

Click on the bookmarks icon on the left of the PDF Reader
for quick links to each article.

Wesleyan Theological Journal

Volume 25 — Number 2 — Fall — 1990

- Anti-Ordinance: A Proto-Pentecostal Phenomenon**
Charles Edwin Jones 7
- Christian Baptism and the Early Nazarene:
The Sources That Shaped a
Pluralistic Baptismal Tradition**
Stan Ingersol 24
- American Holiness Hymnody:
Some Questions: A Methodology**
Mel R. Wilhoit 39
- Trinity and Hymnody: The Doctrine of the Trinity
in the Hymns of Charles Wesley**
Barry E. Bryant 64
- Unity Amid Diversity: Interpreting
the Book of Revelation
in the Church of God (Anderson)**
John E. Stanley 74

Editor
Paul Merritt Bassett

Digital texts copyright 2008
Wesley Center Online
<http://wesley.nnu.edu>

ANTI-ORDINANCE: A PROTO-PENTECOSTAL PHENOMENON?

by

Charles Edwin Jones

Both the Holiness and Pentecostal movements have roots in the popular romanticism¹ of the late nineteenth century. In their brightest moments, the Spirit-directed impulse springing from it has impelled them to the heroic as they have spread the gospel "in the slums, and in the jungles," and throughout "all the world."² In darker moments, the same impulse fueled by arrogance, ignorance, and manipulation of scriptural texts and church authority, has brought the cause into disrepute. Having died as an heretical Holiness ideology, did Anti-ordinance reappear as an attitudinal aberration in Pentecostalism?

Hereditary traits, in religious movements as in men, are difficult to trace with precision. In movements, inheritance from parent to child is obscured further by the fact that always there is a dominant parent, and one or more other, less dominant. Estrangement between mother and child, as in the case of the Holiness and Pentecostal movements, and the interweaving of regressive and positive traits have caused historians of both movements largely to ignore a dark aspect of this inheritance the Anti-ordinance phenomenon.

At the outset, it must be made clear that although in the 1880s, dispute over the necessity of baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Sabbath gave it rise the eye of the storm darted toward other, cardinal issues: the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and the nature and discipline of the church. Couched initially in sacramentarian terms, the debate only secondarily concerned church ordinances. The actual battle was joined over Spirit-guidance, upon which the insurgents came to rely to the exclusion of scripture, church, reason, and tradition. Although within a couple of decades excesses and anarchy dissipated the Missouri-centered coalition, an unflappable Spirit-attributed subjectivity remained, unconscious of history and indifferent either to sacraments or to church discipline.

Anti-ordinance and the setting, in order of the first independent Holiness churches in Missouri, Kansas, Texas, and elsewhere were practically coincident, giving credence to the popular Methodist-Holiness belief that come-

outism and Anti-ordinance were synonymous, when in fact they represented two, quite distinct emphases among independent Holiness radicals in, and influenced by, the Southwestern Holiness Association.

Formed in 1879 following the National Camp Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness at Bismarck Grove, near Lawrence, Kansas, the Southwestern Association drew together most Holiness workers in both branches of the Methodist Episcopal Church in north Missouri and eastern Kansas. Affiliation was limited to members in good standing of some Christian church. The Association was served by the *Good Way* begun that year and issued successively from Savannah, St. Joseph, College Mound, and Chillicothe, Missouri.³

By 1882, when its membership stood at 185, the activities of workers related to the Southwestern Association had brought many of them, particularly in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, into conflict with church officials. In March of that year in Macon, Missouri, A. M. Kiergan, A. L.

Brewer, P. D. Van Deventer, George R. Sneed, F. H. Sumter, all Southern Methodist preachers, and J. W. Blosser, Congregationalist preacher and physician, agreed to withdraw "at a convenient time" from their churches.⁴ The departure from their churches of these and a number of other Holiness preachers in north Missouri, either voluntarily or under threat of discipline, undermined their standing in the Southwestern Holiness Association as well. Although the Southwestern was already regarded by sister associations "as fostering comeoutism" and breeding "church . . . disintegration,"⁵ those affected were successful in convincing the Association, meeting in June of that year at Centralia, Missouri, to amend its bylaws to permit the setting, in order of independent Holiness churches.⁶

The next year, a joint stock company of members of the Association purchased the campus at College Mound, Missouri, of the former Cumberland Presbyterian McGee College from the church presbytery of that name, and opened there a classical academy of its own: the Pauline Holiness College, an institution apparently designed to inspire tent-making ministries like those of the Apostle Paul and of the holiness Methodist Episcopal bishop, William Taylor.⁷ In April 1883, the *Good Way* moved its office and equipment from St. Joseph to College Mound, where it occupied space rent-free in the college building.⁸

The decision of the Southwestern Holiness Association to endorse, when necessary, organization of independent Holiness churches gave the independents equal standing in its deliberations. Ironically, it also freed independents from need of the Association and from need to believe that the churches at whose hands they had so recently suffered were true churches.⁹ They wondered how many others "in the churches, so-called, lorded over by anti-holiness, secret oath-bound, tobacco-eating shepherds" could not "fellowship such pastors, much less receive the communion at their hands."¹⁰

The first of its affiliates to act on the Association provision was the forty-four member Holiness band of Centralia, Missouri, which on March 29, 1883 resolved to be set-in-order and to incorporate under the laws of the state the Church at Centralia, "making a profession of repentance, justification, regeneration, and belief in sanctification" as a work of grace "subsequent to regeneration wrought instantaneously through consecration and faith, the condition of membership."¹¹ Among those identified with it, which within a few weeks

increased to seventy-eight, were practically all the independent Holiness workers of north Missouri.

Autonomous and self-governing, the Church at Centralia and one soon after organized at Nevada, Iowa, had all the marks, admirers said, of the New Testament ecclesia. In their eyes, it was a true church as defined by the (sectarian) Methodist Episcopal Church, South (from which they had so recently had departed): "the visible Church of Christ," "a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance."¹²

Although the Holiness people at Centralia thought otherwise, the events surrounding the beginning of the church there had a distinctly Methodist flavor. The Holiness band there had been organized the previous December following meetings conducted by A. M. and Nina Kiergan and Dora Hunt. The band met in Brother Brown's carpenter shop while constructing "a neat, plain, commodious" chapel. They proposed on May 3, 1883, to dedicate the building debt-free as a "house for the Lord," and by the laying-on-of-hands of the presbytery, to set apart the first class of elders in the Church of God. The day before, the membership "recognized" the ordinations of former Methodist Episcopal Church, South elders A. M. Kiergan and A. L. Brewer, and former Baptist George W. Petty; and recommended nine, all or most of whom were former Southern Methodist local preachers, for ordination as elders the next day: J. F. Watkins,¹³ N. T. Sneed, H. A. Foster, George R. Sneed, F. H. Sumter (ordained later),¹⁴ J. B. Creighton,¹⁵ J. H. Allen,¹⁶ D. C. Brenneman, and W. T. Bean.¹⁷

Though congregationalist, the proceedings on May 3 were as non-parochial in their immediate effect as those of a Methodist conference would have been. In addition to established independent Holiness workers, most of whom were "identified" with the Church at Centralia, the "blood-washed" crowded the house from "Monroe City, Long Branch, Santa Fe, Mount Zion, Sturgeon, Armstrong, Columbia, Callaway County, Mexico, Rush Hill," and other places in north central and northeast Missouri. At eleven o'clock Isaiah Reid of Nevada, Iowa, graduate of the Auburn Seminary who had been expelled from the Presbyterian ministry for preaching holiness,¹⁸ delivered the dedicatory sermon, and trustees were admonished never to permit "sprees or suppers" "to desecrate the sacred place." In the afternoon a presbytery, consisting of Reid, former Southern Methodists Kiergan and Brewer, former Baptist Petty, and former Northern Methodist T. B. Bratton, "solemnly ordained" the eight kneeling at the rail "to the office of an Elder in the Church of God."¹⁹ None was reordained.²⁰

Over thirty years later, "the glory" which "crowned the mercy seat" in the prayers, singing (without instrumental accompaniment), testimonies, sermon, and altar service in the evening were still fresh in the memory of A.M. Kiergan, especially the inspiring *a capella* singing. He recalled Southern Methodist Bishop Holland McTyeire's advice to ordinands at Hannibal in 1876: "Young brethren, you will do well if you keep the organs and the devil out of the churches."²¹

Even as the comeouters of North Missouri took first steps toward recreation of the New Testament church, the first signs of a storm over Spirit-guidance appeared among the Free Methodists and Cumberland Presbyterians in northeast Texas. There, several men and women left their fam-

ilies and holed up in a farmhouse to await divine guidance by physical signs, such as sensations in their joints. One man refused even to return home to care for his wife, who had become seriously ill, until he had such a sign. Another, the Rev. Robert J. Haynes, a Cumberland Presbyterian holiness man, who had become convinced through revelation that he would be alive at the Second Coming, boasted that no gun in existence could kill him. To test his faith, one cold night a gang of ruffians dunked him in a cattle watering tank; then dumped him, unconscious and half-frozen, by the road.²²

Then, in 1884 a pathetic incident occurred in Texas related to later developments in Missouri. That year "a Mrs. Wheaton," self-proclaimed prison evangelist from the "North," came through Ennis spreading the gospel of comeoutism and anti-ordinance. She announced that all churches were "Babylon" and that the recording of one's name "on a church book was an absolute sin." Among the sizable number attracted by Mother Wheaton's plea to "Come out of her, my people," was the Rev. Philip Allen, the youthful local Free Methodist presiding elder, who was convinced by the Spirit to leave both his church and his wife, and directed, he said, to marry a woman in Kansas, whom he had never seen. Allen set out for Kansas posthaste, only to be informed on arrival that his intended had herself received no directive from the Lord to marry him.²³ Not even this fiasco, however, could shake Allen's faith in Spirit-attributed impressions. For her part, Elizabeth Wheaton appeared two decades later at the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles as a seeker after "Pentecost."²⁴

In north Missouri, it was a respected teacher, not an itinerant evangelist, who was destined to formulate the Anti-ordinance ideology and to marshal its offense. Addison Lanius Brewer,²⁵ namesake and son-in-law of the Missouri Methodist pioneer, Jacob Lanius,²⁶ had trudged with Kiergan every step from Episcopal Methodism to what they believed to be reestablishment of the New Testament ecclesia: the Church at Centralia; the Free Church of Nevada, Iowa; and in other places in rapid succession.²⁷ In the early 1870s, both men had served in the Southern Methodist mission in Montana.²⁸ From its opening in 1883 until 1887, Brewer, who was self-taught in Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldee, served as theology teacher of the Pauline Holiness College at College Mound. While there, he developed his Anti-ordinance theory, conflict about which, together with coeducation of the races, led to the school's closing²⁹ and a permanent rift with Kiergan and other orthodox Holiness brethren.

In April and July 1887, Brewer set fire to his ties to College Mound by issuing there the first two numbers of the *Royal Priest*,³⁰ journal of the Anti-ordinance cause. October saw issuance of the third number from Kirksville,³¹ forty miles to the north, site of the origin of the paper through 1898 and of its successor, the *Theocrat*, from December 1900 to September 1903. From beginning to end, Phil Allen was a subscriber and contributor to Brewer's papers.³²

Inconsistencies in conservative sacramental practices became early forensic targets of the insurgents. "A Bit of History" incorporated in the February 25, 1888 letter of S. C. O'Byrne of Sullivan, Missouri, focused on J. H. Allen and George W. Petty, ordinand and member of the presbytery at Centralia. O'Byrne recalled:

When J. H. Allen came from Ill. to Mo., he came as a licensed M. E. preacher. The district conference at Louisiana, Mo., refused to renew his license. Reason, he preached holiness. Pretext, he would not submit to the preacher in charge: and he was excommunicated afterwards for passing the bread and wine at Centralia to men who had been justified and sanctified in his meeting after the elements had been consecrated by the preacher in charge of the circuit, who was willing to string the fish. But Bro. Allen went on preaching holiness all the same: and men got saved all the same: of which I am one. Bless the Lord! And in the same meeting with me there was an ordained Baptist preacher [George W. Petty] sanctified. About this time Bro. Allen was struck with a streak of new lightning, that he must be ordained, and this Baptist preacher laid his hands on him (I presume along with some others [at Centralia]) and ordained him.

Three years later, O'Byrne reported, yet another sacramental role reversal occurred, which illustrated the Methodist (and to the Anti-Ordinance insurgents sectarian) traditionalism of the independent church movements.

And this last summer Bro. Allen had another stroke of new lightning, and he discovered this Baptist preacher's baptism [by immersion] was not valid and he (Bro. Allen) baptized the preacher over again [by effusion]. O Lucifer, Son of the morning, how hast the mighty fallen.³³

Attacks on the sacraments sounded the battle cry. It was the insurgents' theology of Spirit-guidance and of the church, however, which posed the most intolerable threat to orthodox independents because the spirituality and rhetoric of Anti-ordinance, in the beginning, so closely resembled their own. Brewer's own spiritual pilgrimage, long before he arrived in College Mound, is a case in point.

From childhood, A. L. Brewer had regarded instances of yielding to impressions as milestones of spiritual progress. Being "prostrated" during a prayer meeting, he saw as a sign of forgiveness of sins. A dream in which "heavenly messengers" cast "a great stone" "into the bottomless pit . . . exclaiming, Babylon is fallen, is fallen," indicated that he should give up "all worldly pursuits," such as becoming a merchant, to preach. As a condition of entire sanctification, he believed that God required him to give the proceeds from the sale of a hundred acres of land to missions in China. Yielding to such impressions, he stopped pressing for monetary compensation due him from the church and ceased taking medicine should even his own life be threatened. He pointed to such as the basis for a decision to burn his sermon notes and preach only the "naked" Bible. When, on occasion, Brewer sought to check impulse with scripture, the application appears inappropriate. One instance of such was his use of "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God. . .,"³⁴ in answer to a question of his official board about his preaching on holiness to the exclusion of other cardinal doctrines. Another, his test of an impression that he should preach holiness, even if his wife left him because of it, by resort to the passage concerning forsaking father, mother, wife, or children for the gospel.³⁵ Brewer found validation for an impression that he sever his Methodist conference tie by suggestions volunteered by his

wife, who at the time did not profess entire sanctification, that he go and preach for the Holiness independents. In like manner her interpreted non-receipt of the written notice of location, which the Methodist presiding elder had sent, as evidence of divine approval of his decision to withdraw from the "sect."

Brewer's method of discernment, held in common with other independents, nudged other preachers prominent in earliest days of the independent church movement in north Missouri into Anti-ordinance beliefs. These included P. D. Van Deventer, who committed suicide during the fracas,³⁶ and H. A. Foster, D. C. Brenneman,³⁷ and N. T. Sneed, who had been among the eight ordained at Centralia. Awareness that the same method of discernment prevailed among them as well, proved threatening, to the extreme, to their orthodox brethren.

The footings for the Anti-ordinance structure were laid at the very beginning of A. L. Brewer's stay at College Mound. In September 1883, as he was breaking bread for the communion service during a camp meeting in Chariton County, Brewer claimed he heard an inner voice say, "This is to be done away," and countered with scripture about showing forth "the Lord's death until he come." The voice countered: "He has already come." Although he continued the service, Brewer recalled that the incident induced him to "investigate the matter further," leading him finally to conclude that Old Testament "types were to be entirely removed." When asked a month later during a meeting at Knox City to pray for a young woman who had been an invalid for eleven years, he concluded that if the types of bread and wine in the communion and water in baptism had been done away, surely oil for the anointing of the sick had gone with them.

By mid 1887, his work as teacher ended and his work as editor begun, Brewer had constructed, for himself and his readers, an entirely new history of redemption. In doing so, he carefully retained the facade of familiar terminology and accepted piety.³⁸ Brewer himself apparently never abandoned Wesleyan taboos. His grandson, Given, remembered that in 1925 at age eleven he heard his Grandfather Brewer chastise his father for having danced with his mother, albeit in their own home to the accompaniment of a player piano.³⁹

Although Brewer controlled the tone and content of the *Royal Priest*, the paper can be said to be at best a clouded mirror of his views. He faced criticism in print, by word of mouth, and even in the prayers of his brethren. Brother Phelps, a particularly anti-intellectual coworker, asked to be delivered from the likes of Brewer himself:

Oh God almighty, let thy spirit come down and fill thy people. Give us more people led of thy spirit and less of those preaching by Greek and Hebrew. We need more love of God and less Greek and Hebrew. You made the way so plain the wayfaring man tho a fool cannot err therein. We do not need the college education to bring the truth to erring man.⁴⁰

After his death, the Anti-ordinance P. D. Van Deventer was quoted as having characterized the editor of the *Royal Priest* as "the wildest fanatic he ever knew."⁴¹ Yet it was around him, more than any other, that the Anti-ordinance forces rallied. And it was his exit from the Christian pavilion which caused his following finally to disperse.

Brewer's schema derived from the belief that Christ had come the second time in A. D. 70, and had established the Kingdom of God on earth. At His first coming, Christ Himself had become the last animal sacrifice of the Jewish church. Since His return, a royal priesthood (the entirely sanctified) minister to His spiritual body, the church. The ceremonies and sacrifices of the Levitical priesthood and the New Testament ordinances which they fore shadowed and typified have been replaced by the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving of a royal priesthood chosen and directed by the Holy Spirit alone. The church as an organized body, then, is a sect. Composed of all the saved of earth, the General Church or mystical body of Christ alone is the true church, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, its sole authority.

The Anti-ordinance teaching opened many new vistas. As a royal priesthood, Anti-ordinance teachers opposed all church authority. They said: "We still believe that the Holy Spirit is fully competent to guide control, and lead his people." "We do not believe in man made or man ordained elders," who presume "to control and lord it over God's heritage."⁴² "The Lord calls, qualifies, ordains, and sends the ministry." Hence, in ordaining workers the organized church usurps the Lord's prerogative. They were fond of saying that the Lord alone could take one into the church, and He alone could put one out.⁴³

Sectarianism, whether holiness or not, was the real culprit, D. H. Faires believed, when he wrote Brewer, February 15, 1888.

But in dealing with the errors and inconsistencies of sectarianism, I see no reason why the holiness sect (which being the youngest in the family is, as is usually the case, the most selfish and overbearing of all the children) has any better claims to respect than any other. Doubtless most of them are as honest as Paul was when he "verily thought he was doing God's service."

And perhaps some of these days as they go down to Damascus with their license from the chief priest they will get "new light." Well God bless you and your family and all the dear saints, either bond or free, and keep the R. P. free and unsectarian. I have no more use for a holiness sect or an anti-sect sect, or an anti-ordinance sect, than I have for any other sect.⁴⁴

The unsectarian came in many varieties. In 1907, the orthodox W. A. Cole said the Anti-ordinance teaching which had been promulgated in the vicinity of Bennington, Indian Territory, included marital purity: that, except for procreation, it was a sin to cohabit as husband and wife.⁴⁵ In Texas, C. B. Jernigan said that they did not observe Sunday as the Lord's Day because they were not "sun worshipers";⁴⁶ and that they worked at menial jobs, gave up "neat and respectable clothing,"⁴⁷ and upon occasion "became servants to the Negroes" to show humility.⁴⁸ In their own minds, however, they were working within the Spirit's own design. In November 1889, Phil Allen reported:

The Lord is giving me plenty of wood to saw and split, and occasionally a well to clean out, and, in his own way, feeding and caring for us. My soul fills with holy desire to see the kingdom coming in God's own way. Allelujah!⁴⁹

The individual, not the group,⁵⁰ took initiative and accepted responsibility. From Trenton, Missouri, Sister Snyder wrote: "The glory of God goes bounding up and down through my soul like the waves in the sea. I am a *traveling agent* for the Holy Ghost, to walk, ride, sit, stand, preach, or not preach, as *he* may direct."⁵¹ Although in 1892, Joseph Hughes, Sr., of Wellsville, Kansas, built and paid for a meeting-house and horse shed for group use,⁵² more often the meeting place was a rented hall, someone's kitchen,⁵³ a borrowed church building, a tent, or the street. On March 24, 1889, Phil Allen wrote from Ennis, Texas:

On Monday last, brother A. L. Kenney and wife, and brother A. Panis, came to this town and we went on the streets and preached there. On Tuesday night I was arrested by the city authorities and on Thursday I was tried in the city court and the Lord anointed me to preach in court. Some wept and the Lord put conviction on many, but as usual with the followers of Jesus, I was fined ten dollars and costs. Being poor I have to work my fine out on the streets. The town is ashamed of their work and proposed to buy me out by paying my fine if I would quit preaching on the streets. Not being a hireling, I preach without money and without price. Glory to God in the highest.⁵⁴

A few months earlier, the jailing of Annie Monroe in Missouri had been described in even more graphic terms. She wrote:

I went as directed of the Lord to Chillicothe, some 14 miles from our place [Avalon]. Was staying all night with two ladies, a Baptist and [a] cadet in the Salvation Army. I got to shouting in the night, or about three in the morning. A professor [of holiness], so I am told, went and had me arrested on the charge of being drunk, to which charge I plead guilty, and when asked what I had been drinking, I told them it was new wine fresh from my Father's kingdom. The marshals, who were both sanctified men, understood me in part. O glory! My husband thinks it is a disgrace to have his wife in the lock up, but I have never had any better time in all my life. I asked the officer if I must keep still, and he said, no. While I was in there, there were two drunken men in another cell, so the first thing I did was to kneel down and pray and ask God to take the whiskey out of these men.... They would not let me pay the fine: asked me what denomination I belonged to. I answered none, thank God. What church do you belong to? The church of the first born. What is the matter with you? Well I will tell you. My tongue is anointed with full and free salvation, and God has seen fit to set it a going for his name's honor and glory, and all the men this side of the Mississippi could not stop it, for God was ruling my tongue and, praise his name, when I bite my lips again to keep back an amen or glory to God it will be when I am insane or drunk. O glory! Hallelujah! I am just trusting this evening, and believing and receiving. God has made me dare to be a Daniel.⁵⁵

Throughout its existence the *Royal Priest* remained the property and responsibility of Brewer. Issued as frequently as the Holy Spirit by means

of free-will-offerings and annual subscriptions of from 40 cents to \$1.00 indicated, the paper was sent "to the poor" free-upon-request. The convener of an Anti-ordinance convention confessed failure to discern the Spirit's leading when no one showed up.

Albeit inadvertently, at the beginning the *Royal Priest's* principal circulation was the *Good Way*, published in College Mound, whose attacks on Anti-ordinance teachings brought Brewer's new paper to its own readers' attention. A period of quite lively debate was muffled by new developments.

From the conservative side came the declaration of "essential and fundamental truths" by the General Holiness Convention, meeting in Fort Scott, Kansas, June 27, 1888, which sought to ward off the "reproach" to "the cause of true holiness" "that untruthful and unscriptural teachers (many of whom are mere novices in years and in experiences) have brought upon it by a reckless advocacy of offensive heresies."⁵⁶ The convention turned a deaf ear to the Anti-ordinance charge that the framers themselves were sectarians⁵⁷ who had committed the unpardonable sin of making a creed.⁵⁸ The "true" holiness people put an end to the insurgents' habit of assuming that the Lord had appointed them as "pastors wherever they chanced to be,"⁵⁹ by requiring every worker to be amenable to some local church.

That November, A. R. Haughwout, who had been tried for heresy, reported disdainfully:

About three months ago, through the instigation of J. F. Corn, a convention of "true" holiness people was called to try me for heresy. Geo. R. Sneed presided and F. H. Sumter acted as pope. Long before the evidence was in and the case submitted to the consideration of the saints, the pope in a little fifteen minute speech condemned, passed sentence and excommunicated me from the fellowship and communion of HIS church, telling the people they must not have anything to do with me in any respect for I was a dangerous man, a heretic, and fanatic.⁶⁰

Gradually, such expedients shut freelance teachers out of the regularly set-in-order churches. The crowning blow to Anti-ordinance, however, was struck by John P. Brooks, the independent movement's most distinguished preacher and editor, who in 1891 issued *The Divine Church* in defense of the theology, ministry, ordinances, and government of the New Testament ecclesia.⁶¹

From within the Anti-ordinance ranks came ever more extreme pronouncements and actions. Regeneration, some said, was the resurrection; sanctification, the second coming; and glorification, a third⁶² heaven-on-earth experience, the millennium.⁶³ In Avalon, Missouri, a woman so blessed exulted that "she was resurrected, glorified and walking the golden streets of New Jerusalem." One, unconvinced, meeting her said, "I have hold of your hand and I am standing on the street of Avalon." Another, it was reported, declared that he could write a Bible superior to the one we have.⁶⁴ Some scoffed at the idea of heaven and hell, and referred to Christ as a "little black Jew."⁶⁵

As the *Royal Priest* gave way to the *Theocrat*, such excesses and Brewer's own advancing views alienated his more traditional and orthodox followers. Especially upsetting to them was his late hypothesis that Jesus was just another great moral teacher like Buddha. In 1903, the Spirit as manifested

in plummeting circulation figures, caused him to give up as publisher. Anti-ordinance as such had long since lost its drawing power. In March that year, Phil Allen wrote from Denver: "I am simply worshipping the God in me, and being filled with the fullness."⁶⁶

Among those ultimately drawn into Pentecostalism was the unrepentant A. R. Haughawout, who in 1914 described a meeting of followers of Charles Fox Parham⁶⁷ in Webb City, Missouri, in terms of the kingdom-already-come. He exulted:

[Most members of] the old time choir, that added so much to the success of the meeting last Spring, were . . . present, with their harps attuned to the heavenly melodies. At times it seemed impossible to distinguish between the earthly and the heavenly anthems, for no one could doubt the presence of the blood-washed throng as they joined with us to sing the songs of the redeemed. . . . The celestial glory not only illuminated the faces of the singers, but it absolutely filled the room with a halo of glory.... Some present . . . could scarcely endure the "weight of glory" that rested upon them during these exercises.⁶⁸

In 1918, A. L. Brewer left Kirksville for Pasadena, California. By his own admission a "fanatic,"⁶⁹ he on February 21, 1940, died there.⁷⁰

Notes

1. L. Paul Gresham pointed out the romantic impulse which pervaded the founding of these movements.

2. See Art. 2, par. 3 of Constitution of the International Holiness Union and Prayer League [1897], in Paul Westphal Thomas and Paul William Thomas. *The Days of Our Pilgrimage: the History of the Pilgrim Holiness Church*. Marion, In., Wesley Press, 1976, p. 14.

