues in clearly defined terms allowed her to join hands with movements of a similar mind. For a time, she was associated with the MCA in Chicago, Illinois, accepting their extreme worship form of

¹⁸⁴ The date for the name change was May 7, 1917. White explains the name change: ‘Our business had been transacted under the name, The Pentecostal Union, but as the years slipped by we had become better known by the name of our weekly official publication, the *Pillar of Fire*; and it was decided to transfer the holdings in real estate to the corporation in this name’. Alma White, *The Story of My Life*, vol. 4 (Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1938), 141. Suggestions that Pentecostal was dropped from the name due to confusion with Pentecostalism are not confirmed in White’s writings.

¹⁸⁵ See Susie Cunningham Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire: The Life of Alma White*, Gertrude Wolfram, *The Widow of Zarephath: A Church in the Making* (Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1954), and Robinson, ‘Alma White and the Pillar of Fire Movement’, 32-44. White wrote an autobiography entitled *The Story of My Life*. It was first published in six volumes during the years 1919-1934. It was later published in five volumes during the years 1935-1943. References in this thesis will be to the 1935 edition.

¹⁸⁶ Alma White published her perception of the separation and attempts at reconciliation in a volume entitled *My Heart and My Husband* (Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1923). Further reflections were found in volumes 1-3 of *The Story of My Life*. James Robinson seems to portray the perspective of Kent White. See James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Holiness Pentecostal Transition Years: 1895-1906* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013), 32-44. Susie Stanley comments that Alma White never mentioned the stigma of marital separation and its possible impact on her ministry or her profession of entire sanctification. Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire*, 71.

¹⁸⁷ For a discussion of White’s role in the advancement of feminism, see Nichole Kathryn Kathol, ‘The Power of Christ Compelled Her: The Intersectional Identities and Cultural Logic of Bishop Alma B. White’, (PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2010).

‘jumping’.¹⁸⁸ Later she would find common ground with the KKK in their battle against Catholicism, going so far as to pen a volume entitled *The Ku Klux Klan in Prophecy*.¹⁸⁹ From this background, it is necessary to conclude that her response to ‘tongues speaking’ was not due to its radical nature or excessive emotionalism. The impetus for the animus White held for the budding movement appears to have come from deeper motivation relating to her relationship with her husband, who had adopted Pentecostalism.¹⁹⁰

Rejection of Pentecostalism and William J. Seymour

Alma White’s first meeting with Pentecostalism and William J. Seymour predates the Azusa Street outpouring in 1906. Seymour had been called to pastor a congregation in Los Angeles. In transit he visited the headquarters of the Pillar of Fire organisation in Denver, Colorado.¹⁹¹ White related that in the spring of 1906

A colored man by the name of Seymour called at our Bible School in Denver, Colorado. I did not know of his presence until he was brought into the dining room by someone who had been taking him through the building. He introduced himself as being a man of God, and said he was on his way to Los Angeles, California. His appearance aroused my curiosity and at the close of the meal I called on him to pray.

¹⁸⁸ See Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*, 122-124.

¹⁸⁹ Stanley says White discovered an ally in the Klan, ‘an organization that shared not only her anti-Catholicism, fervent patriotism, and nativism but also her militant opposition to modernist theology’. Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire*, 87. White avowed an early aversion to the group and declared, ‘My people are not members of the Klan but we agree with some of the things that they stand for . . .’. The reluctance faded and a blessing was extended, verbally wrapping them in the memory of American Revolutionary soldiers. For discussion of White’s relationship to the KKK, see Alma White, *Ku Klux Klan in Prophecy*, 70-71, 91, 118. The original Klan was organised in 1867 for the general purpose of restoring white rule in the defeated Confederate States. By 1882 it had largely disappeared but was renewed in 1915 by a Methodist local preacher named William J. Simmons over concerns about immigration and its Catholic influence. Those values resonated with White, and she was not alone. NHA evangelist William Jones commented, ‘To us as a nation God has committed a great trust. We must care for our own land with the great multitude of those continually coming to our shores’. William Jones, *From Elim to Carmel: Christian Aspects of Doctrine and Experience* (Boston: Christian Witness, 1895), 78. For discussion of the Klan and Christianity, see Lynn S. Neal, ‘Christianizing the Klan: Alma White, Branford Clarke, and the Art of Religious Tolerance’, *Church History* 78, no. 2 (2009): 350-378.

¹⁹⁰ ‘In 1909, because of doctrinal issues, he severed his connection with the Pillar of Fire. In 1909 Kent White adopted the usage of glossolalia associating with the Apostolic Faith. Later he joined the Apostolic Faith Movement in England’. James White, *The National Cyclopedic of American Biography*, vol. 35 (New York: James T. White, 1949), 152. He was associated with W. Oliver Hutchinson of Bournemouth, England. See Cecil Robeck Jr., ‘Kent White’, in Stanley Burgess, ed., *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 1194.

¹⁹¹ Frank Bartleman was also present for a time at the Pillar of Fire headquarters. Bartleman said, ‘Brother Kent White had a very tender spirit, but his wife was hard and tyrannical’. Bartleman, *From Plow to Pulpit*, 90.

He responded with a good deal of fervor, but before he had finished I felt that serpents and other slimy creatures were creeping around me.¹⁹²

She further described his appearance in unflattering terms: ‘He was very untidy in his appearance, wearing no collar, and had a greenish-looking brass button exposed in the band of his shirt’.¹⁹³ She concluded her account of this brief visit with a negative assessment: ‘I had met all kinds of religious fakirs and tramps but I felt this excelled them all’.¹⁹⁴ Seymour biographers acknowledge the visit, although Seymour himself did not record it. Larry Martin attributes her negative reaction to racial prejudice.¹⁹⁵ It must be noted that the record and assessment of Seymour’s visit did not appear until 1910 with the publishing of White’s volume, *Demons and Tongues*. In the intervening years, the defection of her husband to the burgeoning movement left her with a bitter outlook against Pentecostalism, perhaps colouring her memory of Seymour’s visit.

White’s subsequent attendance at ‘a hall in Los Angeles where the Tongues people were conducting a service’ confirmed her worst suspicions. Irregularities in worship forms and social norms were disturbing. Her perception of religious fraud, both as to testimony and experience, confirmed to her the earlier testimony of the ‘feel of the serpent’. There was ‘An

¹⁹² Alma White, *Demons and Tongues* (Bound Brook, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1910), 67.

¹⁹³ White, *Demons and Tongues*, 67. Synan suggests that the critique of Seymour ‘was probably colored by her theological propensities as well as racial prejudice’. Synan, *The Holiness and Pentecostal Movements*, 105n25. For negative assessment of Alma White, see Kristin Kandt, ‘Historical Essay: In the Name of God; An American Story of Feminism, Racism, and Religious Intolerance: The Story of Alma Bridwell White’, *Journal of Gender, Social Policy and the Law* 8, no. 3 (2000): 753-794. Seymour’s unkempt appearance may possibly be attributed to inferior travel accommodations for African Americans on trains. Amanda Smith comments on this problem: ‘When on my way to California last January, a year ago, if I had been white I could have stopped at a hotel, but being black, though a lone woman, I was obliged to stay all night in the waiting room at Austin, Texas, though I arrived at ten p.m. . . . I could not go in and have a cup of tea or a dinner at a hotel or restaurant. There may be places in these cities where colored people may be accommodated, but generally they are proscribed, and that sometimes makes it very inconvenient’. Smith, *Colored Evangelist*, 115-118.

¹⁹⁴ White, *Demons*, 67-68.

¹⁹⁵ Martin, *Seymour*, 5. Martin says bluntly, ‘She was a racist’. The issue of race does seem to have been prominent in the mind of White and the Pillar of Fire. In her volume, *Demons and Tongues*, there are nine references to colored people. In an article submitted by Charles Bridwell, the brother of Alma White, entitled ‘Fanatical Sect in Los Angeles Claims Gift of Tongues’, there are eleven references to race. See Charles Bridwell, ‘Fanatical Sect’, *Rocky Mountain Pillar of Fire* (June 13, 1906), 4-5. While there is no specific evidence that she rejected glossolalia due to race, there can be no question that her opinions regarding race were demeaning to African Americans. Writing in *Demons and Tongues*, she said, ‘The colored people are the descendants of Ham; and all are familiar with the conditions which caused God to send a curse on Ham, who was one of the sons of Noah . . . Ham who had the first opportunity [to cover his father Noah’s nakedness] failed to do so . . . He was a man, who no doubt, was given to fleshly lusts’. White, *Demons and Tongues*, 102.

unseen power at work . . . no one can deny, but its origin is from the underworld. Years of experience have proved to me that this movement is the devil's Pentecost and that its fruit is wholly corrupt'.¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, 'Demons of lust stalk to and fro in their assemblies, prey upon these victims of the flesh, and lead them into Satan's slime-pits, sealing their doom for damnation'.¹⁹⁷ But the Pillar of Fire would be diligent in its opposition: 'By God's help, we expect to wield this sword [the Word of God] until the field has been cleared of those whose claims are utterly false'.¹⁹⁸

White's concerns were buttressed by the testimony of a former member of 'The Burning Bush', who was 'turned over for a short-time to this awful delusion from which the Lord in his infinite mercy delivered him'.¹⁹⁹ He testified of his journey to Los Angeles, California, and the Azusa Street Mission:

In the very first meeting I attended I thought this to be the power of God. I was perfectly honest . . . before realizing it, I found myself at the altar trembling under this demon power. At once, I felt someone take hold of my head, and a shaky, trembling colored woman held my head probably for a half hour, without any possibility of my getting loose. At last I was relieved, but this strange power still had hold of me.²⁰⁰

Sulger went on to describe his life of subjection to spirits, his fear, and finally his deliverance. In the mind of Alma White, this testimony was confirmation of her worst fears of Pentecostalism.

Rejection of Pentecostalism Based on Prophetic Understanding

In addition to White's instinctive rejection of Pentecostalism, there was her understanding of the role of Israel in the divine scheme of eschatology. She understood the

¹⁹⁶ White, *Demons*, 114-115.

¹⁹⁷ White, 108.

¹⁹⁸ White, 108.

¹⁹⁹ A. Sulger, 'Delivered from the "Tongue" Heresy', *Rocky Mountain Pillar of Fire* (March 27, 1907), 6.

²⁰⁰ Sulger, 'Delivered', 6-7. Sulger subsequently submitted articles entitled 'The Devil's Tongues' (May 1, 1907), 8-9, 'The Tongues: False Prophets and Two-Faced Devils' (May 9, 1907), 6-7, and 'The Tongue Devil' (May 22, 1907), 3, 14.

return of the Prodigal Son in Luke 16 to be a type of the return of Israel to Palestine.²⁰¹ She further believed, from Ezekiel 47, that with Israel's return to its native land, Israel would become a conduit for the message of salvation to the world. White understood the 'tongues movement' to be a satanic effort to hinder, if not defeat, this divine plan. She wrote that, while messengers of salvation under the new covenant will be going to the

ends of the earth, all eyes will be turned toward Jerusalem where God will tread the winepress of His wrath in the destruction of anti-Christ. Great miracles will be performed . . . and men will speak with new tongues—not the counterfeit tongues that Satan has abroad in the land today, but real tongues, enabling them to preach the Gospel to the heathen and others so as to be understood. To prove the claims of the Gentiles to be false, in appropriating the promises of Israel to themselves, the counterfeit Tongues Movement, or the so-called Latter Rain, had to come. The winds of perdition have blown, scattering this false movement over nearly all the face of the earth—but nothing has been accomplished except to sink people into deeper depths of Spiritism, or old-time witchcraft operating under the name of Pentecost. Their so-called tongues are nothing more than the gibberish, or mutterings of witches and wizards.²⁰²

Here White's objections to glossolalia take on a theological perspective in an eschatological setting.

Rejection of Pentecostalism Based on Conflicted Marital Relationship

Whatever her theological resistance to Pentecostalism, it is hard to separate it from her own marital disappointment. Her husband, Kent White, was attracted to the Pentecostal Movement in the fall of 1908. Alma White recorded,

On reaching Denver he [Kent White] attended some meetings of the so called Pentecostals, Latter Rain or Tongues people which proved to be a trap set for him set by the devil. He now repudiated his former belief and the doctrines he had advocated . . . and became completely carried away with this latter-day sorcery which he had previously denounced, by both tongue and pen, as a vine of Satan.²⁰³

She explained that the occasion of his attraction was 'While seeking relief for some physical ailment [and] being attracted by the testimonies of healing being given by some of its

²⁰¹ Alma White, *Restoration of Israel: The Hope of the World* (Zarephath, NJ: Pentecostal Union, 1917), 60-73.

²⁰² White, *Restoration*, 148.

²⁰³ White, *My Life*, vol. 3, 97.

followers'.²⁰⁴ Simply said, Kent became enamoured with Pentecostalism, and this was totally unacceptable to Alma. After several attempts at reconciliation of their marriage, all of which dealt with the matter of his involvement with Pentecostalism, Kent left Alma on August 13, 1909. For Alma, the damage to her marriage was devastating. There would be no turning back, domestically or theologically. She reflected pensively, perhaps with thoughts of Kent,

I know of some who have become so hardened under the influence of this demoniacal power that they are entirely unlike what they once were. They turn away in cold indifference from those who are suffering on their account, and manifest no sympathy toward those whose hearts they are breaking or have broken.²⁰⁵

Summary

Without the complications of her marital relationship, Alma White and the Pillar of Fire would no doubt have opposed Pentecostalism. Theological objections appear to be eschatological and not defensive of the doctrine of Christian perfection, although that may overstate the case. Institutional stability was a concern as well.

My greatest concern was for the reputation of our society on which there had never been a stain or a real cause of reproach . . . I feared our movement would be confused with this latter-day sorcery, and that more harm would result than could be lived down in the next quarter of a century.²⁰⁶

But unique to the Pillar of Fire and Pentecostalism is the defection of a primary leader and spouse of the founder. There is no evidence that the denomination suffered extensive inroads from Pentecostal thought or proclamation.

2.7 Holiness Church of California

In 1880, MEC minister Hardin Wallace,²⁰⁷ Free Methodist minister Henry Ashcraft,²⁰⁸ and Methodist musician James Jayns,²⁰⁹ arrived in Southern California for the

²⁰⁴ White, *My Life*, vol. 3, 124.

²⁰⁵ White, *Demons*, 76.

²⁰⁶ White, *My Life*, vol. 3, 145.

²⁰⁷ See Jones, 'Hardin Wallace', *Wesleyan Holiness Movement*, vol. 2, 1653.

express purpose of preaching the message of holiness as realised in a second work of grace. The resulting revival was the foundation for the California and Arizona Holiness Association, which was organised at Artesia, California, on July 1, 1880, with its first president being J. W. Swing.²¹⁰ By 1883 holiness independents (holiness people who disdained denominations or organised religion),²¹¹ led by James F. Washburn²¹² and B. A. Washburn,²¹³ had gained the ascendancy in the association, organising bands into local churches in California.²¹⁴ Out of this structure emerged the Holiness Church of California.²¹⁵ Local churches were independent but shared common values, including the requirement that members must profess entire sanctification.²¹⁶ The churches were interracial, non-instrumental as related to music, and restricting as to dress and adornment.²¹⁷ The numerical size of the denomination as far as churches and members is not indicated in its history. Its primary importance to this thesis is that it provides a narrative for the effect of the Azusa Street Revival on holiness congregations in the immediate area of Azusa Street.

²⁰⁸ See Jones, 'Henry Ashcraft', *Wesleyan Holiness Movement*, vol. 2, 900.

²⁰⁹ See Jones, 'James Jaynes', *Wesleyan Holiness Movement*, vol. 2, 1254.

²¹⁰ The parents of future AG General Superintendent Ernest Swing Williams were members of the HHC in San Bernardino, CA. Williams was named 'Swing' after HCC pioneer J. W. Swing. See Robert Bryant Mitchell, *Heritage and Horizons: The History of the Open Bible Standard Churches* (Des Moines, IA: Open Bible, 1982), 34-35.

²¹¹ This was a reaction to the perceived hindrance to the proclamation of holiness by the bureaucracy of the MEC and the MEC South.

²¹² For biographical information on James F. Washburn, see Jones, 'James Washburn', *Wesleyan Holiness Movement*, vol. 2, 1659, and Josephine Washburn, *History and Reminiscences of the Holiness Church Work in Southern California and Arizona* (South Pasadena, CA: Record, 1912).

²¹³ B. A. Washburn offered a letter to the 1885 GHA regarding independent congregations or 'comeoutism'. See B. A. Washburn, *Holiness Links* (Los Angeles: Pentecost Office, 1887), 207-212, and Shaw, *Proceedings of the National Holiness Assembly*, 34-37.

²¹⁴ The HCC was in the vanguard of the come-out movement. Defending its position, an article in *The Pentecost* explained, 'The thing that really happens is one of the . . . newly sanctified persons is persecuted to death starved, frozen, ignored, or syrped over with a disarming kindness which soon makes him helpless . . . unless the holiness people hold distinct holiness meetings they are without much influence'. *The Pentecost* (September 29, 1910), 1.

²¹⁵ For information regarding this denomination, see William Kostlevy, 'The Holiness Church', in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 147, Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 58, Dieter, *Holiness Revival*, 263-270, and Thomas and Thomas, *The Days of Our Pilgrimage*, 230-233. For a more negative perspective, see J. C. Simmons, *The History of Southern Methodism on the Pacific Coast* (Nashville, TN: Southern Methodist, 1886), 433.

²¹⁶ See rules and regulations in Washburn, *Holiness Links*, 189-206.

²¹⁷ See Charles Jones, 'The "Color Line" Washed Away in the Blood?: In the Holiness Church, at Azusa Street, and Afterward', *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 34, no. 2 (Fall 1999): 253-254.

Confrontation with Pentecostalism

In July 1906 ‘speaking in tongues’ was first mentioned in Josephine Washburn’s *History and Reminiscences of the Holy Church Work in Southern California and Arizona*.

She recorded,

In the Los Angeles church, under Bro. Pendleton’s pastorate, there began to be taught the error that the baptism or the gift of the Holy Ghost is received some time after sanctification . . . There also appeared among them a manifestation of strange chatterings and mumblings that they in common with some other congregations in Los Angeles, designate as a “gift of tongues” and held as an outward sign of the return of the first Pentecost with its power. There with it sprung up the teaching that none who had not received this so-called gift of tongues had not received their Pentecost, the gift of the Holy Ghost and power. A meeting at this church was held July 12th, at which there was teaching in the meeting, trying by all gentle means to correct their errors of doctrine and bring them back to a scriptural foundation. Bro. Pendleton²¹⁸ was called before the Board and kindly admonished in regard to the Doctrine, which admonition he received kindly, but did not suppress this teaching. The following resolution was passed and read to the meeting, also published in *The Pentecost*.²¹⁹ “We, the Board of Elders, cannot tolerate any teaching of the third work of grace, nor that which leads up to that teaching. Any person who is sanctified has received his Pentecost, the baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire.”²²⁰

Washburn also noted, ‘We hesitated to deal too hastily with it, hoping to win them by tenderness and love’.²²¹ A further meeting firmly established the position of the HCC regarding tongues speech: ‘While we believe in a Scriptural gift of tongues, we do not believe this present manifestation . . . is such and we forbid its use among us’.²²²

Opposition to glossolalia was based upon understood biblical principles and upon the testimony of persons who had experience with the phenomenon. A testimony of a Sister Robbins of Monrovia, California, was reported and accepted as representative of the experiential confusion involved in identifying with the ‘new’ understanding:

²¹⁸ See Robeck, ‘William H. Pendleton’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 684. Robeck says Pendleton took ‘ninety percent of his congregation [and] joined the Apostolic Faith Mission, the remainder of his Los Angeles Holiness Church struggled to survive’. Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 187.

²¹⁹ *The Pentecost* was the periodical of the Southern California/Arizona Holiness Association, and later the HCC.

²²⁰ Washburn, *History and Reminiscences*, 376-377.

²²¹ Washburn, 376-377.

²²² Washburn, 377-378.

It seemed that some great manifestation came upon her which was very pleasant for a time, but left her in awful darkness and agony of soul from which it seemed impossible for her to be delivered. Her experience was thrilling and horrifying, but she at last found deliverance while reading at family worship of Christ's agony in the garden where he sweat great drops of blood.²²³

Her fears were corroborated by an experience of W. M. Kelly with tongues speaking at the Los Angeles Church.²²⁴ Reflecting upon the effects of the encroaching movement, Washburn commented,

Many who had for years enjoyed the blessing of sanctification, preaching and testifying to the same as the excitement spread, fell into the fearful delusion. Some of the brightest and best, as well as a good many with a chronic appetite for anything new, were carried away with the movement. So sure were some that they had received certain unknown tongues that they sacrificed their homes, selling them and taking the money to take them to heathen lands as supposedly ordered of God, fully believing they had the language of the people to who they were divinely sent.²²⁵

Washburn stated that Pendleton and twenty-eight members withdrew from the First Holiness Church of Los Angeles at the request of the Board of Elders. The impact was unfortunate:

Many sad changes have come out of the movement to our knowledge, some falling entirely away, others weeping their way back out of what they testify [as] horrible darkness and wild powerful delusion; others adding new delusions . . . We love and pity those who have been thus led away, many of whom we have been closely associated with us in labor and fellowship of former years.²²⁶

Not only was the California branch of the Holiness Church hindered by emerging glossolalia, but there was also damage done in their ministry to African Americans in the American South. The work was directed by George Going, an African American evangelist, who testified to having witnessed the Azusa Street Revival.²²⁷ Writing from Brownsville, Tennessee, where he had been dispatched to 'assist in setting the church in order', Going wrote to *The Pentecost*,

²²³ Washburn, *History and Reminiscences*, 378-379.

²²⁴ Washburn, 383-384. W. M. Kelly was superintendent of the Holiness Church Faith Home. In 1906 he testified of 'A Night with the So-Called Tongues'. See Washburn, 26-36, 178, 383, 398, 400, and 407-409.

²²⁵ J. F. Washburn as quoted in Washburn, *History and Reminiscences*, 388-389.

²²⁶ Washburn, 390.

²²⁷ George and Laura Going were African American evangelists who took the message of holiness to the South. They made their headquarters in Nashville, Tennessee, at the invitation of a White holiness educator of American Blacks named Joanna Moore. George Going became the chief elder of the Nashville District of the HCC. For biographical information of Joanna Moore, see Joanna Moore, "*In Christ's Stead*": *Autobiographical Sketches* (Chicago: Women's Baptist Home Missionary Society, 1902).

We wish we were able to find a single thing to say in favor of “tongues” teaching and we would say it . . . I stood in the midst and saw it going on at Azusa St., Los Angeles, in the year 1906, and I know and have seen its work in the Southern States since then . . . the thing is surely of the devil.²²⁸

Defections to Pentecostalism

However, while the denomination and a portion of its leaders were strongly opposed to glossolalia, there were persons of note within the organisation who found the practice appealing. Julia Hutchins, also identified as Hutchinson, was the pastor of the church at Ninth and Santa Fe Streets, Los Angeles, who invited William Seymour to the Los Angeles area to pastor at the recommendation of Neely Terry.²²⁹ The denominational ties of this local church have been a matter of debate. Stanley Frodsham identified the congregation as a ‘small colored Nazarene Church’.²³⁰ Carl Bangs takes strong issue with this identification, countering that ‘there is simply no record of Neely Terry or any Nazarene Church, property or mission on Santa Fe Street’.²³¹ Cecil Robeck Jr. sheds light on Hutchins’s denominational predilections:

Mrs. Hutchins had started the congregation to demonstrate her evangelistic and administrative skills to the Holiness Association of Southern California. She wanted to go to the mission field under their auspices. The leaders of the Holiness Association were favorably impressed with her work and published her story in *The Pentecost* . . . Mrs. Hutchins was concerned to preserve holiness orthodoxy among those she had brought in the Holiness Church.²³²

If Charles Jones is correct in understanding ‘Sister S. J. Hutchinson’ to be Julia Hutchins, then there are multiple references to her in Washburn’s *History and Reminiscences of the*

²²⁸ G. A. Going, ‘From the South’, *The Pentecost* (December 17, 1909), 3.

²²⁹ See Alexander, ‘Julia Hutchins’, *Women of Azusa*, 24-35. For Terry, see Alexander, ‘Neely Terry’, *Women of Azusa*, 19-23.

²³⁰ Stanley Frodsham, *With Signs Following: The Story of the Pentecostal Revival in the Twentieth Century*, rev. ed. (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1946), 31. This information was repeated in Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement*, 104, 106, Frank J. Ewart, *The Phenomenon of Pentecost* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame, 1979), 71, Howard Snyder and Howard Runyan, *The Divided Flame: Wesleyans and the Charismatic Renewal* (Grand Rapids, MI: Francis and Taylor, 1986), 40, and Mitchell, *Heritage and Horizons*, 26. Stephens identifies the congregation with the HCC. Robins, *Pentecostalism in American*, 26.

²³¹ Bangs, *Phineas F. Bresee*, 230.

²³² Robeck, *Azusa Street*, 60-63.

Holiness Church Work in Southern California.²³³ True to her Holiness Movement theology, Hutchins padlocked the door of her mission against Seymour, rejecting his third work theology. Later she received her 'Pentecost' and a special tongues gift of the Ugandan language. In 1906 she departed for Monrovia, where the spoken language was English. The last word from her was a letter from Monrovia, Liberia, which was published in *The Apostolic Faith*.²³⁴

Even for those remaining faithful to the HCC and its theological tenets, there was uncertainty. J. M. Roberts was the president of the Southern California Holiness Association and the HCC. He was highly regarded by the Holiness Church faithful.²³⁵ After the closing of the Santa Fe mission to the ministry of Seymour, a meeting was called for Seymour to meet the leaders of the HCC to explain his position.²³⁶ Seymour may have preached or simply responded to questions. Roberts remained unconvinced of Seymour's understanding but perhaps was shaken in his own position. Robeck provides a summary of his response. Roberts forbid Seymour to preach in the HCC, and then Seymour recollected, 'After the President (Roberts) heard me speak of what the true baptism of the Holy Spirit was, he said he wanted it too, and told me when I had received it to let him know'.²³⁷ The comments of Roberts are difficult to understand, as are the recollections of Seymour. Frank Bartleman recorded that at the same meeting

There were at least six Holiness preachers, some of them gray headed, honored and trusted for fruitful service for years, seeking the "baptism" most earnestly. They simply threw up their hands in the face of this revelation from God and stopped to "tarry" for their "Pentecost." The President of the Holiness Church of California (Brother Roberts, a precious man) was one of the first at the altar, seeking earnestly.²³⁸

²³³ See Jones, 'Color Line', 259n29.

²³⁴ Mrs. J. W. Hutchins, 'Speeding to Foreign Lands', *The Apostolic Faith* (January 1907), 3.

²³⁵ For life summary and memorial at his death, see Washburn, *History and Reminiscences*, 437-438.

²³⁶ Sanders says Nazarene ministers were included in this group. He also says that P. F. Bresee, founder of the Church of the Nazarene, had 'created a suitable climate for the new tongues doctrine in Los Angeles as early as 1895'. Sanders, *William Joseph Seymour*, 82, 84.

²³⁷ *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), 1.

²³⁸ Frank Bartleman, *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As It Was in the Beginning*, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles: author, 1925), 70.

Roberts (and others) appears to have been torn between orthodox holiness theology and the hunger for the fullness of available grace. If he was a questing seeker, perhaps he represents the quandary of the rank and file of the HCC. Despite the official rejection of Pentecostalism by the leadership, Charles Jones says,

The outlook of this group, a quarter of a century in the making, was to be the source of much which was later to be regarded as unique in early Pentecostalism . . . It was with these convictions and practices of the Holiness Church that they were to furnish their new spiritual house on Azusa Street.²³⁹

Summary

The Holiness Church of California seems to have faced Pentecostalism with an intense concern for both the integrity of Wesleyan/Holiness theology and an intense experiential orientation. Deeply appreciative of the work of the Holy Spirit, it shared with Pentecostalism a Restorationist motif and seemed reluctant to risk opportunity for the realisation of that potential. Simultaneously, there was a deep appreciation for the theological norms that had shaped their understanding of Christian holiness. The result was an inherent indecisiveness despite official pronouncement, which issued in institutional instability. This denominational characteristic, coupled with geographic proximity to the heart of the Pentecostal experience at Azusa Street, led to major denominational losses from which the organisation never fully recovered. Charles Jones says, ‘The Holiness Church lost hundreds of members’.²⁴⁰

3.8 God’s Bible School and College

²³⁹ Jones, ‘Color Line’, 253, 264.

²⁴⁰ Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 58. Randall Stephens offers a plausible explanation for the defection of persons from the NHA to Pentecostalism: ‘Holiness enthusiasts were restless visionaries, crisscrossing the country in search of spiritual ecstasy’. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 58. While there are theological, cultural, and sociological reasons for their fascination with glossolalia, their spiritual passion was at the heart of their quest. It is an elusive but real component of the confrontation that cannot be quantified or explained to those who do not feel as they felt. It was an extremely subjective stimulus.

God's Bible School was founded by Martin Wells Knapp in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1901.²⁴¹ The official campus periodical was *The God's Revivalist*. Through its pages, Knapp acknowledged his adoption of the 'Fourfold Gospel', placing him in the vanguard of AHM figures adopting the mantra. Writing in *The God's Revivalist*, Knapp said, 'I praise God today for the fourfold gospel: Jesus my Savior, my Sanctifier, my Healer and my Coming Lord'.²⁴² This progressive understanding has prompted Holiness Movement historians to identify Knapp with the RHM.

However, Knapp's doctrinal focus was entire sanctification appropriated as a second work of grace, with the Day of Pentecost as its historical antecedent. This understanding allowed for an emphasis upon emotion in worship, the abandonment of private property, and faith ministry, while espousing concepts such as divine healing²⁴³ and premillennialism.²⁴⁴ While not initially supportive of the come-out movement from the Methodist Church because he felt it represented anarchy, Knapp surrounded himself with persons who supported that cause. GBS became a haven for persons disenchanted both with the modernism of the Methodist Church and with what was perceived as an entrenched Eastern establishment of the NHA.

By 1900 Knapp had forged a relationship with the radical MCA (Burning Bush), especially in emphasising demonstration in worship.²⁴⁵ Wallace Thornton understands Knapp's emphasis to have been at 'the forefront in laying the ideological foundation for Pentecostalism'.²⁴⁶ In 1901 Knapp's growing influence was cut short by his untimely death

²⁴¹ For the history of GBS, see Wallace Thornton Jr., *When The Fire Fell: Martin Wells Knapp's Vision of Pentecost and the Beginnings of God's Bible School* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2014), and Larry Smith, *A Century on the Mount of Blessings* (Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist, 2016).

²⁴² Martin Wells Knapp, *The Revivalist* (January 26, 1899), 10.

²⁴³ For representative support of the doctrine of divine healing, see testimonies in *God's Revivalist* (December 19, 1901), 10.

²⁴⁴ For discussion of controversy concerning divine healing between advocates and the NHA, and a bibliographic listing of recommended books on the Second Coming, see L. L. Pickett, 'Was it a Misrepresentation', *God's Revivalist* (October 17, 1901), 7.

²⁴⁵ See Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*.

²⁴⁶ Thornton, *When the Fire Fell*, 143.

from typhoid fever at the age of forty-eight. Much of the theological direction for the school in the next two decades fell to Oswald Chambers and W. B. Godbey.²⁴⁷

The Third Blessing

The emergence of GBS and Pentecostalism coincide chronologically, but reference to the movement emerged very slowly in the pages of *The God's Revivalist*. Thornton says, '(The) school was apparently distracted at the time by an inner conflict which had nothing to do with tongues-speaking'.²⁴⁸ There is no reference to Charles Parham or Azusa Street, but for unknown reasons the subject was approached obliquely via a discussion of 'The Third Blessing'.

In the March 8, 1906, issue of *The God's Revivalist*, A. M. Hills introduced an article entitled 'The Third Blessing'.²⁴⁹ The article is a clear refutation of the thought of B. H. Irwin and the Fire Baptized Church. However, in refuting 'baptism by fire', Hills laid an important foundation for objections to the subsequent emergence of Pentecostalism. He stated unequivocally, 'there is not the least hint in all [these] Scriptures that there is a third blessing'.²⁵⁰

On February 14, 1907, *The God's Revivalist* offered an article by Oswald Chambers entitled 'Third Work of Grace—A Confusion of the Devil'.²⁵¹ Chambers asserted the synonymous nature of 'entire sanctification and baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire'. Then he presented his opinion that speaking with tongues is a gift, as opposed to the fruit of the Spirit, which is the evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit. He said explicitly, 'What we

²⁴⁷ For biographical information, see David McCasland, *Oswald Chambers: Abandoned to God: The Life Story of the Author of My Utmost for His Highest* (Grand Rapids, MI: Discover House, 1993), Oswald Chambers and Bidley Chambers, *Oswald Chambers: His Life and Work*, 2nd ed. (London: Simpkin Marshall, 1938), and William Kostlevy, 'Oswald Chambers', in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 49-50.

²⁴⁸ Thornton, *When the Fire Fell*, 143.

²⁴⁹ A. M. Hills, 'The Third Blessing', *God's Revivalist* (March 8, 1906), 1, 14.

²⁵⁰ Hills, 'Third Blessing', 1, 14.

²⁵¹ Oswald Chambers, 'The Baptism of the Holy Spirit', *God's Revivalist* (April 25, 1907), 12.

are responsible for is not speaking with tongues, or having gifts, but for having or not having the personal baptism of the Holy Spirit and fire'.²⁵² In a subsequent article, Chambers did perhaps make a veiled reference to Pentecostalism when he insisted, 'The only sign of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit is entire sanctification, and the only sign of entire sanctification is the Baptism in the Holy Spirit'.²⁵³

Inexplicably, Godbey returned to a discussion of the 'Fire Heresy' again in a *God's Revivalist* article from October 3, 1907: 'Some years ago, one of God's most gifted men [apparently a reference to B. H. Irwin] took the lead in promulgating the "Fire" doctrine, causing great commotion throughout the south and west'.²⁵⁴ There is no evidence of Irwin's direct influence in the GBS community, but clearly there were concerns. There appeared to be in the minds of prominent personalities in the *Revivalist* family a perceived connection between the proto-Pentecostal Irwin and the realised Pentecostalism of Parham/Topeka and Seymour/Azusa Street.

Influence of Dr W. B. Godbey

William Baxter Godbey was a MEC South minister from the state of Kentucky.²⁵⁵ Possessed of a good education and proficiency in the study of New Testament Greek, Godbey wielded considerable influence amongst proponents of Christian perfection as a second work of grace. Godbey and Knapp were fast friends, sharing a strong commitment to entire sanctification and premillennialism. Knapp published Godbey's literary efforts and Godbey

²⁵² Chambers, 'Baptism', 12.

²⁵³ Chambers, 12. While Chambers seems to oppose glossolalia and its third work implications, contemporary Pentecostal scholarship understands him to be a precursor to Pentecostalism. After offering a summary of positions held by Chambers, which he feels were consistent with Pentecostalism, Dale Coulter comments, 'he [Chambers] believed fully in a vision of holiness and his theology was absorbed into Pentecostalism'. Dale Coulter, 'Oswald Chambers: The Rest of the Story', Facebook, April 20, 2022, 17:41, <https://www.facebook.com/dmccoulter>.

²⁵⁴ W. B. Godbey, 'The Fire Heresy', *God's Revivalist* (October 3, 1907), 10.