3. Clarence Eugene Cowen. *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)*. Overland Park, Ks., Herald and Banner Press, 1949, p. 141, 142151. The paper moved to Chillicothe in 1894.

4. A. M. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches of the Revival of True Holiness and Local Church Polity from 1865-1916*. Fort Scott, Ks., Board of Publication of the Church Advocate and Good Way, 1972, pp. 3839.

5. *Ibid*, p. 42.

6. *Ibid*, p. 39.

7. See David Bundy. "Bishop William Taylor and Methodist mission: a study in nineteenth century social history," in *Methodist History*, 27 (July 1989), 197210; and, 28 (Oct. 1989), 321; and biography by Marvin H. Harper in N. B. Harmon, ed. *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*. 2 vols., Nashville, TN., United Methodist Publishing House, 1974, p. 23172318.

8. Cowen. *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)*, pp. 3335, 143.

9. "With the organization of independent Holiness churches, fraternity of independents with those remaining in the older churches cooled. The last meeting of the Southwestern Holiness Association was held at College Mound on June 2, 1885. The independent secretary Kiergan, rather than the Methodist president J. W. Caughlan, called it. Caughlan did not attend. See Cowen. *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)*, p. 25. The College Association continued until June 1888. In early 1887, John P. Brooks became editor of the *Good Way*. Both he and his successors advocated independency.

10. A. M. Kiergan, "The present need [1882]." In Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, pp. 4142.

11. *Ibid*, p. 45.

12. Number 13 ~Of the Church) of the Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

13. Longtime pastor at College Mound and Reform, and father of A. C. Watkins, my childhood pastor in Kansas City. See Memorial Number, *Church Herald* (College Mound, Mo.), 19 (Mar. 15, 1918).

14. Obituary in *Church Herald and Holiness Banner* (Fort Scott, Ks.), 45 (Nov. 26. 1924). 6.

15. In February and March 1896, a series of articles by Creighton in the *Church Advocate and Holiness Banner* entitled, "Supremacy of the elders in the Church of God," unleashed a stormy controversy about church polity, which the next year resulted in a twenty-five-year long division of the orthodox movement into two factions. Moving for health reasons to Washington state, he in 1905 joined the Church of the Nazarene, which that year (whether by his agency or not) placed in its discipline statements on "The General Church" and "The Churches Severally" rhetorically congruent to those of the restorationists from whom he had come. With slight abridgment these statements remain in place and unchanged at present. Compare 1905 ed. of Church of the Nazarene *Manual* with 1989 ed. See obituary by F. R. McConnell in *Herald of Holiness* (Kansas City, Mo.),27 (Feb.18,1939),28; also Cowen. *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)*, pp. 4647; and Timothy L. Smith. *Called unto Holiness; the Story of the Nazarenes: the Formative Years*. Kansas City, Mo., Nazarene Publishing House, 1962, pp. 122, 143.

16. Later Allen became a proponent of British Israelism, and his book, *Judah's Scepter and Joseph's Birthright* (1902), a key text in propagation of the theory in America J. Gordon Melton said Herbert W. Armstrong, the Church of God adventist, paraphrased it for use in his ministry. See his *Encyclopedia of American Religions*. 3d ed. Detroit, Gale Research, 1989, pp. 84,86. The 1967 edition of Armstrong's *The United States and Britain in Prophecy* (xii, 226 p., Pasadena Ca, Ambassador College Press) did not acknowledge Allen as a source, even of his paraphrase (p. 82) of what Melton called Allen's "famous quote." In 1953 Ralph Lord Roy, commenting on the racist overtones of the theory, cited Allen's "principle source book of the entire movement" as proof that British Israelites were not intrinsically anti-Semitic. See his *Apostles of Discord a Study of Organized Bigotry and Disruption*

on the Fringes of Protestantism. Boston, Beacon Press, c1953, p.98. By 1917 J. H. Allen was publishing the *Stone Kingdom Herald*, "stone" in this case apparently referring to the Stone of Scone under the British coronation chair, which British Israelites say the Prophet Jeremiah brought to Ireland. See Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, p. 44; and Armstrong. *The United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 120122. Allen was the source of the Anglo-Israel teaching of Charles Fox Parham, founder of American Pentecostalism. In a letter of condolence to Parham's widow in 1929, "Bishop" Allen recalled that Parham had been present when he preached on "our Anglo-Saxon identity" at the Blue Mound (Kansas) Holiness Camp Meeting. "The theme was new to him." At that time [1893 or 1894], Parham was pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Eudora Kansas. Allen himself died May 14, 1930, in Pasadena California See Sarah E. Parham. *The Life of Charles F Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement*. Joplin, Mo., Tri-State Printing Co., 1930, pp. 421422.

17. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, pp. 4546.

18. See obituary, account of the funeral, and tributes in *Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness* (Chicago), (Oct. 26, 1911), 89. Reid was a principal in 1879 in founding the Iowa Holiness Association. The *Highway*, a paper he established in 1875, became its official organ. Neither the obituary nor the tributes made mention of his connection with the independent church movement.

19. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, pp. 4647.

20. See footnote 54.

21. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, p. 48.

22. See George McCulloch. *History of the Holiness Movement in Texas and the Fanaticism Which Followed*. Aquilla, Tx., J. H. Padgett, 1886, pp. 1340. Cover has *The Holiness Movement in Texas*, as title, and Ennis, Tx., as place of publication; and C. B. Jernigan. *Pioneer Days of the Holiness Movement in the Southwest*. Kansas City, Mo., Pentecostal Nazarene Publishing House, 1919, pp. 150151. McCulloch appears to be Jernigan's source.

23. Jernigan. *Pioneer Days*, pp. 151152.

24. In December 1906, a report from Los Angeles said Mother Wheaton had visited the Azusa Street Mission and was "tarrying for her Pentecost." A month later, word came from Clearwater, California, that she had gone there to continue seeking, had been "baptized with the Holy Ghost," and had spoken "in two languages." See *Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles), 1 (Dec 1906), 2:4; and, 1 (Jan. 1907), 1:5. During her last 28 years, she worked out of the Tabor, Iowa, headquarters of the Hephzibah Faith Missionary Association, a holiness group committed to "social and marital purity." She died, July 28, 1923, at the Faith Home there. See biography by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., in S. M. Burgess and G. B. McGee, eds. *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids, Mi., Zondervan Publishing House, 1988, pp.882883; reminiscence and picture of "leaders and missionaries" at 1914 Bellevue, Nebraska, camp meeting in Paul. W. Worcester. *The Master Key*.

Kansas City, Mo., Printed by the Nazarene Publishing House, 1966, pp. 1617, 27; and obituary and tribute by L. B. Worcester in *Good Tidings* (Tabor, Ia.),33 (Aug.16,1923),45,7. In 1901, the (by then) far less radical Wheaton attended the General Holiness Assembly in Chicago

25. Brewer was born June 15,1848, near Colony in Knox County, Missouri. His spiritual autobiography: "Sketches of travels in the land of Canaan," was published in two undated supplements to the *Royal Priest*, and in the Dec. 30, 1891 (vol. 3, no. 10) issue of the journal.

26. See biography by Albea Godbold in Harmon. *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, pp. 13821383.

27. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, p. 50.

28. E. J. Stanley. *Life of L. B. Stateler: a Story of Life on the Old Frontier*. Rev. ed. Nashville, Tn., Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, 1916, pp. 212, 213,214, 216, 217, 238.

29. Pauline Holiness College closed in June 1888. Agitation of the two issues, Anti-ordination and coeducation of the races, was practically coincident. See Cowen. *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)*, pp. 3539.

30. Title taken from 1 Peter 2:9 (AV): "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." In the inaugural issue, Brewer explained the theme: "The people, the priesthood, shall be our key note. We understand that all who are wholly sanctified, are initiated into God's priesthood." See *Royal Priest*, 1 (Apr. 1887), 2.

31. On hearing that Brewer had moved, P. D. Van Deventer wrote: "Was glad to know you had left College Mound. May God bless you with more congenial surroundings than that." See *Royal Priest*, 1 (Jan. 18, 1888), 3.

32. The editorial files of both papers, and the personal papers of A. L. Brewer remained in the possession of his family until the 1970's. At that time, through the agency of Theodore H. Wolff, a retired Methodist minister of Gerald, Missouri, they were placed in the joint custody of the State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, and the Western Historical Manuscript Collection of the University of Missouri, Columbia Publication histories: *The Royal Priest*, 1, no. 12, Apr.July 1887 [College Mound, Mo]; 1, no 38, no 12, Oct. 1887 Dec. 1898 [Kirksville, MO.]; and *The Theocrat*, 13, no 9, Dec.1900Sept. 1903 [Kirksville, Mo].

33. *Royal Priest*, 1 (Mar. 21, 1888), 3. O'Byrne then added: "Now, if this is not true, let Bro. Petty, the Baptist preacher, or any one else correct it and I will say amen."

34. James 1:5 (AV)

35. Matthew 19:29 (AV)

36. See article in *Royal Priest*, 5 (Dec.1894),23, by N. T. Sneed; and reply, 5 (Feb. 1895), 1, 4, by J. B. Creighton, the recent business manager of the

Good Way, in which Creighton answered the accusation of Sneed that Vandeventer's suicide had been, in part, a response to his rejection by the orthodox.

37. After Brenneman died, August 7, 1897, at Stillwater, Oklahoma Territory, his wife, Nannie, continued as an active worker in the Anti-ordinance cause and as a frequent correspondent of Brewer's.

38. How well Brewer succeeded in conveying this approach to his followers is illustrated in Dewane D. Babcock's "An open letter to Sanford Baker" in the *Royal Priest*, 2 (Oct. 30, 1889), 1. Note the zeal and earnestness of the admonition: "It requires much faith to throw off at once all the bandages of 'orthodoxy,' legalism, the decalogue, Sunday schools, &c., be not deceived by the names of goodness; but explore whether it be goodness."

39. See Theodore H. Wolff. *The Tin Box*. Gerald, Mo., 1976, p. ld..

40. As recalled by Brewer's daughter, Jessie, in the draft of an undated letter to her brother, Basil sometime after their father's death. In Brewer Papers, Joint Collection: University of Missouri Western Historical Manuscript Collection, Columbia, and State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts.

41. J. B. Creighton. "A plain statement of facts," *Royal Priest*, 5 (Feb. 1895), 1, 4.

42. D. H. Faires in *Royal Priest*, 1 (Sept. 5, 1888), 1.

43. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, p. 53.

44. Personal letter to Brewer postmarked Fruita, Col., Feb. 15th, 1888 in *Royal Priest*, 1 (Mar. 7, 1888), 4.

45. See "*Reports from the field*" in *Holiness Evangel* (Pilot Point, Tx.), 1 (Apr. 1, 1907). For the wider parameters of the purity ideology see D. J. Pivar. *Purity Crusade: Social Morality and Social Control, 1868-1900*. Westport, Ct., Greenwood Press, 1973.

46. Jernigan. *Pioneer Days*, p. 152. Anti-ordinance excesses in Texas and Missouri were similar.

47. Note the warning against pride in dress as a pitfall to the entirely sanctified: "I am often grieved to see those . . . being led off by *pride*. Yes a love of finery, the Babylonish garments. Yes the costly apparel had better be clean rags, or very cheap clothing, and the shine be in our hearts for the best and nicest clothes will not last always, and the beauty of the soul is eternal." See Mrs. A. M. Shinn in *Royal Priest*, 2 (June 4, 1890), 2. Seven years later, a secular reporter in Oklahoma Territory said neighbors of a colony of "holiness people" on Hell Roaring Creek, forty miles east of Perry, were asking that it be quarantined because of refusal of members to use "water" in personal hygiene or doctors and medicine in caring for the sick. Rather than bathing in water, they anointed themselves with oil. The writer made no mention of use of oil to anoint the sick. See "They anoint with oil," in *Daily Oklahoman* (Oklahoma City), Aug. 17, 1897, 5:3.

48. Jernigan. *Pioneer Days*, p. 152. See comments on marital purity, p.154.

49. Letter in *Royal Priest*, 2 (Nov. 20, 1889), 4.

50. Anti-ordinance was, in fact, anti-institutional. From Raleigh, North Carolina, one correspondent declared that the truly redeemed were undefiled "with any earthly organization. They were in no way connected with any of the so-called churches of today. They were completely separated from all the systems that man has built: political, ecclesiastical and secret orders. If there are any of the Lord's people in any of these worldly societies, such as the daughters of Rebecca and Martha Washington societies, and the Free Masons, Odd Fellows, Knights of Labor, Knight Templars, Knights of Pythias, Farmer's Allied, Temperance societies, and W.C.T.U. societies, tell them the cry is now going forth 'come out of her my people' and be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." See *Royal Priest*, 1 (Sept.5,1888),4.

51. See *Royal Priest*, 1 (May 15, 1889), 3.

52. The shed was necessary, Joseph Hughs said, because "no man could worship and let his horses stand in the cold." See his biography and a brief history of the church in Donna Bosworth Romstedt, ed. *Wellsville, Kansas Bicentennial, 1776-1976*. Wellsville, Ks., 1976, pp. 92, 125. The builder was father of Milton A. Hughs, an Anti-ordinance itinerant evangelist. In later years M. A. Hughs, like Brewer, adopted views far removed from Wesleyan holiness. See Milton A. Hughs. *The Crucified Lamb; or, The Origin of the Christian Religion and How It Came Down to Us*. 94 pp., Wellsville, Ks., c1922.

53. At Lamasco, Texas, Sisters Snyder and Moore reported having held a two-week meeting "in a kitchen, after the removing of furniture, &c., being well seated, with a porch enclosed with canvass." See letter in *Royal Priest*, 1 (Feb. 29, 1888), 2.

54. *Royal Priest*, 1 (Apr. 5, 1889), 4.

55. Letter from Avalon, Missouri, May 27, 1888 in *Royal Priest*, 1 (Nov. 11, 1888), 4.

56. "Address to the Holiness People, from the General Holiness Convention in Ft. Scott, Kansas, June 27th, 1888." Reprinted in Cowen. *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)*, pp. 219-222.

57. A few months later, the Anti-ordinance D. H. Faires, himself the secretary of the Church at Centralia at the time of its setting-in-order, asked: Will "Bro. Brooks" "please explain." "If the Methodist conference, the Baptist association, and the Presbyterian synod, are of God, why did you withdraw from them? If they are not of God, please explain why it was that at the Centralia convocation where the first elders were manufactured by the holiness people, that only those who had been previously ordained by said *ungodly* conference, association, and synod, could lay hands on the candidates for eldership. Well do the brethren know that unless they can establish the apostolic succession through the long line of 'cut offs,' each one taking a graft out of the old to propagate the new, until it comes down to 'The Church at Centra-

lia,' that they have no more authority to manufacture elders than any one who has ever received ordination at the hands of men." Letter from Fruita, Colorado in *Royal Priest*, 1 (Sept. 5, 1888), 1.

58. Cowen. *A History of the Church of God* (Holiness), p. 32.

59. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, p. 54.

60. Letter from Carl Junction, Missouri in *Royal Priest*, 1 (Nov. 11, 1888), 23.

61. John P. Brooks. *The Divine Church: a Treatise on the Origin, Constitution, Order, and Ordinances of the Church, Being a Vindication of the New Testament Ecclesia, and an Exposure of the Modern Church of Sect.* 283 pp., Columbia, Mo, Herald Publishing House, Printers and Binders, 1891; reprinted: El Dorado Springs, Mo., Witt Printing Co., 1960; and New York, Garland Publishing, 1984. In 1888 David B. Updegraff, holiness Quaker editor who favored adoption of the sacraments by the Friends, reprinted an article by Brooks, in which he argued that abandonment of the ordinances inevitably led to fanaticism and unbelief See Thomas D. Hamm. *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907.* Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1988, p. 135.

62. Individual explanations of Anti-ordinance teachings were neither uniform nor hermeneutically consistent one with another. In response to an Hastings, Nebraska reader, Brewer himself said that demonstration from scripture of three (rather than four or five) essential experiences, one had to start at the right place: "The third experience in this age (world or heaven) means the entrance into the Father's dispensation. In order to enter the Father's dispensation and have only three experiences, we must start at Pentecost, that is to be born of the *Spirit* (not of the water and the Spirit, for the water *birth* belonged under the law). Then we may receive Christ the second time without sin unto salvation as our sanctifier. This brings us to Gethesmane. Then we must be crucified with Christ. This brings us to Golgotha. Now we enter the Father's experience which is preeminently an experience of love. 1 Cor. 13." See *Royal Priest*, 2 (Nov. 19, 1890), 2. To follow Brewer in this instance, one must jumble Biblical chronology. The extreme individualism of Anti-ordinance prevents either systematization or syncretization of explanations.

63. In 1910, an independent Holiness church spokesman (probably Kiergan) said: "About one-fourth of the Holiness people in Missouri followed this fanaticism, but it was shortlived." The same observer said that at the beginning the leader (Brewer) had been "an extremely pious man." See *General History of Macon County, Missouri* Chicago, Henry Taylor & Co., 1910, p. 169.

64. Kiergan. *Historical Sketches*, p. 55.

65. See J. B. Creighton's summation of P. D. Van Deventer's confession in *Royal Priest*, 5 (Feb. 1895), 4.

66. Phil Allen in *Theocrat*, 3 (Mar. 1903). In November 1911, R. A. Thompson, a Free Methodist preacher in Texas, reported that Phil Allen was at that

time selling newspapers on the corner of 9th and Olive in St. Louis. See *Free Methodist Advocate* (Campbell, Tx.), 1 (Nov. 1, 1911), 1.

67. In 1897, Parham had categorized "Anti-Ordinance" as an evidence of "fanaticism." He said its adherents had given themselves to "a delusion": "Some deny the divinity of Jesus, refuse and ridicule the ordinances, claim to experience the baptism of a death, a third experience, which to my mind gives them the privilege to do as they please and blame the Lord. They nearly always ruin the true ones whom they deceive, they are given over to believe a delusion, following as many spirits as there are members." See C. F. Parham, "Fanaticism," *Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness*, ns 16 (Jan. 14. 1897). 8.

68. *Apostolic Faith* (Baxter Springs, Ks.), (June 1914),3. For Haughawout's assessment of a camp meeting at Baxter Springs, Kansas, starting July 25, 1913, and of Parham himself see Sarah E. Parham. *The Life of Charles F Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement*, 245246.

69. Recollection of Brewer's daughter, Jessie, in the draft of an undated letter to her brother, Basil sometime after their father's death, in the Brewer Papers, Joint Collection: University of Missouri Western Historical Manuscript Collection, Columbia, and State Historical Society of Missouri Manuscripts.

70. See obituary in *Pasadena Star-News*, Feb. 22, 1940, p. 11; and biography by Given A. Brewer in Theodore H. Wolff. *The Tin Box*, p. 1A-1F.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM AND THE EARLY NAZARENES: THE SOURCES THAT SHAPED A PLURALISTIC BAPTISMAL TRADITION

by

Stan Ingersol

"Unity in essentials; liberty in nonessentials." Around the principle embedded in an old aphorism, the founders of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene merged three separate denominations into one. These churches had originated in different sections of the nation: The Association of Pentecostal Churches of America in the Eastern United States, the Holiness Church of Christ in the South and Southwest, and the Church of the Nazarene on the Pacific coast. In spite of their diverse and independent points of origin, much already united the three groups prior to their merger. Each held to the Wesleyan way of salvation and Christian life as modified by the American holiness movement. Each embraced pietism as its dominant spiritual mede, each also accepting the modifications made to the pietist tradition by American revivalism. All three churches ordained women, had female pastors, and did so on a commonly held theological basis. Likewise, each was a *believers' church*, exhibiting the traits of a distinctive style of churchmanship whose classical characteristics are enumerated by Donald F. Durnbaugh in *The Believers' Church: The History and Character of Radical Protestantism* (1968). Durnbaugh argues that the believers' church is a voluntary fellowship based on the idea of separation from the world and the gathering together of converted believers, rejecting any notion of the visible church as a mixed assembly. The believers' church emphasizes the necessity of all members to be active in Christian work; it practices church discipline; its members care for the poor and especially for Christian sisters and brothers in need; it follows a simple pattern of worship; and its common life is centered on "the Word, prayer, and love."¹ With varying degrees of emphasis, the uniting groups of 1907-1908 reflected the characteristics of the believers' church tradition, and each did so with specific reference over-and-against Episcopal Methodism, then the largest Protestant church in the land and fast developing into the quintessential American denomination.

Differences between and within the regional denominations remained, and these were reconciled by the principle of "liberty in nonessentials." The 1898 *Manual* of Phineas Bresee's Church of the Nazarene in the West makes clear that "essentials" were beliefs necessary to salvation.² Particular eschatologies and baptismal views were nonessentials and required liberty of conscience. Were these doctrines then deemed unimportant? Hardly so. If educator A. M. Hills held staunchly to postmillennialism, Southern churchman J. B. Chapman and others were pre-millennialists with equal conviction. Did general superintendents Bresee and H. F. Reynolds affirm the importance of infant baptism? Rescue worker J. T. Upchurch disdained that doctrine and practice.³ In the newly organized Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, liberty of conscience was required precisely because particular baptismal and eschatological views were affirmed strongly so strongly, in fact, that it was pointless for those of one school of thought on these issues to seek prevalence in church councils over those who held contrary views. Pluralism was not indifference to these doctrines but the very opposite, though rooted in the belief that the focus of Pentecostal Nazarene unity should lie elsewhere on the Wesleyan way of salvation in particular.

Two questions bear examination within this context: what were the actual baptismal traditions of the uniting churches, and what did the very fact of pluralism in baptismal theology bring to the Pentecostal Nazarene synthesis?

I. BAPTISMAL THEOLOGY IN THE HOLINESS CHURCH OF CHRIST

The Holiness Church of Christ was the Southern root of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, and the largest of the three uniting denominations. Itself the product of merger, the Holiness Church of Christ had two parent bodies, and in each a different baptismal tradition emerged. One baptismal tradition was broad and inclusive, while the other was focused and exclusive. These two views were reconciled in 1904 at Rising Star, Texas, when the two Southern churches united, committing themselves in the process to the principle of pluralism of baptismal expression, but with insistence on the absolute necessity of Christian baptism for church members.

The restrictive doctrine of baptism was that held by the New Testament Church of Christ, a restorationist body originating in western Tennessee. The New Testament Church of Christ was a form of Free Methodism indigenized and fitted to the Southern context. Robert Lee Harris, its founder, encountered Free Methodism in Texas in the early 1880's, was sanctified under its auspices, entered the Holiness Movement through its doors, joined its clergy; and was ordained deacon and elder by B. T. Roberts, its founding general superintendent. Harris was a valued evangelist in the Texas Conference of the Free Methodist Church, but his enthusiasm for independent foreign missions put him at odds with denominational programs. He withdrew in 1889, uniting with a Southern Methodist congregation in Memphis. Harris continued his evangelistic career, using a local preacher's license as the new basis of his ministerial authority. He was involved in "the evangelist controversy" in Southern Methodism, and was again drawn into conflict with denominational authority. Another source also fueled Harris' tension with Southern Methodism: as he itinerated, he propagated Free Methodism's distinctive spirituality which was united to restrictive personal ethics and, in many instances, liberal social doctrines. Harris searched for an answer to his

ecclesiastical dilemma throughout his five years in the Southern Methodist Church. Besides scripture, it is unknown what specific theological texts he searched, although he lived in an area conducive to restorationist views. Memphis was the home of Baptist controversialist James Graves and a center for the dissemination of Landmark Baptist doctrines. The people of western Tennessee were also conversant with the restorationist views of the Christian Church, known popularly as Campbellites. But Harris' new movement differed from these by uniting to its restorationist base the spiritual and moral vision of Free Methodism.⁴

Baptismal theology became an important element in the new holiness sect that sprang from Harris' ministry. The New Testament Church of Christ took shape during May and June of 1894 as Harris preached a series of sermons in Milan, Tennessee on "the church question," or the relationship of Wesleyan-holiness people to the "popular churches." According to the unpublished diary of Donie Mitchum, Harris "unmasked sin in and out of the churches and showed all sects and denominations to be unscriptural." Afterwards, he preached a series on "justification, sanctification, second coming of Christ, and how our souls were fed. After [that,] he preached a sermon on pouring as the scriptural mode of Baptism." This last sermon provoked a challenge from a local Campbellite. Harris then set aside services to debate baptismal theology with his challenger, gaining from this debate a new and significant convert: Robert Balie Mitchum, a Baptist deacon.⁵ One month later, on July 5, 1894, the New Testament Church of Christ was "set in order," a phrase meaning that the church of which Christ alone is founder already existed among the Christian people and was being recognized and ordered along scriptural lines. In a service held four days later, Harris summarized the government and doctrines of the New Testament church, called for new members to step forward, and rebaptized those whose previous baptism was by immersion. The identities of two of these are known. One was Donie Mitchum, a lifelong Methodist who taught the young girls Sunday School class at the Methodist Church. Her Baptist husband, Balie Mitchum, was another.⁶ The new church's doctrines were reported by a Memphis newspaper, and Harris' view of baptism was stated succinctly: "The baptism of the holy ghost was administered by pouring, and therefore as water baptism is a likeness of the baptism of the holy ghost, it also must be administered by pouring."⁷

The earliest available exposition of this baptismal theology was published in the 1900 *Guidebook* of the Texas Council of the New Testament Church of Christ. Article 10, on baptism, is identical to the wording that appeared in the Memphis newspaper, and therefore bears the direct stamp of Robert Lee Harris. The article is followed by a series of scripture texts, each dealing primarily with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:15-48; Acts 10:44-48; Acts 11:15-46; and Joel 2:28).⁸ More than three pages of discussion followed. This is significant, for baptism was the only doctrinal point given exposition in the entire manual! The case for pouring as the scriptural mode was stated in three points: (1) "The baptism of the Holy Spirit was promised to believers throughout this dispensation." (2) Spirit baptism is real baptism, while water baptism "is called baptism" because its design is to be "the likeness, or picture, of *real* baptism." Harris argued: "Wine was called the blood of Christ when drank to represent it, yet it was not the blood in reality, but

it wore the name of the thing it [depicted]... so it is with water baptism. If it is not... [done in a mode that depicts] the real baptism, it is no more baptism than wine, when drunk (sic) without reference to the blood of Christ, is blood." (3) Real baptism consists of the Spirit, the baptismal event, and the mode of outpouring. In water baptism, water symbolizes the Spirit, and the mirror image of Spirit baptism is by pouring. Article 11 defined who could baptize, vesting that authority in a duly recognized minister, but adding that "under circumstances of necessity a simple disciple may administer baptism."⁹ There was no printed baptismal ritual, nor any indication of whether infants could be baptized.