²⁵⁵ See W. B. Godbey, *Autobiography of Rev. W.B. Godbey* (Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1909), and Barry Hamilton, *William Baxter Godbey: Itinerant Apostle of the Holiness Movement* (Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen, 2002).

preached at Knapp's funeral. Later, Godbey taught at GBS and subsequently died there.

Thus, Godbey was an important voice for the interest of the *Revivalist* family, and his opinion of Pentecostalism would summarise the unofficial assessment of the college and its constituency.

Godbey's assessment of Pentecostalism seems to stem from a visit to Azusa Street in the summer of 1906.²⁵⁶ In *Tongue Movement, Satanic*, Godbey recorded his visit to Azusa Street:

On arrival [in Los Angeles] I found the city on tip-toe, all electrified with the Tongue movement . . . Evangelist Seymour, their leader complimented me with an invitation . . . When he suggested that I should preach for them I accepted the invitation and went, finding a large audience and serving them, the Lord helping me. After this they waited on me as on all others, asking me if I had received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the sign, i.e. speaking with tongues. It was said that I proved to be the first with an affirmative answer, as I responded, "I can say with Paul, 'I thank God I speak with tongues more than you all,' and at once proceeded, 'Johannes Baptistes tinxit, Petros tinxit et Christus misit suos Apostolos, ut gentes tingerent.'" They shouted over me, and said I had it all right and asked to put me at the front of their movement. But I declined the honor, observing that Jesus had gotten ahead of them and everybody else, and captured me for time and eternity.²⁵⁷

Godbey seems to have returned to California and spent three months ministering among the Holiness people, where he sought in vain for someone who spoke in tongues who could be understood as having spoken in a known language. His assessment of the movement was forthright and negative: 'I must pronounce the *TONGUE HERESY* the most pestilent assault that Satan has yet made against the Holiness Movement'.²⁵⁸ Godbey attributed the movement to satanic influence: 'There is no doubt that much of the phenomena pronounced the *gift of tongues* at this present date is due to demonic influences'.²⁵⁹ Hamilton identifies Godbey's

²⁵⁶ For discussion regarding the dating of the visit(s) of Godbey to California and his interaction with Pentecostalism, see Gerald King, 'When the Holiness Preacher Came to Town: Re-dating W.B. Godbey's Visit to Azusa Street', *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 18, <http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj18/king.html> (accessed September 18, 2018).

²⁵⁷ W. B. Godbey, *Tongue Movement, Satanic* (Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1918), 4-5.

²⁵⁸ Godbey, 'The Tongue Heresy', *Current Heresies*, 27 (author's emphasis).

²⁵⁹ Godbey, 22.

further opposition to glossolalia to be based on what he understood to be a minimizing of entire sanctification as a second work of grace.

For Godbey, any movement which undermined the experience of entire sanctification as the eradication of inward sin, or detracted from its importance as the “climax of redemption,” was a Satanic delusion—a “side-track” to deflect God’s saints away from the highway of Holiness. He roundly condemned any movement . . . which proclaimed any other *ordo salutis* . . .²⁶⁰

Godbey’s opinion appeared in the pages of *The God’s Revivalist*. In an article entitled ‘Errors Regarding Sanctification’, Godbey addressed the idea that ‘the gift of tongues is the witness of Holy Ghost Baptism’, assuring his readers that ‘this teaching . . . is bound to lead honest and sincere souls into confusion’. The article was later reprinted in the April 6, 1911, issue of *The God’s Revivalist*.²⁶¹

Godbey has been given credit not only for preventing the growth of Pentecostalism at GBS but also for the come-out Holiness Movement at large.²⁶² The result was that GBS remained in the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition rather than joining the emerging Pentecostal Movement. In retrospect, however, there appears to be a good reason for agreeing with William Kostlevy that the emphasis of Knapp on emotional demonstration brought the GBS ministry ‘within a whisker of Pentecostalism’s later insistence that “speaking in tongues” was the initial evidence of the “Baptism of the Holy Spirit”’.²⁶³

Contributions to Pentecostalism

While GBS rejected ‘tongues-speaking’ officially, there were those from within her fellowship who would draw different conclusions. Though there is no research to provide quantitative data, the present research will note a few persons who left the institution to promote the fundamental Pentecostal tenets, including tongues speaking.

²⁶⁰ Hamilton, *Godbey*, 261-262.

²⁶¹ W. B. Godbey, ‘An Error Regarding Sanctification’, *God’s Revivalist* (April 6, 1911), 4.

²⁶² Barry Hamilton, ‘William Baxter Godbey’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 114-115.

²⁶³ William Kostlevy, ‘Nor Silver, Nor Gold’, 41. For discussion of Knapp’s thought concerning demonstrative worship, see Hills, *A Hero of Faith and Praise*, 263.

The most prominent Pentecostal adherents with an association to the Cincinnati-based Revivalist ministry were Azusa Street pastor William Seymour, and the Quaker founder of the Church of God (Cleveland), A. J. Tomlinson. Their association with GBS is maintained in Pentecostal historiography, but the school insists there are no records of their involvement. There appears to be no question that Seymour lived for a time in the Mt. Auburn District of Cincinnati, which was the location of GBS. The time of his residence predates the official opening of the school in 1900 but does not predate Revivalist ministries in that location. Apparently, Seymour attended Bible study classes conducted by Knapp or associates, and certainly he was a reader of *The God's Revivalist*.

Tomlinson worked as a colporteur for the Revivalist publications and was certainly on the campus for some while. His background with Quaker holiness advocates from GBS placed him under the influence of Seth Rees and Charles Stalker. Tomlinson's biographer, R. G. Robins, comments that GBS served as a 'half-way house for thousands of Quakers on the road to radical holiness'.²⁶⁴ Whatever their official status, it appears both Seymour and Tomlinson fell under the influence of Knapp and GBS ministries.²⁶⁵

Abbie Morrow (later Brown) was the daughter of Nathan Tibbals, a Methodist publisher in New York City.²⁶⁶ She professed entire sanctification under the ministry of Phoebe Palmer and later worked with J. M. Buckley and the *New York Christian Advocate*. As the field secretary for the (Methodist) Woman's Home Missionary Society, she was transferred from New York City to Minneapolis, where she later was superintendent of a

²⁶⁴ Robins, *A. J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Modernist: Pentecostalism in America* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010), 97.

²⁶⁵ See the earlier discussion of Seymour and GBS in chapter 1 of this thesis.

²⁶⁶ For biographical information, see Abbie Morrow Brown, *The Autobiography of Abbie C. Morrow Brown* (Dayton, OH: John Scruby, 1932).

Methodist Deaconess Home for a brief time. While working in Minneapolis, she was instrumental in bringing John Alexander Dowie²⁶⁷ to the city for a healing crusade.²⁶⁸

Around 1900 she began working for Martin Wells Knapp and *The God's Revivalist*, where in 1901 she became the first editor of the children/youth periodical, *Sparkling Waters from Bible Fountains*. She worked with Godbey in the *God's Revivalist* Sunday school department, providing articles for 'Light from a Pentecostal Standpoint' (International Sunday School Lessons). She endorsed the general call to the GHA of 1901. She was a contributor to the holiness devotional, *Jesus Only: A Full Salvation Yearbook*,²⁶⁹ which included Holiness leaders such as A. M. Hills, M. W. Knapp, and Seth Rees.²⁷⁰ Her time at *The God's Revivalist* appears to have been from 1901 to 1903. She recalled her role as editor only once in her autobiography, saying she remained with the publication until 'A paper that shall be nameless, caricatured and misrepresented me, and tormented them [*The God's Revivalist*] for being in fellowship with me, and they reluctantly dropped me'.²⁷¹

While serving on the staff of *The God's Revivalist* she appears to have been simultaneously working as the editor of *The Word and Work* magazine, published in Framingham, Massachusetts, under the direction of Samuel Otis. Her editorship seems to have begun in January 1899 and continued until the August/September 1904 issue. By January 1905 her address was in Israel, where over the succeeding years she served three short-term assignments working with missionaries from the CMA,²⁷² whom Eric Newberg

²⁶⁷ For biographical information, see Gordon Lindsay, *John Alexander Dowie: A Life Story of Trials, Tragedies and Triumphs* (Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, 1980).

²⁶⁸ Brown, *Autobiography*, 101-105.

²⁶⁹ W. B. Godbey, ed., *Jesus Only: A Full Salvation Year Book* (Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1898).

²⁷⁰ For biographical information on Seth Rees, see Paul Rees, *Seth Cook Rees: The Warrior-Saint* (Indianapolis, IN: Pilgrim Book Room, 1934).

²⁷¹ Abbie Morrow Brown, *Autobiography*, 49. The Burning Bush claimed credit for her exodus from *The Revivalist*: 'We notice that Mrs. Abbie C. Morrow has been dropped from the position of Sunday-school editor of *The Revivalist*. This follows immediately upon the exposure of her heterodox teachings by the *Burning Bush*'. 'Dr. Godbey's Latest Unscriptural Utterance', *The Burning Bush* (May 7, 1903), 6.

²⁷² Eric Newberg offers a rather critical assessment of her time in Israel, describing her service as a 'tourist missionary and her time in Palestine a misadventure of sorts . . . I would characterize her perspective on the

describes as ‘Pentecostal Missionaries in Palestine’.²⁷³ She seems to have returned from Israel in 1911, and from 1912 to approximately 1915 she worked as a contributing editor to the *Pentecostal Herald*, edited by H. C. Morrison, enjoying his explicit approval:

Mrs. Brown is a writer whose pen productions are enjoyed by thousands of people all over the United States and foreign lands, and we need only to mention her as a contributor to assure you that you may count upon something good.²⁷⁴

This relationship raises two questions: 1) was Morrison aware of her Pentecostal sympathies; and 2) was Brown ever an active participant in glossolalia practice?

Upon her return to the United States, Brown remained closely associated with Samuel and Addie Otis and the Christian Workers’ Union, which by that time had publicly declared its Pentecostal loyalties. She also associated with First Fruit Harvesters in Rumsey, New Hampshire, which had only recently espoused Pentecostalism.²⁷⁵ From approximately 1911 until her death she appears to have been an itinerant evangelist, making periodic evangelistic trips back East from her home in Los Angeles. Her schedule was at least partially arranged through appointments coordinated through advertising in *Word and Work*.²⁷⁶ In 1927 and 1928 she visited a camp meeting in Baxter Springs, Kansas, operated by Charles Parham, and expressed elation at the events.²⁷⁷ She died on February 28, 1937, but not without leaving a cryptic comment about preaching in ‘Dr. Bresee’s’ Nazarene Church.’²⁷⁸

Holy Land as “geo-piety””. Eric Newberg, email to the author, July 15, 2020. I have been unable to establish any official connection between Morrow (Brown) and the CMA.

²⁷³ Eric Newberg, *The Pentecostal Mission in Palestine: The Legacy of Pentecostal Zionism* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012), 44. For further study of Leatherman, see Christian Workers Union in chapter 3 of this thesis. Charles Leonard is identified as a Pentecostal evangelist from Springfield, Massachusetts, and a close friend of Samuel Otis. See Newberg, *Pentecostal Mission*, 51-61. Elizabeth Brown was a CMA missionary to Israel who converted to Pentecostalism. Her testimony was reported in the *Apostolic Faith* (May 1908), 1.

²⁷⁴ H. C. Morrison, ‘Some of Our Contributors for 1913’, *Pentecostal Herald* (December 4, 1912), 6.

²⁷⁵ See Kurt Berends, ‘Social Variables and Community Response’, in Blumhofer, Spittler, and Wacker, *Pentecostal Currents*, 68-95.

²⁷⁶ ‘NOTICE Abbie C. Morrow Brown, the well-known evangelist, is to spend the summer in churches, going north over one Railroad and returning on the other. If you desire her ministry for over Sunday or from Saturday to Saturday write to her 0011. Address: Abbie C. Morrow Brown. 5925 La Prada, Los Angeles, California’. *Word and Work* (May 1936), 15.

²⁷⁷ Parham, *Life*, 347, 403.

²⁷⁸ Brown, *Autobiography*, 70-71.

Brown's relationship to Pentecostalism is unclear. At one undated point she commented,

Years ago I passed through a severe trial of perplexity as to whether dear friends were right in pressing me to seek for the gift of tongues, or if I was right in having no desire for it. One night ere I slept I prayed, "Father waken me with a text that will ever settle this question." My first awakening thought was, "Thou has loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." [Hebrews 1:9] It perfectly satisfied me.²⁷⁹

This puzzling moment indicates that she was aware of the matter of glossolalia and was apparently associating with people who had experienced the same and were encouraging her to do so, but she professed no interest.

Subsequently, Brown gave no testimony to glossolalia aside from saying 'After receiving the Holy Spirit',²⁸⁰ although her autobiography provides no date for this experience. As noted, she had professed entire sanctification under the influence of Phoebe Palmer years before.²⁸¹ Later, when feeling led of the Lord to 'Go to Jerusalem', Brown asked in prayer, 'Father, if Thou art sending me to Jerusalem, and bidding me to tell no man, give her (Mary Monsow was present in the room) a message in tongues for me'. She commented that 'Immediately, God answered my cry and I (Brown) wrote it down.'²⁸²

Admittedly, the documentation for Brown's personal Pentecostal experience is fragmentary. She can best be identified with Pentecostalism through her associations. These facts, coupled with her apparent detachment from AHM personalities, seem to confirm her transfer of allegiance to the Pentecostal Movement. She is understood to have been Pentecostal by Charles Jones²⁸³ and Edith Blumhofer.²⁸⁴ Wallace Thornton lists Abbie Morrow Brown as being 'among Knapp's associates [who followed] the modern Pentecostal

²⁷⁹ Brown, *Autobiography*, 359

²⁸⁰ Brown, 135. She used similar language—'soon after I received the Holy Spirit'—in an article entitled 'Authority Over All', where after having confronted a snake with fear, she says, 'One who believes God's promise of authority over all the power of the enemy, has no fear of wild beasts'. Abbie Morrow Brown, 'Authority Over All', *The Vanguard* (July 15, 1914), 2.

²⁸¹ Brown, *Autobiography*, 36-37.

²⁸² Brown, 409.

²⁸³ Jones, *A Guide to the Study of the Pentecostal Movement*, vol. 2, 751.

²⁸⁴ Blumhofer, *The Assemblies of God*, 356.

(tongues-speaking) trajectory'.²⁸⁵ The trajectory seems clear, but whether or not Brown was personally an active participant in glossolalia remains unclear.

Lillian Hunt Trasher²⁸⁶ attended GBS for one semester in 1906–1907 at age eighteen.²⁸⁷ Subsequently, she went to North Carolina to work in an orphanage and later attended Altamont Bible School in Greenville, South Carolina,²⁸⁸ where she was baptised with the Holy Spirit as evidenced by tongues speaking, and became a Pentecostal pastor. In 1910 she left for Africa, where she established an orphanage at Assiut in Egypt. There she became known as the 'Nile Mother of Egypt'. She was so revered that a Muslim official was quoted as saying, 'I believe that when she dies, despite the fact she is a woman and a Christian, that God will take her directly to paradise'.²⁸⁹ Her name is inscribed on an obelisk on the campus of GBS, which identifies the one hundred most influential students to have attended the college. Also, she is included in the GBS Hall of Fame.²⁹⁰ Her prominence in Pentecostal missions historiography highlights the interface between the AHM and Pentecostalism.

The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada were impacted by students who attended GBS. R. E. McAlister, known as 'the Father of Canadian Pentecostalism', attended in 1901 before being forced to leave due to ill health.²⁹¹ A chapel testimony is reported in *The God's Revivalist*, November 14, 1901.²⁹² At approximately the same time, Alfred George (A. G.)

²⁸⁵ Thornton, *When the Fire Fell*, 143-144.

²⁸⁶ For biographical information, see Beth Howell, *Lady on a Donkey* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1960), and Lester Sumrall, *Lillian Trasher: The Nile Mother* (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1951).

²⁸⁷ Sumrall, *Lillian Trasher*, 9.

²⁸⁸ Altamont Bible College (Holmes Bible Institute) was an independent Bible college that accepted Pentecostalism under the ministry of G. B. Cashwell. It was a primary educational option for Pentecostal ministers. For biographical information on the founder of Altamont Bible College (Holmes Bible Institute), see N. J. Holmes and Lucy Holmes, *Life Sketches and Sermons* (Royston, GA: Press of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1920), and David Morgan, 'N. J. Holmes and the Origins of Pentecostalism', *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 84, no. 3 (July 1983): 136-151.

²⁸⁹ Scott Shemeth, 'Lillian Hunt Trasher', in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 852-853.

²⁹⁰ God's Bible School, 'Hall of Fame', <https://www.gbs.edu/alumni/hall-of-fame/> (accessed October 2, 2018).

²⁹¹ See Rudd, *When The Spirit Came*, 134-138. For biographical information of W. E. McAlister, see E. A. Wilson, 'Robert Edward McAlister', in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 566.

²⁹² 'Bible School Testimonies', *God's Revivalist* (November 14, 1901).

Ward entered GBS.²⁹³ Completing the trio of what Rudd calls ‘Pentecostal Pioneers’ who attended GBS was George Augustus (G. A.) Chambers.²⁹⁴ Rudd notes that GBS taught about the Baptism of the Holy Spirit without the initial evidence of speaking with tongues. His conclusion is that ‘While at Mount of Blessing (God’s Bible School) they were unknowingly being prepared for the leadership in the 20th-century Pentecostal revival which was soon to break upon the world’.²⁹⁵

Summary

The seminal values of Pentecostalism, namely emphasis on a Baptism of the Holy Spirit, divine healing, demonstrative worship, and faith principle, were clearly visible at God’s Bible School. Larry Smith muses about the trajectory of the college had Knapp not died at an early age. He concludes that, while the impetus for Pentecostalism was there, the influence of Godbey would have been the necessary restraining influence. The message of entire sanctification distinctly enjoyed as a second work of grace, and its prominence in the Wesleyan/Holiness *ordo salutis*, served as a buffer to any third work experience. With this message and the leadership of W. B. Godbey, the college moved away from what Smith calls ‘what might have been’.²⁹⁶

2.9 Conclusion

When viewing the American Holiness Movement interaction with the emerging Pentecostal Movement through the lens of the official church organs, the consensus is that

²⁹³ Rudd, 200-204. A. G. Ward was the father of C. M. Ward, the voice of the ‘Revivaltime’ radio ministry of the Assemblies of God, USA. For biographical information on A. G. Ward, see B. M. Stout, ‘Alfred George Ward’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 878.

²⁹⁴ Rudd, 75-78. For biographical information, see G. A. Chambers, *Fifty Years in the Service of the King* (Toronto: Testimony, 1960.)

²⁹⁵ Rudd, 202. James Craig concurs with the assessment of Rudd, saying, ‘It is evident that the teaching in the school [God’s Bible School] as well as its spiritual atmosphere helped to bring these three Canadians to the threshold of Pentecostalism’. Craig, ‘Out and Out for Jesus’, 88.

²⁹⁶ Smith, *A Century on the Mount of Blessing*, 111-113.

there was a certain awareness amongst the constituency ranging from curiosity to quizzical but sincere interest. The focus of the AHM was not complex. Douglas Collum calls it a ‘practical simplicity’ as seen in eschatological piety: ‘At the very heart of their religious piety was a soteriology. They sought to shape their lives around no other hub than the gospel message. Their soteriological commitments nurtured a distinctive way of looking at and living in the world’.²⁹⁷ This simplicity of purpose, combined with what Richard T. Hughes calls an ‘ethical primitivism’,²⁹⁸ produced a certain naiveté for all that could be provided by grace in the Holy Ghost dispensation. The similarity in worship styles (minus speaking in tongues) produced a certain vulnerability to a ‘more is better’ understanding of recreating the Book of Acts in the twentieth century based on a missional motif. And yet, the caution of respected leaders seemed to hold the grassroots in check. It is difficult to support the statement of R. G. Robins that ‘Even older communions like the Free Methodists . . . suffered major defections or outright breaches’.²⁹⁹ Whatever the predilection for the fervency and worship patterns of Pentecostalism amongst the AHM faithful, the record does not seem to bear out widespread defections to the new understanding.

The objective of this chapter was to discover the entities comprising the American Holiness Movement and ascertain the motivation behind their negative understandings of Pentecostalism and glossolalia. In examining the AHM generally, we have identified five reasons for their rejection of the new focus on the gifts of the Spirit, and particularly glossolalia, the gift of ‘tongues’. Their primary motivation was the defence of the *ordo salutis* of Wesleyan thought as it focuses upon entire sanctification as a second work of grace, and the credibility of its professed Christian holiness experience as realised in a second work of grace. Second, as we have shown, there were objections to excessive emotionalism

²⁹⁷ Douglas Collum, ‘Gospel Simplicity: Benjamin Titus Roberts and the Formation of the Free Methodist Church’, in Knight, *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street*, 99-108. Collum’s remarks concerning Free Methodism have been generalised to include the entire AHM.

²⁹⁸ Richard T. Hughes, ‘Christian Primitivism as Perfectionism’, in Burgess, *Reaching Beyond*, 239-243.

²⁹⁹ Robins, *Pentecostalism in America*, 33.

in worship. Third, their view of the history of tongues speaking led them to associate the practice with Edward Irving and his followers in the early nineteenth century and with other groups they saw as dubious. Fourth, they argued that the new Pentecostalism had failed in its goals, had distracted from evangelism, and had brought division and strife. Finally, it had failed to engender revival and the gift of tongues had not furthered the missionary cause by providing the ability to speak in foreign languages. We then provided further evidence from several specific denominations and groups affiliated with the National Holiness Association: the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, the Free Methodist Church, the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, the Pillar of Fire, the Holiness Church of California, and God's Bible School and College.

In the main, the organisational entities comprising the AHM maintained their identity, notwithstanding a limited numerical exodus and the challenge of identifying Christian holiness to the potential disciple against the backdrop of Pentecostalism. The rancour that ensued in this confrontation at times belied the profession of faith and profession of perfect love. But when the two decades under review ended, the lines of demarcation that ultimately separated these erstwhile brothers and sisters remained in place.

As this thesis addresses the confrontation between the American Holiness Movement and emerging Pentecostals, chapter 2 has discussed the negative responses of the rejecting segments of the AHM to Pentecostalism. While glossolalia was not the exclusive point of contention, it was the primary one. But not all of the AHM constituency objected to the emerging understanding. There was an important, albeit small, sector that chose to accommodate the practice in public worship, making it a matter of personal choice. None of the leaders of these accommodating segments actually claimed glossolalia for themselves, but they were permissive of the practice. The next chapter will examine three groups that espoused this accommodating position.

CHAPTER THREE

ACCOMMODATION TO PENTECOSTALISM WITHIN THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT

3.1 Introduction

The last chapter examined the negative response of persons and groups within the American Holiness Movement to emerging Pentecostalism. However, this negative response was not the universal conclusion. The adoption of the Pentecost paradigm for a second work of grace demanded that persons professing the experience reproduce the effects of the Day of Pentecost. Many holiness people were convinced that this had not been fully realised by persons professing the same experience as the persons in the upper room. This understanding produced dissatisfaction with the experiential *status quo* amongst some professing entire sanctification. Out of spiritual hunger and a quest for a completely realised Pentecost, they looked for something authentic in terms of power and effect.

This chapter offers a new view of the idea of ambivalence to glossolalia in the American Holiness Movement. In undertaking the present research, analysis of this material has not otherwise been found. Most research focuses on the groups that accepted Pentecostal interpretations of Acts and those who rejected it. This chapter shows the basis of the ambivalence to be rooted in zeal for a new work of the Holy Spirit in what was considered the pressure of the imminent return of Christ and, accordingly, a general disregard for theological preciseness. It also illustrates the significance of the 'initial evidence' theory to the considerations of glossolalia by the American Holiness Movement. The chapter demonstrates the proximity of the two movements as illustrated in the fluidity of personnel who seemed to move somewhat seamlessly from one movement to the other. Finally, it demonstrates through the theological adjustments of Durham how persons could transition

from a strong second work of grace emphasis to the ‘Finished Work’ emphasis without recanting their entire sanctification testimony.

The research now examines three such groups that sought a more authentic representation of the Day of Pentecost. While not thoroughly satisfied that Pentecostalism was the *bona fide* answer to their concerns, they were willing to take a cautious attitude without making the experience the final test of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. This chapter seeks to identify such fellowships, explore their response, and examine the results of their efforts. The groups to be examined are the World Faith Missionary Association, the Christian and Missionary Alliance directed by A. B. Simpson, and John Pike and *The Way of Faith*.

3.2 World Faith Missionary Association

The first group examined as a fellowship accommodating to Pentecostalism is the World Faith Missionary Association (WFMA). It was organised in Shenandoah, Iowa, in 1887 under the leadership of Charles Hanley.¹ Hanley and his wife seem to have come to an experience of entire sanctification independent of any existing holiness network. After their sanctification experience, they were part of the FMC but withdrew amicably in 1894 as a result of a conflict concerning concepts of supervision for independent ministry.²

In 1887 Hanley felt prompted to abandon his role as a newspaper editor and embark on a faith venture in Christian service. The effort would include a faith home, a Bible training school, an evangelistic mission in downtown Shenandoah, and an itinerant evangelistic ministry. In 1887 the organisation also began publication of a periodical called *The*

¹ For biographical information on Charles Hanley, see Charles I. Delong, *“It Ought to be Written”: The Story of Charles and Minnie Hanley, Founders of the World Faith Missionary Association, and the Origin of the Evangelical Church Alliance, Inc.* (Virginia Beach, VA: author, 2009), and Edith Blumhofer, ‘William H. Durham: Years of Creativity, Years of Dissent’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 123-142.

² See W. L. Kershaw, *History of Page County, Iowa: Also Biographical Sketches of Some Prominent Citizens of the County*, vol. 1 (Chicago: S.J. Clarke, 1909), 213. Kershaw says he was a charter member of the local Free Methodist church and subsequently pastored the congregation for two years. *The Biographical History of Iowa* says that Hanley ‘edits the odd newspaper styled “The Fire-Brand”’. *Biographical History of Page County, Iowa* (Chicago: Lewis and Dunbar, 1890), 376.

Firebrand. The paper was totally without advertisements but, rather, was supported by faith in God and the generosity of its patrons. One writer styled it as ‘purely a Free Methodist “Perfection” journal’.³ It was subsequently renamed *The Missionary World*, with Charles Hanley as editor and Clara Lum as office manager. Charles Delong understood that part of the mission of the WFMA was to ‘Train and provide missionaries with the necessary credentials for ministry as they itinerated throughout the United States, especially overseas’.⁴ Blumhofer describes it as providing credentials for those ‘who wanted to work independently of denominations in evangelism and rescue missions’.⁵ Charles Jones provides a listing of persons licensed by the WFMA, and the list is an insight into the theological breadth and openness of the organisation:

Those at some time holding its [WFMA] credentials included many well-known Holiness and Pentecostal workers: Bud Robinson, R. L. Averill, O. Burke Culpepper, J. B. Chapman,⁶ C. M. Keith, B. S. Taylor, M. L. Ryan, William Durham, J. Roswell, and Alice Flower⁷ and Clara Lum.⁸

In 1901 Hanley was listed as giving endorsement to the 1901 GHA meeting in Chicago, Illinois.⁹ Hanley was one in spirit with this group but with a slightly different emphasis. Erik J. Hjalmeby calls the organisation ‘a Holiness-type organization, [but] distinct from others in the movement in its emphasis on Jesus Christ’s finished work at his crucifixion’, adopting the mantra ‘Christ is All’.¹⁰ Writing in *The Firebrand*, Hanley

³ Kershaw, *History*, 322.

⁴ Delong, *Ought to be Written*, 30.

⁵ Blumhofer, ‘Durham’, 127.

⁶ D. Shelby Corlett, *Spirit-Filled: The Life of the Rev. James Blaine Chapman*, (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1947), 44.

⁷ See Edith Blumhofer, *Pentecost in My Soul: Explorations in the Meaning of Pentecostal Experience in the Early Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1989), 43. The Flowers, who became prominent officials in the AG, were ordained by the WFMA. See Brumback, *Suddenly*, 167. David Ringer does not mention the WFMA, saying only that the Flowers were ordained by David Myland. See David Ringer, *J. Roswell Flower: A Brief Biography* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016), 13. For biographical information on David Myland and his concept of ‘The Latter Rain’, see E. B. Robinson, ‘David Wayne Myland’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 633, and David Myland, *The Latter Rain Covenant and Pentecostal Power: With Testimony of Healings and Baptism* (Chicago: Evangel, 1916).

⁸ Jones, *Wesleyan Holiness Movement*, vol. 1, 740.

⁹ Shaw, *Echoes of the General Holiness Assembly*, 12.

¹⁰ Erik J. Hjalmeby, ‘A Rhetorical History of Race Relations in the Early Pentecostal Movement, 1906-1916’, (Master’s thesis, Baylor University, 2007), 82. While Hjalmeby seems to suggest that the WFMA was not of the

expressed his understanding of the work of Christ in an article entitled ‘It Is Finished’: ‘Our redemption is finished. Christ died once for all. Everything was fully done, long, long ago. Nothing can be added to that which is complete. Jesus declared on the cross “It is finished”’.¹¹ Hjalmeby reasons, ‘Thus, using his logic, when one accepted Christ’s work on the cross for a salvation experience, sanctification came along with it, and a separate sanctifying moment was thus unnecessary’.¹² While the immediate focus on this understanding in Hanley’s article is the initial forgiveness of sins, this thread of thought seems to have permeated Hanley’s understanding of soteriology. Blumhofer describes this understanding as ‘more different in nuance than in substance’.¹³ That assessment is debatable.

World Faith Missionary Association and the Pentecostal Movement

The pages of the *World Missionary* periodical are filled with references to an eclectic grouping of evangelicals. From Finis Yoakum and his healing ministry to D. L. Moody and his mass evangelism campaigns, Hanley seemed to pursue a broad evangelical/missionary motif underwritten by the words of Jesus, ‘He that is not against us is for us’ (Luke 9:50). With this background, it seems consistent that Hanley published without comment August 1906 correspondence from his former secretary writing from Azusa Street:

The Lord is saving souls, sanctifying believers and baptizing them with the Holy Ghost. I believe about thirty have been baptized with the Holy Ghost and many are speaking in new tongues. This is one of the signs of Pentecost . . . they have been writing also in different tongues.¹⁴

same identity as the American Holiness Association, Robeck calls it ‘a radical Holiness enterprise’. Robeck and Hunter, *Azusa Street*, 95.

¹¹ ‘It is Finished’, *The Firebrand* (January 1901), 2.

¹² Hjalmeby, ‘Rhetorical History’, 82.

¹³ Blumhofer, ‘Durham’, 126.

¹⁴ Clara Lum, ‘Miss Clara Lum Writes Wonders in Los Angeles Miracles in 1906’, *Missionary World* (August 1906), 2.

In September Hanley again published correspondence from Lum entitled ‘Pentecostal Wonders’:

Sister Leatherman [another WFMA associated worker] has received the gift of tongues for her field . . . over one hundred people here have received the gift of tongues . . . Some of the Free Methodists, Holiness Church people, Burning Bush, Nazarene, Peniel workers, New Testament Church people and others are receiving the gift of tongues.¹⁵

In October 1906 an old friend and fellow worker at Shenandoah, Lucy Leatherman, wrote as she prepared for the mission field, ‘The Lord has endued me with power from on high . . . and I speak other languages. Just before I left California I met an Arab and he said I spoke one of the most skilled dialects of Arabic’.¹⁶ Similar correspondence and references to tongues speaking were published without comment and certainly without condemnation.¹⁷

Hanley’s first published response to tongues speaking came in January 1907 and was a reprinted article from the *Christian and Missionary Alliance* entitled ‘The Gift of Tongues’:

Many people are teaching that no one has the baptism of the Holy Spirit unless they also have the gift of tongues. The exaggeration of the gift of tongues was one of the evils of the apostolic age against which the Apostle Paul gave frequent warning . . . We give these frank and kindly notes of warning to prepare our people to stand in wisdom as well as in love in an age of increasing peril, especially along the higher planes of spiritual truth and life.¹⁸

In May 1907 Hanley offered an editorial on ‘The Gift of Tongues’ that carried discretionary advice:

Now dear reader, if you have received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, do not throw away such a gem because you cannot speak with tongues. Do you bear the fruits of the Spirit? . . . We cannot take any one of the gifts and demand that all shall have that gift or they have not the Spirit . . . If God should give you the gift of tongues use it for His glory—if not, use the one you have. I am yours, not to criticize but to help if I may.¹⁹

¹⁵ Clara Lum, ‘Pentecostal Wonders’, *Missionary World* (September 1906), 4.

¹⁶ Lucy Leatherman, ‘Another Missionary’, *Missionary World* (October 1906), 5.

¹⁷ For example, ‘Mrs. E. C. Ladd, Des Moines Bible Mission’, *Missionary World* (May 1907), 8, Daniel Awrey ‘On Missionary Wings’, *Missionary World* (July 1909), 7, and Anna Moseley, ‘Twelfth Annual Meeting of the World’s Faith Missionary Association’, *Missionary World* (November 1907).

¹⁸ Hanley, ‘The Gift of Tongues’, *Missionary World* (January 1907), 4.

¹⁹ Hanley, ‘Gift’, 7.

In July 1907 he offered what was his studied and summary position on the matter of glossolalia. Quoting the scriptural passage recounting the advice of Gamaliel to the Jewish Sanhedrin (Acts 5:34-35, 38-39), Hanley wrote succinctly, ‘This is our position relative to the tongues movement’.²⁰ *The Church Advocate and Holiness Banner* summarised Hanley’s position regarding tongues: ‘By this we are to understand that they are neutral—neither for or against’.²¹ Subsequently, Hanley printed with approval a statement by A. S. Worrell:

In most places where Pentecostal meetings are held, there is an undue importance attached to speaking in tongues . . . The error of this position ought, it seems, to be apparent to all people of sound spiritual discernment . . . To a very great extent, they ignore the vastly more important work of the Spirit in the development of the Christ-life in the Trinity-filled believer.²²

Later, he would publish discretionary articles by Frank Bartleman,²³ T. C. Todd²⁴, and Carrie Judd Montgomery.²⁵ Hanley, while befriending persons within the Pentecostal Movement, could not accept the exclusiveness of the ‘initial evidence’ theory. Rather, he complained,

There is a tendency with many people to be seeking to speak with tongues rather than seeking the Baptism and the Baptizer. Above all things seek Him. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and Fire, and ye shall be witnesses.²⁶

On August 9, 1925, Charles Hanley died, and on his gravestone are the words ‘Golden Rule’. It would appear that, while he enjoyed the fullness of sanctifying grace without the evidence of glossolalia, he wished desperately to bridge both institutional and theological chasms, bringing brothers and sisters of varying understandings of Christian experience into oneness ‘in Christ’. Minnie Hanley wrote concerning her husband, ‘My darling husband truly

²⁰ ‘About Tongues’, *Missionary World* (July 1907), 4.

²¹ Ella Elkins, ‘About Tongues’, *The Church Advocate and Holiness Banner* (July 27, 1907), 4. *The Church Advocate and Holiness Banner* was a periodical for the Church of God (Holiness) organisation. The article described Hanley as ‘the Hanleys of compromise fame’ and denigrated his adoption of ‘Gamaliel’s advice’ as applied to glossolalia.

²² A. S. Worrell, ‘Tongues’, *The Missionary World* (September 1907), 4. For the significance of A. S. Worrell, see Michael Kuykendall, ‘A. S. Worrell’s *New Testament*: A Landmark Baptist-Pentecostal Bible Translation from the Early Twentieth Century’, *Pneuma* 29 (2007): 254-280.