Robert Lee Harris died five months after the New Testament Church of Christ was formed. That fact altered completely the trajectory of the movement. Harris had created a church in which ecclesiology and soteriology were both determinative doctrines in a theological system, but in the hands of his successors the gravity of theological weight shifted, increasingly subordinating ecclesiological values to soteriological ones. A clear theological transformation took place within the sect over the course of the next decade.¹⁰

As the New Testament Church of Christ expanded, its baptismal doctrine inhibited its growth within a Southern religious culture steeped in immersionist thinking. This was recognized early and led to a reconsideration of the church's baptismal doctrines when the first connectional council met in 1899. The discussion was quite heated. Harris' widow, Mary Lee Harris (soon to become Mary Lee Cagle), insisted that her late husband's founding principles should be maintained without amendment. Others strongly disagreed. Donie Mitchum wrote in her private journal that Mary Harris "would not yield an inch but rather manifested (apparently) an ugly spirit. All other talks were made in the spirit of Christ. My sympathy goes out for her as she has much to overcome on the line of having her way about things." After debating the issue three separate times, the council reaffirmed pouring as the scriptural view but recognized that

there are saved people in [God's] church who give evidence of the same by their godly walk and conversation who have been immersed, and we recognize them as God's children and we as a part of His household cannot afford to turn away those He accepts...as we are congregational in government it is left with each local congregation to say whether or not they accept or reject members who believe in and practice immersion and have not been baptized by pouring.¹¹

On this basis, the sect's churches in Tennessee and Arkansas continued to baptize by pouring but opened the way for individuals previously baptized by other modes to join those New Testament churches that might elect to receive them without rebaptism.

This adjustment applied only to the Eastern Council of the New Testament Church of Christ. Before this time, Mary Lee Cagle had organized congregations in Texas, and in 1902 she formed these into a separate Texas Council. There, baptism by pouring remained a condition of membership, though in 1903 it became a contested issue. In that year, the Texas Council debated a motion that read: "Resolved, that we do not make the mode of water baptism a test of church membership." This resolution was defeated,

but the issue was reopened the following day when the council learned that some congregations had accepted, without rebaptism, members previously baptized by other modes. The council president ruled that such persons were not members, and this ruling stood. Rev. J. W. Manney, who had led attempts to change the rule, then reported "that he had set in order a congregation at Chilton, Texas, composed of 30 members, all of whom agreed to submit to the ruling of the Council on the baptism question."¹² Thus, the Eastern and Texas Councils of the New Testament Church of Christ remained agreed on pouring as the scriptural mode of baptism, but differed on whether rebaptism was required to receive into membership those already baptized by other modes.

During this period, the New Testament Church of Christ moved toward merger with the Independent Holiness Church led by Charles B. Jernigan and James B. Chapman. Jernigan, a consummate organizer, believed in casting wide nets. In 1901, he helped organize both the Holiness Association of Texas, an interdenominational body, and the Independent Holiness Church, a sectarian one. In justifying the rise of the Independent Holiness Church, Jernigan stated repeatedly that its people sought "a place where the sacraments could be administered." In his view, the scattered holiness bands in East Texas needed to be organized into churches because in the bands "there was no baptism, no sacraments for her people, and they were called comeouters by the church people." The Independent Holiness Church recognized all modes of baptism as valid and scriptural, though Chapman, at least, preferred immersion. According to critic B. F. Neely, they also accepted unbaptized Christians into membership.¹³

In the late summer of 1904, Jernigan sought the merger of three Southern churches: the Independent Holiness Church, the New Testament Church of Christ, and the Holiness Baptist Churches of Arkansas organized and led by W. J. Walthall of Texarkana. In sharp contrast to the New Testament Church of Christ, the Holiness Baptists were strict immersionists. Some version of Jernigan's position was obviously the only valid basis for a merger of the three bodies. At their annual council in late September, the Holiness Baptists expressed very strong interest in consolidating with other holiness churches, but only if immersion were the *exclusive* mode of baptism practiced.¹⁴ The other two denominations went forward without the Holiness Baptists, calling for a delegated meeting in November at Rising Star, Texas. There, Mary Lee Cagle and her associate, B. F. Neely, defended pouring as the scriptural mode, but agreed ultimately to a compromise in which both groups made concessions. The two churches agreed that in the new Holiness Church of Christ, baptism would be required for church membership, but mode would be left to the individual conscience. Jernigan's published account of this council declared baptism a "nonessential." What did he mean, exactly? In context, it meant that different modes of baptism could be accommodated in the search for unity in holiness, though baptism itself was a requirement, in their view, for identification with the visible church. This point was strengthened in the *Manual* of 1906, when a sentence was added following that on freedom of mode. The new line declared: "This article can in no wise be construed to mean, that one can be admitted into the congregation without water baptism."¹⁵

II. BAPTISM AND THE ASSOCIATION OF PENTECOSTAL CHURCHES OF AMERICA

Like the Holiness Church of Christ, the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America stood in the believers' church tradition. Also like its Southern sister, it was the product of a merger. No single manual bound this denomination together, for each congregation wrote its own. Like some Baptist denominations, this one was a union of congregations united by a common theology, mutual support between churches, educational and publishing interests, and a strong sense of mission to the world. Except for a lengthy statement on entire sanctification, the doctrinal standards of the denomination were brief, containing but one short reference to baptism as the "initiatory rite" of the visible church. Our method here, then, must be to analyze baptismal statements in congregational manuals.

The older branch of this body was the Central Evangelical Holiness Association, a small New England denomination formed in 1890 by ten independent congregations all less than four years old. One of these was the People's Evangelical Church of Providence, Rhode Island, formed in 1887 under the leadership of Fred Hillery. A vital church, its paper, *The Beulah Christian*, functioned after 1890 as a connectional organ for the New England churches, and after 1897 as the official organ of the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America. A congregational manual of the People's Evangelical Church, dated 1895, resonates with the key themes of the believers' church tradition. Its opening paragraph states

A church consists of a number of believers who unite themselves by a public profession of the Christian religion, and by mutual covenant, to pray together and watch over one another in love, to maintain the worship and service of God, and the ordinances and discipline of the Gospel.¹⁶

The manual contains a Confession of Faith, with three of its eleven articles concerning the church and sacraments (Articles VII, VIII, and IX). Two of these are quoted in their entirety:

ARTICLE VII

We believe that Christ has a visible church in the world, that its ordinances are Baptism and the Lord's Supper; that the Christian Sabbath and the Gospel Ministry are institutions of divine appointment, and that it is the duty of Christians to unite with this visible church and observe its sacred ordinances.

ARTICLE VIII

We believe that the outward sign in Baptism is water applied in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that the inward grace signified in this ordinance is a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness.¹⁷

A good deal is left unsaid. Were infants baptized, and was mode of baptism an issue? Was baptism a condition of church membership? Taking the last question first, Christian baptism was indeed required. Article VII stated clearly that the visible church's ordinances are two in number, and that "it is the duty of Christians to unite with this visible church and observe its

sacred ordinances." The congregational covenant gave this general principle concrete application, a line of it stating: "We do covenant to attend the worship of God and the ordinances of the gospel with this Church." Moreover, a baptismal ritual is integrated into the ritual for church membership. The place in the membership ritual where the baptismal act occurs, is in brackets, indicating the option of omission, but the option would be for new members previously baptized. Indeed, all the means of grace were valued so highly that Standing Rules 10 and 11 made their neglect, including "unnecessary absence" from communion, a ground for church discipline and dismissal. Two other items are worth noting. First, the manual required the church clerk to keep "a chronological register of all members showing name and date of those baptized." Second, the church had five committees, including a Baptism Committee. The Manual set forth its duties:

The committee shall arrange things necessary for the proper observance of this ordinance, and, if the mode of baptism selected by the candidate be immersion, furnish suitable dresses and proper conveyance to and from the water.

Clearly mode of baptism was a matter of individual conscience. Many other marks of the believers' church tradition are reflected in this manual, including a Sick and Destitute Committee composed of nine members. Its duties included visiting the sick, the infirm and the destitute; furnishing watchers for the sick; providing for the needy from the funds at their disposal; and assisting the unemployed find suitable employment.¹⁸ This and other such characteristics reinforce the idea that Christian baptism was understood as initiation into a community of devotion, service and love.

The year after the People's Evangelical Church organized, a sister congregation formed in Lynn, Massachusetts. A manual dated 1898 contains a Confession of Faith identical to that of the People's Church, including three identical articles on the church and sacraments.¹⁹ Everything else in the Lynn church's manual is different, including its church covenant and Standing Rules, though evidence of the believers' church tradition again abounds. The church Constitution established regular covenant meetings as a specific type of meeting distinct from business and prayer meetings. The significance of the covenant meeting was underscored by its relationship to the sacrament of communion: "The covenant meeting should be held the last Friday evening before the first Sunday in every month, and the Holy Communion should be celebrated on the succeeding Lord's day."²⁰ The Lynn congregation vested oversight of baptism in the Official Board of the church, assigning it the task of examining candidates and making necessary preparations for observing the rite. Nothing more of baptism appears in this manual, but the believers' church tradition is the context for the observance of both sacraments. For instance, the Lynn church's emphasis on mutual support is reflected in the fact that among its five committees were a Committee on Sick and Poor and a Committee on Hospitality.²¹

In 1897, the Central Evangelical Holiness Association, including these member churches at Providence and Lynn, united with the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America, an organization formed in 1895 under the leadership of William Howard Hoople of Brooklyn. Both merging groups were congregational in government. Each ordained ministers subject to a congrega-

tional vote and the examination and laying on of hands by a presbytery of ministers.²² Hoople's wing of the merger was vital and growing but may have lacked theological depth, since some later congregational manuals of the united body contain confessions of faith modeled after the confessions of the older New England churches. The name of the younger body was geographically inclusive and was retained as the name of the united body, which by 1907 had congregations extending from Nova Scotia to Iowa.

One finds both less and more when looking for baptismal doctrines in the manuals of the New York and Pennsylvania churches that stemmed from Hoople's wing of the denomination. Lincoln Place Pentecostal Church in Pennsylvania was organized in 1899. Its manual of 1904 has a single article (Article VIII) on the church and its sacraments, referring to the latter simply as "the initiatory and memorial rites, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper." A lengthy exposition of the article follows but deals solely with establishing a theological basis for the independence of the local church. This manual carries no rituals and its only other mention of baptism is to vest the church advisory board with the task of examining baptismal candidates.²³

By 1900, however, the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America had in print a generic manual that new congregations could adopt or modify the generic manual provides the most detailed glimpse available into baptismal practices. It includes rituals for both infant and believers' baptisms. The ritual for infants appeals to Jesus' welcoming the little children. It then sets forth specific conditions for parents or sponsors, including teaching the child to know the "nature and end of this holy sacrament." Children were to be taught to give "reverent attendance upon the means of grace," specifically public and private worship, the ministry of preaching, and study of scriptures. The ritual for believers' baptism is strikingly different. It begins with a narrative of Nicedemus' conversation with Jesus on the distinction between water and Spirit, moves to the renunciation of the devil and his works, affirms the Apostle's Creed, and ends in a vow of obedience to the commandments of God. The generic manual recognizes sprinkling, pouring, and immersion as valid modes, leaving the choice of mode to the candidate.²⁴

The Beulah Christian reports a variety of baptismal practices in use throughout the denomination. In 1893, for instance, Rev. H. N. Brown conducted a service at the church in Keene, New Hampshire in which he "baptized five children, received two adults on probation, and administered the Lord's Supper." In different vein, the church at Malden, Massachusetts conducted a baptismal service in 1895 in which three adults were immersed. One reads that "the service was impressive."²⁵

Baptismal practices within the Association of Pentecostal Churches of American can be summarized as follows. First, each congregation was at liberty to shape its own theological statement about the meaning and significance of baptism. Secondly, the denominational framework allowed the widest latitude, permitting infant as well as believers' baptism, and making choice of mode a matter of the candidate's conscience. Third, the fact of pluralism meant that church members were expected to maintain a spirit of harmony with those who thought and acted differently on the subject. Fourth, all this was within the framework of a strong believers' church tradition that stressed a local congregational covenant, church discipline, good works, and mutual support.

III. BAPTISM IN THE CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE IN THE WEST

In turning to the Church of the Nazarene in the West, the treatment is more cursory, limited to identifying salient features that invite comparison and contrast with the other groups. A key place to turn is to the 1898 *Manual* the first published by Phineas F. Bresee's organization. The contrast with the early ecclesiology of the New Testament Church of Christ could not be more dramatic. An introduction states that the founders of the Pacific movement, "believing that the Lord Jesus Christ had ordained no particular form of government for the Church," were guided by "common consent" in framing their polity, provided that nothing agreed upon was "repugnant to the Word of God."²⁶ Clearly, these people were not restorationists, and certainly not in the ecclesiological sense. Yet the basis for counting this group as a believers' church is unmistakable. The introduction states that those who formed the first congregation in Los Angeles were "called of God to this work, to come out and stand together." They were called especially to live holy lives together, to minister to the poor and neglected, and to give active Christian testimony to their faith. Firm and explicit guidelines were given for applying church discipline.²⁷

The section on baptism is specific and liberal, affirming infant and believers' baptism as proper choices, allowing any mode of baptism, and allowing rebaptism "on account of uncertainty, or lack of proper instruction, or scruples having arisen as to mode." The rituals for infant and adult baptism state that it "is an external seal of the New Covenant," while the internal seal is the baptism with the Holy Spirit. In the case of infants, the external seal of baptism replaces the external seal of circumcision in the Old Covenant. The story of Jesus and the little children in Luke 18 was called to remembrance before the charge to parents or sponsors was read. Among the charges is the obligation of parents to teach the child "the design of this sacrament," the scriptures, and other things necessary to salvation.²⁸

In the ritual for baptizing adults, more explicit connection was made between water and Spirit baptisms. The candidate was reminded that the baptism with the Holy Spirit is promised to all believers and will be fulfilled "in answer to obedient faith." Later in the ritual, the candidate was asked: "Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed, if not, do you now present yourself a living sacrifice to be cleansed from all sin?"²⁹ Thus a connection was made between water and Spirit baptism in which the former could function in some as a witness to Spirit baptism, and in others as anticipation of a future event.

The *Manual* of 1905-06, the last manual of Bresee's church prior to union with other holiness denominations, shows unmistakable development and change in baptismal thinking and ritual. In a forthcoming biography of Phineas Bresee, Professor Carl Bangs will provide a fuller account of these developments. The major points to make here are that in the later manual the connection between water baptism and the Holy Spirit is no longer obvious, and the rite is now tied concretely to the declaration of saving faith. The ritual for believers' baptism has another change, too, with the Apostles Creed now made part of the baptismal covenant.³⁰

IV. CONCLUSIONS

These summaries provide sufficient data to now draw definite conclusions. First, the cursory look at Bresee's branch, and our longer look at the Holiness Church of Christ, shows ongoing development of baptismal theology and practice within the regional groups that created the present-day Church of the Nazarene. Since the principle of development of baptismal doctrine is so well grounded in that early history, there should be little surprise that the new denomination's baptismal theology continued to develop after 1908, and continues to develop today. Secondly, variety of baptismal expression, particularly with regard to mode of believers' baptism, existed in each regional entity prior to their coming together. What is not clear is the stand of the Holiness Church of Christ on infant baptism, though both the Eastern and Western denominations permitted and practiced this. The very fact that early Nazarenes embraced pluralism in baptismal theology indicates that the focus of Nazarene unity rested on other points, namely those related to the Wesleyan way of salvation. The other side of this fact is that outside "the essentials" early Nazarenes not only tolerated but expected diversity of opinion and practice. Third, the founding churches were serious about the practice of baptism because they were serious about the church as a gathered and disciplined body of believers who testified to their faith through words and acts. Jernigan's insistence on the sacramental necessity for organizing the Independent Holiness Church was prompted by a concern to bring the signs and blessings of the visible church to the holiness bands, but it was also an implicit rebuke of the Methodist denominations, which practiced the sacraments in increasingly undisciplined churches in which many of the means of grace were being steadily abandoned by the membership. At first independently, and later as a unified body, the founding groups of the present-day Church of the Nazarene placed their baptismal theologies within the context of the believers' church tradition, with its emphasis on commitment and love.

V. APPROPRIATING THE USEABLE PAST

The Church of the Nazarene did not adopt a formal Article of Faith on "The Church" until 1989. Nevertheless, there were definite ecclesiological assumptions behind the multiple separations of local bodies from Episcopal Methodism, and the coalescing of 'these groups into regional churches, then a national one, and, with the accession of the Pentecostal Church of Scotland in 1915, into a multinational one. The believers' church tradition lies at the very heart of the Nazarene experience, and thereby gives evidence that the Church of the Nazarene originated with a unique soul, one that in its original context was both Methodistic and baptistic, yet not completely one or the other. In birth, it generated a unique soul of its own. This interpretation helps us better understand *why* that church (and some other Wesleyan-holiness churches) came into existence, even though a majority of Wesleyan holiness people remained ever-loyal to Episcopal Methodism. Moreover, it identifies a leading tension between the Methodist and believers' church poles that has shaped a leading Wesleyan-holiness denomination's subsequent development. As a believers' church in the Wesleyan tradition, early Nazarenes were not unlike American Episcopal Methodism in its first century

and British Methodism since the death of John Wesley. Like recent mainline Methodism, however, Nazarenes now risk destroying the character of their original vision, though by way of a much different trajectory. While mainline Methodism now reflects the full pluralism of American culture, the Church of the Nazarene has come to reflect much of the pluralism found within American evangelicalism, much of it based on patterns of thought antithetical to Wesleyan ideas of scripture, salvation, and the means of grace. This tendency has influenced Nazarenes to accent ever more strongly the believers' church side of their tradition in a way that does so at the expense of the Wesleyan side. For this reason, attempts to "re-Wesleyanize" the church, though they may have natural limits, are regarded by some as necessary to restore the balance of the founding vision. A key part of the Nazarene theological task today may be to rediscover what it means to be a *believers' church* in the *Wesleyan* tradition. Indeed, this *may* be a theological need of the Wesleyan-holiness denominations generally. In the Nazarene context, the point is nowhere better illustrated than in the case of current baptismal practice, where the trend increasingly is toward the exclusive practice of believers' baptism, and increasingly by immersion. This is one of the strongest evidences (but by no means the only one) that Nazarenes are developing a Baptist soul and character at the expense of their own, and losing that creative and meaningful tension that characterized early Nazarene faith and practice.

The restoration of that creative tension, if it occurs, will have to come through various means. One aspect of that process can be the joyful recovery and practice of pluralism in baptismal expression. As a matter of conscience, ministers should become able and willing to articulate the theological basis behind each baptismal expression. Likewise, it may be essential for theologians to help by restating the case for these practices, as Rob L. Staples has done in his recent *Outward Sign and Inward Grace* (1991). The historian can also play a role by calling to remembrance the people, words, and deeds that exemplify founding principles.

The historian can call to remembrance, for instance, the testimony of Mary King Snowbarger, the mother of Nazarene educators, who was baptized in Hutchinson, Kansas nearly eighty years ago. In her oral autobiography, she stated that Rev. H. M. Chambers "baptized Bertha, Esther, and myself at the same time as we knelt at the altar. He was using a pitcher and poured water on our heads. That has been a satisfactory baptism to me."³¹ Another person to recall is Phineas Bresee, who was sought out at district assemblies to baptize infants, some of whom are still active church members today.³² Nor was Bresee the only founding general superintendent called upon for this honor. Hiram F. Reynolds was likewise pressed into willing service of this kind. Consider this notation in the 1924 Journal of the Eastern Oklahoma District: "At 2 o'clock Dr. Reynolds baptized six babies, which occasion was a blessing to all. After this a great ordination service followed." Or these lines from the San Antonio District Journal of 1927: "Baptismal service followed. Dr. Reynolds called for all who wished to bring their children for baptism and seven were presented."³³ Similar statements can be found to infant baptisms conducted in district assemblies by early general superintendents Rey T. Williams, J. B. Chapman, and John W Goodwin, indicating the onetime popularity of the practice in a setting that held it, and its theological significance, up to a wide audience.³⁴

The early pluralism of baptismal practice generated a flow of questions to the editor of *Herald of Holiness*, the leading denominational paper, and this became an opportunity for instructing the church. In the 1920s, editor J. B. Chapman, an immersionist, defended infant baptism, immersion, and pluralism itself as acceptable and commendable practices of the church. Chapman also counseled ministers to baptize by modes they did not prefer rather than make people wait for a minister in wholehearted agreement with their mode of choice. One thing he did *not* defend was membership by unbaptized Christians in the Church of the Nazarene. He insisted: "It is expected that people who unite with the Church of the Nazarene shall have *some* water by *some* mode."³⁵

Another person to recall is Mary Lee Cagle, who once stood steadfast for pouring as the only scriptural mode of baptism. After 1904, she embraced thoroughly the ideal of liberty on baptismal mode and timing, becoming on this issue a model pastor who was responsive to the individual consciences among her people. In an autobiography, she recounted a community baptismal service performed by her and her husband in an unchurched town in New Mexico. There were unbaptized people present who had been converted in various revivals over the years. Her account is written in the third person but refers to her husband and herself: "It was one time they baptized every way under the sun, by every mode possible. They dipped, they plunged, they poured, they sprinkled and they baptized babies. It was a time of rejoicing; and the shouts of the redeemed echoed and re-echoed through the hills."³⁶

Notes

1. Donald F. Durnbaugh, *The Believers' Church: The History and Character of Radical Protestantism* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970), pp. 4, 3233.

2. See *Manual of the Church of the Nazarene; Promulgated by the Assembly of 1989 held in Los Angeles, Cal.* (Los Angeles: Committee of Publication [of the Church of the Nazarene], n.d.), p.10.

3. The postmillennialism of A. M. Hills is presented, among other places, in his *Fundamental Christian Theology: A Systematic Theology*, 2 vols. (Pasadena, CA: C. J. Kinne, 1931), II: 339, 351-360. Chapman's pre-millennial views are stated in the same volume, pp.339-351. The practice of infant baptism by Bresee and Reynolds is documented toward the end of this essay. J. T. Upchurch's antagonism to infant baptism is mentioned in *The Holiness Evangel* (June 1, 1907): 1.

4. Robert Lee Harris' Free Methodist background and its impact on his Southern Methodist ministry and on the creation of the New Testament Church of Christ are detailed in chapters 4 and 5 of Robert Stanley Ingersol, "Burden of Dissent: Mary Lee Cagle and the Southern Holiness Movement," Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1989.

5. The Journal of Donie Adams Mitchum, unpublished manuscript, p.17. Microfilm copy in the Donie and Robert Balie Mitchum Collection of the Nazarene Archives. Balie Mitchum became a significant lay leader in the New

Testament Church of Christ and its successor, and at the union of 1908 was president of the Holiness Church of Christ. In 1928, he was a founding member of the General Board of the Church of the Nazarene. He became a rather successful Nashville businessman.

6. Donie Mitchum's Journal, pp.1920; "The Church of Christ," *Milan (TN) Exchange* (July 7, 1894): 4; and "Organized His Church," *ibid.*, (July 14, 1894): 4. The Mitchum daughter Hazel did not require rebaptism, since she had been baptized by pouring at age six in the parlor of the Mitchums' home. That service was performed by Mrs. Mitchum's brother, T. L. Adams, a Southern Methodist minister and holiness evangelist. For that account, see Donie Mitchum's Journal, unnumbered pages inserted inside the front cover.