²³ Frank Bartleman’s article quoted in ‘Read! Read! Read! Read!’, *Missionary World* (February 1908), 4.

²⁴ T. C. Todd, ‘Tongues and Missions’, *Missionary World* (March 1908), 4.

²⁵ Carrie Judd Montgomery, ‘Our Own Sentiments “Knit Together in Love”’, *Missionary World* (December 1908), 4.

²⁶ ‘Pentecost’, *Missionary World* (September 1908), 4.

had a world vision of bringing Christian leadership into a harmonious relationship to each other. The WFMA was organized for that purpose. But few have caught the vision my husband had'.²⁷ Perhaps the insistence of Pentecostalism on the initial evidence theory regarding the possession of the Holy Spirit served to disrupt Hanley's dream.

While Hanley's commitment to the work of the Holy Spirit in entire sanctification should not be questioned, he did not share the exclusiveness of many fellow proponents of the doctrine. The lack of theological/experiential rigidity provided a breadth of fellowship that, although complementary, did not serve well for doctrinal clarity. The permitted ambiguities opened the door for deviations from Wesleyan theology and practice. Edith Blumhofer is correct that 'The World Faith Missionary Association offered fertile soil for the Pentecostal movement'.²⁸ The organisation became the spiritual birthing ground for three prominent persons who shaped both Pentecostal history and theology.

WFMA Leaders Who Accepted Pentecostalism with Initial Evidence

Clara Lum was born in 1867 in Wisconsin.²⁹ She taught school in Artesia, California, and in 1897 moved to Shenandoah, Iowa, to work with the WFMA. She became the co-editor of *The Firebrand* and later WFMA historian. She testified she 'had been sanctified and anointed with the Holy Ghost years ago'.³⁰ Hanley described her as 'the Lord's hand-maiden especially adapted to this work'.³¹ Due to poor health and the difficult winters in Iowa, she returned to the West Coast where for a time she worked as a stenographer for Phineas F. Bresee, founder of the CN.³² She might have remained in that position, but she encountered

²⁷ Minnie Hanley, quoted by Derrick Miller, 'ECA Born from Vision and Struggle', *The Evangel* (quarterly newsletter of the Evangelical Church Alliance) 42, no. 1 (2000), 1.

²⁸ Edith Blumhofer, 'Iowa's Pentecostal Pioneer: Emma Cromer Ladd', *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Fall-Winter 1998-99), 46.

²⁹ See Alexander, 'Clara Lum', *Women of Azusa*, 47-55.

³⁰ *Apostolic Faith* (February-March, 1907), 8. Alexander places the date of the sanctification experience in 1898. See Alexander, *Women of Azusa*, 47.

³¹ Hanley, quoted by Edith Blumhofer, 'Clara E. Lum', *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Summer 2001), 1.

³² 'Field Notes', *Missionary World* (April 1905), 5.

the Azusa Street Revival. She wrote to the WFMA, ‘I have never seen the power of God so manifest in so many people nor have I ever seen such manifestations of power’.³³

When I came to the Azusa Mission, I went in for the baptism with the Holy Ghost. Immediately I had some digging to do but the Lord met me . . . At first He spoke just a few words through me. But recently He spoke different languages and sang songs in unknown tongues.³⁴

The Mission began immediately to utilise her clerical skills. She served as secretary and co-editor of the *Apostolic Faith* from 1906–1908, managed the mailing list, and responded to correspondence.³⁵ Espinosa says she stenographically recorded many of the mission’s testimonies and probably all of Seymour’s published sermons.³⁶ Often she was the voice that read the reports to the gathered Mission congregation, advising of the national and international spread of the Pentecostal message. Her relationship with Hanley and the WFMA seems to have been cordial during this period. In September 1906 Hanley wrote in the *Missionary World* that ‘she [Lum] was being much used of the Lord in Los Angeles’.³⁷ In 1908 she left the Azusa Street Mission with Florence Crawford to begin Pentecostal work in Portland, Oregon.³⁸ The skills she had utilised in Shenandoah with the WFMA were greatly used in the promotion of the Pentecostal revival.

William H. Durham was raised a Baptist in Kentucky before his WFMA contacts, so his roots in the Holiness Movement are sometimes overlooked. Allan Anderson says, ‘Some Pentecostals had come from churches outside the Holiness Movement . . . William Durham

³³ *Missionary World* (August 2, 1906), 2.

³⁴ *Apostolic Faith* (February-March 1907), 8.

³⁵ For discussion of Lum and her relationship to the *Apostolic Faith* magazine, see Edith L. Blumhofer and Grant Wacker, ‘Who Edited the Azusa Mission’s *Apostolic Faith*?’, *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Summer 2001), 15-21. Wacker describes the separation of Seymour and Lum as a “bitter, protracted conflict with white co-editor Clara Lum” and says further “there is no evidence that the dispute started as a racial conflict . . . but given that two of the main protagonists one side were black and two of the other side were white, race hardly could have been absent.” See Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 230.

³⁶ Espinosa, *Seymour*, 331.

³⁷ *Missionary World* (September 1906), 5.

³⁸ Jacobsen comments that ‘her stated reason [for leaving Los Angeles] was the nearness of the Lord’s return, but romantic imaginations or intimations may also have been involved’. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 65. J. C. Vanzandt insists that the move was ‘crooked’, with the result that Seymour would be deprived of income that would be sent to Portland, Oregon, instead of Los Angeles. J. C. Vanzandt, *Speaking in Tongues* (Oklahoma City, OK: Charles Edwin Jones, 2004), 32-38. The booklet was originally printed in Portland, Oregon, in 1926.

was one of these'.³⁹ Similarly, Menzies refers to Durham as a 'Baptist'.⁴⁰ The more correct interpretation is that Durham's formative years of Christian experience had been lived under the influence of the Wesleyan WFMA. His subsequent rejection of the Wesleyan position was a studied response, not reverting to childhood theological training. Faupel says that, based on Durham's personal testimony to his understanding of sanctification, Durham did not reject 'the Second Work doctrine because of his prior Baptist roots'.⁴¹ Farkas takes the matter further by saying that Durham's understanding was 'radicalized Wesleyanism'. He explains this understanding of Durham:

The theological label . . . which best represents the theological dynamic of the Finished Work doctrine is "single work perfectionism," granted the same qualifications Wesley insisted on for the term "perfection" are applied. The status of the believer after conversion is for Durham identical to the condition Wesley saw the believer in after the second crisis of entire sanctification: cleansed from all sin "inward and outward" and "actual," free from any natural proclivity to sin and thus "able not to sin."⁴²

From his home in Kentucky, Durham relocated to Chicago and later to the Minneapolis area. There, under the ministry outreach of the WFMA, Durham was both converted and called to the ministry. In 1901, under the influence of the teaching of the Holiness Movement, he professed sanctification—a profession he would later regard as an experiential anomaly.⁴³ On February 18, 1902, he was ordained, and subsequent issues of the

³⁹ Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 46.

⁴⁰ Menzies, 'Non-Wesleyan Origins of Pentecostal Movement', in Synan, *Aspects*, 91.

⁴¹ Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 268.

⁴² Thomas Farkas, 'William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy in Early American Pentecostalism, 1906-1916', (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Seminary, 1993), 262. Farkas contends that the animus of Durham was to 'subsequence' or secondness, not eradication or the sin nature being removed. Farkas, 'William H. Durham', 237-238. Durham himself said, 'When God saves us He makes us pure and clean'. W. H. Durham, 'The Finished Work of Calvary', *The Pentecostal Testimony* (January 1912), 3. Farkas further insists, 'Durham died and his Finished Work doctrine was left to his successors who either fundamentally misunderstood the teaching, or intentionally altered it . . . as it turned out, the original perfectionist version of the Finished Work teaching essentially went to the grave with Durham'. Farkas, 'William H. Durham', 309-310.

⁴³ For discussion of Durham and sanctification, see Allen Clayton, 'The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography', *Pneuma* 1, no. 2 (Fall 1979): 27-42. Thomas Farkas argues that Durham's contention with Wesleyan holiness was its emphasis upon 'subsequence' but not 'eradication', further complicating identification of the Durham conclusion as anti-Wesleyan in totality. See Farkas, 'William H. Durham', 186, 237-238. For implications of the Farkas conclusion, see Jim Kerwin, *The Rejected Blessing: An Untold Story of the Early Days of the Pentecostal Movement*, 2nd ed. (Chesapeake, VA: Finest of the Wheat, 2012), 71-80.

Missionary World recount his ministerial efforts particularly in the Wisconsin and Minnesota area.⁴⁴ In June 1905 he was married to Bessie Mae Whitmore. A WFMA minister, Charles Croft, officiated the wedding.

In 1907 Durham visited the Azusa Street Revival, and after three weeks of seeking, on March 2, 1907, he professed the gift of tongues.⁴⁵ He returned to his ministry at the North Street Mission in Chicago and a broader ministry in the WFMA context. When Hanley resisted Durham's rejection of a necessary second work of grace, Durham simply moved on to a broader Pentecostal ministry. His wider ministry would include an apparent adjustment in the *ordo salutis* of his theology. Explaining his position, Durham said,

I began to write against the doctrine that it takes two works of grace to save and cleanse a man.⁴⁶ I denied and still deny that God does not deal with the nature of sin at conversion. I deny that a man who is converted or born again is outwardly washed and cleansed but his heart is left unclean with enmity against God in it . . . This could not be salvation . . . It means that all the old man, or old nature, which is sinful and depraved and which was the very thing in us that was condemned is crucified with Christ.⁴⁷

More to the point of his emphasis on the work of Christ, Durham commented,

The doctrine of the Finished Work brings us back to the simple plan of Salvation. Christ died for us. He became a substitute for every one of us . . . We are not saved simply because we are forgiven our sins. We are saved through identification with our Savior Substitute, Jesus Christ. We are given life because he died and rose again.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ It is unclear who performed the ordination, although it would have been under the auspices of the WFMA. Potential persons would be C. S. Hanley, director, or G. L. Morgan, an influential WFMA leader. For biographical information on Morgan, see G. L. Morgan, *Sketches of My Life: With Some of My Experiences in Evangelistic Work* (Oklahoma City, OK: C.E. Jones, 2003).

⁴⁵ For Durham's Pentecostal testimony, see 'A Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost', *The Apostolic Faith* (February-March, 1906), 4.

⁴⁶ Not only did Durham write against the Second Work understanding, but he became quite proactive in his opposition. Bartleman, who agreed with him theologically, parted company with Durham, saying the controversy with the Second Work constituency had become a 'carnal controversy'. Bartleman, *How Revival Came*, 150. But Durham's controversy extended beyond the Second Work people. Nelson is quite blunt in saying that Durham desired to 'become the undisputed, dominant' leader of the Pentecostal Movement. Nelson, 'For Such a Time as This', 251. Shumway simply says he desired 'to rule or ruin'. Shumway, 'A Study of the "Gift of Tongues"', 179. Wacker simply says, "Durham . . . was not the most humble man to trod the earth." See Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 151.

⁴⁷ Durham, quoted in Brumback, *Suddenly*, 99.

⁴⁸ W. H. Durham, 'The Finished Work of Calvary—It Makes Plain the Great Work of Redemption', *Pentecostal Testimony* (July 1912), 5, quoted by Faupel from Charles Parham, *The Everlasting Gospel* (Baxter Springs, KS: author, 1911), 306. For further discussion of the 'Finished Work of Christ' understanding, see Edith Blumhofer, 'The Finished Work of Calvary: William H. Durham', *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Fall 1983), 9-10.

The result was a new emphasis in Pentecostalism called ‘the finished work of Christ’, and the first major split in Pentecostal fellowship. Durham’s presentation of this new understanding in the pulpit of the Azusa Street Mission occasioned considerable controversy.⁴⁹ He was locked out of the Mission by Seymour⁵⁰ and castigated by Parham.⁵¹ Durham died at the age of thirty-nine, leaving an indelible mark on the theology and fellowship of the emerging Pentecostal Movement.⁵² Walter Hollenweger calls Durham ‘the one original theologian of the American Pentecostal Movement’.⁵³ But perhaps Durham was drawing from the theology he had learned from Charles Hanley.⁵⁴ Durham had not only rejected the theology of his mentor, Charles Hanley, but he had also lost the broadness of Hanley’s spirit.

Lucy Leatherman provided another WFMA/Azusa Street connection.⁵⁵ Leatherman was closely associated with Charles Parham at the outset of his Pentecostal ministry, and sometime before 1904 she was affiliated with Charles Hanley and the WFMA. She also

⁴⁹ Christopher J. Richman objects to Pentecostal historiography regarding Durham and the ‘Finished Work of Christ’. He contends that the historical timeline adopted by Pentecostal scholars is in error, resulting in failure to give proper credit to A. S. Copley. See Christopher J. Richman, ‘William H. Durham and Early Pentecostalism: A Multifaceted Reassessment’, *Pneuma* 37 (2015): 224-243.

⁵⁰ Seymour’s primary motivation for excluding Durham from Azusa Mission appears to have been theological, but Borlase suggests that there were racial overtones. See Borlase, *William Seymour*, 215-216.

⁵¹ Parham wrote, ‘The havoc wrought by “The finished work of Calvary” in Chicago is most appalling . . . The diabolical end and purpose of Satanic majesty, in perpetrating [sic] Durhamism on the world, in repudiating sanctification as a definite work of grace has now clearly been revealed’. Parham then predicted Durham’s death within six months. When Durham died on July 7, 1912, Parham observed, ‘How signally God has answered’. Parham, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 118-119.

⁵² For discussion of the life and influence of William H. Durham, see Ewart, *The Phenomenon of Pentecost*, 94-107, Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 231-270, Borlase, *Seymour*, 212-217, and Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 136-193. For Durham’s legacy, see Allen Clayton, ‘Significance’.

⁵³ Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, 25.

⁵⁴ Since Pentecostal historiography (with the exception of Robins) does not make the connection between Hanley and Durham, I am reluctant to be dogmatic. Robins says, ‘Durham placed sanctification within the framework of the Finished Work of Calvary—terminology used by his former associates in the World’s Faith Missionary Association and by the well-known evangelist and educator, Essek William Kenyon’. Robins, *Pentecostalism in America*, 39. Bruce Barron says, ‘Kenyon was not widely known during his lifetime, but his teachings on faith, healing, positive confession, revelation knowledge, and the godlike power available to the “new creation” believers have directly influenced Kenneth Hagin, Kenneth Copeland, and other leaders in the Pentecostal faith movement’. Bruce Baron, ‘Essek William Kenyon (1867-1948)’, *Dictionary of Christianity in America*, Daniel G. Reid, ed. (Downer’s Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990), 611. For Kenyon’s relationship to the Holiness Movement, see Joe McIntyre, *E. W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story* (Orlando, FL: Creation House, 2010) 42-59. For a more detailed study of Kenyon, see Dale H. Simmons, *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power and Plenty* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 1997).

⁵⁵ See Alexander, ‘Lucy Leatherman’, *Women of Azusa*, 71-79.

attended the CMA school in Nyack, New York, where she received her missionary call to reach the Arab population of Jerusalem.⁵⁶ Her exact role at Azusa Street is undefined. *The Apostolic Faith* recorded her Pentecostal testimony:

I said, Father, I want the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the heavens opened and I was overshadowed, and such power came upon me and went through me. He said, Praise Me, and when I did, angels came and ministered unto me. I was passive in His hands, and by the eye of faith I saw angel hands working on my vocal cords, and I realized they were loosing me. I began to praise Him in an unknown language.⁵⁷

In 1906 Seymour sent her with others to the Middle East. Eric Newberg says, 'It would be fair to construe the work done by Lucy Leatherman in Egypt as the foundation upon which other missionaries . . . would later erect a major Pentecostal mission complex'.⁵⁸ From Egypt, she left for Palestine where she earned the distinction of being the first Pentecostal missionary in the land of the Apostles.⁵⁹

Leatherman continued to Beirut and then to the cities of the Sinai. From there she travelled to China and Japan. By 1910 she was working in the Philippines, and by August of 1912 she was in Syria. In 1914 she was busy again in Egypt and Palestine. In 1916 she came back to the United States for a brief stay. Then she headed to South America where she worked with Willis Hoover in Chile.⁶⁰ She was also instrumental in the Pentecostal experience of Norwegian T. B. Barrett,⁶¹ and she was a primary influence in the founding of Glad Tidings Mission in New York City.⁶² After many years as an independent missionary,

⁵⁶ Espinosa, *Seymour*, 362. The timeline of her early life is not clear.

⁵⁷ *The Apostolic Faith* (November 1906), 4.

⁵⁸ Newberg, *Pentecostal Mission*, 50.

⁵⁹ Newberg, *Pentecostal Mission*, 45-51.

⁶⁰ For discussion of Willis Hoover and Pentecostal missions in Chile, see Willis Collins Hoover, *History of the Pentecostal Revival in Chile* (Santiago, Chile: Imprenta Eben-Ezer, 2000). The volume does not mention Leatherman.

⁶¹ *The Apostolic Faith* (December 1906), 3. See Donald E. Miller, Kimon H. Sargeant, and Richard Flory, eds., *Spirit and Power: The Growth and Global Impact of Pentecostalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 50-51, Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 130-131, and David Bundy, *Visions of Apostolic Mission: Scandinavian Pentecostal Mission to 1935* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2009), 168-169.

⁶² For information regarding the Glad Tidings Mission in New York City, see Gordon Gardiner and Marie Brown, *The Origin of Glad Tidings Mission: The Altar of Incense: A sermon* (New York: Glad Tidings, 1955).

she joined the COGC. In June 1924 Lucy Leatherman died. Her days with the WFMA had taught her the missionary impulse and the sustenance of living by faith.

Summary

The exodus of adherents to Pentecostalism from the WFMA, plus the death of Charles Hanley, seems to have spelled the end of its role in the Holiness Movement. While relatively unknown in the AHM, the organisation made major contributions to Pentecostalism. Objecting theologically to the 'initial evidence' insistence of Pentecostalism while accepting the alterations in worship practices did little to stem the flow of prominent personalities to the emerging movement, nor does it appear that this was a matter of major concern to Hanley. Neither was he successful in maintaining an appreciation amongst his followers for the AHM, from which had come his understanding of entire sanctification. Mrs E. C. Ladd, an associate of the WFMA described by Blumhofer as 'Iowa's Pentecostal Pioneer', criticised the NHA:

The National Holiness Association has held a week's meeting here again. As we listened to their messages of repetition of doctrine, rather than exaltation of Jesus Christ and Him crucified, our hearts were tried, or rather His Spirit in our hearts. Oh, it is not doctrine, nor experiences nor graces or gifts, we are to worship, it is the trinity of God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.⁶³

The consistent references to tongues speaking without condemnation suggest an accommodating environment, and the Gamaliel approach seems to have been predominant in Hanley's thought. Hanley expressed his ideal as he reflected on the 1908 WFMA Convention:

God's seal was on every step taken from beginning to end with no friction caused by differences of opinion or experience. All were interested in the worship of God, in considering truths that had been revealed to different ones; in exchanging thoughts and testimonies; in united prayer and conferences; in the beauty and loveliness of worshipping God in the Spirit and in drinking at the Fountain for soul satisfaction in

⁶³ 'Mrs. Ladd's Mission', *Missionary World* (May 1909), 6. For a biographical sketch of Mrs. E. C. Ladd, see Edith Blumhofer, 'Iowa's Pentecostal Pioneer', 21-24, 46, 48-49.

Him. Several were healed; several received their Pentecost; eyes of the understanding were opened, prejudices melted away . . . a helpful unity for service was manifest and the spirit of the Kingdom of God was the spirit of our convention.⁶⁴

If there was any intent to retard the growth of glossolalia, it can be adjudged to have failed, and the accommodating spirit of Hanley seems to have precluded any legacy he might have left in the AHM.⁶⁵ Meanwhile, he was a virtually unknown in the Pentecostal Movement. Hanley was not insistent upon the Wesleyan *ordo salutis*, did not struggle with the idea of a third work of grace, did not seem to object to the emotionalism of Pentecostalism, and did not worry about the organisational stability of the WFMA.

3.3 A. B. Simpson and the Christian and Missionary Alliance

The Christian and Missionary Alliance was founded by Canadian Presbyterian minister A. B. Simpson.⁶⁶ Initially two organizations, the Christian Alliance to direct North American ministry and the Evangelical Missionary Alliance to oversee international work, the two were merged in 1897 with Simpson as director of both. Simpson introduced the ‘Fourfold Gospel’, which was comprised of a focus on Jesus Christ as Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, and Coming King.

A. B. Simpson and the American Holiness Movement

Charles Nienkirchen correctly observes that

⁶⁴ ‘Our Convention for 1908’, *Missionary World* (October 1908), 4.

⁶⁵ For persons associated with the WFMA who were temporarily influenced by Pentecostalism but ultimately retained the Wesleyan position, see G. L. Morgan, ‘Holiness Doctrine Explained’, *Missionary World* (August 1908), 4, and G. M. Henson, ‘The Sanctification’, *Missionary World* (June 1908), 8.

⁶⁶ For biographical information on A. B. Simpson, see A. E. Thompson, *The Life of A.B. Simpson* (New York: Christian Alliance, 1920), A. W. Tozer, *Wingspread* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1943), Bernie Van De Walle, *The Heart of the Gospel: A.B. Simpson, The Fourfold Gospel and the Late Nineteenth Century Theology* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009), and Michael G. Young, *A.B. Simpson: His Message and Impact on the Third Great Awakening* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016). For essays on the thought of A. B. Simpson, see David F. Hartzfeld and Charles Nienkirchen, eds., *The Birth of a Vision: Essays on the Ministry and Thought of Albert B. Simpson, Founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1986).

Historians have made various attempts at locating precisely Simpson's theology of the baptism of the Holy Spirit within the contours of the late nineteenth-century holiness movements . . . In fact the pluralist nature of Simpson's views on this subject makes efforts to classify them virtually useless.⁶⁷

Effort has been made to place Simpson in the Keswick camp. Gilbertson says it would be more accurate to say that Simpson was 'impacted by William Boardman's book *The Higher Christian Life*, which also impacted Keswick . . . [he] had little formal contact with the British Keswick Movement'.⁶⁸ More precisely, Kostlevy says Simpson 'Reject[ed] both the Wesleyan teaching that the sinful nature is eradicated in sanctification and the Keswick notion that the sinful nature is suppressed'.⁶⁹ Thus, the inclusion of Simpson and the CMA in the AHM is problematic. While flourishing contemporaneously with the Holiness Movement, Simpson and his counterparts were rarely if ever included in the matrix of the Methodist-inspired movement. The point of inclusion in the AHM is Simpson's clear and unequivocal testimony to having received entire sanctification as a second work of grace and his insistence that the work of sanctification as a definite second experience be included in the position paper issued by the 1906 conference on CMA doctrine.⁷⁰ In the section concerning Christ the Sanctifier, the terms 'distinct in nature', 'distinct experience', and 'distinct gift' are used. While Simpson himself did not write this section, it can be safely argued that it conveyed his thought.⁷¹

In 1874, while pastoring Chestnut Street Presbyterian Church in Louisville, Kentucky, Simpson was powerfully impacted by William Boardman's volume, *The Higher Christian*

⁶⁷ Charles W. Nienkirchen, *A. B. Simpson and the Pentecostal Movement* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 58-59.

⁶⁸ Gilbertson, *The Baptism of the Holy Spirit*, 42.

⁶⁹ William Kostlevy, 'Albert Benjamin Simpson', *Historical Dictionary*, 232-234.

⁷⁰ 'He [Simpson] held that it was necessary for the believer to have a crisis experience where on totally surrendered to Christ and was filled with the Holy Spirit. This was subsequent to conversion . . . but unlike the Wesleyan/Holiness view, Simpson did not believe in the possibility of eradication of the sin, or the sin nature in the believer's life'. Bernie Van De Walle, 'The Life and Ministry of Albert Benjamin Simpson' (PhD diss., Drew University, 2004).

⁷¹ Gilbertson, *The Baptism of the Holy Spirit*, 283-286.

Life.⁷² A. E. Thompson attributed the impetus for seeking sanctification to the evangelistic campaign of D. W. Whittle and P. P. Bliss in Louisville.⁷³ Regardless of the influence, Simpson came to a clearly defined second work of grace:

We also believe, and this is the emphatic point in our testimony, that this experience of Christ our Sanctifier marks a definite and distinct crisis in the history of a soul. We do not grow into it, but we cross a definite line of demarcation as clearly as when the hosts of Joshua cross the Jordan and were over in the promised land and set up a great heap of stones so that they could not forget that crisis hour.⁷⁴

Nienkirchen seeks to clearly define Simpson:

Notwithstanding the difficulty in accurately contextualizing Simpson, the entire corpus of his writings testifies uniformly to his understanding of the Baptism of the Spirit (also termed “second blessing,” “crisis sanctification,” “the anointing,” “the sealing,” “receiving the Holy Spirit,” “the indwelling of Christ”) as a necessary experience in the life of the believer subsequent to and distinct from conversion-regeneration.⁷⁵

Perhaps the effort to identify Simpson and the CMA as either Wesleyan or non-Wesleyan is best described by Bernie Van De Walle as ‘twins, perhaps, but not identical’.⁷⁶

⁷² William E. Boardman, *The Higher Christian Life* (Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1858). For biographical information on Boardman, see Mrs W. E. Boardman, *Life and Labors of Rev. W.E. Boardman* (New York: Appleton, 1887), and *Work for Jesus: The Experience and Teachings of Mr. and Mrs. Boardman* (Boston: Willard Tract Repository, 1875).

⁷³ Thompson, *A. B. Simpson*, 65. The theological orientation of William Boardman is a matter of debate. In 1873 he joined with Robert Pearsall Smith and William Arthur in promoting a series of holiness meetings that evolved into the Keswick Convention. Curtis identifies him as one ‘who popularized the Keswick or Reformed version of holiness’. Heather Curtis, ‘Lord of the Body: Pain, Suffering and the Practice of Divine Healing in Late Nineteenth Century American Protestantism’ (PhD diss., Harvard Divinity School, 2004), 89. Similarly, James Opp, in *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine and Protestant Faith in Canada, 1880-1930* (Montreal: McGill/Queens’s University Press, 2005), 21, Chappell, ‘The Divine Healing Movement in America’, 63, and Dwight Eckholm, ‘Theological Roots of the Keswick Movement: William E. Boardman, Robert Pearsall Smith and the Doctrine of the “Higher Life”’ (PhD diss., University of Basel, 1991). Dieter disagrees, saying, ‘In spite of his efforts to stay away from Wesleyan terminology, Boardman was essentially a part of the Wesleyan/holiness movement’. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 57. In the debate between cleansings (Wesleyan) and suppression (Keswick), Boardman seemed to make his position very clear. Writing in the Willard Street Tract Repository’s Almanac 1871, Boardman commented under the title ‘Full Salvation by Full Truth in Jesus’, ‘Thou shalt call his name Savior, because He shall save His people from their sins. He was manifested *to destroy* the works of the devil—mark you!—to destroy; not as a help to us to keep sin under, but as the destroyer of sin . . .’. W. W. Boardman, *The Willard Street Tract Repository’s Almanac and Christian Companion, for 1871* (Boston: Willard Street Repository, 1871), 13 (author’s emphasis). Warfield summarised Boardman by saying, ‘When we read it [Boardman’s writings], in its intended sense it is a pure statement of the Wesleyan doctrine . . . as Wesley himself could have penned it’. B. B. Warfield, *Perfectionism*, Samuel G. Craig, ed. (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1967), 228. For a more thorough discussion of Boardman’s theology and his significance, see Roy Williams, ‘William Edward Boardman (1810-1886): Evangelist of the Higher Life’ (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 1998).

⁷⁴ Thompson, *A.B. Simpson*, 67.

⁷⁵ Nienkirchen, *A.B. Simpson*, 59.

⁷⁶ Van De Walle, ‘The Radical Holiness Movement’.

A. B. Simpson and Tongues Speaking

A. B. Simpson longed for the restoration of New Testament Christianity in his own time. He had rejected the Presbyterian cessationist understanding of the supernatural that disallowed miracles after the apostolic age, choosing rather to believe in the Book of Acts as a standard for the Church even in his own time.⁷⁷ This understanding, coupled with his insistence on the any-moment return of Christ, created a priority of evangelism that could be facilitated with miraculous language speech. As early as 1892 Simpson had contemplated the possibilities of such, and concluded that in the power of the Holy Spirit it was possible. Responding to critics of his espousal of divine healing, Simpson answered with a categorical commitment to *charismata*:

A common objection [to divine healing] is urged in this way—Christ’s last promise in Mark embraces much more than healing; but if you claim one, you must claim all. If you expect the healing of the sick, you must also include the gift of tongues and the power to overcome malignant poisons . . . We cheerfully accept the severe logic, we cannot afford to give up one of the promises.⁷⁸

Yet caution prevailed. He was not prepared to accept the gift of tongues as the primary designated methodology for evangelism. Simpson’s sympathy with a supernatural display of the Holy Spirit and yet his reluctance to adopt the new methodology is demonstrated in his response to the Azusa Street Revival. Writing in the *Christian Missionary Alliance*, he warned of acceptance or rejection:

Reports have come to us within the past few months of a remarkable manifestation of spiritual power among a number of earnest Christians in the West. These manifestations are said to have taken the form chiefly of the gift of tongues. It is alleged that many persons have become suddenly possessed with the ability to speak in hitherto unknown languages, and others have had the gift, it is said, of interpretation, so that they have been able to translate the testimonies given . . . First,

⁷⁷ For a discussion of the relationship of glossolalia and Restorationist ideology in the thought of Simpson, see John Bertone, ‘A.B. Simpson and the Experience of Glossolalia: “To Seek or Not to Seek, To Forbid or Not to Forbid”’, [https://online.ambrose.edu/alliancestudies/doc/Simpson Gloss.htm](https://online.ambrose.edu/alliancestudies/doc/Simpson%20Gloss.htm) (accessed November 13, 2018). For a broader discussion of tongues speaking and the CMA, see Paul L. King, *Genuine Gold: The Cautiously Charismatic Story of the Early Christian and Missionary Alliance* (Tulsa, OK: Word and Spirit, 2006).

⁷⁸ Simpson, *Gospel of Healing* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications, 1915), 59.

there is the danger of credulity and fanaticism . . . But on the other hand, let us also guard against the extreme of refusing to recognize any added blessing which the Holy Spirit is bringing to His people in these last days.⁷⁹

But while Simpson wanted to believe the best, there were troubling signs. Writing in the *Christian Missionary Alliance*, Simpson lamented,

There have been many instances where the alleged gift of tongues led the subjects and the audiences into the wildest excesses and were accompanied with voices and actions more closely resembling wild animals than rational beings, impressing all *unprejudiced* that it was the work of the devil. In some well authenticated cases, that which in the beginning appeared to be a genuine move of the Holy Spirit degenerated very soon into wildfire and fanaticism, and became most harmful, not only to the person concerned but to all others affected by it.⁸⁰

Simpson would be forced to act. Outbreaks of tongues speaking occurred in many Alliance churches in the early spring of 1907. Simpson dispatched trusted assistant Henry Wilson to visit Ohio churches where the issue was strong. According to A. W. Tozer, Wilson returned unimpressed and offered a negative assessment with a caveat: ‘I am not able to approve the movement though I am willing to concede that there is probably something of God in it somewhere’.⁸¹

Simpson’s response to Wilson’s visit was characteristically cautious, supporting what he felt he could:

We have been delighted to hear from our good brother, Dr. Wilson . . . that a deep spirit of revival appears to be resting upon the work and the workers in that district, and that our beloved people are being kept to a great extent from fanaticism and excess and are receiving all the fullness of blessing which the Lord is waiting to bestow without the counterfeit. May God give all our people the spirit of entire openness to the Holy Ghost, and yet of spiritual sanity and practical holiness and wholesomeness.⁸²

Simpson further observed,

We are not to question these operations of the Holy Spirit when they are evidently genuine and Scriptural and while the “gift of tongues” is to be expected in these last

⁷⁹ Simpson, *Christian Missionary Alliance* (September 22, 1906), 177.

⁸⁰ Simpson, *Christian Missionary Alliance* (February 2, 1907), 1.

⁸¹ Tozer, *Wingspread*, 133. Nienkirchen takes exception to Tozer’s interpretation of the Wilson trip, suggesting his assessment stemmed from an anti-Pentecostal bias. Nienkirchen, *A.B. Simpson*, 136-139. For a contrasting explanation of Wilson’s comments, see King, *Genuine Gold*, 76-77.

⁸² Simpson, *Christian Missionary Alliance* (April 6, 1907), 157.

days even as in the first, yet this manifestation of the Spirit is not at all considered as a test of Christian experience or the evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit . . .⁸³

In time, Simpson's theological/experiential reservations would be compounded by what he understood to be excesses and threats to the unity of the Alliance. From 1907 forward, Simpson increasingly regarded Pentecostalism in a negative light.⁸⁴ Perhaps Simpson later regretted his decision. Brumback references a conversation Simpson had with David McDowell in 1912 where Simpson is alleged to have said, 'David, I thought what I did was right, but I am afraid that I missed it'.⁸⁵

Alliance Position: Seek Not, Forbid Not—True or False?

The result of Simpson's concerns about Pentecostalism in the CMA was a popularly understood dictum: 'Seek not, forbid not', although these precise words are not to be found in the writings of A. B. Simpson or other Alliance worthies. Actually, the axiom was not formally stated until 1963 and was attributed to A. W. Tozer by Nienkirchen.⁸⁶ Nienkirchen suggests that Simpson himself would have opposed the statement. Entries in Simpson's diary suggest that he himself was a seeker over five years. In an entry dated October 6, 1912, Simpson seems to lay bare his frustrating quest:

Five years have passed since these memories were written. God has been ever with me and wrought for me. No extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit in tongues or similar gifts has come. Many of my friends have received such manifestations, but mine has still been a life of fellowship and service. At times my spirit has been open to God for anything He might be pleased to reveal or bestow. But he has met me still

⁸³ Simpson, *Christian Missionary Alliance* (February 27, 1909), 364.

⁸⁴ Nienkirchen, *A.B. Simpson*, 98. For discussion of Simpson and glossolalia, see John Sawin, 'The Response and Attitude of Dr. A.B. Simpson and the Christian Missionary Alliance to the Tongues Movement of 1906-1920', in *Papers of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting, Society for Pentecostal Studies*, November 13-15, 1986, Costa Mesa, CA, 51.

⁸⁵ Brumback, *Suddenly*, 95.

⁸⁶ Brumback, 139. See also Paul King, 'A Critique of Charles Nienkirchen's Book, *A.B. Simpson and the Pentecostal Movement*', *Alliance Academic Review* (2000), <http://www.kneillfoster.com/aar/2000/AAR2000-6King.php> (accessed February 18, 2020).

with the old touch and spiritual sense, and in distinct and marked answers to believing prayer in my practical life.⁸⁷

Pentecostal interpreters of Simpson understand this entry to be a *bona fide* proof that the founder of the CMA actively sought for tongues, in contrast to the ‘Seek not’ prescription. Grant Wacker says, ‘[Simpson] sought the baptism-tongues experience for a least five years without success. In time Simpson not only gave up but distanced himself and his own thriving sect from the revival’.⁸⁸ Paul King takes vigorous exception to this interpretation. Speaking directly to Nienkirchen’s reliance on the Simpson diaries, King says,

He (Nienkirchen) attempts to substantiate his claims of portraying Simpson as a seeker of tongues, based mainly upon his interpretation of Simpson’s diary and outside Pentecostal sources. Regarding Simpson’s diary, Nienkirchen has misused it and drawn improper conclusions as a result. Simpson’s real belief on tongues and gifts cannot be determined from his diary alone . . . It is true that a person may record things privately that he does not say publicly. However, it cannot be deduced that Simpson’s private thoughts contradict his public pronouncements.⁸⁹

However Simpson is interpreted in his personal experience, it is clear that he did not object to speaking in tongues as a practice, provided it was done in what he understood to be decency and order. It is equally clear that he did not consider it scripturally or theologically mandated to confirm the presence of the Holy Spirit in the believer. This effort to establish a middle ground for the burgeoning practice of tongues in the CMA served to provide a point of exodus for many stalwart supporters, leaving the founder frustrated institutionally and perhaps personally.