7. Clipping on page 23 of Donie Mitchum's Journal.

8. *Government and Doctrines of New Testament Churches* (Waco, Texas: The Evangelist Publishing Company, 1900), pp.2425.

9. *Ibid.*, pp.2529.

10. In Ingersol, "Burden of Dissent," there is discussion of the relationship between the New Testament Church of Christ and the Church of God (Holiness), another holiness-restorationist body, including ordination of elders in the New Testament Church by Church, of God ministers. There is also discussion of *why* these two groups, with similar ecclesiologies, followed different trajectories of development. See pp.165168.

11. Official Journal of the Church of Christ, unpublished ms., New Testament Church of Christ Collection, Nazarene Archives, pp. 34; Donie Mitchum's Journal, p.115.

12. See *Texas Annual Council, New Testament Church of Christ: Second Session; held at Ruby Texas, Nov. 2629, 1903* (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), not paginated. See "Second Day-Afternoon Session," Resolution No.2, and the discussion following. Also see "Third Day-Evening Session."

13. Charles B. Jernigan, *Pioneer Days of the Holiness Movement in the Southwest* (Kansas City: Pentecostal Nazarene Publishing House, 1919), pp. 109 and 123; on Chapman's preference of immersion, see *Herald of Holiness* (Jan.10, 1923): 3, and (February 7, 1923): 3. As settlers in Oklahoma Territory in early 1899, Chapman's family drew close to the Disciples of Christ Church. Later that year, Chapman writes, "one of my sisters and my mother joined the Christian Church and were baptized, putting in their membership at Soldier Creek." Chapman's account is reprinted in D. Shelby Corlett, *Spirit Filled: The Life of The Rev. James Blaine Chapman, D.D.* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, n.d.), p.25. Perhaps Chapman was influenced directly by Disciples' baptismal theology, in which "immersion" was synonymous with "baptism," and John the Baptist was referred to often as "John the Immerser."

14. Annual Convocation of Holiness Baptist Churches," *Pentecostal Herald* (Oct.26, 1904): 6, and Jernigan, *Pioneer Days*, pp.122123. Although the Holiness Baptists did not enter the merger, some ministers and lay people united individually, including Rev. Dora Rice, later a companion and mentor

to Agnes White Diffie, and Rev. F. R. Morgan, later a Nazarene district superintendent.

15. "Union of Holiness Churches," *Pentecostal Herald* (Dec. 7,1904): 4; and Jernigan, *Pioneer Days*, p.123. Also see the *Manual* of the Holiness Church of Christ, 19041905, esp. pp.1516. On Neely's role, see notes of Timothy L. Smith's conversation with him, August 10, 1955, in the Timothy L. Smith collection of The Nazarene Archives. Neely was baptized by Mary Lee Cagle in 1901, and at Rising Star took the position that he "could not and would not join a church that rejected water baptism, one of Christ's commands." Also see Smith's account in *Called Unto Holiness* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962), pp.170171, where he draws out the significance of the water baptism issue in the merger process at Rising Star. On the addition to the article on baptism, see the 1906 *Manual*, p.19.

16. *Manual of the People's Evangelical Church of Providence, R.I.* (Providence: Office of the Beulah Christian, 1895), p.3.

17. *Ibid.*, p.8.

18. See the church's Covenant, *ibid.*, pp.45; for the baptismal covenant and vows, see pp.2728; on Standing Rules related to neglect of the means of grace, see pp.1213; on the registry of baptisms, seep. 18; on the Baptism Committee and other committees, see pp.1922.

An interesting feature of the internal organization of the People's Church was the division of the entire membership into Methodist type classes that met weekly under the direction of class leaders. Among other duties, the class leaders were to "consult with the pastor for the welfare of the Church," take charge of worship in the pastor's absence, and prepare and assist in administering the Lord's Supper. See *ibid.*, pp.10, 1718.

19. *Manual of the First Pentecostal Church of Lynn, Mass.* (Providence, R.I.: Pentecostal Printing Co., 1898), pp.812.

20. *Ibid.*, p.14.

21. *Ibid.*, pp.1517.

22. The ordination practices of the Central Evangelical Holiness Association are clear from reports of ordination in the *Beulah Christian*, 18901894 *in passim*, which show that congregations selected a candidate for minister, and that a panel of ministers from sister churches examined and ordained the candidate. In the united church after 1897, explicit guidelines outline the ordination process, including the statement that ordination will be "by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." See Article VII under Summary of Doctrines in: Association of Pentecostal Churches of America, *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting* (Providence, R.I.: Pentecostal Printing Company, 1901), p.58. The ordination credential of John Norberry, in the Nazarene Archives, has the term "presbytery" in its text and bears the signatures of the ordaining ministers.

23 *Articles of Faith and Government of the Lincoln Place Pentecostal Church of Lincoln Place, Pa.* (Providence: Pentecostal Publishing Company,

1904), pp.1041, 18. This congregation's manual required a monthly communion observance, see *ibid.*, p.17.

24. The generic manual was adopted by two congregations for certain: First Pentecostal Church of Johnson, Vt. and Second Pentecostal Church of Oxford, Nova Scotia. Copies of each are in the Nazarene Archives. The Oxford congregation personalized its manual with a special cover bearing the church name. On the rituals for infants, and adults, see either manual, pp.1417; on mode of baptism, see esp. p.17. Other manuals with the identical ritual include that of the Pentecostal Mission Church, West Somerville, Mass. (1901), the First Pentecostal Church of Lowell, Mass. (1904), and the *Discipline of Ebenezer Pentecostal Church of Allentown, Penn.* (n.d.). (The latter was a congregation formed by former members of the Evangelical Association.) An expanded form of the same ritual appears in the manual of the First People's Church of Brooklyn, N.Y (1907).

25. *Beulah Christian* (Sept. 1893): 2 and (October 1895): 2.

26. *Manual of the Church of the Nazarene*, 1898, p.10.

27. Quotation from *ibid.*, p.9; also see pp.10, 1647, 2021, 24, and 2830.

28. *Ibid.*, pp.2223, 3940.

29. *Ibid.*, pp.4041.

30. *Manual of the Church of the Nazarene... 1905, with Changes Adopted at Assembly of 1906* (Los Angeles: Nazarene Publishing Company) pp 63-64.

31. Mary King Snowbarger, *Autobiography*, edited from interviews conducted by Willis Snowbarger, 1983, Transcript, Nazarene Archives, p.11.

32. One such infant was Alpin P Bowes, who became an official in the Department of Home Missions at the Nazarene Headquarters. Another is Alan Bresee Smith, a retired Presbyterian minister and teacher, now of Osawatomie, Kansas. See: Alpin P Bowes, memo to Stan Ingersol, March 20, 1990, which quotes an extract from the unpublished diary of his father, Alpin G. Bowes; and Alan B. Smith, letter to Stan Ingersol, August 31, 1989.

33. On H. F. Reynolds, see the *Journal* of the Eastern Oklahoma District, 1924: 1617, and the San Antonio District *Journal*, 1927: 36. Also see the Eastern Oklahoma District *Journal*, 1928:22.

34. For references to infant baptisms conducted by general superintendent Rev T Williams, see the *Journal* of the San Antonio District, 1921:30, and *ibid*, 1926: 26; also the *Journal* of the Western Oklahoma District, 1931: 31, and *ibid.*, 1934: 37. On an infant baptism conducted by J. B. Chapman, see the Western Oklahoma District *Journal*, 1929: 28. On John W Goodwin, see *ibid*, 1932: 36; *ibid*, 1935: 45; and the San Antonio District *Journal*, 1936: 31.

35. *Herald of Holiness* (Dec. 13,1922): 2; (August 2, 1922): 2; (Jan.10, 1923): 3; (Feb. 7,1923): 3; (Nov. 5, 1945): 8.

36. Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work of Mary Lee Cagle* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1928), p.119.

AMERICAN HOLINESS HYMNODY SOME QUESTIONS: A METHODOLOGY

by

Mel R. Wilhoit

"How I long for the good old Methodist thunder. One good burst of old-fashioned music would have blown this modern singing out the window like wadding from a gun."¹ That such a request could have been made by Congregationalist minister Henry Ward Beecher in 1857 reveals the degree to which Methodists were known as a singing people. Yet there were many within Methodism who felt that their song was growing weaker. Thus there arose a body of men and women, committed unto "Holiness to the Lord," who added new stanzas and new voices to the old song, swelling the chorus in a mighty crescendo whose echo can still be heard today.

Holiness hymnody, as part of the larger Holiness movement, has played a significant role in the life of American evangelicalism. Yet its role in that drama has generally gone unrecognized. As a framework for beginning to discover and properly evaluate its contributions, this study seeks to raise certain fundamental questions which it is hoped will give direction to future studies. It also seeks to suggest possible avenues of investigation pursuant to the questions raised.

Hymnody has often been called "grassroots theology" for its ability to express the deepest religious beliefs and feelings of a people. The language of such belief is usually stated in popular poetic expressions rather than precise theological terminology, and the music which accompanies such expressions in that which has immediate potential to convey significant meaning to its hearers within their cultural context. When any hymn is widely sung, it should be viewed as an important window into the belief system of those singing it. And precisely because it is a popular, corporate, and usually unconscious statement of belief or practice, it provides a unique opportunity for the understanding of a large cross-section of "ordinary believers," which differs immeasurably from the carefully crafted and highly conscious individual statements of church leaders and theologians.

These observations hold no less true for those who would study the Holiness movement. It should come as no surprise to the student of sanctifica-

tion that, for a people who sought to be characterized by a holiness in thought, word, and deed as directed by the indwelling Holy Spirit, Paul's exhortation to the Ephesians could only be fulfilled by an outburst of song:

And be not drunk with wine wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord. ... (5:18, 19)

The result of both this Scriptural exhortation to reflect a Spirit-filled holy life and the natural inclination of Christians to sing their beliefs produced a rich hymnody which not only expresses but also helps to define the Holiness movement.

But where to begin? If the study of the Holiness movement in general is fraught with certain perils, the study of Holiness hymnody, by extension, experiences a compounding of such problems. Most significant perhaps is the amorphous nature of the Holiness movement and the ensuing lack of clearly defined parameters for studying it.² Although American Holiness hymnody is rooted in the lush garden of Wesleyan hymnody, which has been studied in both depth and breadth, certain offshoots from the garden seem to have grown wild and unattended. As one begins to investigate the subject with any degree of seriousness, one is struck by the fact that there is little or no writing about Holiness hymnody *per se*. As a field of study, it can hardly be said to exist in anything but a nascent state.³

Thus, far from beginning to answer the significant questions relevant to the field, one is confronted with asking the right questions in an initial attempt to define the discipline. For without such critical and defining questions, the field has little point of entrance, shape, or direction. Therefore, the purposes of this study which are relevant to the Holiness movement in general and Holiness hymnody in particular are (1) the raising of key questions which give definition to the field of study, and (2) the positing of various avenues of investigation which, at present, seem to hold great potential.

The primary and fundamental question is undoubtedly, "What constitutes a Holiness hymn?" Although this may initially appear to be an unnecessary query, any attempt to investigate the genre will be confronted with this most fundamental of concerns. While it is true that the term hymn is technically limited to textual considerations, those who regularly sing hymns are clearly not possessed of such definitional limitations; their expressions of faith are as much musical as textual. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the investigator of this "grassroots theology" to consider both the textual and musical implications of hymnody in its broadest context.

Perhaps the most obvious point of entrance into such a study is that of hymn text. As one begins to address a body of hymns that may exhibit Holiness characteristics, one is impressed by the regular appearance of certain terms or phrases which, when employed both singly and in combination, seem clearly to articulate various Holiness conceptions. Although many of the individual terms are common to eighteenth-century Wesleyan hymnody, they also find a powerful and often new voice in the American Holiness hymnody of the mid-nineteenth through the early twentieth centuries.⁴ Conspicuous verbs include "cleanse, consume, fill, perfect, restore, sanctify, wash." Adjectives and adverbs encompass "all, every, full, inbred, no more,

perfect, spotless." Nouns often focus upon "blood, fire, fountain, glory, love, peace, power, rest, sin, salvation, victory, waves." It is of critical import to understand, as Sangster has well observed, that these terms are "not merely used but pressed into emphatic place."⁵

Perhaps typical is the classic Holiness hymn "I Hear Thy Welcome Voice" by Lewis Hartsough.

I hear Thy welcome voice That calls me, Lord, to Thee
For cleansing in Thy precious blood That flowed on Calvary.

Chorus:

I am coming Lord! Coming now to Thee!
Wash me, cleanse me, in the blood That flowed on Calvary.

'Tis Jesus calls me on To perfect faith and love,
To perfect hope and peace, and trust, For earth and heaven above.

Chorus

'Tis Jesus who confirms The blessed work within,
By adding grace to welcomed grace, Where reigned the power of sin.

Chorus

And He the witness gives To loyal hearts and free,
That every promise is fulfilled, If faith but brings the plea.

Chorus

All hail, atoning blood! All hail, redeeming grace!
All hail, the Gift of Christ, our Lord, Our Strength and Righteousness!

Chorus

Even more explicit is Louise Rouse's "Glory, Glory, Jesus Saves Me."

Precious Savior, thou hast sav'd me;
Thine and only thine I am;
O, the cleansing blood has reached me,
Glory, glory to the Lamb.

Long my yearning heart was trying
To enjoy this perfect rest;
But I gave all trying over:
Simply trusting, I was blest.

Trusting, trusting ev'ry moment;
Feeling now the blood applied;
Lying at the cleansing fountain;
Dwelling in my Savior's side.

Consecrated to thy service;
I will live and die to thee:
I will witness to thy glory
Of salvation full and free.

More specifically, the function of certain poetic devices provides a rich field for investigation. In hymnody, the use of metaphor is of particular importance. One of the most popular nineteenth-century examples is the term altar. With the spread of Phoebe Palmer's "altar phraseology" into the realm of common religious jargon during the 1850's and 60's, Holiness hymnody eventually experienced a rich addition to Wesleyan hymnic terminology.⁶

The second stanza of Delia T. White's "'Tis Burning in My Soul" exclaims:

Before the cross I bow, Upon the altar lay
A willing offering now, My all from day to day.
My Savior paid the price, My name he sweetly calls;
Upon the sacrifice The fire from heaven falls.

Mary D. James' "Consecration" confesses:

My body, soul, and spirit, Jesus I give to thee,
A consecrated offering, Thine evermore to be.

Refrain:

My all is on the altar, I'm waiting for the fire.

John Sammis exhorts believers in his "Trust and Obey":

But we never can prove the delights of his love
Until all on the altar we lay;

And Elisha Hoffman, in perhaps the best known of the "altar phraseology" songs, reminds his hearers that

...you cannot have rest or be perfectly blest
Until all on the altar is laid.

Refrain:

Is your all on the altar of sacrifice laid?
Your heart, does the Spirit control?
You can only be blest and have peace and sweet rest,
As you yield him your body and soul.

Another popular metaphor during the period was that of Beulah Land. Although the term's origin comes from Isaiah 62:4 as a figurative expression of restored Palestine during the millennial kingdom, its currency in Holiness circles was more directly related to its inclusion in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* as the symbol of a land of promised rest and blessing. The best known of the resulting "Beulah" songs was Edgar Page Stites' "Beulah Land."

O Beulah land, sweet Beulah land,
As on thy highest mount I stand,
I look away across the sea,
Where mansions are prepared for me,
And view the shining glory shore,
My heav'n, my home, for evermore.

Other less familiar candidates include "Is Not This the Land of Beulah?" (Harriet Requa), "The Land of Beulah" (Rev. J. Haskel), and "The Sweet Beulah Land" (Henry J. Zelle). C. Austin Miles' early twentieth-century contribution "Dwelling in Beulah Land" undoubtedly reflects the pinnacle of this metaphor's concept of victorious Christian living (or spiritual smugness and Pollyannaish isolationism, depending on one's viewpoint).⁷ As widely sung, it boasted:

Far away the noise of strife upon my ear is falling,
Then I know the sins of earth beset on ev'ry hand:
Doubt and fear and things of earth in vain to me are calling,
None of these shall move me from Beulah Land.

Refrain:

I'm living on the mountain, underneath a cloudless sky,
I'm drinking at the fountain that never shall run dry;
O yes! I'm feasting on the manna from a bountiful supply,
For I am dwelling in Beulah Land.

In addition to investigation of various poetic devices which reflect the development of Holiness hymnody, a seminal change in the American Holiness movement can be perceived in the use of verb tense. A survey of Charles Wesley's eighteenth-century hymns on holiness clearly reveals the vast majority to be in the future tense. The following are representative:

Behold the servant of the Lord!
I wait thy guiding hand to feel;

or

Come, Holy Ghost, all-quickenning fire...
Thy mighty working may I feel,

or, from "The thing my God doth hate":

My soul shall then, like thine,
Abhor the thing unclean,

or, from all those exclamatory hymns that begin:

O that my load of sin were gone!

O come and dwell in me,

O Jesus, at thy feet we wait

O for a heart to praise my God,

O joyful sound of gospel grace!
Christ shall in me appear;

O Jesus, full of truth and grace .
I wait to see thy glorious face,

or, in those very personal prayers:

I want a principle within,

I want a heart to pray,

I ask the gift of righteousness,

as well as Wesley's most enduring Holiness hymn, "Love Divine," which pleads:

Let us all in Thee inherit,
Let us find the second rest;

Although these are a sampling of Charles' (and by virtue of his editing, also John's) hymns, they provide a valid insight into the mind of eighteenth-century followers after holiness. And that state of mind was a future-looking expectation and hope of the Spirit's promised work. By contrast, nineteenth-century believers held a differing view concerning the "when" of sanctification.⁸

Edgar P. Stites rejoiced "I've reached the land of corn and wine"; Mrs. C. H. Morris claimed "I still have the blessing," while Delia White glowed, "'Tis burning in my soul... The fire of heav'nly love is burning in my soul." Or this itemization from "The Sacred Fire":

stanza 1: Now I feel the sacred fire,

stanza 2: Now I am. .

stanza 3:... now I know....

chorus: I was dead but now I live.

It would of course be a gross exaggeration to suggest that all nineteenth-century Holiness hymns reflected a present-tense experience; for many, if not the majority of the hymns, still employed a future-tense terminology Witness, for example, Mary James' "Consecration," written at the National Camp Meeting at Round Lake on July 10, 1869. The chorus proclaims:

My all is on the Altar,
I'm waiting for the fire.
Waiting, waiting, waiting,
I'm waiting for the fire.

Although this terminology is still in the future tense, it and many others like it clearly conceive of the longed-for blessing in terms of immediate possibility of fulfillment. This is even evident in James' hymn just cited as the second stanza confidently proclaims, "...I look for Thy salvation, Thy promise now I claim." Abbie Mills' present insistence is no less direct:

I am coming, Jesus coming,
At thy feet I humbly bow:
I have tasted thy salvation
But I want the fullness now.

One can find no clearer proof of this shift in mood towards present tense fulfillment than in the hymn "There is a fountain." For where the second stanza reads "And there may I 'though vile as he...," the sanctified at National Camp Meetings were wont to sing "And there do I 'though vile as he..." Obviously sanctification was no distant hope for those nineteenth-century "cando" sons of "manifest destiny," but rather a *fait accompli*. And it showed in the very verb tense of their hymns.⁹

Much, if not most, of the impact on the altered nineteenth-century view towards sanctification and holiness can be laid squarely at the feet of Phoebe Palmer whose hymn, "The Cleansing Wave," exemplifies her "shorter way" of accomplishing Wesley's longed-for second blessing.¹⁰

O now I see the crimson wave,
The fountain deep and wide ...

Chorus:
The cleansing stream, I see. I see!
I plunge and Oh, it cleanseth me!
It cleanseth me, it cleanseth me!
O praise the Lord! it cleanseth me!

Although a study of Holiness terminology may prove of primary importance in helping to answer, "What is a Holiness hymn?" an investigation into a hymn's usage or context is also critical here. For it quickly becomes evident that not all hymns employed by or closely associated with the Holiness movement contain explicitly Holiness terminology or teaching. Many hymns seem to be candidates for Holiness hymnody, not because of their content, but because of their context. In fact, there seem to be at least three categories of usage related to Holiness hymn texts. These might be called adoptive, generic, and didactic.

Undoubtedly the quintessential example of hymnic adoption is William Cowper's widely sung eighteenth-century contribution to evangelical Anglican life, "There is a fountain filled with blood." The best account of its adoption is contained in George Hughes' *Days of Power in the Forest Temple*. In referring to what became the "Battle-Hymn" for many of a Holiness persuasion, Hughes recounts:

Cowper did not dream of what he was doing for posterity when he wrote that hymn... nor did Rev. Hiram Mattison when he published the tune which has been brought into such extensive use. Both have now been appropriated by the National Association [for the Promotion of Holiness, and are interwoven with the very life of this modern movement.

None, except those who have stood on a National Campground, can have any conception of the effect produced at each opening service, when the president ascends the stand and commences to sing, "There is a fountain filled with blood," and it is rolled through the forest like a battle-hymn indeed. No tuning fork or organ is necessary to help the musical flow. The people strike the right key at once, keep excellent time, and onward it moves with wondrous life and energy.

Hughes continues in almost rapturous language to describe the significance and effect of each separate stanza and then concludes, "Glorious battle-hymn, sung at Vineland and Mannheim, and on other memorable grounds, and to be sung on many more, we doubt not, marshalling the elect of God for bolder exploits!"¹¹

Hughes' fascinating account is obviously more than simply a historical document recording the singing of a particular hymn, for it clearly reveals the process whereby a hymn not intended for holiness purposes could be so thoroughly adopted by the movement. The key to understanding at least part of this process of adoption lies in the essence of the terminology involved. In the main, the Holiness movement tended to imbue numerous terms such as cross, blood, and purity, terms which were common to both Biblical language and nineteenth-century evangelical religious life, with special meanings reflecting the teachings of sanctification. Because so many hymns employed this standard religious vocabulary which could be freely borrowed

by followers after holiness, a large body of hymnody was thus available for appropriation under the right conditions. On this basis, many non-holiness hymns came to inhabit Holiness hymnody.

Additional examples of this process include Isaac Watts' "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross" often with the addition of a loosely related chorus such as, "Then I'm clinging, clinging, clinging, Oh! I'm clinging to the cross. . . ." Undoubtedly the connection was the hymn's emphasis on the blood, a proverbial subject in Holiness hymnody, and the call for a complete surrender: "demands my life, my soul, my all."

Edward Perronet's popular "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name" was also found to be most expressive of Holiness sentiment. Hughes reported that a group from the camp meeting at Oakington [near Baltimore, 1870] visited the Capitol building in Washington and sang the mighty hymn under its vaulted dome.

The Coronation stanzas, inviting all nations to bow at his feet, and place their many crowns upon his adorable head, were sung lustily. The hearts of the company were all "afame with the love of Jesus' name." The fellowship of kindred minds was sweet. The living power was present.¹²

Here the emphasis upon the person and work of Christ seemed to make this hymn particularly desirable as a candidate for adoption.

Augustus Toplady's hymn "Rock of Ages" is perhaps the most unusual adoptee.

In the March, 1776, issue [*The Gospel Magazine*], this hymn appeared in... an article by Toplady dealing with the absolute impossibility of one's paying his indebtedness to God. He discussed the number of sins possible for a man to commit by the day, the hour, the minute, and the second, and calculated that in eighty years a man would commit 2,522,880,000 sins. The hymn was entitled "A living and dying prayer for the holiest believer in the world." The allusion to the "holiest believer" is thought by George John Stevenson to refer to John Wesley and "can only be designed by Mr. Toplady as a sneer at the doctrine of entire holiness, which both the Wesleys so strongly enforced in their preaching and hymns."¹³

The focus of Toplady's rebuttal to Wesley's emphasis on the need for a second work of grace is found in the hymn's lines "Be of sin the double cure; save from wrath [meaning salvation] and make me pure" [from sin's daily power and presence in the life]. Ironically, instead of reading (or singing) this as a statement of the efficacy of a single, Initial salvation experience, the song is sung in Holiness circles as implying a second work in the words "double cure" and the hymn's apparent emphasis upon the two categories or experiences of salvation ("save from wrath") and sanctification ("and make me pure"). Indeed, no less an exponent of Holiness teaching than H. C. Morrison could quote this adopted hymn in the funeral epitaph he penned for himself in 1942.¹⁴

A second and much larger category of hymnic usage might be termed generic terminology and is an outgrowth of the adoptive category. Here one

finds a more obvious, but not necessarily conscious, use of those key or qualifying terms meaningful to believers in sanctification.

Undoubtedly the majority of hymns one might include here were not written from a Holiness perspective but employ that general or generic Biblical and religious language which allowed Holiness believers to *eisegete* (read in) their unique convictions, while non-holiness singers simply perceived meaning in the broader language in which it was penned.

Many of Fanny Crosby's hymns contain terms easily pressed into the service of Holiness hymnody: "Jesus Keep Me Near the Cross" with its healing stream and precious fountain; "Blessed Assurance" containing two "perfect submissions" and one "perfect rest" (sung to a tune composed by Phoebe Palmer's daughter); "To God be the Glory" with "perfect redemption" and "purchase of blood"; "Take the World but Give Me Jesus" exclaiming "O the fullness of redemption"; "Perfect Peace" quotes Isaiah 26:3 and begins each stanza with the popular adjective "precious" in addition to an emphasis on "perfect peace"; and "Redeemed, how I love to proclaim it" with its usually omitted fifth stanza which contains "and soon with the spirits made perfect."

Gospel songwriter Philip P. Bliss penned "More Holiness Give Me," "Wonderful Words of Life" with its "sanctify forever," and "Hallelujah! 'Tis Done" with its "perfect salvation."¹⁵ His co-laborer in revivalism was evangelist and hymn-writer Daniel W. Whittle who produced numerous hymns containing appropriate language: "Believe and Keep On Believing," "Christ is My Redeemer," "Christ Liveth in Me," and "Pardon, Peace, and Power."

E. H. Bickersteth's "Peace! Perfect Peace" has been included in numerous Holiness collections, while Robert Lowry's "Nothing but the Blood of Jesus" is also popular. Other examples include Elizabeth Codner's "Lord, I hear showers of blessing" ("Even Me"); Elvina Hall's "I hear the Savior say" ("Jesus Paid It All"); James Nicholson's "Lord Jesus, I long to be perfectly whole" ("Whiter than Snow"); and Johnson Oatman, Jr.'s "Higher Ground."¹⁶

Of course the presence of generic terminology in the language could cut both ways. Thus, Christians with no knowledge of or sympathy with Holiness beliefs have long sung hymns written from that perspective but in a language so general as to be unnoticed by the uninitiated. Elisha Hoffman has been one of the most successful here with "Abundantly Able to Save," "Are You Washed in the Blood of the Lamb?" "Glory to His Name," "Is Your All on the Altar?" and "What a Wonderful Savior." "Standing on the Promises" by R. Kelso Carter has long been a favorite but is usually published in a form without the stanza which contains "perfect, present cleansing in the blood for me." Edgar P. Stites' "Beulah Land" has lost much of its popularity, but Louise Stead's "Tis So Sweet (to trust in Jesus)" remains popular. Perhaps the most famous hymn with conscious Holiness sentiments (usually not sung as such) is "The Old Rugged Cross" by George Bennard.

The final category of hymn texts related to usage or context might be called didactic. In such hymns there is clear instruction relating to sanctification. Obviously, such hymns are the products of individuals who were strong promoters of Holiness tenants.

Rather surprisingly, Phoebe Palmer seems to have contributed only one significant hymn, the classic "The Cleansing Wave":

O, now I see the crimson wave, The fountain deep and wide,
Jesus, my Lord, mighty to save, Points to His wounded side.

Chorus:

The cleansing stream, I see, I see! I plunge, and Oh, it cleanseth me!
Oh, praise the Lord, it cleanseth me! It cleanseth me, yes cleanseth me.

I see the new creation rise, I hear the speaking blood;
It speaks! polluted nature dies! Sinks 'neath the cleansing flood.

Chorus

I rise to walk in heaven's own light, Above the world and sin,
With heart made pure, and garments white, And Christ enthroned within.

Chorus

Amazing grace! 'tis heaven below, To feel the blood applied;
And Jesus, only Jesus know, My Jesus crucified.

Chorus

William McDonald, Methodist Episcopal minister and editor of the religious magazine
Advocate of Christian Holiness penned:

I am coming to the cross; I'm poor and weak and blind;
I'm coming all but dross; I shall full salvation find.

Chorus:

I am trusting Lord in Thee, Dear Lamb of Calvary;
Humbly at Thy cross I bow; Save me, Jesus, save me now.

Long my heart has sigh'd for thee; Long has devil dwelt within;
Jesus sweetly speaks to me, I will cleanse you from all sin.

Chorus

Here, I give my all to thee, Friends, and time, and earthly store,
Soul and body thine to be, Wholly thine, forevermore.

Chorus

In thy promises I trust; In the cleansing blood confide;
I am prostrate in the dust; I with Christ am crucified.

Chorus

Jesus comes! he fills my soul! Perfected in love I am;
I am every whit made whole; Glory, glory, to the Lamb!

Chorus for stanza 5

Still I'm trusting, Lord, in Thee, Dear Lamb of Calvary;
Humbly at Thy cross I bow, Jesus saves me! saves me now.

In McDonald's "I'm Redeemed" the hymn-writer prays "Speak, and let my heart be
clean... Fully sav'd from inbred sin. . .," and "Let me all Thy fullness know," "Fix on me the
Spirit's seal," "All thy fullness now I claim."

Lewis Hartough, another Methodist minister active in Holiness hymnody wrote: "I Am Glad
There Is Cleansing" and "I Hear Thy Welcome Voice" in which stanzas two and three recount:

Tho' coming weak and vile, Thou dost my strength assure;
Thou dost my vileness fully cleanse, Till spotless all, and pure.

'Tis Jesus calls me on To perfect faith and love,
To perfect hope and peace and trust, For earth and heav'n above.

Mary Wingate's didactic "Consecration" is noted above. Annie Wittenmeyer abandons the lofty heights of Beulali Land to dwell in "The Valley of Blessing":

I have entered the valley of blessing so sweet,
And Jesus abides with me there;
And His spirit and blood make my cleansing complete,
And His perfect love casteth out fear.

Chorus:

Oh, come to this valley of blessing so sweet,
Where Jesus will fullness bestow
And believe, and receive, and confess Him
That all His salvation may know.

Abbie Mills' "Cleanse and Fill Me" provides a fairly complete idea of the Holiness emphasis:

I am coming, Jesus, coming, At thy feet I humbly bow;
I have tasted thy salvation, But I want the fullness now.

Chorus:

Cleanse and fill me, cleanse and fill me, Fill me with thy Spirit now;
Cleanse and fill me, blessed Jesus, Fill me with thy Spirit now.

Take away the bent to sinning, Ev'ry bitter root within;
Heal the tide at its beginning, That has caused me oft to sin.

Chorus

Search as with a lighted candle Ev'ry hidden corner, Lord;
Separate me from the evil Thro' thine ever living Word.

Chorus

Now thou art the blood applying, I am clean, I feel the flow
That alone hath power to make me Whiter than the purest snow.

Chorus

Lo! the promise of the Father Swift descends, and fills me now;
Glory, glory, hallelujah! Thou art cleansing, filling now.

Chorus

Elisha Hoffman was noted above as providing numerous hymns of a generic language enjoying widespread popularity. He also wrote hymns more specifically didactic. One such example is "Glory, Glory, I Am Saved" which builds to stanza four as it rhapsodizes:

Higher, higher, higher, higher! Jesus, Jesus, is there more?
"Yes, the living tongues of fire; Yes, the Pentecostal power.

Delia T White's " 'Tis Burling in My Soul" presents clear Holiness teaching:

God sent his mighty pow'r To this poor sinful heart,
To keep me ev'ry hour, And needful grace impart;

And since his Spirit came To take supreme control,
The love-enkindled flame Is burning in my soul.
Chorus: 'Tis burning in my soul....

Before the cross I bow, Upon the altar lay
A willing offering now, My all from day to day.
My Saviour paid the price, My name he sweetly calls;
Upon the sacrifice The fire from heaven falls.
Chorus

No good that I have done; His promise I embrace:
Accepted in the Son, He saves me by his grace;
All glory be to God! Let hallelujahs roll;
His love is shed abroad, The fire is in my soul.
Chorus

Although George Bennard's famous gospel song "The Old Rugged Cross" contains a passing reference to Holiness teaching which might be missed by the casual singer (noted above), his "Have Thy Way, Lord" is much more explicit:

Jesus, see me at thy feet, With my sacrifice complete;
I am bringing all to thee, Thine alone I'll be.
Chorus: Have thy way, Lord...

O how patient thou hast been With my pride and inbred sin!
O what mercy thou hast shown, Grace and love unknown!
Chorus

Lord, thy love has won my all, Let thy Spirit on me fall;
Burn up ev'ry trace of sin; Make me pure within.
Chorus

Praise the Lord, the work is done! Praise the Lord, the vict'ry's won!
Now the blood is cleansing me, From all sin I'm free.
Chorus

One of the most prolific as well as one of the most explicit in teaching the various specifics of Holiness beliefs was Mrs. C. H. Morris. In "I Long to Be Holy," the songwriter reveals:

I long to be holy, All spotless within,
Free from the defilement Of ev'ry known sin;
The past with its follies All under the blood,
Soul, body and spirit, All yielded to God.
Chorus: Take me and make me holy. .

I long to be holy, Carnality slain,
My heart a fit temple Where Jesus shall reign;
When pure is the fountain, The stream will be pure,
Thy blood for my cleansing, The remedy sure.
Chorus

I long to be holy, Lord, thou hast the pow'r
To sanctify wholly Thy children this hour;

Faith claims the blest promise, Thy word cannot fail,
And for us this moment The blood doth avail.
Chorus

In "Tarry Till the Power Comes Down" the chorus summarizes:

We will tarry till the pow'r comes down,
We will tarry till the pow'r comes down;
Since the Lord for us hath willed that we all be Spirit-filled,
We will tarry till the pow'r comes down.

The experience proves no fleeting one however as is evidenced in "I Still Have the Blessing":

I can ne'er forget the day, when the Lord did me baptize
With the Holy Ghost and fire;
When upon the altar lay my unworthy sacrifice,
And he sent the Holy Ghost and fire.

Chorus:
I still have the blessing. . . For the Blessor in my heart abides enkindling there the flame.

'Twas when I surrendered all, God his spirit did impart...
And that love enkindled flame still is burning in my heart...
Chorus

How the pow'r that day came down and the gift was sanctified...
And the promise of our Lord unto me was verified...
Chorus

Ev'ry longing soul today may be fully satisfied. . .
Yes, the Comforter will come in his temple to abide. . .
Chorus

Perhaps one of the most fruitful avenues of study may be that of demonstrating how didactic Holiness hymns reflect both the more subtle and sometimes almost cataclysmic shifts in doctrinal emphases within the movement. A classic example is that of the Pentecostal influence within Holiness circles. Although the Holy Spirit played an important role in the Wesley hymns,¹⁷ the person and work of Christ was definitely the focus of most nineteenth-century Holiness altar phraseology and hymnody. However, with the rise of Pentecostalism, one can clearly see the growing importance of the role of the Holy Spirit as the primary agent in both salvation and sanctification as well as the exercise of spiritual gifts. Many hymns reflect this shift in emphasis or theology wherein the "second blessing" becomes synonymous with the baptism of the Holy Ghost.¹⁸ Without doubt the category of didactic Holiness hymns should be viewed as a significant barometer of theological change within the movement.

In addition to the textual characteristics of Holiness hymnody, one might well consider the musical aspects of the genre in an investigation of the question "What constitutes a Holiness hymn?" Here there seems to be much less diversity than was found in textual considerations. For, almost without exception, Holiness hymnody seems to have adapted the style of popular

nineteenth century religious music which was first known as the Sunday School song and by 1875 became known as the gospel song. As the product of urban nineteenth-century revivalism, the popularity of the musical genre of gospel hymnody coincided with the age of Holiness popularity and influence. And because both revivalism and Holiness concerns were closely intertwined, with many Holiness leaders often being leading revivalists in Methodism, it is not unusual to find the style of gospel hymnody, which became the musical language of the revivalism, almost universally employed for Holiness purposes.

Many of the leading gospel songwriters during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were also proponents of Holiness thought. These included William G. Fischer, Charles Gabriel, Elisha A. Hoffman, William J. Kirkpatrick, John Sweney and others. In addition, there were no few exponents of sanctification who saw the established churches, particularly Methodism, as being more interested in temporal religious concerns such as buildings, liturgies, and paid quartet choirs than in eternal spiritual concerns such as individual salvation and a holy life. In some minds, the traditional church hymn style undoubtedly suffered a certain amount of guilt by association, while the popular gospel song style seemed to be clearly associated, at least in Holiness thought, with those who sought to win the world to Christ and promote a separated and holy life among believers. Thus, the gospel song style became a natural vehicle for Holiness sentiments.¹⁹

It is obviously difficult if not impossible to discuss Holiness hymn texts or music without reference to the individuals who brought them about. Thus, here a second primary question in Holiness hymnody and its methodology must be addressed: "Who are the significant individuals in Holiness hymnody and what are their contributions?"

In general it might be observed that many of those who made important contributions to the movement were often known more for their efforts in endeavors other than hymnody. Others, who are recognized for their contributions to hymnody, have not been recognized for their Holiness contributions or connections. Where hymnological material is available it is often silent or, at best, incomplete in addressing Holiness hymnological questions.²⁰ As a point of entry on this level, the following individuals should be considered as worthy of investigation for the light which such research will undoubtedly shed on the larger arenas of Holiness hymnody and Holiness studies.

A first grouping might include John Inskip, William McDonald, and Lewis Hartsough. All three edited important collections for the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness, of which Inskip and McDonald were founders.²¹ Hartsough also provided musical editing for *The Revivalist* as well as writing numerous hymns. McDonald wrote hymns and was involved in editing seven song collections. As men whose primary activities were pastoring, evangelism, and denominational concerns, their seminal position as editors of song collections influenced what many were singing in Holiness circles. Their contributions to Holiness hymnody deserve a more careful delineation.

Two other musical editor-publishers should be noted: Henry Shepherd Date and Elisha Albright Hoffman. Both names are linked in the *Pentecostal Hymns* series which Date, an active Methodist, published as the beginnings of Hope Publishing Company.²² Hoffman was one of the musical editors and

a major contributor of texts and tunes for the series. Particularly significant for future investigation is the role these men played in popularizing a body of song which found wide acceptance both within and without Holiness circles. Further research may well demonstrate the pivotal role Elisha Hoffman played in "bridging the gap" between the two worlds of mainstream and Holiness hymnody. Although Hoffman pastored Congregational and Presbyterian churches during his career, he was closely aligned with the Evangelical Association, which was thoroughly Holiness in orientation. In the latter denomination Hoffman was actively involved in assisting or editing the church's periodicals which often included vigorous, if not rancorous, debate concerning the finer points of Holiness theology and its application.²³

William G. Fischer, William J. Kirkpatrick, and John R. Sweney were all contemporary Philadelphians whose interest in Methodism, sanctification, and gospel hymnody makes them worthy of research within a Holiness context. All three are widely known as major contributors to nineteenth-century gospel hymnody, primarily as composers and, in the case of Kirkpatrick and Sweney, editors. Yet their role within the Holiness movement has never been clearly defined.

Two additional gospel songwriters of a distinctly Holiness caste were Johnson Oatman, Jr., and John Hart Stockton. The tunes of Stockton and the texts of Oatman (although not combined with each other) have found wide acceptance both within Holiness circles and without. A third songwriter, Henry Lake Gilmour, should also be noted for his lifelong activity as song-leader and choir director at Methodist camp meetings and for his role in Holiness and gospel hymnody.

Philip Phillips, "The Singing Pilgrim," remains one of the more shadowy figures in the larger world of gospel hymnody. Of international reputation in his day as a gospel singer, he literally circled the globe performing nearly four thousand times. His song collections were not only highly successful but also exerted a powerful influence on persons such as Ira Sankey. Although his work is little known today, he played a significant role in nineteenth-century Methodist life. He edited the Methodist tune book, and his songs, collections, and ministry reflected strong Holiness sympathies.²⁴

Three female Holiness hymnists are Phoebe Palmer, her daughter Phoebe Palmer Knapp, and the Englishwoman Frances Havergal whose hymns became popular in the United States. Although Palmer contributed only one hymn, "The Cleansing Wave," her immense influence on the Holiness movement and its language of expression especially in its "altar phraseology" make her a seminal figure in Holiness hymnody. Her daughter Phoebe was a prolific composer of gospel tunes and a close friend of Fanny Crosby. The question of her influence on the thinking and hymn-writing of the century's most popular hymn-writer must not be ignored. Although Havergal's hymns have not been closely associated with Holiness teachings *per se*, this influential hymn-writer should be reconsidered in the current context. It seems difficult to imagine that such an experience as that of the hymn-writer would not be reflected in her hymns:

Yes, it was on Advent Sunday, Dec. 2, 1873, I first saw clearly the blessedness of true consecration. I saw it as a flash of electric light, and what you see you never can *unsee*. There must be full surrender before there can be full blessedness.²⁵

One of the most prolific and didactic of Holiness women hymn-writers was Lelia Naylor (Mrs. C. H.) Morris. Because of the highly specific nature of her writing, only her more generic hymns have been widely sung outside of Holiness circles. Nevertheless, her highly articulate hymns may prove an excellent indicator of changing Holiness perceptions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As an avocational hymn-writer and one primarily occupied with domestic concerns throughout her life, she provides a fascinating contrast to other women songwriters who were actively involved in ministry.²⁶

Two such women were Civilla Durfee Martin and Margaret J. Harris. Both were actively involved with their respective husbands Walter Stillman Martin and John M. Harris in evangelistic and pastoral work. Both collaborated with their husbands in writing gospel songs which found acceptance in Holiness circles. In addition to the role of women in various aspects of ministry, a study of the life and work of couples such as these may reveal much concerning "grassroots" ministries carried out on less than a national scale, yet ministries which made up the warp-and-woof of the Holiness movement.²⁷

For those interested in the significant but often undocumented role of women in ministry, a few names should be noted. All have provided at least one important contribution (usually hymn text) to Holiness hymnody: Mary D. James, Abbie Mills, Delia T. White, and Annie Wittenmeyer. Although Evangeline Booth is hardly unknown, her role in Holiness hymnody also deserves more attention.

At least three early twentieth-century songwriters of holiness bent should be noted. All were involved in pastoral or evangelistic work at some time during their careers, and all have made important contributions to Holiness hymnody. They are George Bennard ("The Old Rugged Cross"), Haldor Lillenas (of the Lillenas Publishing Company, purchased by Nazarene Publishing House in 1930), and A. B. Simpson (associated with the Christian and Missionary Alliance).²⁸

Three of the most significant figures in nineteenth-century gospel hymnody were undoubtedly Philip P Bliss, Fanny Crosby, and Ira D. Sankey. None was overtly Holiness in persuasion, but all wrote hymns that reflected a sensitivity to or an influence of Holiness theology. As Methodists, and close friends or co-laborers with those professing a second work of grace, Crosby and Sankey were certainly aware of Holiness teaching and terminology. Bliss, although of Baptist and Presbyterian connection, moved in wide evangelical circles in the world of revivalism and was doubtless aware of the movement and its influence. Just what relationship and sympathy these three had with Holiness thought and practice is of real significance for the placing of Holiness hymnody within the larger context of gospel hymnody. And when one realizes that Fanny Crosby has remained revivalism's most popular hymnic voice for over a century, and that Bliss and Sankey edited the *Gospel Hymns* that became the "bible" of gospel hymnody, their relationship to the movement cannot be too clearly delineated.²⁹

Two other names should be mentioned here: Daniel Whittle, the preaching half of the Whittle-Bliss evangelistic team, and Charles Gabriel who was, along with George C. Stebbins, the leading gospel songwriter of the early twentieth century. Whittle was a true nondenominational son of revivalism, yet his texts reflect a proclivity for language sensitive to issues of sanctif-

ication. Much the same can be said for Gabriel who not only furnished the era of Billy Sunday with its best songs but also was a prominent feature at Ocean Grove camp meetings as song-leader.

A third and perhaps fundamental methodological question should be explored as one seeks to ask basic defining questions relevant to Holiness hymnody. It is, "What are the significant song collections or hymnals that illuminate the field?" Growing from this might be, "What is the core hymnody of the Holiness movement?" That is, "What are the most significant texts and tunes that characterize Holiness hymnody?"

Obviously the last two questions relating to the movement's repertoire are far too broad for the present study to consider, but at some point fairly early in defining the discipline's parameters, such a question should be broached. One of the main benefits here is that a specific and reasonably clear body of song must be established as the working content of the subject. If this cannot be accomplished towards the outset, spurious conclusions are liable to be drawn from research not based on representative samples. This is particularly true for those with little experiential knowledge of the songs themselves. It should be axiomatic that not every song included in a Holiness collection or using terminology meaningful to Holiness adherents is indeed a "Holiness hymn" from which theological, sociological, or hymnic conclusions can necessarily be made. Yet, without a core of songs which accurately represent the movement, researchers are forced to invent the wheel anew with nearly every foray into the hymnic wilderness.

The first question relating to significant collections comes perilously close to bibliographic considerations which also must fall outside the realm of this initial query. Yet, some direction for investigation seems appropriate in what remains a rather uncharted area.³⁰

Just as the Holiness movement found it necessary to create its own periodicals, camp meetings, associations, and ultimately denominations in order to further its beliefs, it also became necessary to develop its own song collections in order to define, express, and promote itself. And just as many of the official periodicals, camp meetings, and structures of Methodism seemed to lack the necessary sympathy for or understanding of nineteenth-century concepts of sanctification, so too did the various official Methodist hymnals seem impervious to the flowering of songs that accompanied the Holiness movement. While it is true that all Methodist hymnals included sections variously titled Holiness, Sanctification, or Christian Perfection, the contents were almost wholly those of Wesleyan hymns on the subject with little reflection of the changing theological and musical revolution that was taking place. Thus, one must look elsewhere than official hymnals to trace the development of Holiness hymnody.

As a rule, historically, fledgling religious bodies, especially those of a somewhat amorphous nature, did not issue hymn collections as one of their first priorities, even though the very songs they sang may have been one of the most visible, defining, and unifying activities of that group.³¹ The simple reasons were that for a body to issue a collection of representative or useful songs to meet its unique needs or views, there had to be a reasonable amount of organizational infrastructure and commitment in terms of capital (either organizationally or, often, an individual willing to take the financial risk) to make such a project possible. Thus, before that could happen, a group would

often borrow its hymnody from either appropriate or handy places. Such seems to have been the case with early Holiness hymnody. It certainly had a wealth of Wesleyan hymns on the subject from which to draw, even if they didn't quite express the modified concepts of American Holiness thought.³² In addition there were plenty of standard hymns available filled with language which seemed to suggest sentiments of sanctification. And lastly, there was the popular Sunday School song style which was becoming the musical *lingua franca* of adult revivalism and, by extension, the style of worship music for those groups organizing worship on a revivalistic model.³³

By the late 1860's a number of Holiness leaders were involved in compiling, editing, or contributing to song collections which in turn reflected their enthusiasm for sanctification. Such collections, although not explicitly Holiness in purpose or design, were undoubtedly welcomed by those seeking musical resources to express their beliefs. One popular example was *The Revivalist* (Troy, NY: Joseph Hillman, 1867) whose musical editor was the Reverend Lewis Hartsough. The collection reflects a strong Holiness emphasis. It opens with that perennial favorite "There is a fountain" and continues with songs which speak of "inbred sin" (#25), and the "holy fire descending. . . purify and make us whole" (#38), in addition to what were becoming Holiness standards: "Lord, I Hear Showers of Blessing," "I Hear Thy Welcome Voice," "Jesus Paid It All," "Only Trust Him," "The Great Physician," "Coming To The Cross," "The Cleansing Wave," as well as that classic statement of altar theology "Consecration," by Mary D. James. The collection also contained a topical index in which the section entitled Sanctification listed thirty-eight titles.³⁴

With the establishment of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness in 1867 the production of song collections for Association camp meetings was a logical development. One of the results was *Beulah Songs: A Choice Collection of Popular Hymns and Music New and Old Especially Adapted to Camp Meetings, Family Worship, and All Other Assemblies Where Jesus Is Praised* (Phila.: National Publishing Association for the Promotion of Holiness, 1870), edited by Rev. W McDonald and Rev. L. Hartsough. Needless to say, hymns of Holiness conviction predominated, most being in the popular gospel song style musically. The collection reflects a strong tendency toward subjective and experiential songs with heaven and death being popular subjects, often spoken of in near-rapturous terms. There was definitely a sense of transcending the present evil world.

A second Association publication was *Songs of Triumph: Adapted to Prayer Meetings, Camp Meetings, and All Other Seasons of Religious Worship* (Phila.: Nat. Pub. Assn. for the Promotion of Holiness, 1882) as selected and arranged by Rev. J. S. Inskip, one of the Association's founders. Besides providing additional Holiness songs to the repertoire, this collection seems to reflect the strong influence of William Kirkpatrick and John R. Sweney.

In fact Sweney had for some time been producing collections especially for the musical needs at Ocean Grove where he was the longtime music director. These included *Gems of Praise* (1873) and *Goodly Pearls* (1875), both published by John J. Hood of Philadelphia.³⁵ Such collections were perhaps typical of those that seemed to multiply exponentially as the century drew to a close and during the first few decades of the next when every meeting

or assembly issued its own (often paperback) collection reflecting the newest songs written by national or local aspirants to fame or godly service.³⁶

A most unusual series of songbooks was issued under the title *Pentecostal Hymns* by Henry Date beginning in 1893.³⁷ These were the first publications of Hope Publishing Company, which enjoyed the expertise of Elisha Hoffman as one of the musical editors for the first four volumes in the series. Hoffman was much involved in Holiness hymnody, and his influence is particularly evident in the first three volumes in the series, which rely heavily upon his hymns and tunes. In addition to the series' title which is suggestive of Holiness sympathies, the volumes' contents also reflected a decidedly Holiness caste. However, the series was apparently not directed specifically at the sanctified, for the topical indexes have no headings for Holiness or Sanctification although Purity is listed. Nevertheless, this series should be investigated for the significant role it, and other collections like it, played in "bridging the gap" between Holiness and non-holiness believers.