⁸⁷ Simpson’s diary entry for October 6, 1912, as quoted by Nienkirchen, *A.B. Simpson*, 141-148. An unpublished typed copy of the original is available at Canadian Bible College/Canadian Theological Seminary, Regina, Saskatchewan.

⁸⁸ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 148. Wacker seems to hedge his comments about Simpson by saying, ‘Admittedly, Simpson’s language is elliptical, but taken together, there can be little doubt that he sought all of the gifts of the Spirit, including tongues if the Lord will it’. Wacker, 317n27. Wacker also references the Simpson Diary.

⁸⁹ King, ‘Critique’, 11.

Converts to Pentecostalism from the Christian Missionary and Alliance

The ambivalent position taken by Simpson regarding the practice of tongues speaking created an environment where there was little or no stigma to adopting the practice. Simpson understood that the Alliance was being influenced but seems primarily to have lamented the damage to the institution he created:

We learn with deep sorrow that there is a quiet but continuing movement in a number of places, originating, we believe, in extreme leaders of what is known as the Pentecostal Movement, to turn away godly and useful members of the C&MA from their loyalty to the work and faithful support of foreign mission workers for whom in many cases they have become responsible.⁹⁰

Amongst those adopting glossolalia were leaders of the CMA. Some departed from the CMA fellowship without rancour while others were outspoken in their disappointment with the reticent approach taken by Simpson. Finally, there was a remnant that adopted glossolalia but remained with the organisation.

Carrie Judd Montgomery was an evangelist and strong proponent of divine healing.⁹¹ In 1881 she became the editor of *Triumphs of Faith*, a periodical that focused on faith healing and the promotion of holiness. When the Alliance was organised in 1887 she was the first recording secretary, and her ties to Simpson organisationally and personally were forever strong. Her husband, George, visited the Azusa Street Mission and was convinced of glossolalia, while Carrie Montgomery was hesitant. Open to whatever God had for her, Carrie began to seek God's will in the matter. On June 29, 1908, while visiting her friend Lucy Simmons, she spoke in tongues for the first time. In January 1914 she was ordained in the COGIC and, as that group evolved into the AG, she became a charter member of the Assemblies. She did so without severing her ties to the Alliance family. Montgomery subscribed to the 'initial evidence' understanding of glossolalia but was never a doctrinaire

⁹⁰ Simpson, 'Editorial', *Alliance Witness* (September 13, 1913), 353.

⁹¹ See Carrie Judd Montgomery, *"Under His Wings": The Story of My Life* (Oakland, CA: Office of Triumphs, 1936), and Jennifer A. Miskov, *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery (1858-1946)* (Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2012).

separatist. Miskov refers to her as a ‘bridge-builder between evangelicals and Pentecostals’.⁹² She represents those who departed from the immediate organisation of the Alliance to a Pentecostal ministry without cutting the familial ties.

William Wallace (W. W.) Simpson (no relation to A.B. Simpson) was a pioneer Alliance missionary to China.⁹³ While attending a conference of missionaries in Taochow, China, in 1912, he testified to receiving the baptism of the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues.⁹⁴ Simpson was strongly committed to the doctrine of ‘initial evidence’. When conflict emerged within the CMA in 1914 concerning this doctrine, he withdrew from the Alliance and subsequently joined the AG and returned to China.⁹⁵ Gary McGee says that during W. W. Simpson’s lifetime, ‘[he] became one of the best-known missionaries in the Pentecostal movement’.⁹⁶ Unlike Montgomery, W. W. Simpson did not go quietly.⁹⁷ In a letter dated October 17, 1916, Simpson wrote,

[Stop] fighting against God in turning down the teaching that the Lord baptized people in the Holy Spirit now just as He did on the day of Pentecost . . . And if you will only humble yourself to seek the Lord for this mighty baptism, you’ll get it and then you’ll *know* what I am talking about.⁹⁸

The issue lingered in the minds of the Alliance family. Writing from the mission field, Robert Glover commented in the October 5, 1918, issue of the *Alliance Weekly* that ‘conflicting forces’ had returned ‘To the very center of our field and with the object of raising a controversy and causing a defection from our native churches on the issue of “tongues”’.⁹⁹ Clearly, the reluctance of A. B. Simpson and the Alliance had proved distasteful to Wallace,

⁹² Miskov, ‘Carrie Judd Montgomery: A Passion for Healing and the Fullness of the Spirit’, *Assemblies of God Heritage* (2012), 10.

⁹³ See G. B. McGee, ‘Simpson, William Wallace’, in Burgess, *New International Dictionary*, 1070-1071.

⁹⁴ W. W. Simpson, ‘Notes from Kansu’, *Alliance Weekly* (March 1, 1913), 345.

⁹⁵ *Alliance Weekly* (May 30, 1914), 130.

⁹⁶ Gary McGee, ‘William Wallace Simpson’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 787, and Edith Blumhofer, ‘William W. Simpson’, in *Pentecostal in My Soul*, 237-244.

⁹⁷ For a discussion of factors in the reluctance of the Alliance to accept Pentecostalism, including the defection of W. W. Simpson, see Richmann, ‘Blaspheming in Tongues’, 139-155.

⁹⁸ Letter quoted in Nienkirchen, *A.B. Simpson*, 112. Nienkirchen says the original letter is attached to the Executive Committee *Minutes* of the Alliance Board of Managers for June 13, 1914.

⁹⁹ Robert Glover, ‘Our Foreign Mail Bag’, *Alliance Weekly* (October 5, 1918), 5.

and perhaps he represents many more disenchanted Alliance followers who found the practice of ‘speaking in tongues’ not only acceptable but desirable.

John Salmon represents persons who professed to receive the Baptism of the Holy Spirit with tongues but who did not leave the bounds of the CMA organisation. Simpson and Salmon were described as soul mates. When the Alliance was formed in 1887 Salmon was a founding vice-president and served twenty-five years in that capacity. Salmon professed a Pentecostal experience at a CMA camp meeting in Ohio in August 1907:

About three o’clock in the morning one said to me that we had better retire to rest. I replied to the effect that I would remain till four o’clock. Shortly after that a power came upon me as I was bended lowly in prayer and praise, and straightened me upright and in this attitude I continued for a length of time repeating over and over again: “Glory to Jesus, Glory to Jesus,” till by and by I got down on the straw covering the ground of the Tabernacle. There I remained conscious all the time, but shaking a good deal and uttering a few words in a tongue to me unknown.¹⁰⁰

At the age of seventy-five Salmon entered a new phase of ministry that included ‘Praying for many who were hungry for the baptism of the Spirit’, though there is no evidence that Salmon adopted the ‘initial evidence’ understanding of Pentecostalism.¹⁰¹ While convinced of the Holy Spirit’s work in his heart and satisfied that it was for others, Salmon became concerned about the excesses of the movement. He died with the blessing of the Alliance while at the same time a participant in the Pentecostal Movement.

Summary

A. B. Simpson sought to accommodate the Pentecostal Movement where he could and he ultimately died in frustration. His efforts to reconcile conflicting elements within the Alliance concerning Pentecostalism had failed: ‘Why may we not have the ministry of teaching, the gifts of wisdom, knowledge, the faith of primitive Christianity, and even the

¹⁰⁰ John Salmon, ‘My Enduement’, *Christian Missionary Alliance* (October 26, 1907), 54-55.

¹⁰¹ Montgomery, *Under His Wings*, 187.

tongues of Pentecost, without making them subjects of controversy . . .'.¹⁰² And yet he could not move beyond his principles: 'The most pernicious error abroad today in connection with these gifts is to make them a necessary test of our having received the Holy Ghost, and come into the fullness of Christ'.¹⁰³

Accommodation with the Pentecostal Movement had brought Simpson agony of spirit and extensive conflict and loss in the movement that he had given his life to promoting. His objection to the 'initial evidence' theory was a bridge he could not cross, nor could his friends who had accepted tongues with 'initial evidence' relent in their conviction. While the Alliance was strong enough to accommodate some who remained within their ranks, ultimately the unique organisation furthering missions at home and abroad would move forward without their former friends. To borrow a phrase from Edith Blumhofer, the Alliance 'offered fertile soil' to Pentecostalism.¹⁰⁴

3.4 J. M. Pike and *The Way of Faith*

Alexis de Tocqueville observed,

A newspaper can drop the same thought into a thousand minds at the same moment. A newspaper is an adviser that does not require to be sought, but that comes of its own accord and talks to you briefly every day, of the common weal, without distracting you from your private affairs.¹⁰⁵

He further suggested that newspapers held readers together in space and time.¹⁰⁶ No one illustrated this axiom more adequately than John Pike and *The Way of Faith*.

¹⁰² A. B. Simpson, 'Members One of Another', *Alliance Weekly* (December 8, 1917), 146.

¹⁰³ Simpson, 'Gifts and Grace', *Christian Missionary Alliance* (June 29, 1907), 302.

¹⁰⁴ Blumhofer, 'Iowa's Pentecostal Pioneer', 46.

¹⁰⁵ de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, II.2.6, <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/de-tocqueville/democracy-america/ch28.htm#p6> (accessed December 5, 2018). For the role of print in the spread of Pentecostalism, see Randall Stephens, "'There is Magic in Print': The Holiness-Pentecostal Press and the Origins of Southern Pentecostalism", *Journal of Southern Religion*, <http://jsr.fsu.edu/2002/Stephens.htm>, and <http://jsr.fsu.edu/2002/stephens2.htm> (accessed July 24, 2021). For the impact of *The Apostolic Faith*, see Lindsay Brooke Maxwell, 'The Pneuma Network: Transnational Pentecostal Print Culture In the United States and South Africa, 1906-1948', (PhD diss., Florida International University, 2016).

¹⁰⁶ Interpretation of de Tocqueville by Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 100.

John Pike was a Canadian from Newfoundland where he served as a Methodist district superintendent. His familiarity with the AHM was thorough. Pike reported that

for forty years we have been in close touch with the Holiness Movement. We have known intimately some of the leaders: Inskip, McDonald, Wood, Hughes, and many others. We have attended their meetings, have been a constant reader of their literature.¹⁰⁷

Pike heard John Inskip preach on entire sanctification as a second work of grace and professed to receive this experience. Responding to a call in the *Christian Witness* for holiness ministers to come to the South, he arrived in Columbia, South Carolina, where he worked with the MECS.¹⁰⁸ In 1890 he became director of Oliver Gospel Mission¹⁰⁹ and editor of *The Way of Faith*, an independent publication from Columbia, South Carolina. He would hold the two positions until 1931. It was in his role as editor of *The Way of Faith*, which promoted entire sanctification, that Pike would influence a broad constituency to support the Pentecostal revival, although there is no evidence that he personally ever spoke in tongues.

His sermon on ‘Holiness’ was included in an 1894 collection of NHA sermons, which included messages by holiness worthies such as J. A. Wood, C. J. Fowler, and others.¹¹⁰ He supplied devotional thoughts on ‘Jesus Our Sanctifier’ in a devotional volume entitled *Jesus*

¹⁰⁷ John M. Pike, ‘The Wheat and the Tares’, *The Pentecostal Evangel* (November 27, 1920), 7. This information was included in an article entitled ‘The Wheat and the Tares’ in response to a strongly worded anti-Pentecostal article written in *The Pentecostal Herald* by G. W. Ridout, entitled ‘Satan’s Devices Deceiving the Very Elect’. See *The Pentecostal Herald* (September 1, 1920), 4-5. For G. W. Ridout, see Kostlevy, ‘George Whitefield Ridout’, in Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 252-253. Pentecostal leader E. N. Bell took exception to the Ridout article, calling it ‘uncharitable and misleading . . . revealing the writer’s ignorance of the real situation’. But Bell commended Pike for his response to Ridout’s article, calling him ‘fair-minded’. See Bell, ‘Was It Wise or Charitable’, *The Pentecostal Evangel* (November 27, 1920), 7. Mrs. E. A. Sexton, editor of the Pentecostal periodical *The Bridegroom’s Messenger*, took exception to the Ridout article as well. See Sexton, ‘The Latter Rain Critics’, *The Bridegroom’s Messenger* (October-November, 1920), 1.

¹⁰⁸ For biographical information on Pike, see South Carolina Encyclopedia, ‘Pike, John Martin’, <https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/pike-john-martin/> (accessed August 29, 2020). Raymond Browning says Pike came to the South from Nova Scotia seeking healing for tuberculosis. Browning also perhaps incorrectly identifies John Inskip as a blacksmith from Wilmington, Delaware. See Browning, *God’s Melting Pot* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1951), 23-26.

¹⁰⁹ Oliver Gospel Mission was established July 21, 1888, in Columbia, South Carolina, by Rev Robert Oliver to provide care for destitute citizens. He was a Methodist who professed and preached entire sanctification.

¹¹⁰ Pike, ‘Holiness’, in William McDonald, *The Double Cure, or, Echoes from National Camp Meetings*, (Boston: Christian Witness, 1894), 1-25.

Only: A Full Salvation Year Book, published by Martin Wells Knapp.¹¹¹ In 1901 Pike was listed as a licensed minister with the Pentecostal Mission in Nashville, Tennessee, which was led by J. O. McClurkan,¹¹² and in 1903 he was listed as an associate editor of *Living Water*, a holiness publication from Nashville edited by McClurkan.¹¹³

J. M. Pike's Support of B. H. Irwin

Pike was a zealous seeker after a greater realisation of the presence and power of God. He earnestly sought revival that would issue in worldwide evangelisation. He was constantly scanning the religious horizon for an even greater manifestation of the Holy Spirit. B. H. Irwin and his emphasis on an additional work of the Spirit appealed to Pike, and he forthrightly recommended Irwin to his readers:

Brother Irwin is a local elder in the Wesleyan Methodist Church, is thoroughly Wesleyan in his view of entire sanctification as a work of the Holy Spirit subsequent to regeneration and received instantaneously after complete consecration and faith. He also believes that the Holy Spirit will lead the soul that is loyal to His teachings on to a fuller, richer, deeper baptism of the holy fire . . . Give him a patient, prayerful unprejudiced hearing . . . God bless B. H. Irwin.¹¹⁴

This recommendation is given with the periodical masthead listing ardent holiness traditionalists G. D. Watson and Beverly Carradine as special contributors.¹¹⁵ Synan explains that anomaly:

Three decades later [since Vineland Camp Meeting in 1867] many holiness partisans had lost their fire and had become passive in their sanctification

¹¹¹ Pike, 'June—"Jesus Our Sanctifier"', *Jesus Only*, 90-104. Other writers include W. B. Godbey, A. M. Hills, and Seth Rees.

¹¹² John T. Benson, *A History 1898-1915 of the Pentecostal Mission, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee* (Nashville, TN: Trevecca, 1977), 56. For McClurkan, see H. Ray Dunning and William J. Strickland, *J.O. McClurkan: His Life, His Theology, and Selections from His Writings* (Nashville, TN: Trevecca, 1998).

¹¹³ See *Living Water* (April 23, 1903), 11. During the years 1899-1903 Pike edited a periodical called *Living Water*, headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia. Apparently, *Zion's Outlook*, a periodical edited by J. O. McClurkan, merged with Pike's *Living Water*, with the McClurkan periodical taking the name *Living Water*. See Benson, *A History*, 56.

¹¹⁴ 'Rev. B.H. Irwin', *Way of Faith* (November 25, 1896), 4.

¹¹⁵ For a discussion of accommodation to tongues speaking by G. D. Watson, Wesleyan Methodist evangelist, see King, *Genuine Gold*, 182-183, and Lawrence, *The Apostolic Faith Restored*, 85.

experience and testimony. To Pike and many more holiness people, Irwin seemed like a new hope for the revival and renewal of the movement.¹¹⁶

His readers were also hyped with the burgeoning interest in the ‘any moment return’ of Christ. In 1896 Pike began a section called ‘Current Notes’, which depicted world conflicts, natural disasters and social turmoil as telling evidence of the imminent coming of Christ.

J. M. Pike and the Azusa Street Revival

From California, word came of a special moving of God that involved tongues speaking and the reappearance of the gifts of the Spirit as on the Day of Pentecost. Frank Bartleman began providing serial accounts of events at Azusa Street, which Pike published in *The Way of Faith*. The result was that much of the Holiness Movement in the Southeastern United States was apprised of the event and followed its developments with interest. The effect was powerful against the backdrop of Pike’s agenda for meaningful spiritual renewal.

Stephens assesses the impact of *The Way of Faith* on the spread of the Azusa Street message:

J. M. Pike’s South Carolina-based journal *The Way of Faith* quickly became the key southern disseminator of the Los Angeles movement. Reports of the revival filled its pages beginning in 1906. He reprinted startling accounts of men and women speaking in tongues and performing miracles at Azusa. The editor convinced hundreds, if not thousands, of holiness people that they had somehow been denied the full gospel until now.¹¹⁷

Unfortunately, there are no known extant copies of *The Way of Faith* during 1906–1907, which would have provided Pike’s immediate comments concerning the events of Azusa Street. But Pike did journey to Dunn, North Carolina, and was present when J. B. Cashwell brought the Azusa Street Revival to the eastern United States. His reaction to the services was affirming and supportive:

Beloved, God is in this movement! Get low enough and you will see it . . . Oh! brethren! Let us heed the admonitions, “Be Filled with the Spirit,” and we will soon

¹¹⁶ Synan and Woods, *Benjamin Hardin Irwin*, 30.

¹¹⁷ Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 201.

find ourselves “in tune with the infinite” and all perplexing questions relating to “unknown tongues” and other gifts will be answered.¹¹⁸

Pike’s favourable assessment did not dissipate with the passing of time. In the January 9, 1910, issue of *The Way of Faith*, Pike re-evaluated the Pentecostal revival:

The Reformation begun by Luther, the Holiness Revival prompted by the Wesleys, the new impetus given to the teaching of Divine Healing by Dorothea Trudel in Europe and A.B. Simpson in America, the Welsh Revival promoted chiefly by Evan Roberts, were but the preparatory stages of the greatest spiritual revival since Apostolic times—the Pentecostal Revival of the last three years . . . *Apostolic power is returning to believers* . . . we have been fully persuaded that the origin of the movement was divine, and that it was but the beginning of the great outpouring of the Spirit promised for the latter days.¹¹⁹

And yet, Pike threw a shadow on the very movement he equated with the Wesleys: ‘We have never believed that all the teachings, all the methods, and all the manifestations connected with the Pentecostal movement were of the Lord’.¹²⁰ He did not elaborate on the nature of the objectionable manifestations but cautiously suggested that Satan had ‘managed to introduce fanaticism’.¹²¹

Question of J. M. Pike’s Allegiance to Pentecostalism

There is no question that Pike numbered himself amongst the supporters of the Pentecostal Movement. In response to an attempt by the Board of Trustees of the Oliver Rescue Mission to remove him from the directorship of the mission and editorship of *The Way of Faith* because of his Pentecostal sympathies, Pike set the record straight:

So strong is our conviction on this subject that no power on earth could induce us to deny this truth or cause us to refrain from doing all we can to promote it. God has given us a mission to give it prominence the balance of our days and no prospect of earthly loss of position, or support of friends, or of neglect or ostracism can for a moment cause us to deviate from our appointed mission. We stand for the deepest

¹¹⁸ Reprinted in *New Acts* (February 1907) from an article in *The Way of Faith*. While there are no available copies of *The Way of Faith* from 1907, there are articles from the time period that appeared in other religious periodicals. *New Acts* was a Pentecostal periodical published in Alliance, Ohio, by Levi Lupton.

¹¹⁹ Pike, ‘Watchman, What of the Night?’, *Way of Faith* (January 6, 1910), 1.

¹²⁰ Pike, 1.

¹²¹ Pike, 1.

spiritual experience and the fullest equipment of Christian service and these can only come through the Pentecostal baptism.¹²²

And yet he had questions. Pike reviewed the movement and concluded, ‘Though the work has been hampered by much that is human, fleshly and Satanic, it is heaven-born, and is but the prelude of “the times of refreshing” that shall come from the presence of the Lord preceding the rapture of the saints’.¹²³ But was he a Pentecostal? Malcolm Taylor reviewed the history of *The Way of Faith* and identifies Pike with the ‘glossolalists’: ‘J.M. Pike’s *Way of Faith* . . . [is an] example of magazines that substantially changed their editorial viewpoint into that of firm support for Pentecostalism once their editor had become glossolalist’.¹²⁴ Paul King identifies *The Way of Faith* as ‘a holiness periodical that became Pentecostal’,¹²⁵ and includes Pike in a listing of ‘Tongues Speakers Who Left the C&MA’.¹²⁶ Perhaps it is fair to say that Pike was a Pentecostal at heart but not in practice:

Though we do not yet claim to have received this Pentecostal baptism in all its fullness, blessedness and joy and enrichment to our own experience, while tarrying for this blessing it has but deepened our conviction of its heavenly origin.¹²⁷

In the strictest sense, then, Gerald Wayne King is correct in identifying Pike as a ‘holiness booster of Pentecostalism’.¹²⁸

Summary

The loyalties of Pike are confusing. His accommodation to Pentecostalism is apparent in his active promotion of the movement on the printed page, his personal quest for complete identification in experience, and his readiness to defend the movement despite the excesses

¹²² ‘Dr. Pike in His Defense’, *The Daily Record* (April 10, 1909), 7. For the conflict with the Oliver Mission Board of Trustees, see *The Daily Record* (April 10, 1909), 1. Pike retained his position by a single vote after the resignation of the chairman of the board, Methodist Rev F. G. Anderson, before the decisive action.

¹²³ J. M. Pike, quoted in ‘Editor J. M. Pike’, *Word and Work* (June 1914), 177.

¹²⁴ Malcolm John Taylor, ‘Publish and Be Blessed: A Case Study in Early Pentecostal Printing History, 1906-1926’ (PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 1994), 71.

¹²⁵ King, *Genuine Gold*, 99.

¹²⁶ King, *Genuine Gold*, Appendix 1.

¹²⁷ ‘Dr. Pike in His Defense’, 7.

¹²⁸ Gerald Wayne King, ‘Disfellowshipped: Pentecostal Responses to Fundamentalism in the United States, 1906-1943’ (PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2009), 171.

he acknowledged. But this identification did not preclude his continued association with the broader Holiness Movement that rejected Pentecostalism. The October 14, 1909, issue of *The Way of Faith* carried articles by G. D. Watson and a news item concerning his recent visit with Beverly Carradine and the holiness people of Bennettsville, South Carolina, whom he commends for being ‘in the succession of old-time, Scriptural, Methodist testimony’.¹²⁹ By 1913 his questioning of usage of the term ‘second blessing’ as too narrow for the potential of Christian experience earned him the approval of early AG leader, E. N. Bell.¹³⁰

Pike’s support of the AHM and the emerging Pentecostal Movement, coupled with his ready endorsement of B. H. Irwin and the Fire Baptized message, suggests that Pike was an earnest seeker after the work of God through the power on the Holy Spirit. His apparent zeal for demonstrative aspects of religion suggests marginal concern for theology. Without question, his publishing work was extremely influential, especially throughout the Southeastern United States, and his promotion of Pentecostalism established him as a primary accommodating influence in the Holiness Movement, which was his original home and which he never rejected.

3.5 Conclusion

The strident opposition to Pentecostalism by the National Holiness Association and the majority of its component parts is in stark contrast to the accommodation represented by C. S. Hanley, A. B. Simpson, and J. M. Pike. The latter three were not insistent upon the Wesleyan *ordo salutis*, did not struggle with the idea of a third work of grace, did not seem to object to the emotionalism of Pentecostalism, and with the exception of Simpson, did not worry about the organisational stability of their respective ministries. Their commonality with the NHA lay in their acceptance of entire sanctification as a second work of grace.

¹²⁹ ‘On the Wing’, *Way of Faith* (October 14, 1909), 1.

¹³⁰ E. N. Bell, ‘The Second Blessing’, *Word and Witness* (December 20, 1913), 2. For biographical information on Bell, see Wayne Warner, ‘Eudorous N. Bell’, Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 53.

However, the commonality did not override the accommodation to Pentecostalism. While the accommodating party might find it possible to find fellowship with their counterparts, those who understood the emerging movement to be unscriptural and undesirable could not respond in kind. Time extended the lines of demarcation until the constituencies of the two viewpoints became virtually exclusive of each other. Hanley, Simpson, and Pike did not want it that way. They each viewed their position of accommodation as capable of being extended to both parties involved, but this viewpoint was not shared. The World Faith Missionary Association would lose its organisational identity. The Christian and Missionary Alliance, while maintaining the second work of grace in their doctrinal statement, would move away from the association with the AHM maintained by Simpson.¹³¹ *The Way of Faith* would revert to its more traditional holiness origins, with holiness stalwart John Paul succeeding Pike as editor.¹³² Meanwhile, as their respective destinies evolved, the three groups made important contributions to the emerging Pentecostal Movement. The idealism of accommodation being lost, opposition or acceptance to Pentecostalism became the more definable narrative as the AHM confronted Pentecostalism.

¹³¹ The present statement of the CMA regarding a second work of grace is as follows: 'It is the will of God that each believer should be filled with the Holy Spirit and be sanctified wholly . . . This is both a crisis and a progressive experience wrought in the life of the believer subsequent to conversion'. Christian and Missionary Alliance, 'Statement of Faith', <https://cmalliance.org/who-we-are/what-we-believe/statement-of-faith/> (accessed June 28, 2022). Despite the statement of faith regarding a second work of grace, the CMA has not always been understood as Wesleyan in their understanding of the same. Grant Wacker comments, 'Ultimately [the reformed view of holiness] was institutionalized in the Christian and Missionary Alliance'. Wacker, quoted in Edwin Tait, 'The Cleansing Wave', *Christian History and Biography* 82 (2004), 22-25.

¹³² 'Editor J. M. Pike', *Word and Work* (June 1914), 177. For biographical information on John Paul, see William Kostlevy, 'John Haywood Paul', *Historical Dictionary*, 202-201.

CHAPTER FOUR

ACCEPTANCE OF PENTECOSTALISM WITHIN THE AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT

4.1 Introduction

This research has examined the groups within the American Holiness Movement that rejected Pentecostalism and those that accommodated tongues speaking. This chapter will examine groups that accepted Pentecostalism and became part of the emerging movement. For these groups, the concerns of the Wesleyan *ordo salutis*, biblical exposition of Acts 2, extreme emotionalism, worship practices, and institutional stability were adjudged to be of less (if any) importance when compared to the replication of the Day of Pentecost, particularly tongues speech. Methodism placed strong emphasis upon experimental religion and was born with a certain primitivism that marked both the British and American families. Albert Outler observes,

There can be no doubt that for Wesley, Apostolic Christianity was normative or that its restoration continued as an ideal for him and for his people . . . even the American Methodists, with a far less vivid or rich sense of tradition, understood themselves as reforming a debilitated church rather than reconstituting one.¹

This same impulse to recover apostolic Christianity remained latent, if not vividly expressed, in the AHM. Consequently, there was no sense of the ‘cessation of the charismata’ in its theology or worship. Rather, there was an emphasis on its importance, particularly in the more radical segments of the Holiness Movement. W. B. Godbey said,

While none of the gifts are essential to our salvation they are all essential in the salvation of others. Consequently, we cannot appreciate them too highly in their place, while we should guard against the trick of the enemy, who would have us exalt them above the graces, by which our own souls are saved.²

¹ Albert Outler, “‘Biblical Primitivism’ in Early American Methodism”, in Richard Hughes, ed., *The American Quest for the Primitive Church* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 134.

² W. B. Godbey, *Bible Theology* (Cincinnati, OH: God’s Revivalist Office, 1911), 150.

It was in this tension of genuine versus spurious that the AHM engaged Pentecostalism. And it was with a passion for the ‘fullness of God’ that some found the practice of tongues speech both authentically like the early Church in the past, and confirming valid Christian experience for themselves and others in the present. Some would understand the movement to fall into Godbey’s category as a ‘trick of the enemy’, but others would embrace the movement as a fulfilment of the divine promise in anticipation of the premillennial coming of Christ. Denominational acceptance of Pentecostalism would primarily appear in the Southeastern United States, where the third work emphasis of the Fire Baptized Holiness Church prepared them both theologically and experientially for acceptance. Others, more diverse geographically, would simply aspire to a more complete appreciation of the gifts and find the new movement fulfilling.

There were specific issues that contributed to the decision to accept glossolalia. Some are overt and others covert. But they need to be examined to properly understand the acceptance of Pentecostalism.

Premillennialism

One of the defining aspects of the RHM that confronted Pentecostalism was the commitment to premillennialism. Drawing from their roots in the RHM, Pentecostals immediately accepted this interpretation of the second coming of Christ with even greater enthusiasm than their counterparts. They understood that the immediacy of the second coming of Christ mandated evangelistic urgency at home and abroad. The barrier to foreign evangelism was communication. With the introduction of glossolalia as a missionary language, the barrier had been breached. With the conviction of premillennialism as a motivating force, Pentecostals hurried to the four corners of the world, able (as they thought) for the first time to directly communicate the message of salvation.

Divine (or Faith) Healing

The focus on healing of the body came slowly to the American Holiness Movement.³ The early leadership of the NHA was reluctant to emphasise it fearing it would distract the public from the doctrine of entire sanctification. The RHM readily adopted the emphasis and practised it. The message of divine healing brought a renewed emphasis on the charismata, which was understood to be characteristic of the early church. The Restoration motif was a driving force in the energy of emerging Pentecostals. Divine healing, then, provided a segue from a renewed emphasis upon supernatural activity in the church to the practice of glossolalia.

Ecstatic Worship

The worship styles of the AHM saw transition from the more structured forms recommended by Wesley for the MEC to the more exuberant expressions of the holiness camp meeting. The RHM enthusiastically adopted demonstrative worship. *Free Methodist* editor Charles Ebey even suggested that Pentecostal worship as demonstrated at Azusa Street was rather ‘tame’ compared to Free Methodist camp meetings in the eastern United States.⁴ For persons attracted to glossolalia, the emotional atmosphere of the RHM services provided for an easy transition to the patterns of Pentecostal worship.

Lifestyle Patterns

The lifestyle mores of the AHM seem to have emerged from their Methodist roots. However, they were quickly adopted and intensified by the RHM, given its ‘other-worldly’ approach to society. Wallace Thornton Jr. provides discussion of the priority of lifestyle

³ See discussion on pages 14-15 of this thesis.

⁴ Ebey, ‘Tongues Mission, Azusa Street, Los Angeles, California’, *The Free Methodist* (May 7, 1907), 8.

issues in the RHM in his volume, *Radical Righteousness: Personal Ethics and the Development of the Holiness Movement*.⁵ The early Pentecostals inherited this concept. But the emphasis must not be understood exclusively as a replication of their roots. The practice of the early church regarding the common ownership of goods illustrated their ‘other-worldly’ approach to living. Pentecostals with their Restoration motif found this circumscribed lifestyle attractive.

Upward Mobility

Closely associated with Restoration-modelled lifestyle simplicity was the alternative example of the AHM. The issue of accommodation to societal values figured largely in the history of the AHM. The early American Holiness Movement was located on the American Eastern Seaboard where there was established wealth and cultural awareness. The MEC became the largest Protestant denomination in the United States. Methodist Bishop Matthew Simpson seems to illustrate the schizophrenic struggle between piety and prosperity. Charles Jones notes that Simpson ‘encouraged the building . . . of the first gothic temple in American Methodism, and toyed with the possibility of sanctioning liturgical worship in selected congregations’.⁶ Yet he attended the Palmer Tuesday Morning Prayer Meeting, the first holiness camp meeting at Vineland, New Jersey, and preached at National Holiness Association camp meetings. The environs of the Ocean Grove Holiness Camp meeting reflect this stress point. Attended by wealthy corporate executives, the tented gathering became a ‘city in the woods’ complete with stylish living quarters.

The RHM rejected this social adjustment. The Free Methodist Church offers a classic example of rejecting societal *status quo* for ministry to the poor. P. F. Bresee emphasised

⁵ See Wallace Thornton Jr., *Radical Righteousness: Personal Ethics and the Development of the Holiness Movement* (Salem, OH: Schmull, 1998).

⁶ Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 11. For further discussion of the contrasts in the life of Simpson, see Robert Clark, *The Life of Matthew Simpson* (New York: MacMillan, 1956), 164, 276.

ministry to the poor. Timothy Smith describes the ‘chief aim’ of the Church of the Nazarene as ‘to preach holiness to the poor’.⁷ Rejecting high-steepled churches, paid pews and choirs, and preferences to the rich, the RHM identified with the marginalised of society, providing missions for the chemically dependent, homes for unwed mothers, and orphanages.

Pentecostalism reflected these values and reacted radically to the model of Christian holiness immersed in contemporary society.

Effects of Societal Shifts

However, not all who had espoused entire sanctification would retain the strictures of the RHM or Pentecostalism. Charles Jones, in his volume *Perfectionist Persuasion*, attributes some lifestyle changes amongst the holiness faithful to the influence of urban life.⁸

Transitioning to the cities for work, these believers encountered mixed racial neighbourhoods, lower moral standards, and alternate worship styles. The working class values that had shaped their lives while living in the rural areas were jettisoned by some to compete with what to them was a new norm of conduct. Jones offers the example of U. E. Harding, who recovered from an altered lifestyle to seek the religion he had known in the rural areas.⁹ He was not alone. Persons and families seeking to maintain their old values clustered in missions and sometimes private homes to maintain (or restore) the ‘old time religion’ they had been taught in rural holiness settings. For those with Pentecostal roots, these gatherings saw renewal of the practices of glossolalia, divine healing, and exuberant worship. The stress of society drove them to their roots. For others without the Pentecostal orientation, the worship and living patterns of these largely marginalised city dwellers

⁷ Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 113.

⁸ Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 79-82.

⁹ Jones, 81. For biographical information of U. E. Harding, see U. E. Harding, *Is the Young Man Safe?* (West Salem, IL: Silent Evangel Society, 1911), and William Kostlevy, ‘Harding, U(lle) E(arl)’, Kostlevy, *Historical Dictionary*, 124-125.

provided an avenue of escape from a world they required for daily bread but with which they were not comfortable.

This chapter will identify denominational entities and ministries which found glossolalia to be attractive and even desirable. As part of the RHM, they accepted Pentecostalism and became the core of the emerging Pentecostal Movement.

4.2 Samuel G. Otis and the Christian Workers' Union

The primary Pentecostal focal point in the New England states revolved around Samuel G. Otis and his publication entitled *Word and Work*. Otis began his ministry in Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1878 and concluded it in Framingham, Massachusetts. Always very aggressive in his support of revival and missionary efforts, Otis identified with an intense understanding of piety involving separation from the world and sacrificial involvement in missionary endeavour. Pursing these priorities, he moved his loyalties from the NHA to the Burning Bush Movement and finally to Pentecostalism.