The unofficial bible of gospel hymnody was the six-volume series *Gospel Hymns and Sacred Songs* (New York: Biglow and Main; Cincinnati: John Church, 1875-1894) edited by P P Bliss (Nos. 1, 2), Ira D. Sankey, and (Nos. 36) James McGranahan, George C. Stebbins. The overwhelming popularity of the series made the name gospel a generic term for any personal, unsophisticated, popular religious song. The series succeeded in exerting vast influence over the rest of the publishing industry involved in popular church music. Gospel Hymns eventually began to supplant Sunday School collections in the Sunday School, devotional meetings, and evening services, and became a general all-purpose songbook.

The main stream of gospel hymnody followed *Gospel Hymns*, and this series remained unchallenged to the end of the century. Gospel songs which first appeared in other collections later became immensely popular through their inclusion in one of the six editions.³⁸

This certainly appears to have been the case with certain Holiness hymns. Although originally published in *The Revivalist* in 1868, Hartsough's "I Hear Thy Welcome Voice" did not gain the widespread recognition it came to enjoy until after its inclusion in *Gospel Hymns* (No.1, 1875). The same is true for William Hunter's "The Great Physician." John Stockton's "Come every soul by sin oppressed" ("Only Trust Him") provides a slightly different example of the commanding position and influence of *Gospel Hymns*. Stockton published the song with a chorus which read "Come to Jesus, come to Jesus, come to Jesus now; He will save you, he will save you now," and it was disseminated widely in Holiness song collections in that form. However, Ira Sankey felt the chorus to be too repetitive because "come" was also prominent in the stanzas. He therefore changed the chorus to read "Only trust Him, only trust Him now..." as published in *Gospel Hymns* (No.1). And that has been the form in which the hymn has enjoyed its popularity ever since. Numerous additional examples could also be cited.

It would be a wrong inference, however, to conclude that *Gospel Hymns* was an important series for the spread of Holiness hymnody for, in general, it reflected the world of revivalism which D. L. Moody epitomized; and Moody was always adamant to steer a moderate, non-sectarian course on all mat-

ters theological. Although Moody himself had experienced a dramatic 'second work' or "empowering" in late 1871, which he credited with being the reason for his success, he was always suspicious of religious enthusiasm for anything other than the simple gospel. Thus, the body of songs which characterized his ministry, as sung, directed, compiled, published, and popularized by Ira Sankey, was typical of revivalism itself which stressed the basic fundamentals of belief and left the finer points of doctrinal disputation to others. As the most important example of "mainstream" gospel hymnody, the *Gospel Hymns* series, issued over a period of nearly twenty years (1875-1891), provides a "control" or musical plumb-line against which Holiness collections might be compared.

Over four centuries ago the theologian and hymn-writer Martin Luther exclaimed, "I am strongly persuaded that after theology there is no art that can be placed on a level with music; for besides theology music is the only art capable of affording peace and joy of the heart... the devil flees before the sound of music almost as much as before the Word of God." Apparently such ideas have not been limited to Luther alone, for, three hundred years after Luther nailed his theses to the church door at Wittenburg in an effort to reform a spiritually dead church, another group of reformers set out to revive the dying embers of holiness teachings within Methodism. Both reform movements produced a rich body of hymnody which not only articulates their beliefs but also finds widespread acceptance outside of the movements themselves. Thus, the convictions and beliefs which motivated such bold words and deeds are yet echoed round the world as Christians lift their hearts in song.

"Sing unto the Lord, O ye saints of his! and give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness" (Psalm 30:4).

NOTES

1. E. S. Bucke, ed. *The History of American Methodism* (NY: Abingdon, 1964), Vol.11, p.341.

2. David Bundy, "Historiographical Issues Presented by Printed and Archival Resources," a paper delivered at "Resources for Research on the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement," a pre-conference event of the Twenty-fifth Annual Conference of the Wesleyan Theological

Society (Nov., 1989), makes a good case for typical problems confronting the researcher in many phases of Holiness studies, including hymnody.

3. One of the few works on the Holiness movement in general which also provides an excellent treatment of hymnody within the context of its broader concerns is Charles E. Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement in American Methodism*, 18674936, ATLA Monograph Series No.5 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974), chapter 5.

4. Although some mark the beginnings of the American Holiness movement as early as 1835 with Sarah Lankford's experience, while others see the revival of 1857-1858 as central, the focus of this study on Holiness

hymnody is more likely to coincide with the time frame posited by Charles Jones in *Perfectionist Persuasion* of 1867-1936.

5. William E. Sangster, *The Path to Perfection*, (NY/Nashville: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1943), p.60.

6. A myriad of accounts and interpretations of Palmer's "altar phraseology" are available: Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, Studies in Evangelicalism, No. 1, (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1989): 2731; Dale Dunlap, "Tuesday Meetings, Camp Meetings, and Cabinet Meetings: A Perspective on the Holiness Movement in the Methodist Church in the Nineteenth Century, *Methodist History* 13 (April, 1975): 85106; Theodore Hovet, "Phoebe Palmer's 'Altar Phraseology' and the Spiritual Dimension of Woman's Sphere," *The Journal of Religion* 63 (July, 1983): 26480; Ivan Howard, "Wesley versus Phoebe Palmer: An Extended Controversy," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, 6 (Spring, 1971): 3140; Charles E. White, *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist, and Humanitarian*, (Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press, 1986). It should be noted that Charles Wesley did use the metaphor of altar at times but with a different meaning than Palmer:

O Thou who camest from above
The pure celestial fire to impart,
Kindle a flame of sacred love
On the mean altar of my heart.

7. The genre of "Beulah songs" may well represent a strong trend in Holiness life toward an emphasis on being rather than doing (Dieter, *The Holiness Revival*, p.122). Dunlap ("~Tuesday Meetings," pp.97, 105) sees a strong shift in this direction after 1880 with an increased concern for personal holiness and little or no sense of social holiness; Jones (*Perfectionist Persuasion*, pp.3546) includes a number of additional examples of "Beulah songs" within the larger context of the Christian pilgrimage. Jones' fine approach via the extended pilgrimage metaphor encompasses many excellent and diverse examples of hymns reflecting the rich tapestry of shades and meanings available by means of this common poetic/hymnic device.

8. This can be best understood in the context of the discussions on Phoebe Palmer's "altar phraseology"

9. George Hughes, *Days of Power in the Forest Temple: A Review of the Wonderful Work of God at Fourteen National Camp meetings from 1867-1872*, (Boston: John Bent, 1873), p.246.

10. It is somewhat ironic that her classic hymn contains no specific reference to "altar phraseology" although it does reflect the immediacy of her 'shorter way.'

11. Hughes, *Days of Power*, pp.245247.

12. Hughes, *Days of Power*, pp.258259.

13. William J. Reynolds, *Companion to Baptist Hymnal*, (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1976), pp.186187; also see Lawrence R. Schoenhals, *Companion to Hymns of Faith and Life*, (Winona Lake, IN: Light and Life Press, 1980), pp.283285.

14. H. C. Morrison, "A Parting Word to Herald Readers," *Pentecostal Herald* (April 8, 1942): 1. Timothy Smith, "The Holy Spirit in the Hymns of the Wesleys," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 16 (Fall, 1981): 38, sees another reason for adoption of the hymn: "By some special kind of poetic irony, six generations of American Wesleyans have sung Toplady's hymn . . . in blissful disregard of its author's staunch Calvinism....They read Methodist meanings into Toplady's grander lines, remembering John Wesley's teaching that water in Biblical symbol nearly always stands for the sanctifying Spirit." Toplady's hymn has experienced numerous alterations. The last line of the first stanza was originally penned "save me from its guilt and power." In A. B. Earle's *Revival Hymns* (No.46) the lines took on a decidedly Holiness complexion: "be of sin the perfect cure, save me Lord and make me pure.

15. Although "More Holiness Give Me" uses an appropriate term in its title, a closer look at the full text strongly suggests Bliss was teaching a growth or maturing process in the Christian's life rather than a second work experience. Bliss often used the terms full and perfect in his hymns "perfect" examples of generic usage.

16. This song could easily fit into the adoptive category, for it contains few or no generic terms appropriatable by Holiness believers; in fact, the song seems quite clearly to teach a continuing process of sanctification rather than a specific second experience. However, because of the author's close association with the Holiness movement and perhaps because of the song's overriding focus on another level of Christian experience, it "at once took high rank among the holiness people, and secured a lasting place in American hymnology. Nothing can bring forth more shouts at a camp-meeting of 'Glory' and 'Hallelujah' than the singing of Higher Ground.'" (J. H. Hall, *Biography of Gospel Song and Hymn Writers*, NY: Fleming Revell, 1914 pp.357358).

17. For an excellent overview of this subject, see Timothy L. Smith, "The Holy Spirit in the Hymns of the Wesleys" and T. Crichton Mitchell, "Response to Dr. Timothy Smith on the Wesleys' Hymns," both in *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 16 (Fall, 1981).

18. This and a half dozen other important theological shifts in Holiness theology are analyzed in Donald Dayton's "Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology" *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9 (Spring, 1974); Dayton has also observed the changing terminology in various Holiness hymns. Some of the best examples of Pentecostal terminology in hymns are by Mrs. H. C. Morris whose hymns have been quoted.

Perhaps the best collection of articles related to Pentecostal hymnody is contained in *The Hymn: A Journal of Congregational Song* Vol.38, No. 1 (Jan., 1987). The entire issue is dedicated to music of Pentecostal churches and Charismatic fellowships and includes articles on historical roots, early Pentecostals, praise singing, singing in the Spirit, a bibliography of hymnals, and various responses.

19. In reaction to the growing musical sophistication in Methodist worship George Hughes bemoaned, "She is in danger... of being shorn of much of her musical poetry. Ritualistic ideas, where they have sway, demand what is very artistic in this department, but very soulless, possessing little of the

spirit of Christian worship. Congregational singing... will ere long, we trust, be substituted for quartet arrangements, and all attempts at praising God by proxy," (*Days of Power*, pp.243244); another concerned voice, Rev. T. M. Eddy, proposed that "No man should be allowed to sing his fugue tunes, his opera music, or to flourish through his demise, miquavers, No! We want good, old stirring tunes full of melody, full of soultunes in which the congregation can join," (Dieter, *Holiness Revival*, p.146).

The best single source on the music of gospel hymnody remains the unpublished thesis of James C. Downey, "The Gospel Hymn, 1875-1930," (University of Southern Mississippi, 1963); also see Harry Eskew, "Gospel Music, I." *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1980, VII, 549554; *The New Grove Dictionary of American Music*, 1986, 11, 249254; Donald P. Hustad, *Jubilate: Church Music in the Evangelical Tradition*, (Carol Stream, IL: Hope Pub., 1981); Edmund S. Lorenz, *Church Music: What a Minister Should Know About It*,

(NY: Fleming Revell, 1923); Ira D. Sankey, *My Life and the Story of the Gospel Hymns*, (NY: Harper and Bros., 1906); and Mel R. Wilhoit, "A Guide to the Principal Authors and Composers of Gospel Song of the Nineteenth Century," (unpublished dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982).

20. Although few sources treat individual gospel song writers from a Holiness perspective, the following standard works should be consulted as many make reference to areas of interest related to Holiness studies: Emory Bucke, Fred Gealy, Austin Lovelance, and Carlton Young, *Companion to the Hymnal A Handbook to the 1964 Methodist Hymnal*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970); Donald P. Hustad, *Dictionary Handbook to Hymns for the Living Church*, (Carol Stream, IL: Hope Pub., 1978); Robert Guy McCutchan, *Our Hymnody: A Manual of the Methodist Hymnal*, (NY: Methodist Book Concern, 1937); William J. Reynolds, *Companion to Baptist Hymnal* (1975), (Nashville: Broadman, 1976); Reynolds, *Hymns of Our Faith* (Companion for *Baptist Hymnal* 1956), (Nashville: Broadman, 1964); Homer A. Rodeheaver, *Hymnal Handbook for Standard Hymns and Gospel Songs*, (Chicago: Rodeheaver Co, 1931); Lawrence R. Schoenhals, *Companion to Hymns of Faith and Life*, (Winona Lake, IN: Light and Life Press, 1980); also see J. H. Hall, *Biography*; Edmund Lorenz, *Church Music*; and Mel R. Wilhoit, "Guide to the Principal Authors and Composers." George Hughes, *Days of Power*, (Chapter XI "The Power of Song in the Forest Temple") does briefly note a number of persons in relation to their role in Holiness hymnody. For general biographical data see Matthew Simpson, ed., *Cyclopedia of Methodism*, (Phila.: Louis H. Everts, 1881).

21. Discussed under section on important song collections.

22. Discussed under section on important song collections.

23. The extent of Hoffman's participation in the theological dynamics of certain Holiness interpretations (and battles) within his own denomination is documented in J. Wesley Corbin, "Christian Perfection and the Evangelical Association Through 1875," *Methodist History* 7, (Jan., 1969); for a more thorough biographical account see Robert S. Wilson and Mel R. Wilhoit, "Elisha Albright Hoffman," *The Hymn* 35, (Jan., 1984): 3539.

24. Philip Phillips, *Song Pilgrimage Around and Throughout the World*, (Chicago: Fairbanks, Palmer and Co., 1880).

25. S. Olin Garrison, ed., *Forty Witnesses Covering the Whole Range of Christian Experience*, (Freeport, PA: Fountain Press, reprint, 1955), p.190; also see John H. Johansen, "Frances Ridley Havergal, 1836-1891: Poetess of Consecration," *The Hymn* 7, (April, 1956): 4148. Charles White, *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as..*., does touch upon her role as hymn-writer but makes little of her contribution in that area as a woman (especially since one of the descriptive adjectives in the book's title is feminist); it may be possible that the wider role Palmer carved out for women in the religious world influenced the acceptance of women hymn-writers, a traditionally male domain. Charles Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, provides a brief interpretation of Palmer's hymn and contrasts its theology with that of Wesley.

26. Mary Ethel Wiess, *Singing at Her Work: A Biography of Mrs. C H. Morris*, (Kansas City: Lillenas Pub. Co., 1934).

27. Walter Stillman was first ordained a Baptist minister and later joined the Disciples of Christ although he was very active in Holiness work throughout his life. Haldor Lillenas, *Modern Gospel Hymn Stories*, (Kansas City: Lillenas Pub. Co., 1952) reports that both the Harrises were large people and sang with great power and freedom; Mrs. Harris was a powerful exhorter and personal worker.

28. Whose hymnal editor was Holiness songwriter R. Kelso Carter.

29. D. W. Whittle, ed., *Memoirs of Philip P Bliss*, (NY: A. S. Barnes, 1877); Bob J. Neal, "Philip P Bliss (1838-1876): Gospel Hymn Composer and Compiler," (dissertation, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1977); Donald P. Hustad, ed., *Fanny Crosby Speaks Again*, (Carol Stream, IL: Hope Pub. Co., 1977); Bernard Ruffin, *Fanny Crosby*, (United Church Press, 1976); Ira D. Sankey, *My Life*; David Williamson, *Ira D. Sankey: The Story of His Life*, (London: S. W Partridge, n.d.). Also see Sandra Sizer, *Gospel Hymns and Social Religion: The Rhetoric of Nineteenth-Century Revivalism*, (Phil~: Temple Press, 1978); Wihoit, 'A Guide. . . .'

30. Of a certainty, Charles Edwin Jones, *A Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement*, ATLA Bibliography Series No. 1 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press and American Theological Library Association, 1974), provides some of the best landmarks for the disoriented albeit sanctified hymnologist. An extensive bibliography of song collections relevant to Holiness hymnody provides excellent direction in this area.

31. There was apparently enough distinctiveness about Holiness songs or singing to warrant the notice of their opponents. Even as an exercise in hyperbole, the following diatribe suggests the presence of a growing body of Holiness songs: "They have changed the name of our meetings, substituting Holiness for Methodist. They preach a different doctrine...; they sing different songs... they have adopted radically different words of worship..." quoted in Harold Mann, *Atticus Greene Haygood*, (Athens, GA: Univ. of GA Press, 1965), pp.164-165.

32. This seems to have been the case with the earliest Holiness camp meetings. Commenting on these early gatherings, George Hughes recounts: "Two things have been observable on these occasions. First, the revival of the old, well-tried hymnology of primitive days. Charles Wesley, our immortal poet, has renewed his youth, and once more taken his place at the front. His hymns, so full of Bible truth, and so soul-stirring, have been in favor." *Days of Power*, p.244.

33. The power of the gospel song style (words and music) cannot be taken too lightly in seeking to understand Holiness hymnody. In many ways, the new songs of sanctification were probably influenced as much by the dynamics of gospel hymnody as they were by Holiness theology. This critical point should not be overlooked in seeking to place Holiness hymnody within its larger context of revivalism and evangelicalism. One of the significant influences in this larger context was the role of emotionalism. Winthrop Hudson points out that during the nineteenth century there was a "movement from a relatively restrained recognition of the role of emotion in religious experience to an uninhibited emotionalism, an emotionalism deliberately heightened by preaching techniques, by the use of 'spiritual songs' (simplified texts with repetitive refrains set to popular tunes), and by a variety of other 'new measures' designed to elicit a highly emotional response," ("The Methodist Age in America," *Methodist History* 12, April, 1974, p.7.) "It was inevitable that pietists would discover in the camp meetings... that the emotional patterns of the conversion experience could become the liturgy and sacrament of the religious fellowship," Melvin Dieter, *Holiness Revival*, p.147 quoting Smith and Jamison, *The Shaping of American Religion*. Thus, gospel hymnody's influence on the church music of its day was a force to be reckoned with.

34. The version here consulted was the revised edition of 1872. For an excellent survey of the volume from a broad perspective, see Ellen Jane Lorenze Porter, "The Revivalist," *The Hymn: A Journal of Congregational Song* Vol. 41, No.2 (April, 1990).

35. Sweney's music for Edgar Stites' "Beulah Land" was probably the most popular of all the Beulah songs. Although the song is infrequently sung in most religious circles today, the irony is that it may well find its most enduring epitaph in the music of the American composer Charles Ives: Symphonies Nos. 2 and 4 and Violin Sonata No.3.

36. See Charles Jones, *A Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement*.

37. The full title read *Pentecostal Hymns: A Winnowed Collection for Evangelistic Services, Young People's Societies and Sunday Schools*. The series eventually ran to six volumes.

38. William J. Reynolds, *A Survey of Christian Hymnody*, (NY: Holt, Rhinehart, Winston, 1963), p.106; rev. ed. by Reynolds and Milburn Price entitled *A Joyful Sound*, 1977.

39. William Reynolds, *Companion*, pp.100, 214215, 5051.

TRINITY AND HYMNODY: THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY IN THE HYMNS OF CHARLES WESLEY

by

Barry E. Bryant

This paper was read at a conference on Trinitarian Theology, held by the Institute of Systematic Theology at King's College, the University of London, 26 September 1990.

It has been conservatively estimated that Charles Wesley composed over 6,000 hymns.¹ Admittedly, among that vast collection there are some dismal failures in communicating the Christian faith. But for the most part his hymns are insightful and articulate expressions of it. His mastery of Biblical English, his ability to express simply the often complex issues of Christian theology, and his understanding of the Hanoverian mind helped him to write hymns that were readily and easily grasped by the hearts and minds of early Methodists. John and Charles Wesley never underestimated the power of music to "affect the hearers, to raise various passions in the human mind."²

For the Wesleys, however, the hymn had a greater purpose than simply an aesthetic or emotive appeal. From the very beginning, when they published their first hymnal in 1737, *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns*, their hymns had a didactic character to them. Charles' hymns were published by his elder brother John and used as a tool for instructing the early Methodist societies. This was no easy task when one considers that early Methodists were comprised mostly of the working poor from Newcastle to Bristol to London. They were not very well-educated and they were more than just a little rough around the edges. When *A Collection of Hymns for a People Called Methodist* finally appeared in 1780, John ambitiously (and perhaps somewhat optimistically) called it "a little body of experimental and practical divinity."³ It was finally admitted into the "Wesley canon" as one of the standard books on Wesleyan doctrine, along with John Wesley's *Sermons*, and his *Explanatory Notes on the New Testament*. The Wesleys' hymns were intended to be metrical theology and should be read as such.

More specific examples of this didactic use of metrical theology came on two occasions prior to the hymnal's publication in 1780. First, in 1746 the Wesley brothers published a collection of twenty-four hymns entitled *Gloria Patri... or Hymns on the Trinity*.⁴ This was a short collection of hymns in praise of God for the Trinity, and praise of God through the Trinity. Unfortunately, none of these hymns was selected to appear in the *Collection*. Two examples of hymns in *Gloria Patri....* will be discussed later.

The second, and more significant, example came in 1767, when they published 136 hymns in *Hymns on the Trinity*, along with 52 more, "Hymns and Prayers on the Trinity" [hence "Hymns and Prayers"], in one volume.⁵ *Hymns on the Trinity* was inspired by, and patterned after William Jones' work, *The Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity proved by above an hundred short and clear arguments, expressed in the terms of Holy Scripture, compared after a manner entirely new, and digested under the four following Titles: 1. The Divinity of Christ; 2. The Divinity of the Holy Ghost; 3. The Plurality of Persons; 4 The Trinity in Unity: with a few reflections* (1754). Jones wrote this while principal of Jesus College Oxford, and made it his contribution to the Trinitarian controversy between Samuel Clarke (1675-1729) and Daniel Waterland (1683-1740). In it, he scathingly attacked Arians, Socinians, Deists, and Samuel Clarke for their views. He also criticized Methodists and Quakers for making "wrong use of Deism."⁶

John Wesley certainly would have been aware of the issues involved in the Clarke and Waterland debates on the Trinity. In a letter dated June 19, 1731, he demonstrates a knowledge of Clarke's teachings.⁷ Then, in his Savannah diary he records having read Waterland's, *The Importance of the Trinity* on March 23, 1736.⁸ The Wesleys would not allow Jones' criticism of Methodism to deter them from siding with Trinitarian theology. They endorsed Jones' work. Charles used it as a blueprint for *Hymns on the Trinity*, and followed the order suggested by the work's title, composing hymns for each section, and then adding a few of his own. Of Charles' poetic interpretation of Jones' work, elder brother John wrote glowingly,

Mr. Jones' book on the Trinity is both more clear and more strong than any I ever saw on that subject. If anything is wanting it is the application, lest it should appear to be a mere speculative doctrine, which has no influence on our hearts or our lives; but this is abundantly supplied by my brother's Hymns.⁹

The notion that the doctrine of the Trinity was not simply a speculative doctrine, but a doctrine with practical application was indeed a significant development in the history of Trinitarian hymnody. To the Wesleys, the doctrine of the Trinity was not simply something to be speculated about by academic theologians and then believed by the Church. It was to influence "hearts and lives," ultimately affecting the way people lived. Obviously, to the Wesleys, the doctrine of the Trinity had far-reaching and pastoral implications.

Never one to shy away from controversy, John undoubtedly published *Hymns on the Trinity* because the growing popularity of Socinianism, its Arian-like denials, and unitarianism, posed a daunting threat to the Trinitarian evangelicalism of the Methodist revival and its Puritan ethic. Lines such

as the following left no doubt as to whom the theological opponents were [the words italicized here were italicized in the original text]:

Thy glorious Deity blasphemes
With *Arian* or *Socinian* dreams . . .
[HT, XXII]

Arise, ye dead, and meet your doom!
Arians, behold His glorious face!
His face ye shall behold no more. . .
[HT, XXVII]

Boot out Thine *Unitarian* foe,
No longer let his place be found,
The crescent by the cross o'erthrown,
And loose the world in darkness bound.
[HT, LII]

Men who *Arians'* blasphemies
Dare to *scripture-doctrine* name,
Let their dire delusions cease,
Sink to hell from whence it came.
[HT, LXXXIX]10

Before we place these hymns under the genre of "theological hooliganism," keep in mind that the Wesleys took their Trinitarian theology seriously. The reason for such strong language was their conviction that to undermine the theology of the Trinity was to undermine the hearts, lives, and salvation of people. Unitarianism threatened the very foundations of the Church. To John and Charles Wesley, such corrupt teaching could only be conceived in hell, and to hell it should return.

With the publication of first, *Gloria Patri*, and later, *Hymns on the Trinity*, with its "Hymns and Prayers on the Trinity," we see a clear and deliberate attempt to combat Unitarianism, and to teach the Methodist societies Nicene Trinitarian doctrine and theology through verse. Although John published at least two sermons on the same subject, both Wesleys thought perhaps the best way to combat the Unitarian heresy was through the hymnal, not through declarations from the pulpit. The pulpit was used to convert. The hymnal was used to instruct in Christian doctrine in order to influence the lives of the Methodists.

After this somewhat lengthy, but necessary, historical introduction, we can perhaps better appreciate what Charles had to say on the Trinity. What this paper will do from here is to look at what the Wesleys taught about the Trinity through the hymns contained in these sources: *Gloria Patri*.... ; *Hymns on the Trinity*, "Hymns and Prayers on the Trinity"; and, *A Collection of Hymns for a People Called Methodists*.

I. "A TRINITY IN UNITY" [Collection, 249.4.1]

The most pronounced doctrine which the Wesleys taught about the Father Son, and Holy Spirit is that of "A Trinity in unity" [*Collection*, 249.4.1 = hymn.verse.line]. Here is just a sample of the phrases Charles used to describe this:

One undivided Trinity [*Collection*, 251.2.1]
Jehovah in three persons [*Collection*, 253.2.1]
Three Persons equally divine [*Collection*, 251.5.1]
One inexplicably Three,
 One in simplest Unity [*Collection*, 252.3.12]
a mystical plurality [*Collection*, 248.2.1]
Three uncompounded Persons One,
 One undivided God proclaim:
 In essence, nature, substance one,
 [*Collection*, 255.2.13]
[the Son] In substance with thy Father one,
 [*Collection*, 245.2.2]

7 The Father is both God and Lord;
 Both God and Lord is Christ the Son;
The Holy Ghost, the glorious third,
 Both God and Lord his people own.
8 Both God and Lord, who him believe,
 Each person by himself we name:
Yet not three Gods or Lords receive,
 But One essentially the same.
[*Collection*, 255.78]

Throughout all of his Trinitarian hymns Charles seemed concerned with re-expressing these three concepts: (1) the concepts of "person" (hypostasis) and unity of "substance" (homoousia); (2) the role each Person of the Trinity plays in the life of the believer in the process of salvation (i.e. economic Trinity), which is the eschatological revelation and prophetic fulfillment of (3), the idea of the Three-in-One God (i.e. essential or immanent Trinity). All of this is the vocabulary and the expression of Trinitarian theology as found in the creed of Nicaea (325), with deliberate use of its concepts and language of "person" and "substance." What is so astonishing is not so much the opinions he held, but the way, in which and to whom, he proposed to teach these opinions. Charles was not at all reluctant to teach the simple Methodists such sophisticated ideas and finer theological subtleties. He never underestimated either their ability or their motivation to understand the Three-in-One and the One-in-Three nature of the Trinity.

Unfortunately, we do not have time to explore Charles Wesley's understanding of the relationships between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit within the Trinity, a concern of much recent inquiry. Roughly one third of the nearly two hundred Trinitarian hymns deals with this and could be a subject of its own. Perhaps it should be said that Charles refers to the Holy Spirit as being

The gift of Jesus . . . [*Collection*, 492.3.2]
The Spirit that doth from Both proceed,
[HT, LXIII],
We the Spirit receive
That proceeds from the Father and Son.
[*Collection*, 476.3.5, 6]

These lines reveal a decidedly Western and Augustinian understanding of the relationship between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.¹¹

II. "AN IMAGE OF A TRIUNE GOD" [*Collection*, 248.6.3]

We must now move on to the second area of our inquiry, even if prematurely. Perhaps the most interesting features of Charles Wesley's Trinitarian hymns are their Trinitarian anthropology and Trinitarian soteriology. It is the doctrine of the Trinity which binds the doctrine of salvation with anthropology. Inherent in this anthropology is the view of Adam and Eve being created in

An image of a Triune God [*Collection*, 248.6.3; *HT LXXXVII*]
The Triune God of holiness
[*Collection*, 254.3.4; "Hymns and Prayers," XVII]

Adam and Eve were created by the Trinity, as this line reveals:

And all the glorious persons joined to form thy
fav'rite, man. [*collection*, 248.4.34; *HT, LXXXVII*]

They were also created within a triune image of the Trinity, as this couplet reveals:

Stamped with the Triune character;
Flesh, spirit, soul, to thee resign,
[*Collection*, 253.4.45; *HT, XVII*].

Firmly fixed in Wesleyan anthropology and soteriology was the belief that the original image of God given to the first humans was both triune and holy in nature. This notion of God's image being triune in nature follows Augustine's lead, except that Augustine's notion of a Trinitarian *imago Dei* is more Aristotelian.¹² As far as I know, the only other Protestant theologian to take up a Trinitarian notion of the image of God was Andreas Osiander.¹³ In refuting Osiander, Calvin explicitly, and rather tersely, rejected it.¹⁴ Luther was more diplomatic in his denial of it.¹⁵

Here, we must differentiate the implicit dissimilarity between the "lost" and the "marred" image of God. Charles writes,

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
In council join again
To restore thine image, lost
By frail, apostate man
[*Collection*, 357.4.14]

Bring back the heavenly blessing, lost
By all mankind, and me.
[*Collection*, 243.1.34]

Come Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
Whom one all-perfect God we own,
Restorer of thine image lost,
Thy various offices make known . . .
[*Collection*, 253.1.13; "Hymns and Prayers," XIV].

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
Be to us what Adam lost;
Let us in thine image rise,
Give us back our paradise! [*Collection*, 500.4]

The "lost" image referred to here is not the one triune in character. The triune character of the image of God consists of flesh, spirit, and soul. This is irreducible anthropology and cannot be lost without forsaking essential elements of humanity. The flesh, spirit, and soul were, however, marred. What was "lost" was the image of perfect love, the image of righteousness, and the image of liberty.¹⁶ Without the lost image of righteousness and holiness, the flesh, spirit, and soul (particularly the latter two) became "sin sick" and marred.¹⁷ Throughout his hymns Charles more often uses metaphors of sin as a sickness, and salvation as the "therapy of the soul," than he uses forensic ones. Examples of these metaphors can be seen in the following:

Speak, gracious Lord, my sickness cure,
Make my infected nature pure
[*Collection*, 127.4.14]

My Sin's incurable disease,
Thou Jesus, thou alone canst heal
[*Collection*, 383.18]

Wouldst thou the body's health restore,
And not regard the sin-sick soul?
The sin-sick soul thou lov'st much more,
And surely thou shalt make it whole.
[*Collection*, 385.6.14]

What results is an interesting view which sees original sin primarily as a sickness resulting from the lost image of righteousness, holiness, and love, marring the triune character of humanity, i.e. body, soul, and spirit.

As we were created by the Trinity, in the image of the Trinity, only the Trinity can therapeutically restore the image lost by Adam and Eve and heal sin infected humanity. Considering the Wesleys' preoccupation with their evangelistic effort it should come as no surprise that Charles would be largely concerned with the Trinity's role in salvation. The following is a sustained description of the role which each Person of the Trinity plays in salvation;

1 Jehovah, God the Father, bless,
And thy own work defend!
With mercy's outstretched arms embrace,
And keep us to the end!

2 Preserve the creatures of thy love
By providential care,
Conducted to the realms above
To sing thy goodness there.

3 Jehovah, God the Son, reveal
The brightness of thy face!
And all thy pardoned people fill
With plenitude of grace!

4 Shine forth with all the Deity
Which dwells in thee alone;
And lift us up thy face to see
On thy eternal throne!

5 Jehovah, God the Spirit, shine,
Father and Son to show;
With bliss ineffable, divine,
Our ravished hearts o'erflow.

6 Sure earnest of that happiness,
That human hope transcends,
Be thou our everlasting peace
When grace in glory ends.
[*collection*, 250; *HT CIV*]

The process of salvation is about the restoration of this lost image of God. It comes to a crisis in entire sanctification. One of the most controversial aspects of the Wesleys' thought is brought to light at this point. They believed that the restoration of the lost image of God could take place in this life, in entire sanctification. Without apology, Charles believed that in entire sanctification a Christian believes,

And the whole Trinity descends
Into our faithful hearts
[*Collection*, 254.4.34; *HT XVII*];

And when we rise in love renewed,
Our souls resemble Thee,
An image of the Triune God to all eternity.
[*Collection*, 248.6.14; *HT LXXXVII*]

Come Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
Restorer of Thine image lost,
The flaming sword remove.
[*HT XXX*]

At this point one is entirely sanctified, the image of God restored, and one is able to love the Lord our God with all one's heart, soul, mind, and strength, and one's neighbor as one's self. This, for Wesley, also restores the original holiness and righteousness lost in the first act of human disobedience. With it, spiritual health and wholeness are restored. It is not, however, the last step in the Wesleys' order of salvation, which is glorification, the eschatological conclusion of salvation. While the Methodists were perhaps not able to articulate precisely the doctrinal language of the Trinity, they nevertheless showed that they believed the doctrine by their "experience of salvation from the Father, by the work of the Son, through the Holy Spirit."¹⁸

The recreative dynamic of the order of salvation from beginning to end is the Holy Spirit, who is constantly at work in the life of the believer illuminating the Son. The Son, in turn, reveals to us the Father.

The importance of the Trinity to the Wesleys' doctrine of salvation has long been overlooked. As Charles Tyson has correctly observed,

The doctrine of the Trinity was not merely an artifact of theological tradition in [their] soteriology; it was, rather, a dynamic principle that cemented [their] theology of the redemption together at several important points.¹⁹

III. "HIM IN THREE PERSONS MAGNIFY" [247.3.41]

The Wesleys understood the Trinity not to be simply the means by which salvation is obtained. They also understood the Trinity as both the means and object of worship, thus helping men and women to find their ultimate purpose in life, namely to praise God and glorify Him forever. Geoffrey Wainwright has already pointed out the doxological intention of the Wesleys' Trinitarian doctrine.²⁰

As the twenty-four hymns found in *Gloria Patri, &c. or Hymns to the Trinity* are all dedicated to the theme of worship, our inquiry will be focused there. The *collection* consists mostly of hymns one or two verses long. Hymns IV and VII are the best examples of the contents.

- 1 Praise be to the Father given!
Christ He gave
Us to save,
Now the Heirs of Heaven.
- 2 Pay we equal Adoration
To the Son:
He alone
Wrought out our Salvation.
- 3 Glory to the Eternal Spirit!
Us He seals,
Christ reveals,
And applies His Merit.
- 4 Worship, Honor, Thanks and Blessing,
One in Three,
Give we Thee,
Never, never, ceasing. [*GP*, IV]
- 1 Father of Mankind Be ever adorn'd:
Thy Mercy we find, In sending our Lord,
To ransom and bless us; Thy Goodness we praise,
For sending in Jesus' Salvation by Grace.
- 2 O Son of His Love, Who deignest to die,
Our Curse to remove, Our Pardon to buy;
Accept our Thanksgiving, Almighty to save,
Who openest Heaven, To all that believe.
- 3 O Spirit of Love, Of Health, and of Power,
Thy working we prove; Thy Grace we adore,
Whose inward Revealing applies our Lord's Blood,
Attesting and sealing us Children of God.
[*GP* VII]

The most striking thing about these hymns is their Trinitarian worship. The three-in-one helps us to worship the one-in-three. It is worship of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost that helps us to achieve true worship of the One God. Charles wrote

To Father, Son, and Spirit
Ascribe we equal Glory!
[*GP*, XI]

This is not in keeping with the many caricatures of the Wesleys which depict them as either Jesus or Holy Spirit worshippers. Instead, it repudiates the often lopsided evangelical worship of the Son above the Father and the Spirit, or the lopsided charismatic worship of the Spirit above the Father and the Son. It is my guess that given the didactic purposes of their hymns, the Wesley's were probably trying to correct a similar imbalance in early Methodist worship. It is only appropriate that since the human person is a Trinitarian creation, in the image of a Trinitarian God, and since salvation is a Trinitarian process, worship must be emphatically Trinitarian in its focus. The challenge of Christian worship is keeping the balance.

The Wesleys had a vigorous doctrine of the Trinity which was vital to their theology and they defended the doctrine against all comers. They saw it as a doctrine having a direct influence on the "hearts and lives" of the Methodists. Through their hymns, they were able to address the *Unitarian* heresy, but at the same time they' were able to arm the Methodists to defend themselves. In doing so they shaped and molded the theological character of early Methodism with clear teaching on the Trinity.

The metrical theology of Charles Wesley has made, and can continue to make, an important contribution to Trinitarian theology. This is a timely reminder to an age where "pop" culture has invented a disposable music which has infiltrated the church with its shallow and often misinformed theological content. John and Charles Wesley are there to remind us that the hymn can do more than provide emotive or aesthetic inspirations. The hymn can instruct and assist us in our understanding and worship of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. But this will not happen by accident.

NOTES

1. For the definitive collection see G. Osborne, *The Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley* (London: Wesleyan Methodist Conference Office, 1870).

2. *Arminian Magazine*, 4(1781):1037.

3. John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley*, volume VII, Franz Hildebrandt, Oliver Beckerlegge, editors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), p.74. Hence, *Collection*.

4. Charles Wesley, *Gloria Patri or Hymns on the Trinity*, (London: Strahan, 1746). Hence, GP

5. Charles Wesley, *Hymns on the Trinity*, (Bristol: Pine, 1767). Hence, *HT* Perhaps it should be pointed out that this work was originally published anonymously, as were many of Charles' hymns.

6. William Jones, *Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity* (1756), p. xx.

7. John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley*, vol.25, *Letters*, Frank Baker, editor (Oxford: Clarendon Press), p.288.

8. *Journal*, Curnock, 1:186; *Journal*, Ward, I:371.

9. John Wesley, *Letters of John Wesley*, 8 vols., John Telford, editor, (London: The Epworth Press, 1931), VI:213.

10. It should be noted that none of these found their way into the *Collection*.

11 This is somewhat ironic given the view held by many that John Wesley's pneumatology is more influenced by the Eastern tradition.

12. I.e. memory, intellect, and will, see Calvin, *Institutes*, Book 1, Chapter xv, par. 4; Augustine, *On the Trinity*, Book VII, par. 12; Book XV, ch. 23; *City of God*, Book XI, par. 26; Aristotle, *Ethica Eudemia*, 1218b, 1235,1236.

13. See Reinhold Seeburg, *The History of Doctrines*, Charles Hay, trans. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), 11:36972. Also, Andreas Osiander, *Disput. de justificatione* (1550); *Von dem emigen Mitler Jesu Christo und Rechtfertigung des Glaubens* (1551).

14. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Henry Beveridge, trans., (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981), 1:165; cf. *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis*, John King, trans. (Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1989), p.93.

15. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, vol.1, Commentary on Genesis, (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958), pp.6067.

16. John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley*, volume 4, Albert Outler, editor, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987), p.293. The image of righteousness, holiness, and love were also seen as a part of the image of the Triune God, but not triune in essence.

17. For example see *Collection*, numbers 1, 31, 38, 47, 68, 82, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 383, 384, 385, 386, etc.

18. Henry Rack, "Early Methodist Visions of the Trinity," *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, 46(1988)69.

19. John Tyson, *Charles Wesley, A Reader*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), p.46.

20. Geoffrey Wainwright, "Why Wesley was a Trinitarian," *The Drew Gateway*, 59(1990)2:2643.

UNITY AMID DIVERSITY: INTERPRETING THE BOOK OF REVELATION IN THE CHURCH OF GOD (ANDERSON)¹

by

John E. Stanley

Introduction

Since its inception in 1880-1881, the ecclesiology of the Church of God, its doctrine and experience of the church, has determined its eschatology. This fact, and the calls of Joseph Coleson and Stanley Walters to exploration of the significance of apocalyptic literature to the establishment and development of holiness traditions, prompt the present study.²

The church-historical method of interpreting the Biblical books of Daniel and Revelation provided the pioneers of the movement which would come to be known as the Church of God (Anderson) with a Biblical foundation for their self-understanding as God's called out people in the final era of church history. According to this exegetical method, Daniel and Revelation present prophetic symbols which outline and predict God's plan for history. They are believed to declare God's periodic judgments against the pagan, papal, and Protestant religious systems, and to predict and describe the emergence of the pure church of God in 1880.

But this approach to the books of Daniel and Revelation did not originate entirely with the Church of God Reformation Movement. John V. W. Smith and Melvin Dieter have shown that early Church of God leaders had become well-acquainted with Adventist interpretations of apocalyptic literature, especially with the work of Uriah Smith, and had forged their views in the heat of debate, explicit and implicit, with that tradition, and that the debate had not been "all or none."³ Affinities developed along with the disagreements.

Among the debaters, D. S. Warner, initiator of the Church of God movement, and F. G. Smith, long-lived missionary, pastor, and writer within it, especially, established the church-historical approach to the book of Revela-

tion as authoritative for their fellow believers. And it was to hold its place almost unquestioned until the mid1920's.

This paper will explore the influence of Uriah Smith's work on that of Warner and F. G. Smith and then turn to show that from the mid1920's to the mid1940's a transition occurred in the understanding of what it means to be "church," which, in turn, opened the possibilities for diverse eschatologies. The churchhistorical approach to Daniel and Revelation yielded to other exegetical methods, or at least it lost its place as normative, under the influence of the broader scholarship of Russell Byrum, Otto F. Lian, and Adam Miller. More narrowly stated, this paper will make the point that, for the Church of God (Anderson), the vision and experience of the church has shaped the interpretation of the book of Revelation, rather than the obverse, that the interpretation of the book of Revelation has shaped the vision and experience of the church.

In some sense, my personal pilgrimage recapitulates the development chronicled here. In March, 1959, a month after my conversion, I attended a series of presentations entitled "Prophetic Lectures on Daniel and Revelation," and found myself questioning the lecturer's interpretations of history and his parochialism regarding other churches, though I did appreciate his conviction that the Church of God is central to God's eternal purpose. Then, in the early 1970's, as a pastor to a Church of God congregation in Maryland, I had to work with the perplexities of a group who, on the one hand, increasingly cooperated with other churches but who, on the other hand, in accepting the church historical interpretation of Revelation, had taken the sense of destiny which it engendered in an exclusivist way. Robert Reardon, a leader in the Church of God, writing of the movement as a whole at the end of the 1970's, described our early experience.

... the collapse of "last reformationism" which began to appear among us in the twenties and thirties left a central theological vacuum, an identity crisis, which cannot be underestimated in the traumatic effect it has had on the movement.⁴

In some ways, this paper points to the remediation of the situation which Reardon describes. It attempts to show that the experiencing of a sense of spiritual-ecclesiastical unity among the leadership of the Church of God has, along the way, opened an alternative to the "central theological vacuum" in the acceptance of doctrinal diversity.

I. Church of God: Adventist Parallels: 1880-1908

The story is best told by going back to the earliest days of the Church of God Movement and looking at one of its major theological taproots, its understanding of the Biblical books of Daniel and Revelation. And from the beginning, we must reckon with the significant similarities between the earliest Church of God interpretations of these books and those of the Seventh-Day Adventists. Most important in this reckoning is the work of the Seventh-Day Adventist editor, Uriah Smith, and his influence on the Church of God's Daniel S. Warner and F. G. Smith.

Uriah Smith served for more than fifty years as editor of *Review and Herald*, principal publication of the Seventh-Day Adventists, and for much of that time also taught a Sabbath School class on Daniel and Revelation

which had been established by James White, husband of Ellen White, mother of Seventh-Day Adventism.

It was in the discharge of this second responsibility that Uriah Smith collected a personal library of more than one hundred commentaries on Daniel and Revelation and wrote four books: *Thoughts, Critical and Practical on the Book of Daniel* (1873),⁵ *The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing* (1877),⁶ *Thoughts, Critical and Practical on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation* (1882)⁷ and *Daniel and Revelation* (1897)⁸ Smith's books were to form, according to his biographer; Eugene Durand, "the standard Adventist position except for a few details."⁹

Smith developed three interpretive principles and an instructional method which were to have wide effect. First, he insisted on the idea that "a day equals a year" in Bible prophecy. This made possible a very specific interpretation of Daniel 8:14, a text critical to Adventist understandings of history. It speaks of the "cleansing of the sanctuary" after a period of 2300 days. Earlier Adventists had used this passage to predict 1844 as the date for Christ's Second Coming. Smith set about to analyze the calculations and scriptures behind that earlier prediction. He concluded that the calculations pointing to 1844 were correct but that the earlier understanding of what was supposed to happen in that year had been incorrect.

Here entered his second interpretive principle: the baseline year, as it were, for the interpretation of the books of Daniel and Revelation is the year 457 B.C., the year in which the Jews began the rebuilding of the Temple under the leadership of Ezra. From this baseline, Uriah Smith calculated the 490 Sabbath years of Daniel 9:24-27 to have ended in A.D. 34. Then, subtracting those 490 years from the 2300 day/years of Daniel 8:14, he came to the year 1810, to which he added the 34 years beyond the birth of Christ to which the 490 Sabbath years had brought him, and arrived at the year 1844. Working with the 1290 days of Daniel 12:11 and the 1260 days of Revelation 12:6, he came to supporting conclusions. But, said Smith, we should understand 1844 not as the year for the return of Christ but as the year which "marked the commencement of the work of cleansing the sanctuary."¹⁰ And, rather than understanding the "sanctuary" as the (holy) land, or the land of Canaan, or the church, said Smith, we should understand it to be the heavenly temple or sanctuary, in which are recorded all human deeds.¹¹

Smith's calculations led him to divide church history into three periods: pagan Roman, from A.D. 31 to 538; papal Roman, from 538 to 1798; and Protestant, since 1798.¹² Here was his third hermeneutical principle.

Smith's instructional method arose in part from the fact that he was a talented artist. As early as November, 1854, he was producing and printing woodcuts of the beasts from Daniel and Revelation.¹³ He also preserved and interpreted the prophetic charts used by earlier Adventists and made diagrams of his own understanding of history.¹⁴ The charts and diagrams were, of course, based on church historical exegesis of the two books.

Neither Uriah Smith's principles for interpretation nor the interpretations themselves were necessarily original, but they were influential. And among those influenced by them were D. S. Warner and other Church of God pioneers. By 1908, Church of God writers had developed three affinities with Smith's work. First, they accepted Smith's day/year system of historical interpretation of Daniel and Revelation. Second, they accepted Smith's divi-

sion of history into three periods: pagan, papal, Protestant, and added their own, that of the "evening light." And third, they developed and used graphics, such as diagrams and charts, to explain the symbolism of the two books and to advance their teaching.

John W. V. Smith has argued that the affinities developed on the basis of later Adventist teachings;¹⁵ Melvin Dieter more specifically dates the entry of Adventist ideas into Warner's purview as occurring between 1880 and 1897.¹⁶ But contrary to either of these, Warner's own journal indicates that he was aware of Adventist teachings as early as 1874. On November 21 of that year, Warner attended a lecture by a Mr. Boyd, who spoke "on the beasts, heads and horns as is usual for the Adventists." He then met with "Brothers Figard and Osburn" to arrange a debate with Boyd. Boyd agreed, and a debate was set for November, 2425. Warner devoted November 23 to preparation for the debate, spending much of the time deepening his understanding of Boyd's position.¹⁷ We also know that on December 27, 1874, Warner mentions meeting another Adventist, a Mr. Kenestron.¹⁸ And given the facts that Battle Creek, Michigan, was the Seventh-Day Adventist center, and Warner traveled continually and extensively in northern Ohio, northern Indiana, and southern Michigan, it is highly likely that Warner knew Adventist teachings quite well.

Most telling is Warner's own copy of Uriah Smith's *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation*, which is preserved, with the rest of his library, in the Church of God archives at Anderson University. Warner's marginal notes and markings and a full page of manuscript commentary inserted into the book, all at the point of Smith's exposition of the cleansing of the sanctuary (Daniel 89), indicate a vigorous interaction between author and reader.¹⁹ Especially important is Warner's having written the word "church" in the margin precisely at the place at which Smith interprets the "sanctuary" as heavenly temple.²⁰

By the time of his death, on December 12, 1895, Warner had written some 400 pages of reply to Smith's "disgusting theory."²¹ This reply was completed by H. M. Riggle and published in 1903 under the title *The Cleansing of the Sanctuary or the Church of God in Type and Antitype, and in Prophecy and Revelation*.²² And in addition to the book, Warner and others wrote a number of other critiques of Adventist theory in the Church of God's Gospel Trumpet in the years from 1880 to 1908.²³ It seems clear that the Church of God and the Seventh Day Adventists were competitors, especially in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, and especially for persons intrigued by eschatology. They knew each the other's position well. And so it is that Church of God writers, D. S. Warner being the first among them, developed affinities with Adventist thought, but they usually constructed doctrinal edifices very different from those built by the Seventh-Day Adventists.

Warner clearly shows the affinities with Adventism which we listed earlier. He adopted the day/year system in the interpretation of prophecy and accepted some of Uriah Smith's temporal calculation in interpreting the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14; he disagreed with Smith only at the point of insisting that the 2300 brought us to 1880 and the establishment of the true Church of God, rather than to 1844 and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. And Warner accepted Smith's division of history into pagan, papal, and Protestant periods, but Warner added a fourth age, that of the evening light, which

began in 1880.²⁴ Warner got his notion of the evening light from his understanding of Zechariah 14:7. He took it to refer to the radiance of God's now-revealed pure church as contrasted with the cloudy light which had shone, more or less, between 1530 and 1880. He took to graphic representations of his own ideas; in fact, a number of them strongly resembled Uriah Smith's older ones.²⁵

The principal disagreement between Uriah Smith and D. S. Warner lies at the point of interpreting the lamb-like beast of Revelation 13:11-19. Earliest Adventism had believed it to represent their Saturday Sabbath; Smith had deliberately opposed this view and saw it as symbolic of the United States of America; Warner believed that it symbolized Protestantism.²⁶

The principal element which the Church of God writers built into their understanding of Bible prophecy which made it different from the Adventist teaching was the insistence on exclusivity. The Church of God understood the prophecy of the "cleansing of the sanctuary" to refer to God's work in purifying and reforming the church of and from denominationalism, "sectism."²⁷ It had gone into bondage in Babylon and become confused and contaminated, and now, in 1880, God began to call and gather believers out from the bondage in Babylon into holiness and unity in the emerging Church of God. Following Uriah Smith's interpretation, Church of God writers understood the "Babylon" of Revelation 14:8 and 18:2 to be the confused religions of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.²⁸ Then, appealing to Revelation 18:4, they called persons out of both personal sin and the Babylon of sectarianism/denominationalism. Here, they both approved and disapproved of the Holiness Movement. They applauded its emphasis on holiness of heart and life but they criticized very sharply its failure to call people out of the established denominations, corrupted by Babylonian captivity, into true Christian unity.²⁹ "God's church is exclusive," Warner declared.³⁰

Dieter is thus quite correct in placing Warner, and by implication other early Church of God writers and preachers, among the radical "comeouters" of the Holiness Movement,³¹ and Andrew Byers quite aptly characterizes Warner's ministry in the very title of his book on the topic: *The Birth of a Reformation*.³² The emergence of the Church of God marked a "new epoch," as Byers and others saw it.³³

This sense of divine destiny, with its characteristic exclusivism finds succinct expression in a paragraph from E. E. Byrum, second editor of the *Gospel Trumpet*:

Many think they belong to the best denomination on earth and perhaps they do belong to as good as any, but it is far from being the genuine true Church of God. Praise the Lord the evening light is now shining forth in the glorious splendor of the God's true church.³⁴

Here were people who were convinced, as John W. V. Smith says, "that they were participants in the fulfillment of a segment of divine destiny for humanity"³⁵ This conviction, in fact, was one of the four primary articles of faith which motivated the Church of God pioneers. And it was held in the context of an understanding that theirs was a reformation movement within Christianity, a reformation, not a novelty.