Samuel Otis and the American Holiness Movement

In 1878 Otis and his wife, Addie, organised the Christian Workers' Union, which published a periodical entitled *Word and Work*, and from its pages the history of the organisation is derived. Generally understood to be a Holiness periodical, the subject of holiness was seldom mentioned.¹⁰ The primary connection to the AHM was the attraction of Otis to the Portsmouth, Rhode Island, Camp meeting, where Holiness stalwart Seth Rees was the president. The pages of *Word and Work* reported sermons by Rees, M. W. Knapp, and Charles Stalker. Addie Otis transcribed the sermons and published them under the title

¹⁰ A specific exception to this general rule is an article entitled 'Entire Sanctification', which was an address from the Methodist Bishops in 1824. See *Word and Work* (May 1903), 139.

Hallelujahs from Portsmouth Camp Meeting.¹¹ Samuel Otis conducted an early morning prayer meeting. The editor noted that the Portsmouth camp meetings were

Udenominational and the truths and experiences of regeneration and sanctification were kept . . . in the forefront and divine healing and the personal near coming of the Lord Jesus Christ were given a place, and God wonderfully poured out his Spirit upon the people.¹²

By December 1901 the editor reported a convention at Park Street Church in Boston, where the speakers were Duke Farson and E. L. Harvey, founders of the MCA. Kostlevy attributes the lack of reference to the NHA to the fact that Otis was ‘increasingly frustrated with the conservatism of the National Holiness Association’.¹³ The only links to the broader Holiness Movements appear to be the literary contributions to *Word and Work* by G. D. Watson and the faithful attendance of Otis at the Portsmouth camp meeting.¹⁴ Latent toleration (and perhaps appreciation) for the more extreme expressions of Christian experience are perhaps betrayed in comments regarding Pandita Ramabai and the revival at the Mukti Mission in India.¹⁵ Commenting on reported emotional excesses, *Word and Work* observed, ‘Of course, there are many things which tend toward fanaticism, but these precious, honest souls who are just coming out of heathenism should not be criticized’.¹⁶

Christian Workers’ Union, Otis, and the Pentecostal Movement

¹¹ The pages of *Hallelujahs from Portsmouth* suggest a closer relationship to the AHM than do the pages of *Word and Work*. For instance, in *Hallelujahs from Portsmouth #4* (they were produced for each camp meeting) the speakers include E. F. Walker, Byron Rees, Edgar Levy, F. M. Messenger, John Norberry, William H. Hoople. See *Hallelujahs from Portsmouth #4* (Springfield, MA: Christian Workers Union, 1899).

¹² ‘Portsmouth (R.I.) Camp Meeting’, *Word and Work* (August 1901), 243.

¹³ Jones, ‘Christian Workers’ Union’, *Dictionary*, 180. For discussion of the Boston Convention sponsored by the Burning Bush, see Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*, 77-79.

¹⁴ For information on George Douglas Watson, see Eva Watson, *Glimpses of the Life and Work of George Douglas Watson* (Cincinnati, OH: God’s Bible School and Revivalist, 1929), and Louis Bouck, ‘A Study of the Contribution of George Douglas Watson to Promotion of Holiness’ (Master’s thesis, Pasadena College, 1965).

¹⁵ For a study of the Mukti Revival and Ramabai, see Allan Anderson, ‘Pandita Ramabai, Mukti Revival and Global Pentecostalism’, *Transformation* 23, no. 1 (January 2006) <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/026537880602300106> (accessed January 9, 2019). For the relationship between Ramabai and the FMC, see Snyder, *Populist Saints*, 895-908.

¹⁶ ‘God Bless Ramabai’, *Word and Work* (May 1906), 145.

The first hint that the CWU leadership was open to modifications of the traditional Holiness message was the publication of an article by Baptist Pentecostal sympathiser A. S. Worrell entitled ‘Is There Anything Beyond A Clean Heart’.¹⁷ Since the date of the article in 1903 precedes the Azusa Street Revival (1906), Worrell did not offer a Pentecostal solution; but apparently the Wesleyan *ordo salutis* was not binding to Otis or his readers.¹⁸ This seems to suggest dissatisfaction with the contemporary Holiness Movement solution to the sin problem and clearly raises the issue of ‘something more’.

The first reference to tongues speech to appear in *Word and Work* came in January 1907 with an article written by Addie M. Otis entitled ‘The Gift of Tongues’. While the periodical did not mention the Azusa Street Revival, news of the event had reached the eastern United States. Mrs. Otis received the report with an expression of lament: ‘It is surprising to see the various religious papers of the country denouncing wholesale the gift of tongues. We cannot understand how they dare to do so in the face of Paul’s command, “Forbid not to speak with tongues.” I Cor. 14:39’.¹⁹ The article proceeded to equate contemporary tongues speaking with the gifts of the Spirit and expressed both appreciation and caution for the renewing of the ‘gifts of the early Church’. The following month Addie Otis reported with apparent excitement, ‘The wonderful work of God which began in April of last year in Los Angeles, Cal., known as the “Tongues Movement” increases in interest and has been spreading fast. People are slain under the power of God and rise up speaking in new tongues’.²⁰

By April 1907 S. G. Otis addressed the matter. Writing about ‘The Apostolic Faith Work in New England’, Otis commented approvingly, ‘Pray that the Holy Fire may

¹⁷ Worrell, ‘Is There Anything Beyond a Clean Heart?’, *Word and Work* (March 1903), 68.

¹⁸ There is no mention of Charles Parham and the Topeka experience in *Word and Work*.

¹⁹ Addie M. Otis, ‘The Gift of Tongues’, *Word and Work* (January 1907), 12.

²⁰ Addie M. Otis, ‘The Apostolic Faith Movement’, *Word and Work* (February 1907), 51.

spread'.²¹ Successive issues of *Word and Work* were occupied with positive reports of tongues speech from California to New England and internationally. Writing in June 1907, the value of tongues speech was recognised:

There are four definite uses for the gift of tongues: First, it equips one to preach to every creature. Without this gift one cannot fulfill the great commission to preach the gospel to every creature he comes in contact with. Second, it is for the edification of the church, provided there is interpretation. Third, it is for the edification of our self, the one speaking. Fourth, it is a sign to unbelievers. Better have tongues than magic lanterns to draw the people.²²

In July 1908 Otis addressed the publishing ministry of the CWU with a clear statement of priorities: 'The Holy Ghost is using the press mightily in these days for spreading of the Apostolic Faith work over the earth. We praise him that he has given us a little part in it, in this corner of the great harvest'.²³ The August 1909 issue of *Word and Work* proclaimed for the first time on the front page the adoption of Pentecostal values. The title read '*Word and Work*—Issued Monthly for the dissemination of Pentecostal Latter-Rain Truths'.²⁴ Wayne Warner says that through the ministry of *Word and Work*, 'Many in the Northeast heard the Pentecostal message for the first time'.²⁵ In 1917 Otis broadened his ministry to Pentecostalism when he began publishing *The Bridal Cry*, a publication edited by Aimee Semple McPherson. The arrangement lasted two years.²⁶

With a change in editorship, the new editor, Morton W. Plummer (Otis remained the Superintendent of the CWU), announced a modified approach to presenting Pentecostalism:

From henceforth this publication will be devoted to the dissemination of distinctively "Latter Rain" truths. Our pages will contain less of testimony and more of teaching than most other Pentecostal papers. We expect to present articles from the clearest and strongest writers on the special truths for the times.²⁷

²¹ S. G. Otis, 'The Apostolic Faith Work in New England', *Word and Work* (April 1907), 113.

²² 'Utility of Tongues', *Word and Work* (June 1907), 162.

²³ 'The Publishing Work', *Word and Work* (July 1908), 210.

²⁴ *Word and Work* front page (August 1909).

²⁵ Wayne Warner, 'Heritage Letter', *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Spring 1990), 19.

²⁶ See Aimee Semple McPherson, ed., 'Publisher's Letter', *The Bridal Call* (July 1919), 3.

²⁷ Morton W. Plummer, 'A Divine Call to "Write"', *Word and Work* (August 1909), 148.

Otis claimed divine direction for this decision, saying, ‘When the Latter Rain began to pour out nine years ago, we were led to devote our publication to the Pentecostal Work and God has greatly blessed us in doing so’.²⁸ The transition from the AHM to Pentecostalism had been made. The combined final issue for 1919 and the initial issue for 1920 read boldly, ‘*Word and Work: A Pentecostal Magazine in the Time of the Latter Rain*’.

In 1912, following a financial collapse in Springfield, Massachusetts, Otis moved to Framingham, Massachusetts, where he purchased an old Methodist campground called Montwait. In 1913 he opened a Pentecostal camp meeting with Maria Woodworth-Etter as the evangelist. Woodworth-Etter would later write,

Thousands attended the meetings. The miracles were as great as in the days of Christ and the Apostles . . . Some had visions and revelations, and many came through speaking in tongues and interpreting . . . The heavenly choir²⁹ was manifested many times and it was most glorious.³⁰

Camp meetings continued at this site until 1921 when the CWU moved to Wellesley Park, Massachusetts, and a new facility was constructed and multiple ministries were conducted. The camp meeting saw the ministries of A. H. Argue,³¹ Zelma Argue,³² S. A. Jamieson,³³ Donald Gee,³⁴ Christine Gibson,³⁵ and many more.

²⁸ S. G. Otis, ‘A Little of My Experience’, *Word and Work* (April 1915), 104-105.

²⁹ See ‘Special Souvenir Edition’, *Word and Work* (May 1989). For discussion of the phenomenon known as the heavenly choir, see Kimberly Ervin Alexander, ‘Heavenly Choirs in Earthly Spaces: The Significance of Corporate Spiritual Singing in Early Pentecostal Experience’, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 25, no. 2 (September 10, 2016): 254-268.

³⁰ Maria Woodworth-Etter, *Signs and Wonders God Wrought in the Ministry of Mrs. M.B. Woodworth-Etter for Forty Years*, 4th ed. (Indianapolis, IN: author, 1916), 305-306. For biographical information on Woodworth-Etter, see Wayne Warner, *The Woman Evangelist: The Life and Times of Charismatic Evangelist Maria B. Woodworth-Etter*, Studies in Evangelicalism No. 8 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1986). The camp was the setting for the trial of Mrs. Woodworth-Etter for collecting money for healing and failing to perform. The case was dismissed. See Warner, *Woman Evangelist*, 216-233, and Woodworth-Etter, *Signs and Wonders*, 309-328.

³¹ E. A. Wilson, ‘Andrew Harvey Argue’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 22, and ‘A.H. Argue’, *Word and Work*, 8-9.

³² For biographical information, see Zelma Argue, *Contending for the Faith*, 2nd ed. (Winnipeg, MB: Messenger of God, 1928).

³³ ‘S.A. Jamieson’, *Word and Work*, 10.

³⁴ D. D. Bundy, ‘Donald Gee’, Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 330-332, and ‘Donald Gee’, *Word and Work*, 11-12.

³⁵ For biographical information on Christine Gibson, see Mary Campbell Wilson, *The Obedience of Faith: The Story of Rev. Christine A. Gibson, Founder of Zion Bible Institute* (Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1993).

Summary

Word and Work did not carry negative commentary towards the AHM, nor is there testimony from S. G. and Addie Otis as to their own experiences in tongues speech. Kostlevy says that superintendent Otis and editor Plummer later adopted the ‘Finished Work’ teaching of William H. Durham, but this theological adjustment is not apparent in the pages of the magazine.³⁶ There was, however, no looking back to the Holiness Movement once the decision had been made. They saw Pentecostalism as God’s evangelism tool for the latter times. In 1935 the majority of the CWU’s members joined the AG, and *Word and Work* was subsequently abandoned.

4.3 The Pentecostal Holiness Church (of North Carolina)

The AHM arrived in North Carolina primarily through the ministry of Ambrose Blackmon (A. B.) Crumpler.³⁷ A native North Carolinian and member of the MECS, Crumpler professed entire sanctification under the ministry of Beverly Carradine during a Methodist ministers’ meeting in Bismarck, Missouri, in 1890.³⁸ He returned to North Carolina ‘to preach the blessed doctrine of full salvation to my own people’,³⁹ and in 1896 a major revival promoting holiness occurred in Dunn, North Carolina.⁴⁰ In 1897 he organised the North Carolina Holiness Association following an organisational pattern utilised by the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness. The organisational meeting was

³⁶ William Kostlevy, ‘Christian Workers’ Union’, in Burgess, *International Dictionary*, 528.

³⁷ For biographical information on Crumpler, see Thornton, *Fire in the Carolinas: The Revival Legacy of G.B. Cashwell and A.B. Crumpler* (Lake Mary, FL: Creation House, 2014), and Morris, *The Vine and the Branches—John 15:5: Historic Events of the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements* ([Franklin Springs, GA?]: Advocate, 1981), 7-14.

³⁸ *The Discipline of the Holiness Church* (Goldsboro, NC: Nash Brothers, 1901), 3. For discussion of Crumpler and his sanctification experience, see Thornton, *Fire in North Carolina*, 39-42.

³⁹ *Discipline*, 3.

⁴⁰ For a brief account of the Dunn Revival, see Goff, *Fifty Years on the Battlefield*, 19-20. This revival must not be confused with the Cashwell meeting in 1906.

characterised by ‘many strange manifestations and demonstrations’.⁴¹ G. F. Taylor was present and recorded that

People would laugh, holler, scream, jump, dance, run, slap their hands and praise the Lord. The most remarkable thing on this line was the trance . . . When the trance was over, some would report that they had seen many wonderful things, some said they had been to heaven, and some reported they had seen hell.⁴²

Such was holiness worship in North Carolina. Crumpler subsequently preached at revivals and camp meetings throughout eastern North Carolina, earning the displeasure of the MECS. In 1899 he was tried by the MECS and found guilty of violating Methodist rule 301, which forbade a minister to preach in the assigned territory of another minister without permission.⁴³ Realising his time in the MECS was effectively concluded, Crumpler withdrew and organised the Holiness Church (PHCNC).⁴⁴

The Holiness Church of North Carolina

The Pentecostal Holiness Church was organised in 1900.⁴⁵ Believing that persons associated with the church were using the term ‘Pentecostal Church’ to escape the stigma of the term ‘holiness’, in 1901 the church dropped the word ‘Pentecostal’ from the name and added ‘of North Carolina’.⁴⁶ Until 1909 the group would be known officially as the Holiness Church of North Carolina.⁴⁷ In 1901 Crumpler began publishing a periodical called *The Holiness Advocate*, which would serve as the denominational periodical. While the

⁴¹ G. F. Taylor, ‘Our Church History’, *The Pentecostal Church Advocate* (January 27, 1921), 9.

⁴² Taylor, ‘Our Church History’, 9.

⁴³ For discussion of Crumpler’s relationship to the MECS, see Crumpler, ed., *The Holiness Advocate* (March 1, 1902), 2.

⁴⁴ For discussion of Crumpler’s conflicts with the MECS from his viewpoint, see Crumpler, ‘Why I Did and Why I Don’t’, *Holiness Advocate* (March 1, 1902), 2.

⁴⁵ Synan says the inclusion of the term Pentecostal (pre-Azusa Street) reflects the influence of Martin Wells Knapp and the literature published by the Revivalist Press, which made strong usage of the term ‘Pentecostal’. Synan, *Old Time Power*, 63-64.

⁴⁶ Synan, *Holiness-Pentecostal*, 73.

⁴⁷ There is disagreement amongst historians relating to the inclusion of ‘of North Carolina’ in the name. Synan says the church was known as ‘The Holiness Church of North Carolina’. Synan, *Old Time Power*, 77. G. F. Taylor says that, though the church was commonly called The Holiness Church of North Carolina, the ‘true name of the organization from 1901 to 1909 . . . was simply “The Holiness Church”’. Taylor, ‘Our Church History’, *Pentecostal Holiness Advocate* (February 24, 1921), 8.

movement was generally confined to North Carolina environs and personalities, the broader Holiness Movement was represented by the ministries of L. L. Pickett, G. D. Watson, and Seth Rees. Led by ‘that sanctified man’,⁴⁸ A. B. Crumpler, the church popularised the message of entire sanctification throughout North Carolina and presented a united front for Holiness evangelism.

The Holiness Church and the Debate Concerning Pentecostalism

In 1906 news of the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles, California, reached the Carolinas, primarily through the pages of *The Way of Faith*, a holiness periodical from Columbia, South Carolina.⁴⁹ Taylor comments,

Many of us [Holiness Church of North Carolina] were much interested in the California revival, but we did not yet catch the true significance of what was coming. We took it as a great outpouring of the Spirit in addition to what we had already received or a revival in perfect harmony with our doctrines . . . with speaking in other tongues as a gift of the Spirit.⁵⁰

Holiness Church minister G. B. Cashwell decided to visit Los Angeles, where he professed his Pentecost and spoke in unknown tongues.⁵¹ Eager to present his newfound experience, he returned to Dunn, North Carolina, and engaged in a three-week meeting, preaching and demonstrating his newly found Christian experience. The meeting sent shock waves through the PHCNC. Many of the ministers sought and found the experiences as presented by Cashwell.

Crumpler was in Florida holding evangelistic meetings and consequently was not present to hear or observe the Dunn revival. But from a distance, Crumpler was not impressed. Even before leaving for Florida, Crumpler told G. F. Taylor that ‘If Brother

⁴⁸ Goff, *Fifty Years*, 19.

⁴⁹ Crumpler commented on the incident of tongues speaking in Topeka in *The Holiness Advocate* (May 15, 1907), 1.

⁵⁰ G. F. Taylor, ‘Our Church History’, *Pentecostal Holiness Advocate* (March 17, 1921), 8. For biographical information on George Floyd Taylor, see H. Stanley York, *George Floyd Taylor: The Life of an Early Southern Pentecostal Leader* (Maitland, FL: Xulon, 2013).

⁵¹ For biographical information on Cashwell, see Beacham, *Azusa East*.

Cashwell was teaching the speaking in tongues as the evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, he [Crumpler] was going to oppose him'.⁵² The denomination waited eagerly to hear the response of their President.

Crumpler's first response was to print a cautiously supportive article from J. M. Pike's periodical *The Way of Faith*. With Pike, he would concur that the revival had positive features, although he was not prepared to support all theories and facts suggested by proponents of tongues speech. He did say, 'we believe in this revival'.⁵³ In the May 15, 1907, issue of *The Holiness Advocate*, Crumpler again offered qualified support of glossolalia:

We see no reason why the outpouring of the blessed Spirit should not be accompanied by the manifestation of all of His gifts in these days as well as in former periods of His dispensation. Only let us not discount our brother or his blessing simply because, in the distribution of the gifts, he did not get the one we did.⁵⁴

Yet from the beginning, Crumpler seems to have rejected the concept of tongues as the initial evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit for everyone, saying, 'All who receive the Holy Ghost do not speak in tongues'.⁵⁵ In the succeeding weeks, Crumpler addressed the matter in the pages of *The Holiness Advocate* while concurrently allowing testimonies concerning tongues speech to be printed in the same paper. Crumpler complicated the matter by publishing his own experience involving an unknown language. Crumpler wrote that, while praying with a deep burden for lost souls,

Suddenly the burden rolled away and I ceased to pray. Then in the next moment I began to pray in a language such as I had never heard; therefore unknown to me. It seemed that someone else was praying, and yet the sounds I heard were coming from my own lips. But not a word could I comprehend with my mental understanding.⁵⁶

⁵² Taylor, 'Our Church History', 8.

⁵³ 'Press the Revival—Reject the Counterfeit', published in *The Way of Faith* and quoted in *The Holiness Advocate* (May 15, 1906), 4.

⁵⁴ *Holiness Advocate* (May 15, 1907), 1.

⁵⁵ *Holiness Advocate* (May 15, 1907), 1.

⁵⁶ Crumpler, 'He Satisfies: He Abides', *Holiness Advocate* (June 1, 1907), 1. In the same issue, Crumpler printed a letter from G. B. Cashwell explaining his experience in glossolalia and the baptism of the Spirit. Crumpler also included an article by J. A. Culbreth entitled 'The Comforter', which clearly supported understanding the Baptism of the Holy Spirit as a third work of grace: 'Two works of grace are absolutely necessary to make us eligible to even seek the Baptism of the Holy Ghost'. J. A. Culbreth, 'The Comforter', *Holiness Advocate* (June 1, 1907), 5.

⁵⁶ *Holiness Advocate* (May 15, 1907), 1.

Thornton comments, 'From this testimony, it is obvious that Rev. Crumpler received the Pentecostal experience as defined by the early Azusa Street founders'.⁵⁷

Whatever the interpretation of the experience, there is no further record of tongues speech by Crumpler, and the experience did not mellow his attitude towards Pentecostals. G. F. Taylor remembered the turmoil of 1907:

Our president and editor was at first silent on the subject in *The Advocate*. Later he began to write against it, and soon grew very bitter in his attacks. Then the dividing line was drawn sure enough. For a while it seemed that at least half of the church would reject the revival. Others fought, and much of the year 1907 was spent in conflict and battle . . . In spite of the conflict, the revival swept on in mighty power, and the Pentecostal folk kept gaining ground.⁵⁸

The convention of 1907 was tense, although the demeanour of both sides was commendable. During the year 1908, subscriptions to *The Holiness Advocate* dwindled until publication was cancelled. Meanwhile, the Pentecostal revival was spreading.

Holiness Church Becomes Pentecostal

The 1908 convention of the PHCNC convened in Dunn, North Carolina. Taylor remembered Crumpler suggesting a separation between the two factions, since 'there was no more fellowship between the two factions than there was between the Holiness and Hard Shell Baptist'.⁵⁹ Crumpler was re-elected president unanimously but, perhaps sensing the shift in opinion, abruptly resigned and forever departed the church he had founded. A. H. Butler, a Pentecostal, was elected president. The convention proceeded to alter the article of the church discipline relating to entire sanctification:

The Scripture teaches us that after we are cleansed (John 15:30, Acts 10:25, 44) with the Blood, we then need to receive the filing of the Spirit, the Baptism with the Holy Ghost . . . that on receiving the baptism with the Holy Ghost, we have the evidence

⁵⁷ Thornton, *Fire in the Carolinas*, 172.

⁵⁸ Taylor, 'Our Church History', 8.

⁵⁹ Taylor, 8.

which followed in Acts 2nd, 10th and 19th chapters, to wit: “The speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gave utterance.”⁶⁰

A second definitive action was to restore the word ‘Pentecostal’ to the denominational name, thus reverting to its origins as ‘The Pentecostal Holiness Church’.⁶¹

Summary

Crumpler’s association with the national AHM provided him a defined understanding of the balance between theology and experience. He would have learned from Carradine and others that theology was the conduit for both receiving and regulating experience. For him, theology taught both cleansing and fullness, but never in the context of a third work of grace. Theology taught that the confirming evidence of sanctifying grace was the witness of the Spirit rather than ecstatic utterance. However, for many of those for whom Crumpler was a spiritual father and guiding light, their experience with the FBHC distorted this view. In the end, a voice of restraint was an unwelcome intrusion into what was understood and enjoyed as both Christian experience and liberty. Unable to stem the tide that he had both encouraged and sought to restrain, Crumpler limped into veritable obscurity as relates to the experience he promoted and the fellowship he had inaugurated.⁶²

⁶⁰ *Discipline of the Holiness Church*, quoted in A. D. Beacham Jr., *A Brief History of the Pentecostal Holiness Church* (Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1983), 53.

⁶¹ This name should not be confused with the Pentecostal Holiness Church, which would be the resulting denomination of a merger between the Pentecostal Holiness Church (of North Carolina) and the Fire Baptized Holiness Church in 1911.

⁶² For an account of Crumpler’s latter days, see Thornton, *Fire in the Carolinas*, 202-205. The questions surrounding Crumpler and Cashwell are intriguing. Thornton makes an attempt to explain (perhaps even justify) their disappearance while Campbell is less accommodating. Somewhere in the mix for both of them is the matter of church politics. Cashwell appears to have been a rather volatile person requiring apologies to his colleagues even before Azusa Street. The issues of the Cape Fear Conference and his own lack of promotion within the Holiness Church of North Carolina could have cooled his enthusiasm for Pentecostalism. Crumpler never seems to have been enthusiastic about glossolalia. Even his ‘testimony’ is weak. Thornton says that, after leaving the Holiness Church of North Carolina, he remained a vigorous leader in politics, but his enthusiasm for church politics seems to have been quenched.

4.4 The Fire Baptized Holiness Church

The FBHC was an institution formed through the ministry of B. H. Irwin which emphasised a third experience in the *ordo salutis* of Christian holiness. His ministry ended with his tragic downfall and resignation.⁶³ He was replaced by J. H. King, a Georgia minister who had been serving as editor of the denominational paper.⁶⁴ The headquarters of the organisation was moved from the Midwest to Royston, Georgia, and from that base of operations King rallied disheartened followers, preserving a remnant primarily located in the Southeastern United States. The Discipline was revised and, at the General Council of 1906, the church renounced ‘the doctrine of the definite baptism of fire before the baptism of the Holy Ghost’. At that juncture, the FBHC maintained that the ‘baptism of the Holy Spirit’ was received in entire sanctification as a second work of grace, which was an experience they professed to have obtained.

The Fire Baptized Holiness Church’s Acceptance of Pentecostalism

The Pentecostal message of tongues speech as the evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit was brought to the Southeastern United States primarily through the ministry of J. B. Cashwell and the revival he initiated at Dunn, North Carolina. The meeting at Dunn, North Carolina, was attended by ‘most’ of the ministers and members of the FBHC and became an experiential norm without official acceptance by the leadership of the church. J. H. King was pastoring in Toccoa, Georgia, when he began to receive news of the meeting in Dunn, North Carolina. He chose not to attend. He did not object to speaking in tongues *per se*, but was strongly opposed to the ‘initial evidence’ understanding. He determined to oppose this idea

⁶³ For a compassionate discussion of Irwin’s downfall, see Campbell, *Pentecostal Holiness Church*, 201n254.

⁶⁴ See Tony G. Moon, *From Plowboy to Pentecostal Bishop: The Life of J. H. King* (Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2017), and J. H. King, *Yet Speaketh: Memoirs of the Late Bishop Joseph H. King* (Franklin Springs, GA: Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1949).

with all his might. Not only did he believe it was unscriptural, but he was also convinced it was ‘dangerous’.⁶⁵

But King was a student and a seeker for God’s best. After an intensive search of Scripture and commentary, combined with prayer and seeking the mind of God, he felt constrained to alter his opposition. His testimony of speaking in tongues was perhaps not as compelling as some, but it was sufficient for him and his followers in the FBHC. King recounted,

The day was closing and I sat by the fire musing over the new discoveries. I must accept the new light or be dishonest. I had said that if proof was produced from the Word in support of this theory, I would accept it. It had been done. I could not deny it. And so I accepted it.⁶⁶

That evening King went forward in a public meeting to seek the experience. As he knelt and prayed,

There was a joy in my heart, and I began uttering praise with my lips. There came into my heart something new, though the manifestation was not great. There was a moving of my tongue, though I cannot say that I was speaking a definite language. I only know that there was a moving of my tongue as I had never experienced before.⁶⁷

King’s acceptance of the doctrine of tongues speech essentially removed the last hurdle to adopting Pentecostalism as official theology in the FBHC.⁶⁸ As A. D. Beacham Jr. describes it, ‘With the baptism of King, the F.B.H.C. had full support for the experience and the initial evidence from its top leadership down to the local church’.⁶⁹

The news travelled quickly, with the editor of *The Apostolic Faith*, the official journal of the Azusa Street Mission, reporting,

Publishers receive Pentecost and it transforms a paper and changes a whole movement. The position of *Live Coals* has been completely changed. God

⁶⁵ Moon, *From Plowboy*, 107. For King’s biblical basis for objecting to tongues speech, see Moon, 107.

⁶⁶ King, *Yet Speaketh*, 119.

⁶⁷ King, 120.

⁶⁸ King’s most thorough theological work regarding Pentecostalism was *From Passover to Pentecost* (Franklin Springs, GA: Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1934). For a discussion of the influence of J. H. King on Pentecostal theology, see Tony G. Moon, ‘J. H. King’s “Expansive” Theology of Pentecostal Spirit Baptism’, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 21 (January 2012): 320-343, and David Alexander, ‘Bishop J.H. King and the Emergence of Holiness Pentecostalism’, *Pneuma* 8, no. 1 (January 1986): 159-183.

⁶⁹ Beacham, *A Brief History of the Pentecostal Holiness Church*, 55.

unmistakably revealed to the editorial staff the unscripturalness of the views they entertained and entire renunciation took place . . . Henceforth the paper will be unqualifiedly committed to the truth that Pentecost is evidenced by speaking in tongues and will forever defend it against all opponents of the same, and will publish nothing contrary thereto.⁷⁰

The General Council of the FBHC met in Anderson, South Carolina, in April 1908, and amended the Basis of Union to be

In harmony with the true import of the Word and incorporated the doctrine of Pentecost according to its Scriptural aspect . . . The church began to grow and expand as a result of the real baptism of the Spirit coming upon its membership, and in a few years several new conventions were organized. The old ones began to be enlarged and in a comparatively short time their membership was doubled.⁷¹

This official action resulted in the FBHC becoming the first official Pentecostal organisation in the United States.

As a *bona fide* Pentecostal denomination, the church found itself co-existing in the Southeast with the Holiness Church of North Carolina, although they both held to the same doctrinal tenets. In 1910 the General Council of the FBHC joined in merger consultations with the sister organisation, with the results that the FBHC was dissolved into the Pentecostal Holiness Church.⁷²

Summary

B. W. Irwin's promotion of a third work of grace had prepared the people of the FBHC theologically and experientially for the transition to Pentecostalism. There was no conflict regarding the *ordo salutis*, although Irwin and his followers considered themselves Wesleyan. J. H. King, having been educated and ordained in the MEC, posed the most stringent objections, which were theological and biblical. These were resolved to his satisfaction. Thus, the FBHC, in accepting Pentecostalism, merely followed the instincts of

⁷⁰ *Apostolic Faith* (February-March, 1907), 5.

⁷¹ King, 'History of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, Chapter IV', *The Pentecostal Advocate* (April 14, 1921), 11.

⁷² For history of the consolidation, see Morris, *The Vine and the Branches*, 45-56.

its foundational understanding, which did not necessitate the internal conflict over Pentecostalism that would adhere to other denominations. Her relationship to the broader Holiness Movement is primarily, if not exclusively, to be traced through King to Irwin and his roots in the Iowa Holiness Association.⁷³

4.5 The Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee)

The Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) emerged from pious and almost indigenous beginnings amongst the mountain people of eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina.⁷⁴ Led by R. G. Spurling, a small group of spiritually sensitive persons began praying for revival in their isolated area of the country.⁷⁵ After much prayer and discussion, Spurling was joined by seven others to commit themselves

To take the New Testament, or law of Christ, [as our] rule of faith and practice, giving each other equal rights and privilege to read and interpret for yourselves as your conscience may dictate, and [be] willing to sit together as the church of God to transact business as the same.⁷⁶

The date was August 19, 1886, and the message was a call to holiness through the abandonment of worldly and sinful practices. The message of the work of the Holy Spirit was not mentioned due to unfamiliarity with the subject.

Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) and the Revival of 1896

In 1892 the Spurling group was joined by sympathetic believers from Cherokee, North Carolina, led by W. F. Bryant, a Baptist lay minister. In 1896 a revival occurred in the

⁷³ See Synan, *Old Time Power*, 81-86.

⁷⁴ For the history of the COGC, see Conn, *Like A Mighty Army Moves the Church of God* (Cleveland, TN: Church of God, 1955), and Phillips, *Quest to Restore God's House: A Theological History of the Church of God: Vol. 1 (1886-1923)* (Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2014). For a review of denominational development, see *Book of Minutes: A Compiled History of the Work of the General Assembly of the Church of God* (Cleveland, TN: Church of God, 1922). Authorship is generally attributed to L. Howard Juillerat in 1918, and completed by Minnie E. Hayes.

⁷⁵ For biographical information on R. G. Spurling, see James M. Beatty, *R.G. Spurling and the Early History of the Church of God* (Cleveland, TN: Derek, 2012).

⁷⁶ Juillerat, ed., *Book of Minutes*, 8.

Shearer schoolhouse. Services were intense and emotional and came to be characterised by a practice of speaking in tongues unknown to the speaker—a practice totally foreign to the participants.⁷⁷ But the practice was only one of several physical manifestations. Wade Phillips notes,

Notwithstanding the Pentecostal manifestations exhibited in their meetings, speaking in tongues was not at first recognized as a significant and distinct manifestation . . . the reason that early historical accounts failed to mention the manifestation of tongues speech seems to be that the attention of believers was at first focused on the more sensational and obvious demonstrations of shaking, quaking, jerking, shouting and dancing in the Spirit.⁷⁸

The revival spread, with many converted. But it would be beset with fanaticism.

Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) and the Influence of the Fire Baptized Holiness Association

Contemporaneous with the revival at Shearer schoolhouse was the coming of the Fire Baptized Holiness Church into the area.⁷⁹ Phillips comments,

The fire-baptized movement was destined to have a profound and lasting effect on the Church of God, so much so that it would be impossible to understand the spirit and developments in the church in the early twentieth century without a thorough knowledge of this movement; for the Church of God entered the twentieth century having been transformed by this movement.⁸⁰

The negative approach to holiness was popularised by the revival message of Spurling and other preachers from the mountains. In addition, the influence of the FBHC in the Beniah, Tennessee, area brought the strict regulations of the FBHC regarding dress, entertainment, and diet, and the Fire Baptized approval of demonstrative worship only confirmed the practices of the mountain people. These characteristics created a negative social image for the

⁷⁷ C. T. Davidson, *Upon This Rock*, 297-298.

⁷⁸ Phillips, *Quest to Restore*, 107.

⁷⁹ For a discussion of the interaction between the FBHC and the COGC, see Phillips, *Quest to Restore*, 119-172, and Hunter, 'Beniah at the Apostolic Crossroads', and Daniel G. Woods, 'Daniel Awrey, the Fire-Baptized Movement, and the Origins of the Church of God: Toward a Chronology of Confluence and Influence', *CyberJournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 19, <http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyber19.html> (accessed January 5, 2018).

⁸⁰ Phillips, *Quest to Restore*, 119-120.

COGC amongst other area congregations of established denominations while fostering a sense of inferiority amongst the Cleveland-based denomination. The fall of Irwin brought the FBHC into disrepute, but it also cast a shadow upon the COGC and her accepted tenets. The result was that, while the group never lost the practice of speaking in tongues, it was obscured in the efforts for survival. Persecution both bodily and psychological became a major part of the narrative for the emerging holiness denomination.

Organisation of Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee)

While shaken by theological unrest and social rejection, the church maintained its identity. On May 15, 1902, it was organised as ‘The Holiness Church at Camp Creek’.⁸¹ By 1904 the focus of activity had shifted from the mountain ministry to the more largely populated environs of Cleveland, Tennessee. In 1906 annual General Assemblies began to be held with positions formulated regarding formative doctrines and practices. The initial meeting was called to order by A. J. Tomlinson, an Indiana Quaker who had joined the group in 1903. In 1907 the group changed its name to the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), and in 1909 the first General Moderator (later Overseer) was elected. That position of leadership was filled by Ambrose Jessup (A. J.) Tomlinson, who would hold the post until 1923. While the genesis of the COGC predates Tomlinson, the story of its development, including the official adoption of Pentecostalism, pivots on his influence. Phillips says, ‘The significance of Tomlinson’s joining the church cannot be overestimated, for his charismatic personality and leadership abilities so overwhelmed the church that it became more or less an extension of his ideas and vision’.⁸²

⁸¹ This is a continuation of the same organisation that started sixteen years before but in a different locality. See Charles Conn, *Our First Hundred Years 1886-1986* (Cleveland, Tennessee: Pathway, 1986), 18.

⁸² Phillips, *Quest to Restore*, 174.

The Leadership of Ambrose Jessup (A. J.) Tomlinson

A. J. Tomlinson⁸³ was born in central Indiana near Westfield, a centre of Quaker holiness emphasis.⁸⁴ Heavily influenced by David Updegraff⁸⁵ and Dougan Clark,⁸⁶ the area would be home to holiness stalwarts Seth Rees and Charles Stalker.⁸⁷ The concepts of the AHM had overwhelmed the traditional forms of Quakerism, producing emotional revivals with a strong emphasis on experiential religion. Tomlinson professed ‘salvation’ in 1889 and ‘sanctification’ in 1893.⁸⁸ In 1897 he visited the ministry of Frank Sandford in Durham, Maine,⁸⁹ and in the summer of 1901 he visited the campus of GBS, Cincinnati, Ohio.⁹⁰ By

⁸³ For biographical studies of A. J. Tomlinson, see Lillie Duggar, *A. J. Tomlinson Former General Overseer of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee)* (Cleveland, TN: White Wing, 1964), and R. G. Robins, *A. J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Modernist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁸⁴ Tomlinson attended Westfield Union High School, a Quaker school in Westfield, Indiana, started by William M. Smith. Smith had been an associate of Levi Lupton, a Quaker become Pentecostal. Smith rejected glossolalia and became associated with the Quaker segment of the AHM. Lupton joined the CMA and went on to achieve notoriety in the Pentecostal Movement. See Simeon O. Smith, ‘William Smith’s Experience with Tongues’, *Biography of William M. Smith and History of Union Bible Seminary* (Westfield, IN: Union Bible Seminary, 1982), 51-57. For information on Levi Lupton, see C. E. McPherson, *Life of Levi Lupton: Twentieth Century Apostle of the Gift of Tongues, Divine Healer, Etc.* (Alliance, OH, 1911), Gary McGee, ‘Levi Lupton: A Forgotten Pioneer of Early Pentecostalism’, Paul Elbert, ed., *Faces of Renewal: Studies in Honor of Stanley M. Horton Presented on his 70th Birthday* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 192-208, and Shane Hoover, ‘Tales from the Rep Morgue: S2E8, Levi Lupton Part 1’, podcast audio, <https://omny.fm/shows/rep-audio-vault/tales-from-the-rep-morgue-s2e8-levi-lupton-part-1>, and ‘Tales from the Rep Morgue: S2E9, Levi Lupton Part 2’, podcast audio, <https://omny.fm/shows/rep-audio-vault/tales-from-the-rep-morgue-s2e9-levi-lupton-part-2> (accessed July 19, 2021). While the lives of Smith and Tomlinson would have coincided while living in Westfield, Indiana, no mention is made of Smith in either the Duggar or Robins biographies.

⁸⁵ Updegraff was a Quaker minister who professed and preached entire sanctification. For biography, see Dougan Clark and Joseph H. Smith, *David B. Updegraff and His Work* (Cincinnati, OH: M.W. Knapp, 1895).

⁸⁶ Dougan Clark was a Quaker minister and medical doctor who professed and preached entire sanctification. He was a professor at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana.

⁸⁷ For discussion of Holiness in the Quaker tradition, see Thomas D. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988). Both Seth Rees and Charles Stalker were contemporaries of Tomlinson in Westfield, Indiana, and Tomlinson and Stalker maintained their friendship after the Pentecostal experience of Tomlinson. See Homer Tomlinson, ed., *Diary of A.J. Tomlinson*, vol. 1 (Cleveland, TN: White Wing, 2012), 187. For Charles Stalker, see Kostlevy, ‘Charles Stalker’, *Historical Dictionary*, 242-243.

⁸⁸ The dating of Tomlinson’s sanctification experience is problematic. For a discussion of the 1893 date vs 1896, see Robins, *A. J. Tomlinson*, 118-121. For Tomlinson’s account of his entire sanctification experience, see A. J. Tomlinson, *Answering the Call* (Cleveland, TN, 1913), 5-6.

⁸⁹ For Frank Sandford, see Shirley Nelson, *Fair, Clear and Terrible: The Story of Shiloh, Maine* (Latham, NY: British American, 1989), and W. C. Hiss, ‘Shiloh: Frank W. Sandford and the Kingdom, 1893-1948’ (PhD diss., Tufts University, 1978). For the influence of Sandford on Tomlinson, see Phillips, *Quest to Restore*, 194-201.

⁹⁰ For GBS, see chapter 2 of this thesis. The information that Tomlinson attended GBS as a student is attributed to Homer Tomlinson, see Tomlinson, *Diary*, 207, and repeated in C. T. Davidson, *Upon This Rock*, 303, but denied by school authorities. See Robins, *A.J. Tomlinson*, 167.

the time Tomlinson reached the Appalachian Mountains to begin his life's work he was thoroughly familiar with the teachings of the AHM, albeit in a more radical expression.⁹¹

In 1899 Tomlinson initiated a pioneer work in Culbertson, North Carolina, and in 1903 he joined Richard Spurling Jr. and W. F. Bryant in a group known as 'The Church of God of the Bible'. By 1904 Tomlinson had moved to Cleveland, Tennessee, and was pastoring there when he presided at the first General Assembly of the COGC on October 10, 1906. In 1909 he was elected General Moderator (Overseer).⁹²

A. J. Tomlinson and Pentecostalism

Tomlinson perhaps encountered tongues speech while visiting Frank Sandford, and he certainly would have become familiar with the practice when he arrived in Appalachia. Spurling, Bryant, and others practised this worship form without a great deal of speculation or explanation. There is no immediate written evidence of interest in the Azusa Street Revival, nor does there appear to be recognition of the Dunn, North Carolina, meetings under Cashwell. It has been suggested that Tomlinson was, however, following these events in the pages of Pike's *Way of Faith*. As early as September 18, 1906, Tomlinson noted in his diary that he seemed to be divinely directed to consider the gifts of the Spirit more fully.⁹³ Later he would recount, 'In January 1907, I became more fully awakened on the subject of receiving the Holy Ghost. The whole year I ceased not to preach that it was our privilege to receive the Holy Ghost and speak in tongues as they did on the day of Pentecost'.⁹⁴

⁹¹ There are few references to Tomlinson's contact with persons in the broader AHM. In 1901 and 1902 Tomlinson edited a periodical entitled *Samson's Foxes*, in which a solitary article by Daniel Steele represented the AHM. In May 1903 he attended a convention directed by G. D. Watson. On March 15, 1905, he was present in Atlanta to hear Bud Robinson and Will Huff. On October 7, 1905, he preached with boyhood friend Charles Stalker. See Tomlinson, *Diary 1901-1924*, 35, 41, 44.

⁹² For the removal of Tomlinson from office, see Conn, *Like a Mighty Army*, 165-183.

⁹³ Robins, *A. J. Tomlinson*, 184.

⁹⁴ Tomlinson, *Answering the Call*, 10.

In June 1907 Tomlinson joined fellow COGC minister M. S. Lemons and journeyed to Birmingham, Alabama, to attend a Pentecostal revival under the direction of M. M. Pinson.⁹⁵ The pair returned to Tennessee convinced of, but not as yet blessed with, the gift of tongues speech. Meanwhile, the subject had received currency amongst the COGC people, with many experiencing the practice. Tomlinson took it upon himself to invite Cashwell to be present for the Eighth General Assembly.⁹⁶ The *Minutes* indicate that he did not preach during the General Assembly, but on Sunday, January 12, 1908, following General Assembly adjournment, Cashwell presented his experience.⁹⁷ Tomlinson recounted,

At nearly the close of his discourse, the Spirit so affected me that I slid down onto the floor, or on the rostrum, and as I went down I yielded myself up to God; and after a considerable time of agony and groans . . . After a paroxysm of suffering the Holy Ghost spoke through my lips and tongue beyond my control, that which seemed to be the very language of [an] Indian tribe.⁹⁸

He concluded this testimony by saying, ‘This was really the baptism of the Holy Ghost as they received Him on the Day of Pentecost, for they all spake with tongues’.⁹⁹ Conn says, ‘When he (Tomlinson) received his baptism, all of the Church of God ministers were then Holy Ghost baptized men, for all the others had received the experience—some as much as twelve years earlier’.¹⁰⁰

The Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) Officially Becomes Pentecostal

⁹⁵ Tomlinson, *Diary*, 67. Lemons gave his account of this event in an interview conducted by H. L. Chesser, 1948. Transcript located at Dixon Pentecostal Research Center, Cleveland, Tennessee. Pinson would later become associated with the AG. For biographical information, see Pinson, ‘Sketch of the Life and Ministry of Mack M. Pinson (Better Known as M.M. Pinson)’ (unpublished manuscript, 1949). Pinson’s account of his conversion to Pentecostalism was also recorded in B. F. Lawrence, *The Apostolic Faith Restored* (St. Louis, MO: Gospel, 1936), 90-95. Pinson was a licensed minister with Rev J. O. McClurkan and the Pentecostal Mission in Nashville, Tennessee. For biographical information, see Strickland, *J.O. McClurkan*. The group later joined the CN. For information on McClurkan and the Pentecostal Mission, see Benson, *A History*. Pinson was led into the Pentecostal understanding by Cashwell.

⁹⁶ The record of Tomlinson’s inviting Cashwell is quoted in Conn, *Like a Mighty Army*, 84.

⁹⁷ Tomlinson says Cashwell preached on Saturday night. See Homer Tomlinson, *Diary*, 2, but the *Minutes* say ‘The Assembly closed a few minutes after midnight January 11, 1908’, with no mention of Cashwell. *Minutes*, 30.

⁹⁸ Tomlinson, *Diary*, 27-28.

⁹⁹ Tomlinson, 29.

¹⁰⁰ Conn, *Like a Mighty Army*, 85.

The COGC transition to Pentecostalism would follow the journey of Tomlinson to Pentecostalism.¹⁰¹ In the months following the baptism of Tomlinson, the revival expanded throughout East Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, and the Bahamas. No official pronouncement of doctrine was offered. Conn suggests two reasons for the failure formally to adopt tongues speech in a denominational statement: ‘The New Testament was accepted as statement enough on the belief of the church and there was a nagging idea that such a written declaration might be an exercise in formalism’.¹⁰² In the August 15, 1910, issue of the *Church of God Evangel*, a list of twenty-five teachings was published as the first official statement of doctrine with the issue of tongues speech included:

8. Baptism with the Holy Ghost subsequent to cleansing. The enduement of power for service: Matthew 3:11, Luke 24:49-53; Acts 1:4-8. 9. The speaking in tongues as the evidence of the baptism with the Holy Ghost: John 15:26; Acts 2:4; Acts 10:44-46; Acts 19:1-7.¹⁰³

The teachings were adopted as the official position of the church at the 1911 General Assembly and published in the *Minutes* of the 1912 General Assembly.

Summary

Tongues speech was indigenous to the COGC, as was Wesleyan theology. Tomlinson discovered these realities when he arrived in the Appalachian Mountains and met Richard Spurling and W. F. Bryant. For that reason, aside from a short-lived connection with B. H. Irwin and the FBHC, there does not appear to be any direct link to the NHA. The coming of Tomlinson provided an exception to this norm and, due to his influence, provided an indirect link, but a link nonetheless. Due to the unique predisposition of the COGC to tongues speaking, it cannot be strictly said that the church represents an transition to Pentecostalism,

¹⁰¹ For discussion of the transition of the COGC into Pentecostalism, see Roebuck, ‘From Azusa to Cleveland: The Amazing Journey of G.B. Cashwell and the Spread of Pentecostalism’, in Hunter and Robeck, *The Azusa Street Revival*, 111-125.

¹⁰² Conn, *Our First 100 Years*, 37.

¹⁰³ *The Evening Light and Church of God Evangel* (August 15, 1910), 3. This list was prepared by a committee designated for that purpose by the 1910 General Assembly.

although Conn says that it was a ‘holiness’ church before it was a Pentecostal Church.¹⁰⁴ However, their maintaining the message of a second work of grace places them within the Wesleyan Holiness constituency, and the formal statement of ‘initial evidence’ presented in the statement of August 15, 1910, gives reason to include the denomination amongst those who moved beyond the Wesleyan *ordo salutis* to adopt the three-tiered understanding of salvation from sin.

4.6 The Church of God in Christ

The Church of God in Christ was a largely African American denomination that emerged in the late nineteenth century out of the labours of Charles Price Jones and Charles Harrison Mason.¹⁰⁵ Wesleyan-Holiness in theological orientation, it espoused the Pentecostal message, occasioning a denominational schism that produced the non-Pentecostal denomination called the Church of Christ (Holiness) led by Charles Price Jones.¹⁰⁶ It is necessary to examine the ministry of Jones to understand the dynamics that led to the organisation of COGIC.

Influence of Charles Price Jones

Charles Price Jones was the child of slave parents.¹⁰⁷ Orphaned in his teenage years, he drifted from city to city until making his home in Arkansas. He professed conversion to

¹⁰⁴ Conn, *Life a Mighty Army*, xxvi.

¹⁰⁵ There was an association of Pentecostal ministers known as the Church of God in Christ (White). Founding Bishop of COGIC Charles Mason extended permission to a group of white ministers to use the name to obtain ministerial benefits, namely ordination and clergy railroad discounts. In 1913 a second group utilising the name Church of God apparently merged with the authorised segment. Out of this merged group came the AG, which organised in Hot Springs, Arkansas, in 1914. The group adopted the ‘Finished Work of Christ’ theology promoted by William H. Durham. See W. E. Warner, ‘Church of God in Christ (White)’, in Burgess and McGee, *Dictionary*, 203-204.

¹⁰⁶ For background on the Church of Christ (Holiness), see Willenham Castilla, *Moving Forward on God’s Highway: A Textbook History of the Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A.* (Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2007), and Otho B. Cobbins, ed., *History of Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A.* (New York: Vantage, 1966).

¹⁰⁷ For information on Charles Price Jones, see Anita Bingham Jefferson, *Charles Price Jones: First Black Holiness Reformer* (Jackson, MS: author, 2011), an autobiographical sketch in Cobbins, *History*, 21-32, and Dale T. Irwin, ‘Charles Price Jones: Image of Holiness’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 37-50.

Christ in 1884 and was ordained as a Baptist minister in 1887. Gifted in speaking and writing, he served several congregations in Arkansas and ‘was ranked among the first preachers of the state’.¹⁰⁸

In 1894 Jones was called to pastor the Tabernacle Baptist Church in Selma, Alabama, which was the college church of Selma University.¹⁰⁹ While he was there, Jones testified to an awareness of a need for a deeper work of God in his life:

I found myself in need of a deeper experience of grace, a larger power. As I asked God for this grace He demanded that I let Him sanctify me; which I did. For as He demanded of me, I fasted and prayed for three days and nights. He then sanctified me sweetly in His love.¹¹⁰

There is no record of any surrounding influences or broader Holiness Movement connections that would have spawned this awareness, nor do such connections appear in the future. But his commitment to a second work of grace was elementary to his theology. Writing later in his volume, *Waymarks and High Heaps*, Jones definitively stated his belief in the ‘second blessing of grace’, given only to those ‘who have repented of all sin’.¹¹¹

In 1895 Jones accepted a call to the Mt. Helm Baptist Church in Jackson, Mississippi. His pulpit ministry there was characterised by an emphasis on holiness as a definite experience and a catalyst to separated living from societal norms. In 1897 he felt directed to issue a call for a holiness convention, which became a source of contention within the Baptist fellowship. In 1899 Jones was expelled from the Baptist Association, leading to the formation of a loose fellowship of churches sharing the holiness message. Castilla calls this association ‘the holiness movement’, although it had no connection with the NHA.¹¹² The fellowship of Holiness churches expanded, and in 1906 Jones began to discuss further organisation. Up to

¹⁰⁸ Jefferson, *Jones*, 4.

¹⁰⁹ For history of Selma University, see <https://www.selmauniversity.info/selma-university-history.html> (accessed May 27, 2019).

¹¹⁰ Cobbins, *History*, 22-23.

¹¹¹ Charles Price Jones, *Waymarks and High Heaps* (Jackson, MS: Truth, [1898?]), 11.

¹¹² Castilla, *Moving Forward*, 11-13. This terminology can be confusing to students of the broader context, but it was common amongst the followers of Jones.

that time the group had not identified as a denomination but, rather, as ‘the work’, utilising various titles such as Church of God in Christ, Church of God, Christ Holiness Church, and Christ Temple.¹¹³ The group existed without a charter. Jones was the senior bishop and president of the fellowship, and among the ministers was Charles Harrison Mason. Jones would maintain his place of leadership among his followers until he died in Los Angeles, California, on January 19, 1949. Part of his legacy is his collection of over one thousand hymns, which he felt divinely commissioned to write.¹¹⁴

Influence of Charles Harrison Mason

Charles Harrison Mason was born in 1866 near Memphis, Tennessee, and was also the son of slave parents.¹¹⁵ In 1891 he was ordained to preach. Influenced by the autobiography of African American evangelist Amanda Smith, Mason accepted the doctrine and professed the experience of entire sanctification.¹¹⁶ Mason met Charles Price Jones in 1895, and together they preached the doctrine of holiness, incurring the wrath of area Baptist associations. The two were expelled from the National Baptist Convention in 1899 and initiated a fellowship of Holiness churches in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Tennessee. Mason and Jones were colleagues and fast friends, promoting the cause of holiness as a second work

¹¹³ The origin of the name Church of God in Christ is attributed to a revelation received by Charles Mason while walking along a street in Little Rock, Arkansas, purportedly based on 1 Thess 2:14 and 2 Thess 1:1. See Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason*, 11.

¹¹⁴ As part of his sanctification experience, Jones understood ‘the Spirit spoke within from the holy of holies of my redeemed spirit, and said, “You shall write the hymns for your people.” This he said six or seven times till it was fixed in my head. I got up and went to the organ in the corner of the room, wrote a song titled “Praise the Lord,” ruled off a tablet, set it to music and sang it before I left the room’. Cobbin, *History*, 25. His first compilation of hymns was published in a songbook entitled *Jesus Only*, printed by Truth Publishing Company, Jackson, MS. The CN hymnal, *Sing to the Lord*, includes two of his songs: ‘I Would Not Be Denied’ and ‘Deeper, Deeper’. Ken Bible, ed., *Sing to the Lord* (Kansas City, MO: Lillenas, 1993), 390, 475.

¹¹⁵ For biographical information, see Ithiel C. Clemons, *Bishop C.H. Mason and the Roots of the Church of God in Christ* (Bakersfield, CA: Pneuma Life, 1996), Raynard D. Smith, ed., *With Signs Following: The Life and Ministry of Charles Harrison Mason* (St. Louis, MO: CMP, 2017), Mary Mason, *The History and Life Work of Elder C.H. Mason, Chief Apostle, and His Co-laborers* (Memphis, TN: Church of God in Christ, 1934), and Daniels, ‘Charles Harrison Mason: The Interracial Impulse of Early Pentecostalism’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 255-270.

¹¹⁶ See Amanda Smith, *An Autobiography*.

of grace and changing ‘the religious landscape in the black community and [broadening] the black religious experience’.¹¹⁷

Division over Pentecostalism

In 1906 word reached Mississippi concerning a revival in Los Angeles, California, characterised by glossolalia as evidence of receiving the Baptism of the Holy Spirit.¹¹⁸ Jones would say in later days that he had read about the revival in the *Apostolic Faith* magazine. In 1907 Charles Mason, J. A. Jeter, and D. J. Young went to Los Angeles to investigate the revival for themselves.¹¹⁹ All three professed to receive the baptism and returned to their holiness fellowship to bring testimony and encourage local sanctified believers to seek the newly experienced phenomenon.¹²⁰

In August 1907 the General Assembly of the holiness fellowship convened in Jackson, Mississippi. The findings of Mason and Young were reported to the body and promptly rejected by Bishop Jones. He did not reject tongues speech *per se*, but he opposed the initial evidence understanding, as well as what he perceived to be unacceptable worship practices. Speaking to these issues, he wrote,

I believe God’s gift of tongues shall some day be restored to the church but it will not go with a false doctrine. Why should there not be people who now speak with tongues? But they would not call a nervous gibberish a tongue, nor would they call it an evidence or **the** evidence, or the only evidence for the Bible does not.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason*, 1.

¹¹⁸ Pentecostal scholars are divided over whether Jones met William Seymour before the Azusa Street Revival. For discussion of their meeting, see Irwin, ‘Jones’, in Goff and Wacker, *Portraits*, 43-45.

¹¹⁹ The stimulus for this trip is debated. Raynard Smith says, ‘Rev. C.P. Jones selected Rev. John A. Jeter, Rev. C.H. Mason, and Rev. D.J. Young to investigate the revival’. Smith, *With Signs Following*, 16. Others suggest the trip was self-initiated by the interested parties.

¹²⁰ The testimony of C. H. Mason is recorded in *The Apostolic Faith* (February-March, 1907), 7. Jeter’s testimony is recorded in *The Apostolic Faith* (February-March, 1907), 6. Mason’s Azusa Street experience is studied in detail in Eugena Green, *Mason: The Profiling of a Saint* (Panorama City, CA: Education Plus, 2012), 33-39. Jeter later recanted, declaring the experience to be an illusion. D. J. Young’s testimony is recorded in *The Apostolic Faith* (May 1907), 1.

¹²¹ Charles Jones, *Characters I Have Met* (Chicago: Church of Christ (Holiness), n.d.), 42, quoted in Irwin, *Jones*, 42 (author’s emphasis). For further explanation of the position of Jones regarding tongues pre-Azusa Street, see Charles P. Jones, *The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Churches: What He Now Wishes to Do in Them* (Jackson, MS: Truth, 1896), 73-74. For the understanding of Jones concerning tongues post-Azusa Street, see

After considerable discussion, the General Assembly withdrew the right hand of fellowship from Mason and his supporters.¹²² Mason wrote to *The Apostolic Faith*, ‘The fight has been great. I was put out because I believed that God did baptize me with the Holy Ghost among you . . . He did and it just suits me. Glory in the Lord’.¹²³

More than Pentecostalism?

While there is no question that Jones and Mason disagreed over glossolalia, was there a complicating issue in the background? Both had emerged from slavery and both were familiar with the practices of the slaves that had been a part of their survival techniques while oppressed. Now that they both were leaders in the Black holiness movement, how would they regard such methodology represented in the ‘holy dance’ or the ‘ring shout’? Clemmons understands this to be a major issue. He describes Jones as a ‘cosmopolitan, self-contained leader of unbendable conviction’. He further understands Jones to have been of the ‘European-enlightenment with its basis in the power of reason . . . that struggled to convince whites of blacks’ intellectual and social equality’.¹²⁴ The suggestion is that glossolalia reminded Jones of his past from which he wished to be free and from which he wanted his followers to be free.

Mason was an ‘evangelist’ and interested in preserving what he felt to be the ‘rich spiritual phenomena’ resident in slave religion. He believed that ‘as blacks clamored for acceptance by whites and assimilation into the American cultural mainstream, they risked losing a spiritual treasure—the power of religious experience’.¹²⁵ Clemmons says that while

Charles P. Jones, ‘The Baptism of the Holy Spirit’, *The Gift of the Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts: A Book of Sermons* (Jackson, MS: Truth, 1910), 5-12.

¹²² Faupel understands the conflict to have been a ‘power struggle’. Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 218n127.

¹²³ *The Apostolic Faith* (January 1908), 4.

¹²⁴ Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason*, 17.

¹²⁵ Clemmons, 17. For the sociological impact of Mason’s insistence on maintaining the historic Black religious tradition, see Clemmons, 28-39. Estrela Alexander says Jones was equally insistent on maintaining slave

Mason was committed to the doctrine of entire sanctification, he was even ‘more interested in preserving what he believed to be the rich spiritual phenomena resident in Slave Religion’.¹²⁶ While there is no record of this discussion transpiring between the two friends, their respective worldviews generated by their common experience in slavery may have driven them apart.

Church of God in Christ Organised

In September 1907 Mason issued a call for a meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, of all ministers who believed in receiving the baptism of the Holy Ghost with evidence of speaking in tongues. Fourteen ministers responded, with C. H. Mason being elected bishop. They formally adopted the name Church of God in Christ. Two years of legal battles ensued to determine the proper ownership of the name and properties. In 1909 judgement was rendered, giving the name to the group led by Mason.¹²⁷ It became the first legally chartered Pentecostal body incorporated in the United States, and until 1914 it was the only Pentecostal body that could legally ordain ministers. The challenging group, led by Charles Price Jones, adopted the name Church of Christ (Holiness).

Summary

Jones’s response to the new experience of C. H. Mason was a response to Pentecostal theological/experiential innovation. It concerned theology (the role of the Holy Spirit versus the place of Christ), experience (*ordo salutis* and initial evidence), worship practices, and institutional stability. But it was more. The conflict between these two erstwhile friends

religion, citing a volume of poetry written by Jones entitled *Appeal to the Sons of Africa*, where he recalled the linkage of Blacks to their African homeland. While not denying or rejecting his ancestral roots, Jones does not seem to have insisted upon slave religion practices as did Mason. See Alexander, *Black Fire*, 49-50.

¹²⁶ Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason*, 17.

¹²⁷ For the record of court proceedings, see Calvin S. McBride, *Frank Avant vs. C. H. Mason: Mason and the Holy Ghost on Trial* (Bloomington, IN: IVerse, 2009).

mirrors Grant Wacker's 'travail of a broken family'.¹²⁸ In Mason, Jones had found a kindred spirit, a burning spirit, and a cooperative spirit. In Jones, Mason had found a man who was 'very sweet in [the] spirit of the Lord and prayed much, until I loved [him] with unfeigned love'.¹²⁹ The separation brought pain particularly because, as Stephens says, 'The break was far from amicable'.¹³⁰ Out of the dispute emerged two denominations. Both would survive beyond the conflict, but the conflict itself reflects a struggle that was not unique to those two. It was a primary characteristic of the confrontation between the Holiness Movement and the emerging Pentecostalism.

4.7 Conclusion

The AHM could ill afford to lose the passionate, intense, and energetic persons who found a new home in the Pentecostal Movement. In the early twentieth century, when mainline Holiness denominations were seeking to establish organisational identity and the NHA was coming of age from its Methodist cradle, the people who accepted tongues speech were investing in prayer, fasting, and intense missionary outreach. In time, internal theological strife deriving from the 'Finished Work of Christ' and 'Oneness' movements would rend the Pentecostal fellowship as surely as their insistence on tongues speech had brought schism within their original church home. But the landscape of holiness emphasis in the time period of 1901–1919 would be dramatically changed by the children of the Azusa Street Revival, and much of this can be attributed to the assenting denominations of Wesleyan/Holiness background that accepted, professed, and proclaimed the imperative of tongues speech as an evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

This chapter has examined organisations that transitioned from the American Holiness Movement to Pentecostalism. Any concerns about the Wesleyan *ordo salutis* were

¹²⁸ Grant Wacker, 'Travail of a Broken Family'.

¹²⁹ Mason, *The History of Elder C. H. Mason*, 15.

¹³⁰ Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 226.

waived in the interest of what was considered to be a more authentic identification with the day of Pentecost. Worship practices needed to be subservient to the perceived promptings of the Holy Spirit. Institutional ecclesiastical structures were equally subservient to the 'new wine' of the Holy Spirit. Ultimately, in the Pentecostal mind, the true church would follow their lead in accepting and adopting the practices of the early church, as they understood the Pentecost context. Having endeavoured to inform the AHM of their newfound Holy Spirit power with only limited success, they left their previous church homes to challenge the church and the world with their understanding of the power of the Holy Spirit, as they perceived it demonstrated in the Upper Room. The adversarial relationship with the American Holiness Movement concerning tongues speech was the price for being in the vanguard of what Vinson Synan calls 'the Century of the Holy Spirit'.

CONCLUSION

This thesis addresses two decades of conflict when the American Holiness Movement confronted emerging Pentecostalism, a force similar to itself but distinctive in a primary way. The focus of the confrontation was namely (though not exclusively) the role of glossolalia as an expression of the charismata. This thesis argues that the conflict resulted in a tripartite division regarding glossolalia as a means for personal assurance of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and evangelism. A large portion of the AHM rejected glossolalia as a third work of grace, an authentication of Christian experience, and a legitimate interpretation of Acts 2. It was also concerned about the decorum of worship and organisational stability. Another segment chose not to accept or reject the practice of glossolalia or persons associated with it. Instead, they believed the Holy Spirit was doing a new work in the latter days. Finally, a third group accepted glossolalia as evidence of spiritual grace and a missionary tool. The third group formed the core of what would come to be known as the Pentecostal Movement. The thesis traces the confrontation between the two movements by narrating the events, identifying the primary issues that underlay the conflict, and identifying the personalities that orchestrated the confrontation.

It is important to note that the conflict did not occur in isolation from the outside world. Although both groups saw themselves as ‘otherworldly’, they existed in a period known as ‘The Gilded Age’, which saw significant development in American society. But this development did not always spell improvement. Elizabeth Perry and Karen Smith suggest the term implied a ‘false glitter over a cheap base’.¹³¹ Increased industrialisation shifted labour opportunities from rural America to the cities, which became overcrowded. Painter observes that sensitivity to the feelings of minorities (both racial and economic) was

¹³¹ Perry and Smith, *The Gilded Age*, 134.

lacking.¹³² Of particular concern with the emergence of a post-Civil War society was insensitivity to African Americans. Reactionary impulses such as the Ku Klux Klan, labour unions, and the Farmer's Grange appeared. Out of this societal milieu, a middle class emerged whose standard of living exceeded that of the poor, but who empowered the upper class as a workforce. Wage differentials between 'white-collar' employees and 'blue-collar' labourers became more pronounced. As society became stratified based on economics, it emphasised class, with status determined by buying power. The rich became more affluent and the poor became poorer, while the middle class struggled economically and socially to keep pace with the developing material norms in society. The 'battle for bread' was complicated by burgeoning immigration from countries in Western Europe. Julie Greene places the issue of immigration in perspective:

During the Gilded Age and Progressive Era immigrants transformed the nation demographically, socially, politically, and culturally. They provided the labor that built industrial capitalism, they fueled the debates about race, ethnicity, and national identity, they shaped the legal structure of the nation, they contributed, often unwillingly, to the global power of the United States, and they generated—and participated in—wide reaching social reform efforts.¹³³

This massive influx of people of foreign extract was directly related to the Gilded Age:

Throughout the Gilded Age and Progressive Era the power of an expansive corporate capitalism and its concomitant industrialization constituted the central machine of the time, and it depended on and encouraged mass immigration.¹³⁴

The fact that these 'foreigners' were of Roman Catholic religious background brought further diversity and, hence, confusion to society.¹³⁵ The growing frustration with life was reflected by the abuse of chemical stimulants, prompting the birth of the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

¹³² See Nell Painter, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1889), 1-4.

¹³³ Julie Green, 'Race, Immigration and Ethnicity', Nichols and Unger, *Companion to the Gilded Age*, 137.

¹³⁴ Greene, 'Race, Immigration and Ethnicity', 137.

¹³⁵ See 'Immigration and Religious Diversity', in Kidd, *America's Religious History*, 150-169.

Unfortunately, the American church was in a state of flux. In his essay ‘The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880-1910’, Grant Wacker sees the church as accepting of a *status quo*, which he describes as the mainstream church life derived from the Reformed tradition and reflected in the middle class.

The Gilded Age had a dramatic and moulding effect on both the AHM and Pentecostalism. The AHM saw numerical growth during this period of social change. The national restlessness and insecurity occasioned by racial, economic, and ethnic restructuring afforded the movement an opportunity to appeal to benefits of entire sanctification, which encouraged persons to transcend self-centredness, occasioning personal peace and love for one’s neighbours. This internal change opened their eyes to the privations of race, gender, and ethnicity. And yet insensitivity toward African Americans remained in the AHM and Pentecostalism as well. Wacker observes that ‘race relations kept getting mixed up’.¹³⁶ While references to the intermingling of the races occurred in both movements, Wacker says that ‘those references did not constitute normative statements about human equality in world matters, let alone acceptance of social integration outside the meeting-house’.¹³⁷ Amongst those professing perfect love, the barrier of race continued. James Goff Jr. makes an interesting observation: ‘Though Holy Spirit baptism implied divine enablement to overcome human frailties, few seem clear about its implications or able to accept the radical consequences of its message’.¹³⁸

In chapter one, the thesis identifies the American Holiness Movement as it existed in 1901. Methodist theology was modified by American followers of Wesley, namely (though not exclusively) by Phoebe Palmer, to focus on the instantaneous reception of the grace of entire sanctification. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, this American modification of Wesley evolved into the Radical Holiness Movement as realised in the ministry of Martin

¹³⁶ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 234.

¹³⁷ Wacker, 234.

¹³⁸ James Goff Jr., quoted in Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 235.

Wells Knapp and his Revivalist movement. It was the radicalised AHM that confronted emerging Pentecostalism in the decade 1901 to 1919. The Pentecostal Movement is identified as tracing its origins initially to Charles Parham and his ministry in Topeka, Kansas, and subsequently to the ministry of William Seymour at Azusa Street, Los Angeles, California, focusing on glossolalia.

Chapter two identifies the segment of the AHM that rejected Pentecostalism and glossolalia. Comprising this group was the National Holiness Association, an umbrella organisation that provided structure for the early AHM and component organisations: the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America, the Free Methodist Church, the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, the Pillar of Fire, the Holiness Church of California, and God's Bible School and College.

Chapter three examines the segment of the AHM that regarded glossolalia with ambivalence, neither rejecting nor accepting the practice. Represented by the World Faith Missionary Association, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, and the ministry of J. M. Pike and *The Way of Faith* periodical, this group sought to maintain fellowship with all, regardless of their position concerning glossolalia.

Chapter four identifies the portion of the AHM that adopted glossolalia as both acceptable practice and confirmation of Holy Spirit baptism. It formed the core of the emerging Pentecostal Movement, further confirming the thesis's contention that the issue of glossolalia brought division and not consensus. This segment of the AHM included the Christian Workers' Union, the Pentecostal Holiness Church of North Carolina, the Fire Baptized Holiness Church, the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), and the Church of God in Christ. As a result of the decision to accept glossolalia, the entities examined were generally understood to have separated themselves from the American Holiness Movement.

Contributions

The research presented in this thesis offers an intensive understanding of the confrontation between the established American Holiness Movement and the emerging Pentecostal Movement. It provides a fresh look at the ‘family scrabble’ between the two movements by revealing internal struggles, which produced a public family ‘breakup’. But since the AHM was comprised of individual entities with their own histories and personalities, this study offers a view into the substructure of the Movement. This, despite the strife, drew little attention in broader American evangelicalism.

The thesis contributes to the field of AHM and Pentecostal studies by identifying objections of the AHM to Pentecostalism to be theologically based rather than merely an objection to a worship form. Since the experience of entire sanctification was built upon the Wesleyan *ordo salutis*, glossolalia altered the essence of what the AHM believed and practised. While the worship forms of Pentecostalism did appear chaotic to the AHM, the objections went far deeper into the AHM's self-identification. As Stephens observes, ‘the new Pentecostal message compelled converts to concede that their former holiness experiences were not just incomplete but inauthentic’.¹³⁹

The thesis identifies the caution within the AHM concerning the identification of tongues speaking in 1 Corinthians 14 and the usage of glossolalia on the Day of Pentecost. In an era when religious excitement focused on restorationist impulses, many within the AHM were reluctant to carelessly dismiss what might be a renewal of the gifts of the Spirit within the church. They did not want to grieve the Holy Spirit. The rejection of glossolalia was not a hasty reaction for the AHM and its constituents.

The thesis highlights the contributions of the ambivalent segment of the AHM to the growth of Pentecostalism. Attention is drawn to the influence of the World Faith Missionary

¹³⁹ Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 11.

Association and its contribution of primary personnel, particularly to the Azusa Street Revival, and the interrelationship of C. S. Hanley's emphasis on the work of Christ and WFMA minister William Durham's focus on the Finished Work of Christ, which would become the predominant theological understanding of entire sanctification within Pentecostalism. The CMA contributed essential leaders to the global Pentecostal revival, and J. M. Pike, through the pages of *The Way of Faith*, became the primary advertising venue for Pentecostalism, particularly but not exclusively in the American Southeast.

The research draws particular attention to the impact of persons transitioning between the two movements. While there was little or no dialogue between the two movements at a leadership level, the AHM and Pentecostalism constituents were keenly aware of the presence of the other, finding desirable and undesirable characteristics. The thesis identifies a far more open mind concerning Pentecostalism within the AHM than is generally realised at the grassroots level.

Finally, the thesis points to an intense sense of preserving self-identification by the AHM, both experientially and organisationally. The rapid abandonment of the identifying term 'Pentecostal' clearly confirms this modification to avoid being confused with emerging Pentecostalism.

Suggestions for Future Research

The research gap identified in the Introduction to this thesis suggests that research concerning the details of the division between the American Holiness Movement and the Pentecostal Movement has been largely neglected. Casual observers have generally assumed that the AHM summarily dismissed glossolalia when, in fact, the numerical and material losses were significant. Even this does not consider the loss of promotional energy that the AHM could ill afford to lose. More in-depth studies of particular denominations and

networks, including those that were impossible to include in this analysis, will be critical, as would a study of bilateral relationships between denominations sharing similar social, economic, and geographical profiles.

A study of the interrelationship between the two movements after 1919 deserves examination. In 1942, Pentecostal denominations were afforded membership status in the National Association of Evangelicals, which included AHM entities. Was the debate between 1901 and 1919 resolved, or did the compromise of dearly held past positions erase previous concerns? What were the motivations for the NEA to extend an invitation for membership to Pentecostals? Did the invitation mark a transition in the NEA attitude toward Pentecostalism, and what was the rationale for Pentecostals in identifying with entities that remained highly critical of glossolalia?¹⁴⁰

The role of the Gilded Age in the development of Pentecostalism needs further investigation. How did the emergence of a ‘middle class’ contribute to a national religious environment that allowed Pentecostalism to flourish? Did this middle class actually give further identification to a lower class along racial, educational, and economic lines? While Pentecostals perceived their emergence to be consistent with eschatological expectations, were there more pragmatic reasons for the growth of Pentecostalism?

The historical significance of the ‘initial evidence theory’ is critical to discussing the separation between the two movements. Little attention has been given to its importance in the mind of the AHM. Could there have been coexistence between the two understandings of glossolalia had Pentecostalism relaxed its ‘initial evidence’ position? The thesis has identified persons such as A. B. Simpson, who did not object to glossolalia *per se* but found the ‘initial evidence’ understanding to be problematic. Was the ‘initial evidence theory’ more than a

¹⁴⁰ For discussion of the National Evangelical Association and its acceptance of Pentecostal organisations, see David Bundy, ‘Introduction’, in David Bundy, Geordan Hammond, and David Sang-Ehil Han, eds., *Holiness and Pentecostal Movements: Intertwined Pasts, Presents, and Futures* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2022), 6-7, and Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith*, 180-197.

theological concept? Was it the fatal flaw that contributed to the AHM's reaction, and how did the accepting segment of the AHM bridge this gap?

Finally, the nature of glossolalia as understood by the AHM/RHM itself needs explanation. What is it, and from whence does it come? Is it divine or demonic? Perhaps it is neither. Could its origin be psychologically induced? The historical development of that understanding within the AHM would contribute largely to understanding the AHM attitude toward glossolalia.

Summary

The thesis thus fulfils the objectives outlined in the Introduction. It contributes to the historical study of the tripartite division between the American Holiness Movement and the new Pentecostalism by identifying the reasons given by leaders of the Holiness Movement for their rejection of what they called 'the tongues movement'. The first reason was the defence of the *ordo salutis* of Wesleyan thought as it focused upon entire sanctification as a second work of grace, and the credibility of its professed Christian holiness experience as realised in a second work of grace. Second, they objected to excessive emotionalism in worship. Third, they associated glossolalia with Edward Irving and various groups they saw as dubious. Fourth, they argued that the new Pentecostalism had failed in its goals, had distracted from evangelism, and had brought division and strife. Finally, they argued that it had failed to engender revival and the gift of tongues and had not furthered the missionary cause by providing the ability to speak in foreign languages.

The thesis then demonstrates that those who adopted the new Pentecostalism believed that their view was based on Acts 2, adding an element of the Pentecostal experience that had been missing in the American Holiness Movement. They saw their present experience of the Spirit and the compelling needs of missions as more important than the traditional doctrinal

structure inherited from Wesley and Methodism. Those who sought to moderate between the two factions generally rejected the view that the gift of tongues was an essential aspect of the baptism with the Holy Spirit, but they did not want to deny the experience of their Pentecostal brothers and sisters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives

- Cleveland, TN:
 Dixon Pentecostal Research Centre
- Fishers, IN:
 Wesleyan Church Archives
- Indianapolis, IN
 Marston Memorial Free Methodist Historical Centre and Archives
- Marion, IN:
 Indiana Wesleyan University Special Collections and Archives
- New Haven, CT:
 Yale University Archives
- Lenexa, KS:
 Church of the Nazarene Archives
- Overland Park, KS:
 Church of God (Holiness) Archives:
- Springfield, MO:
 Pentecostal Heritage Centre
- Wilmore, KY:
 Asbury Theological Seminary – Archives and Special Collections

Periodical Publications Mapped in this Research

- The Alliance Weekly 1913–1918
- The Alliance Witness 1913
- The Apostolic Evangel 1908
- The Apostolic Faith 1906–1908
- The Apostolic Messenger 1908
- The Beulah Christian 1907
- The Bridal Call 1919
- The Bridegroom's Messenger 1908–1914
- The Burning Bush 1903–1904
- The Canadian Methodist and Holiness Era 1893
- The Christian Evangel 1910
- The Christian and Missionary Alliance 1907
- The Christian Witness 1885–1919
- Church Advocate and Holiness Banner 1907
- Church of God Evangel 1916–1917
- The Daily Record 1909
- Divine Life 1897
- The Evangel 2000
- The Evening Light and Church of God Evangel 1910
- The Firebrand 1901
- The Free Methodist 1902–1916
- The God's Revivalist 1901–1907
- Gold Tried in the Fire 1913

The Herald of Holiness 1917–1919
 Holiness Advocate 1902–1921
 The Holiness Evangel 1902–1909
 The Household of Faith 1909
 The Latter Rain Evangel 1912–1919
 Live Coals 1899–1900
 The Los Angeles Herald 1906
 Michigan Holiness Record 1884
 The Missionary World 1906–1909
 The Nazarene 1899
 The Nazarene Messenger 1906–1908
 New Acts 1907
 The Pentecost 1897–1909
 Pentecostal Holiness Advocate 1907–1921
 The Pentecostal Evangel 1920–1931
 The Pentecostal Herald 1900–1920
 Pentecostal Power 1907
 The Pentecostal Testimony 1912
 Rocky Mountain Pillar of Fire 1906–1907
 The Signs of the Times 1926
 Triumphs of Faith 1907
 The Vanguard 1914
 The Way of Faith 1895–1910
 The Wesleyan Methodist 1902–1913
 Word and Witness 1913
 Word and Work 1901–1989

Minutes, Yearbooks, Reports

- Church of the Nazarene. *Proceedings of the Seventh General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City, MO, 1928.
- Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. *Minutes of the Fifth General Assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene*.
- Wesleyan Methodist Church. *Minutes of the Fifteenth Quadrennial Session of the General Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America, Held at Sheridan, IND., October 18-25, 1899*. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1899.
- . *Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Session of the South Carolina Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, or Church of America held at Landrum, S.C., November 18-22, 1908*. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1908.
- . *Minutes of the Seventeenth Quadrennial Session of the General Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America held at Fairmount, Indiana, October 16-22, 1907*. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1907.

Primary Sources

- Argue, Zelma. *Contending for the Faith*. 2nd ed. Winnipeg, MB: Messenger of God, 1928.
- Bartleman, Frank. *From the Plow to the Pulpit*. Los Angeles: author, 1924.

- . *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As It Was in the Beginning*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: author, 1925.
- Belew, Pascal. *Light on the Tongues Question*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1926.
- Biographical History of Page County, Iowa*. Chicago: Lewis and Dunbar, 1890.
- Boardman, William E. *The Higher Christian Life*. Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1858.
- . *The Willard Street Tract Repository's Almanac and Christian's Companion, for 1871*. Boston: Willard Street Tract Repository, 1870.
- . *The Great Physician*. Boston: Willard Street Tract Repository, 1881.
- Boardman, Mrs. W. E. *Life and Labors of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*. New York: Appleton, 1887.
- Boland, J. M. *The Problem of Methodism: Being a Review of the Residue Theory of Regeneration and the Second Change Theory of Sanctification, and the Philosophy of Christian Perfection*. Nashville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church South, 1888.
- Brown, Abbie C. Morrow. *The Autobiography of Abbie C. Morrow Brown*. Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, 1932.
- Buffum, Herbert. *From Stage to Pulpit: The Personal Experience of Evangelist Herbert Buffum*. Topeka, KS: author, 1913.
- Byrum, Russell R. *Christian Theology*. Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet, 1925.
- Carter, Kelso. *A Full Salvation for Soul and Body: Divine Healing or the Atonement for Sin and Sickness*. New York: John B. Alden, 1888.
- . *"Faith Healing" Reviewed after Twenty Years*. Boston: Christian Witness, 1897.
- Chapman, J. B. *A History of the Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1926.
- Chapman, Mary Weems. *Mother Cobb, or, Sixty Years' Walk with God*. Chicago: T.B. Arnold, 1896.
- Clark, Dougan, and Joseph H. Smith. *David B. Updegraff and His Work*. Cincinnati, OH: M.W. Knapp, 1895.
- Constitution and General Rules of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church*. Royston, GA: Live Coals, 1905.
- Crooks, E. W. *Life of Rev. A. Crooks, A.M., Written and Compiled by His Wife*. Syracuse, NY: D.S. Kinney, 1875.
- Cullis, Charles. *Work for Jesus: The Experience and Teachings of Mr. and Mrs. Boardman*. Boston: Willard Tract Repository, 1875.
- Daniels, W. H. *Dr Cullis and His Work: Twenty Years of Blessing in Answer to Prayer*. Boston: Willard Tract Repository, 1885.
- The Discipline of the Holiness Church*. Goldsboro, NC: Nash Brothers, 1901.
- Flower, Wilfred. *The Promise of the Father, or, The Theology of the Third Blessing*. Brockville, CA: Christian Standard, 1906.
- Fowler, Charles. *Christian Unity: Its Secret and Success*. Chicago: Christian Witness, 1907.
- Girvin, E. A. *Phineas F. Bresee: A Prince in Israel, a Biography*. Kansas City, MO: Pentecostal Nazarene, 1916.
- Godbey, W. B. *Woman Preacher*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1891.
- , ed. *Jesus Only: A Full Salvation Year Book*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1898.
- . *Holiness or Hell*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1899.
- . *Jesus is Coming*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1901.
- . *Current Heresies*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1908.
- . *Autobiography of Rev. W. B. Godbey*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1909.
- . *Bible Theology*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1911.

- . *Tongue Movement, Satanic*. Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1918.
- Godbey, W. B., and Seth Rees. *The Return of Jesus*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, n.d.
- Goff, Frank. *The Promised Enduement, or, The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*. Clarksburg, ON: Bulletin, 1921.
- Haney, M. L. *The Story of My Life: An Autobiography*. Normal, IL: author, 1904.
- Hart, E. P. *Reminiscences of Early Free Methodism*. Chicago: Free Methodist, 1903.
- Hatfield, John T. *Thirty-three Years a Live Wire: The Life of John T. Hatfield, the "Hoosier Evangelist"*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1913.
- Haynes, B. F. *Tempest-Tossed on Methodist Seas; or, A Sketch of My Life*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1921.
- . *The Beauty of Holiness*. 2nd ed. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1927.
- Hills, A. M. *A Hero of Faith and Prayer, or, Life of Rev. Martin Wells Knapp*. Cincinnati, OH: Mrs. M. W. Knapp, 1902.
- . *The Tongues Movement*. Manchester, UK: Star Hall, 1910.
- Hogue, Wilson T. *History of the Free Methodist Church of North America*. 2 vols. Chicago: Free Methodist, 1915.
- Hoke, Edna Wells. *He Faileth Not, or, The Triumphs of Faith*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1927.
- Holmes, Nickels J., and Lucy Elizabeth Simpson Holmes. *Life Sketches and Sermons*. Royston, GA: Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1920.
- Horner, Ralph C. *From the Altar to the Upper Room in Four Parts*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1891.
- . *Pentecost*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1891.
- . *Notes on Boland, or, Mr. Wesley and the Second Work of Grace*. Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1893.
- . *Bible Doctrines*. Ottawa, ON: Holiness Movement, 1908.
- . *Ralph C. Horner, Evangelist: Reminiscences from His Own Pen, also Reports of Five Typical Sermons*. Brockville, ON: Standard Church Bookroom, 1926
- Humphrey, J. M. *Select Fruits from the Highlands of Beulah*. Lima, OH: Gospel Grain, 1913.
- Irwin, B. H. *The Old Man*. n.p.: n.d.
- Jacobs, S. P. *The Real Christian*. Bedford, MI: author, 1899.
- Jennings, A. T. *History of American Wesleyan Methodism*. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1902.
- Jernigan, C. B. *From the Prairie Schooner to a City Flat*. Brooklyn, NY: author, 1926.
- Jones, Charles Price. *Characters I Have Met*. Chicago: National Publishing Board of the Church of Christ (Holiness), n.d.
- . *The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Churches: What He Now Wishes to Do in Them*. Jackson, MS: Truth, 1896.
- . *Waymarks and High Heaps*. Jackson, MS: Truth, [1898?].
- . *The Gift of the Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*. Jackson, MS: Truth, 1910.
- Jones, William. *From Elim to Carmel: Christian Aspects of Doctrine and Experience*. Boston: Christian Witness, 1895.
- Juillerat, L. Howard, and Minnie E. Hayes. *Book of Minutes: A Compiled History of the Work of the General Assembly of the Church of God*. Cleveland, TN: Church of God, 1922.
- Kaufman, A. H. *Fanaticism Explained: Symptoms, Cause and Cure*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: author, 1906.
- Keen, Mary J. Palmer. *Memorial Papers, or, The Record of a Spirit-Filled Life*. Cincinnati, OH: M.W. Knapp, 1899.
- Keen, S. A. *Praise Papers: A Spiritual Autobiography*. Chicago: Christian Witness, 1894.

- Kershaw, W. L. *History of Page County, Iowa: Also Biographical Sketches of Some Prominent Citizens of the County*. Vol. 1. Chicago: S.J. Clarke, 1909.
- Knapp, Martin Wells. *Pentecostal Wine from Bible Grapes: A Pentecostal Yearbook*. Cincinnati, OH: author, 1897.
- . *Flashes from Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies, or, Devices of the Devil Unmasked*. Cincinnati, OH: Office of the Revivalist, 1898.
- . *Pentecostal Messengers*. Cincinnati, OH: author, 1898.
- , ed. *Electric Shocks from Pentecostal Batteries, or, Food and Fire from Salvation Park Camp-Meeting*. Cincinnati, OH: Office of the Revivalist, 1899.
- . *Pentecostal Aggressiveness, or, Why I Conducted Meetings of the Chesapeake Holiness Union at Bowens, Maryland*. Cincinnati, OH: author, 1899.
- . *Holiness Triumphant: or, Pearls from Patmos, Being the Secret of Revelation Revealed*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1900.
- LaBerge, Agnes N. O. *What God Hath Wrought*. Chicago: Herald, 1921.
- Lawrence, B. F. *The Apostolic Faith Restored*. St. Louis, MO: Gospel, 1916.
- Lee, Luther. *Slavery Examined in the Light of the Bible*. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1855.
- . *Autobiography of the Rev. Luther Lee, D.D.* New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1883.
- Lowrey, Asbury. *Possibilities of Grace*. New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1884.
- Mackie, Alexander. *The Gift of Tongues: A Study in Pathological Aspects of Christianity*. New York: George Doran, 1921.
- Martin, I. G. *Leaves from Life's Pages*. Peniel, TX: Advocate, n.d.
- . *My Scrapbook*. Mansfield, IL: n.p., 1936.
- Matlack, Lucius. *The Life of Rev. Orange Scott: In Two Parts*. New York: C. Prindle and L.C. Matlack, 1851.
- . *The Anti-Slavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church*. New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1881.
- Matthews, John. *Speaking in Tongues*. Kansas City, MO: n.p., 1925.
- McDonald, William, ed. *The Double Cure, or, Echoes from National Camp Meetings*. Boston: Christian Witness, 1894.
- . *Modern Faith Healing Scripturally Considered*. Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1892.
- McDonald, William, and J. E. Searles. *The Life of the Rev. John S. Inskip*. Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1885.
- McPherson, C. E. *Life of Levi Lupton: Twentieth Century Apostle of the Gift of Tongues, Divine Healer, Etc.* Alliance, OH: n.p., 1911.
- Montgomery, Carrie Judd. *"Under His Wings": The Story of My Life*. Oakland, CA: Office of Triumphs, 1936.
- Moore, Joanna. *"In Christ's Stead": Autobiographical Sketches*. Chicago: Women's Baptist Home Mission Society, 1902.
- Morgan, G. L. *Sketch of My Life: With Some of My Experiences in Evangelistic Work*. Jones reprint. Oklahoma City, OK: C. E. Jones, 2003 [1940].
- Morrison, H. C. *The Optimism of Pre-millennialism*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1927.
- . *Some Chapters of My Life's Story*. Louisville, KY: 1941.
- Myland, D. Wesley. *The Latter Rain Covenant and Pentecostal Power, with Testimony of Healings and Baptism*. Chicago: Evangel, 1910.
- The Nazarene Pulpit*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1925.
- Neely, B. F. *The Bible Versus the Tongues Theory*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, [1920?].
- Oliphant, Margaret. *The Life of Edward Irving, Minister of the National Scotch Church, London*. Vol. 2. 2nd ed. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1862.
- Palmer, Phoebe. *The Way of Holiness*. New York: Lane and Scott, 1848.

- Parham, Charles. *The Everlasting Gospel*. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Church, 1911.
- Parham, Sarah E. *The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement*. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Church, 1930.
- Pepper, E. I. D., ed. *Memorial of Rev. John S. Inskip*. Philadelphia: National Publishing Association for the Promotion of Holiness, 1884.
- Perry, Albert W. *The St. Charles Camp Meeting of 1885*. Chicago: T.B. Arnold, 1885.
- Perry, J. H. *Reply to Prof. Mattison's "Answer," Etc.; Being the Summing up of the Case of Professor Mattison against Mrs. Palmer*. New York: John A. Gray, 1856.
- Pickett, L. L. *The Blessed Hope of His Glorious Appearing*. Louisville, KY: Pickett, 1901.
- Polovina, Sam. *From Heathenism to Christ: Life Story of Samuel Polovina, the Converted Austrian*. Cleveland, OH: God's Revivalist Office, 1920.
- Rees, Byron J. *Hallelujahs from Portsmouth Campmeeting, number 4: A Report of the Campmeeting Held at Portsmouth, Rhode Island, July 28 to August 7, 1899*. Springfield, MA: Christian Workers Union, 1899.
- Rees, Seth. *The Ideal Pentecostal Church*. Cincinnati, OH: M.W. Knapp, 1897.
- Rishell, C. W. 'The Doctrine of Sanctification Psychologically Developed.' J. W. Mendenhall, ed. *The Methodist Review* 8, no. 5 (July 1892): 528.
- Roberts, B. T. *Why Another Sect: Containing a Review of Articles by Bishop Simpson and Others on the Free Methodist Church*. Rochester, NY: Earnest Christian, 1879.
- . *Ordaining Women*. Rochester, NY: Earnest Christian, 1891.
- Roberts, Benson Howard. *Benjamin Titus Roberts, Late General Superintendent of the Free Methodist Church: A Biography*. North Chili, NY: Earnest Christian, 1900.
- Robinson, Bud. *Sunshine and Smiles: Life Story, Flashlights, Sayings and Sermons*. Chicago: Christian Witness, 1903.
- . *My Life's Story*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1928
- Robinson, Charles C. *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*. Austin, TX: author, n.d.
- Scott, Orange. *The Grounds of Secession from the M.E. Church*. New York: L.C. Matlack, 1849.
- Searles, J. E. *History of the Present Holiness Revival*. Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1887.
- Shaw, S. B. *Echoes of the General Holiness Assembly*. Chicago: S. B. Shaw, n.d.
- , ed. *Proceedings of the National Holiness Assembly Held at Park Avenue M.E. Church, Chicago, May 20-26, 1885*. Reprint. Oklahoma City, OK, 2002.
- Shelhamer, E. E. *Five Reasons Why I Do Not Seek the Gift of Tongues*. Atlanta, GA: Repairer, n.d.
- . *Popular and Radical Holiness Contrasted*. Atlanta, GA: n.p., 1906.
- Shumway, Charles William. 'A Critical History of Glossolalia.' PhD diss., Boston University, 1919.
- Simmons, C. *The History of Southern Methodism on the Pacific Coast*. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1886.
- Simpson, A. B. *The Fourfold Gospel*. Harrisburg, PA, 1890.
- . *Gospel of Healing*. Rev. ed. Harrisburg, PA: Christian, 1915.
- Smith, Amanda. *An Autobiography: The Story of the Lord's Dealings with Mrs. Amanda Smith, the Colored Evangelist*. Chicago: Christian Witness, 1921.
- Smith, F. G. *The Gift of Tongues: What It Is and What It Is Not*. Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet, [1920?].
- Steele, Daniel. *Antinomianism Revived*. Boston: McDonald and Gill, 1887.
- Stevens, Abel. *Life and Times of Nathan Bangs*. New York: Carlton and Porter, 1863.
- Terrill, J. G. *The Life of John Wesley Redfield, M.D.* Chicago: Free Methodist, 1899.
- Thompson, A. E. *The Life of A.B. Simpson*. New York: Christian Alliance, 1920.
- Tomlinson, A. J. *Answering the Call*. Cleveland, TN: n.p., 1913.

- Vanzandt, J. C. *Speaking in Tongues: A Discussion of Speaking in Tongues, Pentecost, Latter Rain, Evidence of Holy Spirit Baptism and a Short History of the Tongues Movement in America and Some Foreign Countries*. Reprint. Oklahoma City, OK: Charles Edwin Jones, 2004 [1926].
- Wallace, Adam, ed. *A Modern Pentecost: Embracing a Record of the Services of the Sixteenth National Camp-Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness Held at Landisville, PA*. Philadelphia, PA: Methodist Home Journal, 1873.
- Warner, D. S. *Bible Proofs of a Second Work of Grace*. Goshen, IN: E.U. Mennonite, 1880.
- Washburn, B. A. *Holiness Links*. Los Angeles: Pentecost Office, 1887.
- Washburn, Josephine M. *History and Reminiscences of the Holiness Church Work in Southern California and Arizona*. South Pasadena, CA: Record, 1912.
- Watson, Eva. *Glimpses of the Life and Work of G.D. Watson*. Cincinnati, OH: God's Bible School and Revivalist, 1929.
- Watson, G. D. *Christ Returneth: Being Expositions of the Transfiguration and Other Prophetic Scriptures on the Coming of the Lord*. Columbia, SC: Way of Faith, [1900?].
- Wheatley, Richard. *The Life and Letters of Mrs. Phoebe Palmer*. New York: W.C. Palmer Jr., 1876.
- White, (Mollie) Alma Bridwell. *Demons and Tongues*. Bound Brook, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1910.
- . *Restoration of Israel, the Hope of the World*. Zarephath, NJ: Pentecostal Union, 1917.
- . *My Heart and My Husband*. Zarephath, NJ: n.p., 1923.
- . *The Ku Klux Klan in Prophecy*. Zarephath, NJ: Good Citizen, 1925.
- . *The Story of My Life*. 5 Vols. Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1938.
- White, Kent. *The Word of God Coming Again: Return of Apostolic Faith and Words Now Due Upon the Earth: With a Sketch of the Life of Pastor W. Oliver Hutchinson*. Winton, England: Apostolic Faith Church, 1919.
- Wilson, George W. *The Sign of Thy Coming*. Boston: Christian Witness, 1899.
- Woodworth-Etter, Maria Beulah. *Signs and Wonders God Wrought in Ministry for Forty Years*. Indianapolis, IN: author, 1916.

Secondary Sources

- Alexander, David. 'Bishop J. H. King and the Emergence of Holiness Pentecostalism.' *Pneuma* 8, no. 1 (January 1986): 159-183.
- Alexander, Estrela. *The Women of Azusa Street*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2005.
- . *Black Fire: One Hundred Years of African American Pentecostalism*. Downer's Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Alexander, Kimberly Ervin. 'Heavenly Choirs In Earthly Spaces: The Significance Of Corporate Spiritual Singing In Early Pentecostal Experience.' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 25, no. 2 (September 2016): 254-268.
- Anderson, Allan. 'The Dubious Legacy of Charles Parham: Racism and Cultural Insensitivities among Pentecostals.' *Pneuma* 27, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 51-64.
- . *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- . 'Pandita Ramabai, the Mukti Revival and Global Pentecostalism.' *Transformation* 23, no. 1 (January 2006). <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/026537880602300106> (accessed January 9, 2019).
- Anderson, Robert Mapes. *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.

- Avery-Quinn, Samuel John. 'From Parlor to Forest Temple: An Historical Anthropology of the Early Landscapes of National Camp-Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness, 1867–1871.' PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2011.
- Ayers, Edward L. *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Bangs, Carl. *Phineas F. Bresee: His Life in Methodism, the Holiness Movement and the Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1995.
- Barfoot, Charles H. *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Making of Modern Pentecostalism, 1890–1926*. London: Equinox, 2011.
- Beacham, A. D., Jr. *A Brief History of the Pentecostal Holiness Church*. Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1983.
- Beacham, Doug. *Azusa East: The Life and Times of G.B. Cashwell*. Franklin Springs, GA: LifeSprings Resources, 2006.
- Beals, Ivan. *75 Years of Heralding Scriptural Holiness by the Editors of "The Herald of Holiness"*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1987.
- Beatty, James M. *R.G. Spurling and The Early History of the Church of God*. Cleveland, TN: Derek, 2012.
- Benson, John T. *A History 1898–1915 of the Pentecostal Mission, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee*. Nashville, TN: Trevecca, 1977.
- Bertone, John. 'A.B. Simpson and the Experience of Glossolalia: "To Seek or Not to Seek, To Forbid or Not to Forbid".' <https://online.ambrose.edu/alliancestudies/doc/SimpsonGloss.htm> (accessed November 13, 2018).
- Bible, Ken, ed., *Sing to the Lord*. Kansas City, MO: Lillenas, 1993.
- Black, Robert, and Keith Drury. *The Story of the Wesleyan Church*. Indianapolis, IN: Wesleyan, 2012.
- Bloch-Hoell, Nils. *The Pentecostal Movement: Its Origin, Development, and Distinctive Character*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1964.
- Blumhofer, Edith L. 'The Finished Work of Calvary: William H. Durham.' *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Fall 1983): 9-10.
- . *The Assemblies of God: A Chapter in the Story of American Pentecostalism*. Vol.1. Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1989.
- . *Pentecost in My Soul: Explorations in the Meaning of Pentecostal Experience in the Early Assemblies of God*. Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1989.
- . *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- . 'Iowa's Pentecostal Pioneer.' *Assemblies of God Heritage* 18, nos. 3/4 (Fall–Winter 1998–1999): 46.
- . 'Clara E. Lum.' *Assemblies of God Heritage* 21, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 1.
- Blumhofer, Edith L., and Grant Wacker. 'Who Edited the Azusa Mission's *Apostolic Faith*?' *Assemblies of God Heritage* 21, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 15-21.
- Blumhofer, Edith L., Russell Spittler, and Grant Wacker, eds. *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Borgatti, Stephen P., Martin G. Everett, and Jeffrey C. Johnson. *Analysing Social Networks*. London: Sage, 2013.
- Borlase, Craig. *William Seymour: A Biography*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2006.
- Bouck, Louis A. 'A Study of the Contribution of George Douglas Watson to the Promotion of Holiness.' Master's thesis, Pasadena College, 1965.
- Bradley, James, and Richard A. Muller. *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works and Method*, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

- Branstetter, C. J. *Purity, Power and Pentecostal Light: The Revivalist Doctrine and Means of Aaron Merritt Hills*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.
- Brasher, J. Lawrence. *The Sanctified South: John Lakin Brasher and the Holiness Movement*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- Brown, Kenneth O. *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler: "Wholly and Forever Thine"; Early Leadership in the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness*. Hazelton, PA: Holiness Archives, 1999.
- Browning, Raymond. *God's Melting Pot*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1951.
- Brumbach, Carl. *What Meaneth This?*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1947.
- . *Suddenly . . . from Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God*. Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1961.
- Bruner, Dale Frederick. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1970.
- Bundy, David. 'Spiritual Advice to a Seeker: Letters to T.B. Barratt from Azusa St., 1906.' *Pneuma* 14, no. 2 (Fall 1992): 159-170.
- . 'G.T. Haywood: Religion for Urban Realities.' In *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders*, edited by James Goff Jr., and Grant Wacker. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2002.
- . 'Religion for Modernity: Martin Wells Knapp and the Radical Holiness Network of the American Progressive Era.' *World Christianity and the Fourfold Gospel* 1 (2015): 43-80.
- . *Visions of Apostolic Mission: Scandinavian Pentecostal Mission to 1935*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet Press, 2009.
- Bundy, David, Geordan Hammond, and David Sang-Ehil Han, eds. *Holiness and Pentecostal Movements: Intertwined Pasts, Presents, and Futures*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2022.
- Burgess, Stanley, ed. *Reaching Beyond: Chapters in the History of Perfectionism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986.
- . *The Holy Spirit: Medieval Roman Catholic and Reformation Traditions*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- . *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.
- Burgess, Stanley, and Gary McGee, eds. *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988.
- Burrow, Rufus, Jr. *Making Good the Claim: Holiness and Visible Unity in the Church of God Reformation Movement*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016.
- Butler, Anthea D. *Women in the Church of God in Christ: Making a Sanctified World*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Butler, Jon, Grant Wacker, and Randall Balmer. *Religion in American Life: A Short History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Caldwell, Wayne E., ed. *Reformers and Revivalists: History of the Wesleyan Church*. Wesleyan History. Indianapolis, IN: Wesleyan, 1992.
- Campbell, Joseph E. *The Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1898–1948: Its Background and History*. Franklin Springs, GA: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951.
- Carr, Edward H. *What Is History?*. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.
- Carroll, Noel. 'Interpretation, History, and Narrative.' *The Monist* 73, no. 2 (April 1990): 134-166.
- Carter, Howard. 'The Pentecostal Movement.' *Pentecostal Evangel* 29 (May 1946), 3.

- Castilla, Willenham. *Moving Forward on God's Highway: A Textbook History of the Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A.* Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2007.
- Cerillo, Augustus, Jr. 'The Beginnings of American Pentecostalism: A Historiographical Overview.' In *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism*, edited by Edith Blumhofer, Russell Spittler, and Grant Wacker, 229-259. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- . 'Frank Bartleman: Pentecostal "Lone Ranger" and Social Critic.' In *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders*, edited by James R. Goff and Grant Wacker. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2002.
- Chambers, G. A. *Fifty Years in the Service of the King*. Toronto: Testimony, 1960.
- Chambers, Oswald, and Bidley Chambers. *Oswald Chambers: His Life and Work*. 2nd ed. London: Simpkin Marshall, 1938.
- Chapman, J. B. *Bud Robinson: A Brother Beloved*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1943.
- Chappell, Paul. 'The Divine Healing Movement in America.' PhD diss., Drew University, 1983.
- Chilcote, Paul Wesley. *John Wesley and the Early Women Preachers of Methodism*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 1991.
- Christian and Missionary Alliance. 'Statement of Faith.' <https://cmalliance.org/who-we-are/what-we-believe/statement-of-faith/> (accessed June 28, 2022)
- Clayton, Allen. 'The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography.' *Pneuma* 1, no. 2 (Fall 1979): 27-42.
- Clement, John. *The Experiences of a Blue Ridge Evangelist*. High Point, NC: author, 1936.
- Clemmons, Ithiel C. *Bishop C.H. Mason and the Roots of the Church of God in Christ*. Bakersfield, CA: Pneuma Life, 1996.
- Cobbins, Otho B., ed. *History of Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A., 1895–1965*. New York: Vantage, 1966.
- Collingwood, R. G. *The Idea of History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Conn, Charles. *Like a Mighty Army: A History of the Church of God*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway, 1955.
- . *Our First Hundred Years, 1886–1986: A Retrospective*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway, 1986.
- Cook, Judith. *Zion City, Illinois: Twentieth Century Utopia*. Utopianism and Communitarianism. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1996.
- Corlett, D. Shelby. *Spirit-Filled: The Life of the Rev. James Blaine Chapman, D.D.* Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 1947.
- Cowen, Clarence Eugene. 'A History of the Church of God (Holiness).' PhD diss., University of Missouri, 1948.
- . *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)*. Overland Park, KS: Herald and Banner, 1949.
- Craig, James. "'Out and Out for the Lord": James Eustace Purdie, an Early Anglican Pentecostal.' Master's thesis, University of St. Michael's College, 1995.
- Creech, Joe. 'Visions of Glory: The Place of the Azusa Street Revival in Pentecostal History.' *Church History* 65, no. 3 (September 1996): 405-424.
- Croswell, Laurence, and Mark Croswell. *Lift Up a Standard: The Life and Legacy of Ralph C. Horner*. Indianapolis, IN: Wesleyan, 2012.
- Cunningham, Floyd, ed., *Our Watchword and Song: The Centennial History of the Church of the Nazarene*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill, 2009.
- Curtis, Heather. 'Lord of the Body: Pain, Suffering and the Practice of Divine Healing in Late Nineteenth Century American Protestantism.' PhD diss., Harvard Divinity School, 2004.

- . *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860–1900*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Dallimore, Arnold. *Forerunner of the Charismatic Movement: The Life of Edward Irving*. Chicago: Moody, 1983.
- Daniels, David D. ‘Charles Harrison Mason: The Interracial Impulse of Early Pentecostalism.’ In *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders*, edited by James R. Goff Jr., and Grant Wacker. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2002.
- Davidson, C. T. *Upon This Rock*. Vol 1. Cleveland, TN: White Wing, 1973.
- Dayton, Donald. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1987.
- . ‘John Fletcher as John Wesley’s Vindicator and Designated Successor? A Response to Laurence W. Wood.’ *Pneuma* 26, no. 2 (January 2004): 355-361.
- Declerc, Diane. ‘Phineas Bresee and the Women of the Church of the Nazarene.’ *Grace and Peace* 21 (Spring 2014): 33-36.
- DeLong, Charles I. *“It Ought to be Written”: The Story of Charles and Minnie Hanley, Founders of the World Faith Missionary Association, and the Origin of the Evangelical Church Alliance, Inc.* Virginia Beach, VA: author, 2009.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Henry Reeve. marxists.org. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/de-tocqueville/democracy-america/index.htm> (accessed March 3, 2022).
- Dieter, Melvin. *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1980.
- . ‘Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal Movements: Commonalities, Confrontation, and Dialogue.’ *Pneuma* 12, no. 1 (1990): 4-13.
- Douglas, Cecelia Luelf, and Ruth Smith Taylor. *The History of the Bible Holiness Church*. Shoals, IN: Whispering Pines, 2011.
- Drummond, Andrew L. *Edward Irving and His Circle: Including Some Consideration of the ‘Tongues’ Movement in the Light of Modern Psychology*. London: James Clarke, 1937.
- Duggar, Lillie. *A.J. Tomlinson: Former Overseer of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee)*. Cleveland, TN: White Wing, 1964.
- Eckholm, Dwight. ‘Theological Roots of the Keswick Movement: William E. Boardman, Robert Pearsall Smith and the Doctrine of the “Higher Life”.’ PhD diss., University of Basel, 1991.
- Edwards, Rebecca. *New Spirits: Americans in the Gilded Age, 1865-1905*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Elbert, Paul, ed., *Faces of Renewal: Studies in Honor of Stanley M. Horton Presented on his 70th Birthday*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Elton, G. R. *The Practice of History*. New York: Crowell, 1967.
- Enos, Tiffany. ‘The Death of Postmillennialism in the Holiness Tradition Following World War I.’ Master’s thesis, George Fox University, 2001.
- Espinosa, Gastón. *William J. Seymour and the Origins of Global Pentecostalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Ewart, Frank J. *The Phenomenon of Pentecost*. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame, 1979.
- Farkas, Thomas. ‘William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy in Early American Pentecostalism, 1906–1916.’ PhD diss., Southern Baptist Seminary, 1993.
- Faupel, William. *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*. Dorset, UK: Deo, 2009.
- Flower, J. Roswell. ‘Birth of the Pentecostal Movement.’ *Pentecostal Evangel* 26 (1950): 3.

- French, Talmadge. *Early Racial Oneness Pentecostalism: G.T. Haywood and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (1901–1931)*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014.
- Frodsham, Stanley. *With Signs Following: The Story of the Pentecostal Revival in the Twentieth Century*. Rev. ed. Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1946.
- Gardiner, Gordon, and Marie E. Brown. *The Origin of Glad Tidings Tabernacle; The Altar of Incense: A Sermon*. New York: Glad Tidings, 1955.
- Gilbertson, Richard. *The Baptism of the Holy Spirit: The Views of A.B. Simpson and His Contemporaries*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian, 1993.
- God’s Bible School. ‘Hall of Fame.’ gbs.edu. <https://www.gbs.edu/alumni/hall-of-fame/> (accessed October 2, 2018).
- Goff, Florence. *Fifty Years on the Battlefield for God: Being a Sketch of the Life of Rev. J.A. Hodges, Coupled with Some of the Lord’s Dealings with H.H. Goff and Wife, Evangelists of the Cape Fear Conference of the Free-Will Baptist Church*. Falcon, NC: author, 1948.
- Goff, James R., Jr. ‘The Pentecostal Catalyst to the South: G.B. Cashwell (1906–1909).’ Unpublished manuscript, 1980.
- . ‘Charles Parham and His Role in the Development of the Pentecostal Movement: A Reevaluation.’ *Kansas History* 7, no. 3 (Autumn 1984): 226-237.
- . *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1988.
- Goff, James R., Jr., and Grant Wacker, eds. *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2002.
- Gohr, Glenn W. ‘William Jethro Walthall and the Holiness Baptist Churches of Southwestern Arkansas.’ *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Fall 1992): 15-20.
- . ‘Known Persons Who Were at Hot Springs.’ *Assemblies of God Heritage* 24, no.1 (Spring 2004): 122.
- . ‘Charles F. Parham: Interacting with Culture in the Context of His Belief System.’ Presentation, 45th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, San Dimas, CA, March 10–12, 2016.
- Goldman, Lawrence. ‘History and Biography.’ *Historical Research* 89, no. 245 (August 2016): 319-411.
- Greene, Eugenia. *Mason: The Profiling of a Saint*. Panorama City, CA: Education Plus, 2012.
- Gresham, L. Paul. *Waves Against Gibraltar: A Memoir of Dr. A. M. Hills, 1848-1935*. Bethany, OK: Southern Nazarene University Press, 1992.
- Haines, Lee, and Paul Thomas. *An Outline History of The Wesleyan Church*. 3rd ed. rev. Marion, IN: Wesley, 1985.
- Haines, Maxine L., and Lee M. Haines. *Celebrate Our Daughters: 150 Years of Women in Wesleyan Ministry*. Indianapolis, IN: Wesleyan, 2004.
- Hall, Clarence W. *Samuel Logan Brengle: Portrait of a Prophet*. New York: National Headquarters, the Salvation Army, 1933.
- Hamilton, Barry. *William Baxter Godbey: Itinerant Apostle of the Holiness Movement*. Studies in American Religion 72. Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen, 2002.
- Hamilton, Blaine. ‘The Spirit in Black and White: Early Twentieth-Century Pentecostals and Race Relations, 1905–1945.’ PhD diss., Rice University, 2013.
- Hamm, Thomas D. *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800–1907*. Religion in North America. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Hammond, Geordan. ‘The Third Blessing: John Wesley and the Sanctification of the Mind.’ Presentation, Nazarene Theological College Research Seminar, Manchester, UK, September 30, 2020.

- Hardesty, Nancy. *Faith Cure Divine: Healing in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Harley, Alan. 'Are We Really a Holiness Movement?' *Journal of Aggressive Christianity* 60 (April–May, 2009): 31-33.
- Harmon, Nolan B, ed. *The Encyclopedia of World Methodism*. Vol. 2. Nashville, TN: United Methodist, 1974.
- Harris, John W. *Tears and Triumphs: The Life Story of a Pastor-Evangelist*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, 1948.
- Hartzfeld, David F., and Charles Nienkirchen, eds. *The Birth of a Vision: Essays on the Ministry and Thought of Albert B. Simpson, Founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian, 1986.
- Hassey, Janette. *No Time For Silence: Evangelical Women in Public Ministry around the Turn of the Century*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986.
- Hayes, Michael. 'Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation.' January 2007. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308782294_Notes_on_Narrative_Method_in_Historical_Interpretation (accessed September 22, 2021).
- Hayes, W. M. *Memoirs of Richard Baxter Hayes*. Greer, SC: Dunlap, 1945.
- Hill, Harold. *Saved to Save and Saved to Serve: Perspectives on Salvation Army History*. Eugene, OR: Resource, 2017.
- Hilson, James Benjamin. *History of the South Carolina Conference, Wesleyan Methodist Church of America: Fifty-five Years of Wesleyan Methodism in South Carolina*. Winona Lake, IN: Light and Life, 1950.
- Hiss, W. C. 'Shiloh: Frank W. Sandford and the Kingdom, 1893–1948.' PhD diss., Tufts University, 1978.
- A Historical Account of the Apostolic Faith*. Portland, OR: Apostolic Faith, 1965.
- Hjalmeby, Erik J. 'A Rhetorical History of Race Relations in the Early Pentecostal Movement, 1906–1916.' Master's thesis, Baylor University, 2007.
- Hollenweger, Walter J. *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1972.
- Hoover, Shane. 'Tales from the Rep Morgue: S2E8, Levi Lupton Part 1.' Podcast audio. <https://omny.fm/shows/rep-audio-vault/tales-from-the-rep-morgue-s2e8-levi-lupton-part-1> (accessed July 19, 2021).
- . 'Tales from the Rep Morgue: S2E9, Levi Lupton Part 2.' Podcast audio. <https://omny.fm/shows/rep-audio-vault/tales-from-the-rep-morgue-s2e9-levi-lupton-part-2> (accessed July 19, 2021).
- Hoover, Willis Collins. *History of the Pentecostal Revival in Chile*. Translated by Mario G. Hoover. Santiago, Chile: Imprenta Eben-Ezer, 2000.
- Horridge, Glenn. *The Salvation Army: Origins and Early Days, 1865–1900*. Godalming, Surrey: Ammonite, 1993.
- Howard, Ivan. 'Wesley Versus Phoebe Palmer: An Extended Controversy.' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 6 (1971): 31-40.
- Howell, Beth. *Lady on a Donkey*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1960.
- Hughes, Richard, ed. *The American Quest for the Primitive Church*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Hunter, Harold. 'Beniah at the Apostolic Crossroads: Little Noticed Crosscurrents of B.H. Irwin, Charles Fox Parham, Frank Sandford, A.J. Tomlinson.' https://C:/Users/17723/Downloads/Beniah_At_The_Apostolic_Crossroads.pdf (accessed June 22, 2021).
- Hunter, Harold D., and Cecil M. Robeck, eds. *The Azusa Street Revival and Its Legacy*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009.

- Jacobsen, Douglas, *Thinking in the Spirit, Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 2003.
- Jefferson, Anita Bingham. *Charles Price Jones: First Black Holiness Reformer*. Jackson, MS: author, 2011.
- Johnston, Robin. *Howard A. Goss: A Pentecostal Life*. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame, 2010.
- Jolley, Jennie A. *As An Angel of Light, or, Bible Tongues and Holiness and Their Counterfeits*. New York: Vantage, 1964.
- Jones, Charles E. *Perfectionist Persuasion The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867–1936*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1974.
- . *A Guide to the Study of the Pentecostal Movement*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1983.
- . ‘Anti-Ordinance: A Proto-Pentecostal Phenomenon?’ *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 25, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 7-23.
- . ‘The “Color Line” Washed Away in the Blood?: In the Holiness Church, at Azusa Street, and Afterward.’ *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 34, no. 2 (Fall 1999): 252-265.
- . *The Wesleyan Holiness Movement: A Comprehensive Guide*. 2 vols. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2005.
- Kadushin, Charles. *Understanding Social Networks: Theories, Concepts and Findings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Kandt, Kristin. ‘Historical Essay: In the Name of God; An American Story of Feminism, Racism, and Religious Intolerance: The Story of Alma Bridwell White.’ *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy and the Law* 8, no. 3 (2000): 753-794.
- Kathol, Nichole Kathryn. ‘The Power of Christ Compelled Her: The Intersectional Identities and Cultural Logic of Bishop Alma B. White.’ PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2010.
- Kaufman, Paul Leslie. *“Logical” Luther Lee and the Methodist War Against Slavery*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2000.
- Kendrick, Klaude. *The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement*. Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1961.
- Kerwin, Jim. ‘Isaiah Reid (1836–1911), His Life, Leadership, and Influence in the American Holiness Movement.’ Master’s thesis, Regent University, 2006.
- . *The Rejected Blessing: An Untold Story of the Early Days of the Pentecostal Movement*. 2nd ed. Chesapeake, VA: Finest of the Wheat, 2012.
- Kidd, Thomas. *America’s Religious History: Faith, Politics, and the Shaping of a Nation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019.
- King, Gerald Wayne. ‘Disfellowshipped: Pentecostal Responses to Fundamentalism in the United States, 1906–1943.’ PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2009.
- . ‘When the Holiness Preacher Came to Town: Re-dating W.B. Godbey’s Visit to Azusa Street.’ *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research*. <http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj18/king.html> (accessed September 18, 2018).
- King, J. H. *From Passover to Pentecost*. Franklin Springs, GA: Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1934.
- . *Yet Speaketh: Memoirs of the Late Bishop Joseph H. King*. Franklin Springs, GA: Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1949.
- King, Paul L. ‘A Critique of Charles Nienkirchen’s Book, *A.B. Simpson and the Pentecostal Movement*.’ *Alliance Academic Review*, 2000. <http://www.kneillfoster.com/aar/2000/AAR2000-6King.php> (accessed February 18, 2020).
- . *Genuine Gold: The Cautiously Charismatic Story of the Early Christian and Missionary Alliance*. Tulsa, OK: Word and Spirit, 2006.

- Kipgen, Paominlen. 'History and Theology of Pentecostal Movement.' academia.edu. <https://trinitycollegeandseminary.academia.edu/PaominlenKipgen> (accessed October 4, 2019).
- Knight, Henry H., III, ed. *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street: Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal Visions of the New Creation*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010.
- Knight, John A. 'John Fletcher's Influence on the Development of Wesleyan Theology in America.' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (Spring 1978): 13-33.
- Kostlevy, William. 'Nor Silver, Nor Gold: The Burning Bush Movement and the Communitarian Holiness Vision.' PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1996.
- . 'Christian Perfectionism in Pennsylvania Dutch Country: The 1868 Manheim Camp Meeting of the National Holiness Association.' Presentation, Young Center for the Study of Anabaptist and Pietist Groups, Elizabethtown, PA, November 13, 1997.
- , ed. *Historical Dictionary of the Holiness Movement*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2001.
- . *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progress Era America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Kostlevy, William, and Wallace Thornton Jr., eds. *The Radical Holiness Movement in the Christian Tradition*. Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2016.
- Kulaga, Jon S. *Edward Payson Hart: The Second Man of Free Methodism*. Spring Arbor, MI: Spring Arbor University Press, 2007.
- Kuykendall, Michael. 'A.S. Worrell's *New Testament*: A Landmark Baptist-Pentecostal Bible Translation from the Early Twentieth Century.' *Pneuma* 29 (2007): 254-280.
- Labadorf, Nathaniel Paul. 'O Glory! I Feel the Fire! The Theology of the Fire Baptized Holiness Church.' Doctoral paper, Bob Jones University, 2019. academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/38545936/O_Glory_I_Feel_the_Fire_The_Theology_of_the_Fire_Baptized_Holiness_Church?email_work_card=view-paper (accessed August 2, 2021).
- Leclerc, Diane. 'Phoebe Palmer: Spreading "Accessible" Holiness.' In *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street: Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal Visions of the New Creation*, edited by Henry H. Knight III. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010.
- Lennox, Steven. 'The Eschatology of George D. Watson.' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 29 (Spring–Fall 1994): 111-126.
- Lewis, James. 'The Phenomena of the Spirit.' Presentation, 119th North American Convention of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), June 29, 2005. <https://anderson.edu/uploads/sot/phenomena-of-the-spirit.pdf> (accessed September 27, 2021).
- Lindsay, Gordon. *John Alexander Dowie: Life Story of Trials, Tragedies and Triumphs*. Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, 1980.
- Little, David. 'Narrative History.' Understanding Society Blog. Entry posted November 24, 2008. <https://understandingsociety.blogspot.com/search?q=narrative> (accessed September 20, 2021).
- Lofthouse, Richard. 'Books Essay: The Importance of Biography.' *Financial Times*, September 24, 2004. <https://www.ft.com/content/e3bada5c-0c6b-11d9-b543-00000e2511c8> (accessed September 14, 2021).
- Lowery, Kevin. 'Fork in the Wesleyan Road: Phoebe Palmer and Christian Perfection.' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 36, no. 2 (2001): 186-222.
- MacRobert, Iain. *The Black Roots and White Racism of Early Pentecostalism in the USA*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Marsden, George. *Religion and American Culture: A Brief History*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1990.

- Marston, Leslie. *From Age to Age a Living Witness: A Historical Interpretation of Free Methodism's First Century*. Winona Lake, IN: Light and Life, 1960.
- Martin, Larry. *The Life and Ministry of William J. Seymour*. Joplin, MO: Christian Life, 1999.
- . *The Topeka Outpouring of 1901*. Joplin, MO: Christian Life, 2000.
- . *Holy Ghost Revival On Azusa Street: Chosen Vessels*. Joplin, MO: Christian Life, 2010.
- Mason, Mary. *The History and Life Work of Elder C.H. Mason, Chief Apostle, and His Co-laborers*. Memphis, TN: Church of God in Christ, 1934.
- Massey, James Earl. 'Race Relations and the American Holiness Movement.' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 31, no. 1 (1996): 40-50.
- . *African Americans and the Church of God Anderson, Indiana: Aspects of a Social History*. Anderson, IN: Anderson University Press, 2005.
- Maxwell, Lindsey Brooke. 'The Pneuma Network: Transnational Pentecostal Print Culture in the United States and South Africa, 1906–1948.' PhD diss., Florida International University, 2016. <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/2614> (accessed July 26, 2021).
- McAlister, W. E. 'Saunders Called Home: An Appreciation.' *The Pentecostal Testimony* (November 1962): 9.
- McBride, Calvin S. *Frank Avant vs. C.H. Mason: Mason and the Holy Ghost on Trial*. Bloomington, IN: IVerse, 2009.
- McCasland, David. *Oswald Chambers: Abandoned to God: The Life Story of the Author of My Utmost for His Highest*. Grand Rapids, MI: Discover House, 1993.
- McGee, Gary. *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- McIntyre, Joe. *E.W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story*. Orlando, FL: Creation House, 1997.
- McLaughlin, G. A. *Autobiography of George Asbury McLaughlin*. Chicago: Christian Witness, 1933.
- McLeister, Ira Ford, and Roy S. Nicholson. *History of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America*. Marion, IN: Wesley, 1951.
- Meier, August. *Negro Thought in America, 1880–1915: Racial Ideologies in the Age of Booker T. Washington*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1969.
- Menzies, William. *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God*. Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1971.
- Miller, Donald E., Kimon H. Sargeant, and Richard Flory, eds. *Spirit and Power: The Growth and Global Impact of Pentecostalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Miller, Thomas. *Canadian Pentecostals A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada*. Mississauga, ON: Full Gospel, 1994.
- Miskov, Jennifer A. 'Carrie Judd Montgomery: A Passion for Healing and the Fullness of the Spirit.' *Assemblies of God Heritage* (2012): 10.
- . *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery (1858–1946)*. Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2012.
- Mitchell, Robert Bryant. *Heritage and Horizons: The History of the Open Bible Standard Churches*. Des Moines, IA: Open Bible, 1982.
- Moon, Tony G. 'J.H. King's "Expansive" Theology of Pentecostal Spirit Baptism.' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (January 2012): 320-343.
- . *From Plowboy to Pentecostal Bishop: The Life of J.H. King*. Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2017.

- Morgan, David. 'N.J. Holmes and the Origins of Pentecostalism.' *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 84, no. 3 (July 1983): 136-151.
- Morris, W. Eddie. *The Vine and the Branches—John 15:5: Historic Events of the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements*. [Franklin Springs, GA?]: Advocate, 1981.
- Moser, Kevin, and Larry Smith. *God's Clock Keeps Perfect Time: God's Bible School's First 100 Years, 1900–2000*. Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist, 2000.
- Murray, Frank. *The Sublimity of Faith: The Life and Work of Frank W. Sandford*. Amherst, NH: The Kingdom, 1981.
- Nash, Ronald. *Christian Faith and Historical Understanding*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984.
- Neal, Lynn S. 'Christianizing the Klan: Alma White, Branford Clarke, and the Art of Religious Tolerance.' *Church History* 78, no. 2 (2009): 350-378.
- Nelson, Douglas. 'For Such a Time as This: The Story of Bishop William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival.' PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 1981.
- Nelson, Shirley. *Fair, Clear and Terrible: The Story of Shiloh, Maine*. Latham, NY: British American, 1989.
- Newberg, Eric Nelson. *The Pentecostal Mission in Palestine: The Legacy of Pentecostal Zionism*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.
- Nichols, Christopher McKnight, and Carol C. Unger, eds. *A Companion to the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2017.
- Nichols, John Thomas. *Pentecostalism: The Story of Growth and Development of a Vital New Force in American Protestantism*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Nicholson, Roy S. *Wesleyan Methodism in the South: Being the Story of Eighty-six Years of Reform and Religious Activities in the South as Conducted by the American Wesleyans*. Syracuse, NY: Wesleyan Methodist, 1933.
- Nienkirchen, Charles W. *A.B. Simpson and the Pentecostal Movement*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Noll, Mark. *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1992.
- . *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Opp, James. *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine & Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880–1930*. Montreal: McGill-Queens's University Press, 2005.
- Painter, Nell. *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877–1919*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1989.
- Paul, Harold. *Dan T. Muse: From Printer's Devil to Bishop*. Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1976.
- Perabeau, Charles L. 'The Church of the Nazarene in the U.S.: Race, Gender, and Class in the Struggle with Pentecostalism and Aspirations Toward Respectability, 1895–1985.' PhD diss., Drew University, 2011.
- Perry, Elizabeth Israels, and Karen Manners Smith. *The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era: A Student Companion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Phillips, Wade H. *Quest to Restore God's House: A Theological History of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee): Vol. 1 (1886–1923)*. Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2014.
- Pinson, M. M. 'Sketch of the Life and Ministry of Mack M. Pinson (Better Known as M.M. Pinson).' Unpublished manuscript, 1949.
- Purinton, William T. "'Red Hot Holiness': B.H. Irwin and the Fire Baptized Holiness Tradition.' Presentation, 27th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Cleveland, TN, March 12–14, 1998.

- Purkiser, W. T. *Called Unto Holiness, Vol. II: The Story of the Nazarenes: The Second Twenty-Five Years, 1933–1958*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1983.
- Rand, Carl W., and Dorts Sanders. *Joseph Pomeroy Widney: Physician and Mystic*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1970.
- Raser, Harold. *Phoebe Palmer, Her Life and Thought*. Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen, 1987.
- Ratner, Lorman. *Powder Keg: Northern Opposition to the Antislavery Movement, 1831–1840*. New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- Reed, D. S. *The Circuit Rider*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal, n. d.
- Rees, Paul. *Seth Cook Rees: The Warrior-Saint*. Indianapolis, IN: Pilgrim Book Room, 1934.
- Reid, Daniel, ed. *Dictionary of Christianity in America*. Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990.
- Richards, Robert J. 'The Role of Biography in Intellectual History.' *Know* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2017): 295-318.
- Richmann, Christopher J. 'Blaspheming in Tongues: Demons, Glossolalia, and the Christian Missionary Alliance.' *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 139-155.
- . 'William H. Durham and Early Pentecostalism: A Multifaceted Reassessment.' *Pneuma* 37 (2015): 224-243.
- Ringer, David. *J. Roswell Flower: A Brief Biography*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016.
- Robeck, Cecil. *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2006.
- Robert, Dana. "Occupy Till I Come": *A.T. Pierson and the Evangelism of the World*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2003.
- Rodgers, Darrin J. *Northern Harvest: Pentecostalism in North Dakota*. Bismarck, ND: North Dakota Council Assemblies of God, 2003.
- . 'Mary Weems Chapman: Called to the Prostitutes and Untouchables of South India.' *This Week in AG History, April 18, 1925* (April 18, 2019).
- Robins, R. G. *A.J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Modernist*. Religion in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . *Pentecostalism in America*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010.
- Robinson, James. *Pentecostal Origins: Early Pentecostalism in Ireland in the Context of the British Isles*. Studies in Evangelical History and Thought. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
- . *Divine Healing: The Holiness Pentecostal Transition Years, 1890–1906*. Theological Transposition in the Transatlantic World. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013.
- Rudd, Douglas. *When the Spirit Came Upon Them: Highlights from the Early Years of the Pentecostal Movement in Canada*. Mississauga, ON: Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, 2002.
- Ryan, Maxwell. 'Signs and Wonders and the Salvation Army.' *Journal of Aggressive Christianity* 11 (February–March 2001).
- Sánchez Walsh, Arlene M. *Pentecostals in America*. Columbia Contemporary American Religion Series. New York: Columbia University Press, 2018.
- Sanders, Cheryl J. *Saints in Exile: The Holiness-Pentecostal Experience in African American Religion and Culture*. Religion in America. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Sanders, Rufus. *William Joseph Seymour: Black Father of the 20th Century Pentecostal/Charismatic Movement*. Maitland, FL: Xulon, 2003.
- Sanner, Asa. *Life of John Goodwin*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1945.
- Sawin, John. 'The Response and Attitude of Dr. A.B. Simpson and the Christian Missionary Alliance to the Tongues Movement of 1906–1920.' Papers. Sixteenth Annual Meeting, Society for Pentecostal Studies, Costa Mesa, CA, November 13–15, 1986.

- Schrag, Martin. 'The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Rev. Benjamin Hardin Irwin.' *Brethren in Christ, History and Life* 4, no. 1 (June 1981): 3-29.
- Simmons, Dale H. *E.W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power and Plenty*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 1997.
- Sims, John A. *Our Pentecostal Heritage*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway, 1995.
- Smith, Harold B., ed. *Pentecostals From the Inside Out*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1990.
- Smith, James K. A. 'Tongues and Philosophy of Language: Conceptual Production at the Limits of Speech.' Presentation, 35th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Pasadena, CA, March 2006.
- Smith, John W. V. *The Quest for Holiness and Unity: A Centennial History of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)*. Anderson, IN: Warner, 1980.
- Smith, Larry. *A Century on the Mount of Blessing: The Story of God's Bible School*. Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist, 2016.
- Smith, Raynard D., ed. *With Signs Following: The Life and Ministry of Charles Harrison Mason*. St. Louis, MO: CMP, 2017.
- Smith, Simeon O. *Biography of William M. Smith and History of Union Bible Seminary*. Westfield, IN: Union Bible Seminary, 1982.
- Smith, Timothy. *Called unto Holiness, Vol. 1: The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1962.
- Snider, William. 'Introduction of Faith Healing into American Evangelicalism: A Study of the Life and Influence of Dr. Charles Cullis.' Master's thesis, Cincinnati Christian University, 2008.
- Snyder, Howard, ed. *Live While You Preach: The Autobiography of Methodist Revivalist and Abolitionist John Wesley Redfield, 1810–1863*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2006.
- . *Populist Saints: B.T. and Ellen Roberts and the First Free Methodists*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2006.
- Snyder, Howard, and Daniel V. Runyon. *The Divided Flame: Wesleyans and the Charismatic Renewal*. Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury, 1986.
- Spalding, Roger, and Christopher Parker. *Historiography: An Introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Spengemann, William. *The Forms of Autobiography: Episodes in a Literary Genre*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Stanley, Liz. *The Auto/Biographical I: The Theory and Practice of Feminist Auto/Biography*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.
- Stanley, Susie Cunningham. *Feminist Pillar of Fire: The Life of Alma White*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim, 1993.
- . *Holy Boldness: Women Preachers' Autobiographies and the Sanctified Self*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2002.
- Stephens, Randall. "'There is Magic in Print": The Holiness-Pentecostal Press and the Origins of Southern Pentecostalism.' *Journal of Southern Religion*, 2002. <http://jsr.fsu.edu/2002/Stephens.htm> (accessed on July 24, 2021).
- . *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Stone, Lawrence. 'The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History.' *Past and Present* 85 (November 1979): 3-24.
- Strickland, William J, and H. Ray Dunning. *J.O. McClurkan: His Life, His Theology, and Selections from His Writings*. Trevecca Centennial Collection 2. Nashville, TN: Trevecca Nazarene University Press, 1998.
- Sullivan, Charles. 'A Critical Look at Tongues and Montanism.' The Charles A. Sullivan Blog. Entry posted January 2, 2012, updated August 9, 2020.

- <https://charlesasullivan.com/2660/a-critical-look-at-tongues-and-montanism/> (accessed June 22, 2021).
- Sumrall, Lester. *Lillian Trasher: The Nile Mother*. Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1951.
- Sutton, Matthew Avery. *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Resurrection of Christian America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- . *American Apocalypse: A History of Modern Evangelicalism*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Synan, Vinson, ed. *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1975.
- . *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1971.
- . *The Old-Time Power: A Centennial History of the International Pentecostal Holiness Church*. Rev. ed. Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1986.
- . *Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Revival, 1901–2000*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- Synan, Vinson, and Charles R. Fox Jr. *William Seymour: Pioneer of the Azusa Street Revival*. Alachua, FL: Bridge Logos, 2012.
- Synan, Vinson, and Daniel Woods. *Fire Baptized: The Many Lives and Works of Benjamin Hardin Irwin: A Biography and a Reader*. Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2017.
- Tait, Edwin. ‘The Cleansing Wave.’ *Christian History and Biography* 82 (2004).
- Taylor, Malcolm John. ‘Publish and Be Blessed: A Case Study in Early Pentecostal Printing History, 1906–1926.’ PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 1994.
- Thomas, Joseph. *Perfect Harmony: Interracial Churches in Early Holiness-Pentecostalism, 1880–1909*. Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2014.
- Thomas, Paul Westphal, and Paul William Thomas. *The Days of Our Pilgrimage: The History of the Pilgrim Holiness Church*. Wesleyan History Series 2. Marion, IN: Wesley, 1976.
- Thompson, Steve. *A 20th Century Apostle: Life of Alfred Garr*. Wilkesboro, NC: MorningStar, 2003.
- Thornton, Michael. *Fire in the Carolinas: The Revival Legacy of G.B. Cashwell and A.B. Crumpler*. Lake Mary, FL: Creation House, 2014.
- Thornton, Wallace, Jr. *Radical Righteousness: Personal Ethics and the Development of the Holiness Movement*. Salem, OH: Schmul, 1998.
- . ‘God’s Trustee: Martin Wells Knapp and the Radical Holiness Movement.’ In *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street: Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal Visions of the New Creation*, edited by Henry H. Knight III, 148-157. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010.
- . *When The Fire Fell: Martin Wells Knapp’s Vision of Pentecost and the Beginning of God’s Bible School*. Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2014.
- Tippin, Kenneth R., ed. *Powerful Words: Selected Radical Writings by Pioneers of the Church of God Reformation Movement*. Sturgis, MI: Douglas Carr, Gateway River of Life Ministries, 2001.
- Tisby, Jemar. *The Color of Compromise: The Truth about the American Church’s Complicity in Racism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019.
- Tomlinson, Homer, ed. *Diary of A.J. Tomlinson*. New York: Church of God World Headquarters, 1949.
- Tozer, A. W. *Wingspread: Albert B. Simpson: A Study in Spiritual Altitude*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian, 1943.
- Turley, Briane. *A Wheel Within a Wheel: Southern Methodism and the Georgia Holiness Association*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1999.

- Tyson, James L. *The Early Pentecostal Revival: History of the Twentieth-Century Pentecostals and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, 1901–30*. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame, 1992.
- University of Texas Arlington Special Collections. ‘Rest Cottage Records: A Guide.’ Texas Archival Resources Online. <https://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/taro/utarl/00198/arl-00198.html> (accessed August 2, 2021).
- Van De Walle, Bernie A. ‘The Life and Ministry of Albert Benjamin Simpson.’ PhD diss., Drew University, 2004.
- . *The Heart of the Gospel: A.B. Simpson, The Fourfold Gospel and the Late Nineteenth Century Theology*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 106. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009.
- . ‘The Radical Holiness Movement and the Christian Missionary Alliance: Twins, Perhaps, but Not Identical.’ Bernie A. Van De Walle Blog. <http://bavdw.com/index.php/papers-presentations/fourfold-on-gospel-papers/15-the-radical-holiness-movement-and-the-christian-and-missionary-alliance-twins-perhaps-but-not-identical> (accessed November 14, 2018).
- Vogel, Dan, and Scott C. Dunn. ‘“The Tongue of Angels”: Glossolalia among Mormon’s Founders.’ *Journal of Mormon History* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 1-34. [jstor.org. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23286373](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23286373) (accessed July 14, 2021).
- Wacker, Grant A. ‘The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880-1910.’ *Journal of American History* 72, no. 1 (June 1985): 45-62.
- . ‘Travail of a Broken Family: Radical Evangelical Responses to the Emergence of Pentecostalism in America, 1906–1916.’ In *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism*, edited by Edith Blumhofer, Russell Spittler, and Grant A. Wacker, 23-49. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- . *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Waldvogel, Edith L. (Blumhofer). ‘The “Overcoming Life”: A Study in the Reformed Evangelical Origins of Pentecostalism.’ PhD diss., Harvard University, 1977.
- Walker, Charles O. *A History of the Holiness Baptist Association of Georgia*. Jasper, GA: author, 1968.
- Walters, Kenneth Richard, Jr. *Why Tongues? The Initial Evidence Doctrine in North American Pentecostal Churches*. Dorset, UK: Deo, 2016.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. *Studies in Perfectionism*. Edited by Samuel G. Craig. B. B. Warfield Collection. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1967.
- Warner, Wayne. ‘Herbert Buffum.’ *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6, no. 3 (Fall 1986): 11-14.
- . *The Woman Evangelist: The Life and Times of Charismatic Evangelist Maria B. Woodworth-Emmett*. Studies in Evangelicalism 8. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1986.
- . ‘Heritage Letter.’ *Assemblies of God Heritage* 10, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 19.
- Weaver, C. Douglas. *Baptists and the Holy Spirit: The Contested History of the Holiness-Pentecostal-Charismatic Movements*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019.
- Welch, Tim. *Joseph Smale: God’s “Moses” for Pentecostalism*. Studies in Evangelical History and Thought. London: Paternoster, 2013.
- Wesche, Percival. *Henry Clay Morrison: Crusader Saint*. Berne, IN: Herald, 1963.
- Williams, Roy. ‘William Edward Boardman (1810–1886): Evangelist of the Higher Life.’ PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 1998.
- White, Calvin, Jr. *The Rise to Respectability: Race, Religion and the Church of God in Christ*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2012.

- White, Charles E. *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist and Humanitarian*. Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury, 1986.
- White, Hayden. 'The Question of Narrative in Contemporary History Theory.' *History and Theology* 23, no. 1 (February 1984): 1-33.
- White, James T., ed. *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*. Vol. 35. New York: James T. White, 1949.
- Williams, Thomas E. Q. *Search the Ground: Brother John T. Hatfield, "the Hoosier Evangelist" on the 100th Anniversary of His "Home Camp"*. Greenfield, IN: Coiny, 2001.
- Wilson, Mallalieu. *William C. Wilson: The Fifth General Superintendent*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene, 1995.
- Wilson, Mary Campbell. *The Obedience of Faith: The Story of Rev. Christine A. Gibson, Founder of Zion Bible Institute*. Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1993.
- Winstead, M. Brandon. *There All Along: Black Participation in the Church of the Nazarene, 1914–1969*. Lexington, KY: Emeth, 2013.
- Wittlinger, Carlton. *Quest for Piety and Obedience: The Story of the Brethren in Christ*. Nappanee, IN: Evangel, 1978.
- Wolfram, Gertrude. *The Widow of Zarephath: A Church in the Making*. Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1954.
- Wood, Dillard, and William H. Preskitt Jr. *Baptized with Fire: A History of the Pentecostal Fire-Baptized Holiness Church*. Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate, 1982.
- Woods, Daniel. 'Failure and Success in the Ministry of T.J. McIntosh, the first Pentecostal Missionary to China.' *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 12. <http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj12/woods.html> (accessed January 4, 2018).
- . 'Daniel Awrey, the Fire-Baptized Movement, and the Origins of the Church of God: Toward a Chronology of Confluence and Influence.' *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 19. <http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj19/woods.html> (accessed February 28, 2022).
- Woods, David G. 'Speaking in Tongues of Unity.' Master's thesis, Regent University, 2013. *Word and Work* 111, no. 5 (May 1989).
- York, H. Stanley. *George Floyd Taylor: The Life of An Early Southern Pentecostal Leader*. Maitland, FL: Xulon, 2013.
- Yount, Michael G. *A.B. Simpson: His Message and Impact on the Third Great Awakening*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016.