But there is irony here, for while Warner's original vision (and that of the other pioneers in the Church of God) had been one which included all born-again persons, the very call to come out of the Babylon of sectism was a call to come into the Church of God Reformation Movement. And this nourished a grassroots exclusivism. Competition with other holiness groups only exacerbated the irony. The reforming ideal was holiness and the unity of all believers. But the very implementation of the ideal often sowed the seeds of separation and exclusiveness.

Church of God Reformation Movement preachers and people based their insistent call to join them on the church historical interpretation of Daniel and Revelation. They had turned to these Biblical books to "project the date for a new, and final, reform of the church...." And they found there a Biblical foundation for their self-understanding as God's called-out people in the final era of church history, for their calculations convinced them that Bible prophecy declared that the great reform was to come "at the approximated time of the beginning of the movement in which they were involved."³⁶

II. The Role of F. G. Smith in Establishing Church of God Teaching

It was F. G. Smith, preacher, missionary, writer, editor, and executive who firmly established the church historical interpretation of Daniel and Revelation among the Church of God. Smith began his ministry in 1898, served as a missionary in Syria, edited the *Gospel Trumpet* from 1916 to 1930, served as a pastor in Ohio for seventeen years, and returned to Anderson, Indiana, as President of the Gospel Trumpet Company from 1946 until his death in 1947.

Smith's wide influence on the theology of the Church of God is indicated by Robert Reardon: one man, more, perhaps than any other, gave a strong skeletal structure to our faith and practice. His name: F. G. Smith."³⁷ John W V. Smith, reflecting within a narrower range, says that F. G. Smith was "the chief authority and spokesperson for the church-historical interpretation of prophecy applied to the Church of God."³⁸ Referring more narrowly still to F. G. Smith's interpretation of the book of Revelation, John W V. Smith says, It was his very capable work on the subject which made this interpretation standard and identified it as crucial to the movement's existence."³⁹ One's own personal experience bears out the accuracy of this evaluation.

F. G. Smith was a scholar in the era before the Church of God had colleges and other opportunities for the formal education of its ministry. but he read widely and was helped along by what John W V. Smith reported to be a photographic memory. For instance, in his sermon, "The Millennial Dream," he quotes Plato, Aristotle, Vergil, several of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and Eusebius; and the church historians Neander, Mosheim, Gregory and Ruter, and Waddington.⁴⁰ And elsewhere, he draws upon a thorough reading of Adam Clarke.⁴¹ In the preface to *The Revelation Explained*, he describes his research method:

I have availed myself of all the helps and commentaries within my reach in the study of this important subject. However, I have seldom referred to the opinions of expositors.⁴²

F. G. Smith's major works include *The Revelation Explained* (1908),⁴³ *What the Bible Teaches* (1~4),⁴⁴ *The Last Reformation* (1919),⁴⁵ and *Prophetic*

Lectures on Daniel and Revelation (1941).⁴⁶ In addition to these and other books, he wrote regularly for *The Gospel Trumpet* during his tenure as editor (1916-1930).

But, in spite of his influence, or perhaps because of it, F. G. Smith's teachings did not go unchallenged, especially not after the publication of *The Last Reformation* in 1919. As some Church of God ministers and congregations came to involve themselves with Christians in other denominations, they came to feel uneasy about the exclusivism implied in the church-historical interpretation of Revelation and its bearing on ecclesiology, especially in the form in which F. G. Smith presented it. By the 1920's and 1980's, some, who had become aware of the affinities between the church-historical interpretation and Seventh-Day Adventism, wondered if Smith were not teaching something too near to the convictions of the Adventist tradition. In fact, the suspicion lingers that Smith simply substituted Church of God dates into the Adventist system, though comparison of his work with that of Uriah Smith clearly allays that suspicion.

Still, there are parallels between the works of F. G. Smith and Uriah Smith. These may be explained by coincidence, that both authors arrived at the same conclusions independently; or by reference to a source or sources drawn upon in common by both Smiths; or by acknowledgment of indebtedness, conscious or unconscious. The evidence seems to point to the third explanation as the most likely. F. G. Smith knew and utilized the work of Uriah Smith.

Six major similarities to the thought of Uriah Smith appear in the writings of F. G. Smith.

First, both Uriah Smith and F. G. Smith use the church-historical method of interpreting Daniel and Revelation, and both employ the "a day equals a year" principle. Moreover, both divide history into distinct periods, basing their Systems on the 2300 years of Daniel 8:14, though F. G. Smith amends the termination dates calculated by Uriah Smith and adds a fourth period to Uriah Smith's three.⁴⁷ The Adventist Smith had posited a pagan Roman period running from A.D. 31 to 538; the Church of God Smith had altered it to the year A.D. 1 to 270. The Adventist Smith's papal Roman period ran from 538 to 1798; the Church of God Smith's ran from 270 to 1530. Uriah Smith believed that the age of apostate Protestantism had come in 1798; F. G. Smith believed that the age of the "cloudy light" of Protestantism had run its course by 1880 and that in that year we had entered the age of the "evening light," the fourth age.

The second area of ideas in which one finds parallels (and differences) between Uriah Smith's work and that of F. G. Smith is that of their interpretations of the Biblical symbol, Babylon. Both turn to Revelation 16:19 and interpret "Babylon" there as being composed of three parts: paganism, Catholicism, and Protestantism. Their single difference at this point lies in F. G. Smith's preference for the word "heathenism" in place of Uriah Smith's consistent use of "paganism."⁴⁸

The third area of similarity between the writings of the two Smiths lies in their understanding of the six seals of Revelation 6. Only on the meaning of the last of the six do they differ significantly, though in writing of the meaning of the fifth seal, F. G. Smith is more specific concerning the Protestant reformers than is Uriah Smith. The closest parallel between the two

writers comes in the description of the rider upon the pale horse in Revelation 6:8, where both simply paraphrase (F. G. Smith with a single clause of commentary) the Biblical text.⁴⁹ With regard to the five seals on the meaning of which there is essential agreement, there seems to be little direct quotation, or even close paraphrase of Uriah Smith by F. G. Smith though the ideological parallels are quite clear.

In the fourth instance of similarity, there is some evidence of both Smiths having borrowed from a third source at one point, but otherwise, Adventist Smith seems to have served as the basic source for the work of Church of God Smith. The latter attaches the same interpretation to the trumpets as the former, in two instances using almost identical language; and the latter refers to the same secondary sources as the former. So, for both,

the first trumpet symbolizes the decline of Rome's western Empire,
the second trumpet symbolizes the Vandals (and both Smiths cite Gibbon, with specific reference to the Vandal chief Genseric);
the third trumpet symbolizes Attila and the Huns;
the fourth trumpet symbolizes the collapse of imperial government (and both refer to the role of Odoacer, with Uriah Smith acknowledging his source);
the fifth trumpet symbolizes Mohammed; and
the sixth trumpet symbolizes the Turks and the Ottoman Empire (though they differ on the dates of the decay of the Ottoman Empire).⁵⁰

As a sort of parenthesis, we might use the similarity in the two Smiths' treatments of the third trumpet as an example of the complexity involved in determining F. G. Smith's sources. He writes, as if it were his own line: "It was the boast of Attila that the grass never grew on the spot which his horse had trod."⁵¹ The same sentence appears in Uriah Smith's work, in an attributed seven line quotation from an otherwise unknown writer named Keith.⁵² Further, F. G. Smith introduces the line with words similar to those of Uriah Smith's (and Keith's) though he moves away from it in a way very different from that of Uriah Smith. Clearly, F. G. Smith has borrowed. But from whom? From Uriah Smith? From "Keith"? Of course, even to attribute the sentence to Keith is somewhat misleading. The quotation originally comes from Gibbon (*Decline and Fall* vol I, ch. 35), who says it is a saying, but does not cite its source. The weight of evidence would seem to tip the scales in favor of concluding that F. G. Smith borrowed rather directly from Uriah Smith in this case, but it is not really conclusive.

A fifth instance of similarity between the understandings of F. G. Smith and Uriah Smith may be seen in the two authors' understanding of the meaning of the leopard beast of Daniel 7:6 and Revelation 13:1-10. Both say that it represents the papacy and the papal period of history. And further analysis shows that F. G. Smith quoted quite directly from Uriah Smith in the development of his commentary on the matter, but without naming him. (He only calls him a "certain expositor.")⁵³ But from whence came Uriah Smith's understanding? The Adventist Smith was usually rather careful to let the reader know when he was quoting directly and there is no such indication

in this case, so we may conclude that F. G. Smith worked directly with Uriah Smith's work and not with some third source common to them both.

A sixth instance of similarity between the works of the Adventist Uriah Smith and the Church of God's F. G. Smith may be seen in F. G. Smith's occasional reliance upon Uriah Smith's earlier charts and diagrams.⁵⁴

It is of interest to note that in his later work, *Prophetic Lectures on Daniel and Revelation* (1941), in which F. G. Smith returns to analyze the relationship of the little horn of Daniel 7 to the beast of Revelation 13:1-10, he essentially recaps what he had written in *The Revelation*

Explained (1908), but this time finds nine similarities between the two beasts (instead of the earlier six, five of which he took verbatim from the Adventist Smith), and this time he omits the direct quotation from the "certain expositor," Uriah Smith.⁵⁵ Why the change? Was it incidental or was F. G. Smith somehow responding in this way to criticism that he had relied too heavily upon the Adventist point of view?

Whatever may be the answer in this case, so obvious and heavy was F. G. Smith's use of the work of Uriah Smith that some said (and even yet some say) that F. G. Smith's system was essentially that of Uriah Smith, with some changing of dates. But the fact is, there are basic differences between their systems.

First, as we have seen, they disagreed on the internal chronology of the 2300 years. They aligned their historical epochs differently. Especially important is their difference regarding the great prophetic year at the end of the 2300.⁵⁶ For Uriah, it marked the beginning of the work of atonement in heaven; for F. G., it denoted the dawn of the Church of God as the final reformation. And from this difference arise very important divergences regarding the sanctuary, its cleansing, and the atonement.

Second, they differed significantly in their interpretations of the two-horned beast of Revelation 13:11-18. For Uriah Smith, it "symbolizes a government which is Protestant in religion, or which at least is a non-Catholic power.... The United States is a Protestant nation, and meets the requirements of the prophecy admirably in this respect."⁵⁷ For F. G. Smith, the beast symbolized Protestantism itself, as it developed after the Augsburg Confession (1530). In this way, F. G. Smith retains a thoroughly religious understanding of history, one which does not entangle itself with political developments as Uriah Smith's does.

Third, and this is a weighty difference, the two Smiths disagree in their interpretations of the seven bowls of Revelation 16:1-21. Uriah Smith locates the pouring out of the vials in the future. F. G. Smith believed that the first five were poured out between the years 1765 and 1870. The sixth bowl, he believed, represented the downfall of Babylon and was being poured out in the age of the restored church. The seventh bowl will be emptied at the final judgment.⁵⁸

These differences demonstrate the fact that whatever may be their similarities in method, the obvious congruities in the treatments of certain Biblical passages and symbols, and even the verbatim parallels in their commentaries, the two Smiths articulated diverse theologies. And governing those diverse theologies were diverse principles as well. Eschatology served as the governing category for Uriah Smith's theology while ecclesiology served that function for F. G. Smith's theology. Or, to put it in terms of F. G. Smith's

theology only, ecclesiology governed eschatology. His experience of the church dominated F. G. Smith's eschatology. Consequently, he saw his eschatology as serving the Church of God. He employed it to calculate the date of birth of the church which he loved and served.

In profound ways, the ecclesiastical and ecclesiological commitments of both Smiths shaped their respective exegeses. They read Daniel and Revelation through presuppositional lenses. That is to say, they understood the symbols in those books to explain the significance of their own faith communities.

Contemporary critics of such perspectives might recall David Kelsey's analysis of the use of Scripture by contemporary theologians. Kelsey shows that the "imaginative acts" or prior commitments of those theologians have very much to do with the ways in which they use and interpret Scripture.⁵⁹

F. G. Smith articulated his interpretation of Revelation in such a way that it became the standard, and almost institutionalized and official, point of view with respect to the book in the Church of God. That it did not finally reach official status is a consequence of the development of new forces and interests in the 1920's and of the teaching methods and points of view of Russell Byrum, Otto F. Linn, and Adam Millerto whom we now turn.

III. The Transition to Diversity in Eschatological and Ecclesiological Understandings

Between 1920 and 1943, the Church of God underwent transition in its interpretation of the book of Revelation. Russell Byrum, Otto F. Linn, and Adam Miller led the church to recognize the acceptability of interpretations other than that provided by the church-historical method of D. S. Warner and F. G. Smith. And hand in hand with the transition in eschatological understanding went a transition in understanding the nature of the church.

F. G. Smith faced opposition to his point of view no sooner than he published it in *The Last Reformation*, in 1919. Among others, John Morrison, Principal of Anderson Bible Training School, "openly told F. G. Smith he did not agree with the positions set forth [in that book]."⁶⁰ But Smith was not to be deterred from his plan to make his teaching official within the Church of God. In 1924, he urged the General Ministerial Assembly to establish the literature then published by the Church of God as its standard literature.⁶¹ In the opinion (and words) of Reardon,

as Smith looked around he was aware that his foundational work, *Revelation Explained*, upon which he built the whole rationale for the last reformation, was being discreetly undermined by a new brand of scholars whose views on prophetic literature did not match his own.⁶²

So he sought the path of official endorsement of his views as definitive.

His strategy failed, but not because his perception was erroneous. Winds of change were blowing across both the practices and the literature of the Church of God. In some quarters, especially, cooperation with other churches was replacing exclusivism.

Typical of the expressions of change (and a-typical of traditional fare) was a sermon preached by Marcel Desgalier at the 1928 Anderson Camp Meeting. Desgalier testified to having been deeply moved in a Methodist Church in Baltimore, and went on to refer positively to Henry Ward Beecher,

Francis Xavier, John Calvin, Martin Luther, and Charles Finney "sectarians" all.⁶³ And while Desgalier was expressing positive appreciation for persons representative of "sectism," the Board of Sunday Schools and Religious Education, which had been organized in 1923, had begun looking toward cooperation with the International Council of Religious Education. By 1930, it was sending a representative, Bessie (Mrs. Russell R.) Byrum, to the Convention of the Council, held in Toronto that year. The Convention was, of course, a cooperative interchurch event, so it is indicative of changes in perspective among the leadership of the Church of God that Ms. Byrum's quite positive report on it appeared in the August 21, 1930, number of the *Gospel Trumpet*.⁶⁴ In effect, her column was an unofficial endorsement of the Convention by the Gospel Trumpet company.

Change came to other areas in the Church of God as well, opening the way to new questions and new responses regarding the nature of the church and interchurch relationships. In 1928, Anderson Bible School and Seminary began to offer a liberal arts education, and in the following year it changed its name to Anderson College and Theological Seminary. And from 1922, the General Ministerial Assembly began to establish boards and committees intended to organize the work of the Church on a movement-wide scale, but not (this was almost always made explicit) to organize the Church itself. The most important of these, with the dates of their establishment, were the Board of Church Extension and Home Missions (1922); the Executive Council (1931), which was founded as an agency for carrying out any administrative tasks necessary to the wellbeing of the movement between assemblies; and the National Women's Home and Foreign Missionary Society (1932).

In this period of organization, the Church of God also experienced its highest rate of growth, which brought it to the period surrounding its Golden Jubilee reflecting on its past, pondering the very significant changes in its present, and looking toward a bright future.⁶⁵

Movement into that future seemed to many to require a transition from what seemed to them a brittle, exclusivist theology to one more inclusive and tolerant of differences. Most of those calling for change believed that the greatest ideological obstacle to such change as was needed was the church-historical interpretation of the book of Revelation. As Russell Byrum put it some forty years later:

After a preacher preached on Sunday evening that the other churches are "harlot" churches, he could not be very consistent in meeting the pastors of those churches in the city ministers' meetings in fellowship. Times had changed in this respect, and with our strong emphasis on Christian unity we needed to adjust. Our teaching on Revelation had become a practical matter.⁶⁶

Byrum's background had not suggested that he would be at the center of the storm of transition. His parents left the United Brethren Church in 1886 to help found Praise Chapel, New Pittsburgh, Indiana, and one of his earlier recollections related to the Church of God was reading the announcement of the death of D. S. Warner in the *Gospel Trumpet* in December, 1895. Byrum's father built the *Gospel Trumpet* homes in Moundsville, West Virginia, and in Anderson, Indiana, as well as the first auditorium on the Ander-

son Camp Grounds. Russell Bynim himself had helped to establish three congregations in West Virginia, and, in 1917, he had accepted the invitation to serve as Managing Editor of the Gospel Trumpet Company under the direction of F. G. Smith. Concurrently, he served as Assistant Principal of the then-new Anderson Bible Training School, and as teacher of Bible and theology there. His wife, Bessie, also served on the faculty of the Bible Training School teaching church history. Russell Byrum's claim to being a true child of the earliest period of the "evening light" movement was at least as strong as that of F. G. Smith.⁶⁷

And, in fact, early on in his career, Byrum approached his work from a quite conventional, traditional Church of God point of view. His *Christian Theology*, published in 1925,⁶⁸ follows a church-historical method in interpreting the book of Revelation, including reference to the Church of God as the restoration of the evening light of Zechariah 14:6-7.⁶⁹ He referred readers who desired more information on the place of the church in Biblical prophecy to "an able treatment of the subject, *The Last Reformation*, by F. G. Smith."⁷⁰ *Scripture Readings and Sermon Outlines*, compiled and edited by Byrum, and published in 1928,⁷¹ contains two sermons by H. M. Riggle which quite clearly follow the church-historical method of interpretation: "The Church in Prophecy and Revelation" and "The Church in the Gospel Day." Another sermon, "The Fall of Babylon," follows the same hermeneutical path as those of Riggle.

So it is that Byrum's earlier work as writer and editor, much of it done as Managing Editor of the Gospel Trumpet Company, of which F. G. Smith was Editor, attests his fidelity to the traditionally received church-historical method of interpretation.

But already in 1926, the year following the publication of his *Christian Theology*, he began to express publicly some uneasiness concerning the traditional hermeneutic. In that year and the following, Byrum taught "Introduction to the New Testament" at Anderson Bible Training School, and his teaching ignited the fuse of controversy. Forty-five years later, he recalled making certain decisions about teaching the book of Revelation in that course:

I decided to be honest with the students, and yet be as mild as possible. After giving the History of the Various Methods of Interpretation, I showed how the "year for a day" teaching in the post-reformation period had made the "beast" the Roman Catholic Church and how other Protestant churches had worked out the 1260 days to show the beginning of their respective churches and how D. S. Warner had made the year 1880 a prophetic year. Then I stated that we had no proof that the year for a day method had any real support in the Bible. Then I read a few pages to the class from "Syllabus for New Testament Study" by A. T. Robertson, professor of New Testament at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.⁷²

John Morrison, Principal of the Bible Training School, and later President of Anderson College, described Byrum's teaching method.

He used Dr. Smith's book, *The Revelation Explained*, in his classes, but he did not feel obliged to defend the book's thesis. Nor did he oppose it. He merely presented different views of a

given aspect of the subject and then encouraged the students to make up their own minds as to the truth. As teaching, the method was excellent.⁷³

But as apologetic or as polemic it was useless, and some pastors and other leaders objected to it. C. E. Byers, pastor in Springfield, Ohio, led the defense of the church-historical method and posed the issue to Byrum in a letter dated February 3, 1928.

I have been informed by some of the good brethren who are very close to the school, that in your teachings you infer that the Church of God has been wrong in her teachings on the church questions and the Brothers Smith and Riggle and other writers can no longer be depended upon and that their books are not to be considered as authoritative but that you refer to other men's writings in Protestantism as being authoritative.... I have your book on Christian Theology and prize it very highly. But I understand that you have changed your mind on a number of topics in the past two years.⁷⁴

Byrum had already written Byers on February 2. The two letters probably crossed in the mail. In Christian love, Byrum assured Byers that he (still) believed what he had written in *Christian Theology* concerning the church, reformation and future punishment. And responding to Byers' letter of February 3, Byrum added a postscript:

As to my having changed my mind on any points concerning the church since I wrote the theology, I do not know of a single point on which I have done so. That book ought to be taken as my present teaching.⁷⁵

At issue then was not the question of Byrum's agreement with the church-historical method of interpretation but the question of his right to present and explain other views, as he had done.

The controversy smoldered until June, 1929, when a committee of twenty-eight Church of God ministers listened as Byrum presented his case and then voted to vindicate him. As Byrum himself put it, "The judges agreed in my favor."⁷⁶

However, the trustees of the Bible Training School, now newly renamed Anderson College, produced a creed which they asked all faculty members to sign. Byrum refused to sign because, as he later said, "I saw this would limit our thinking, and the purpose of the school was to learn to think."

Still, Byrum sought to maintain the unity of the church. He "arose and said, 'This whole trouble is because of me, and a simple solution is for me to resign from my teaching work.'"⁷⁷ The trustees accepted his resignation and Byrum went into the building business. The trustees then withdrew their demand that the faculty sign the creed.⁷⁸

John W. V. Smith's analysis of the significance of this episode interprets it as a return to an earlier principle.

[It affirmed the church's] original stance of openness to truth by rejecting the principle of demanding adherence to what had been written in the "standard" literature. The Byrum "trial" came close to snapping the lid shut, but the judges exonerated him of teach-

ing "heresy," even though his views were at variance with previous interpretation.⁷⁹

Byrum, reflecting back on the events of 1929 from the vantage point of 1973, reiterated the principle laid down, with great personal pain and at great personal cost, at the earlier date.

At this point it might be well to consider the basic question: Is it necessary that a church group all see and teach alike on all matters of doctrine and practice?... We humans do not see alike because we do not know alike and never can on all matters. But we can learn to love each other enough that we appreciate the other person's sincerity in thinking as he can.... We must allow a "conservative" and a "liberal" wing in the church, for individual progressives and those not so. But love will help us to be respectful and considerate toward those who see differently.⁸⁰

In June, 1930, F. G. Smith's term as Editor for the Gospel Trumpet Company expired. The Publications Board, taking into account the fact that Smith's interpretation of the book of Revelation had become a center of controversy, invited Charles E. Brown, a moderate in the debate, to succeed him as Editor. Brown accepted the invitation and would serve in that post until 1951.

The departures of Byrum and Smith from Anderson College and the Gospel Trumpet Company in 1929 and 1930, respectively, marked a transition. Implicit within their leaving were the seeds which would blossom into an acceptance of diverse eschatologies in the Church of God. But even as late as 1930, no one had yet articulated a clear alternative to the church historical method of interpretation. It remained for Otto F. Linn, almost unwittingly; certainly unexpectedly, to rise to that challenge.

Otto Linn, a native of Oklahoma, was, like Russell Byrum and F. G. Smith, a child of the Church of God Reformation Movement. Intellectually, he was immersed in the church-historical understanding of Bible prophecy. He entitled his Master of Arts thesis (1980) at Enid Seminary, "The Apocalyptic Enemies of Christ,"⁸¹ and identified those enemies as paganism, the papacy and Protestantism. These had opposed both Christ and the true church. He concluded:

... in the onward march of history we have come to a date when this third false system [i.e., Protestantism] is being judged, and God is calling his people back to the simplicity and purity of the early church.⁸²

In 1935, Linn completed a Ph.D. in New Testament at the University of Chicago, the first Ph.D. earned by a Church of God scholar in Bible or theology. And later he served on the Advisory Committee for the translation that came to be known as the Revised Standard Version. In the meantime, between 1930 and 1942, Linn revised his views on the book of Revelation.

Linn's change of perspective came to light as he responded to a request from the Gospel Trumpet Company that he write a series of articles on New Testament books, which Warner Press planned to collect and publish as three short commentaries. Warner published the first two collections without any serious question: *Studies in the New Testament: The Gospels and Acts* (April,

1941),⁸³ and *Studies in the New Testament: Romans to Philemon* (April, 1942).⁸⁴ But the Press refused to publish the third, and last, volume: *Studies in the New Testament: Hebrews to Revelation*.⁸⁵ In the opinion of Editor C. E. Brown and former Editor F. G. Smith, it "presented a variant view of interpreting the Book of Revelation."⁸⁶ "Variant" meant "unacceptable" to some, but only "different" to others. So, while Warner Press refused to publish the book, it was given to an independent publisher, the Commercial Service Company, and printed.

In what ways was Linn's view "variant"?

After noting, in the preface to volume three, that many ministers had urged him to write on the book of Revelation,⁸⁷ Linn expresses some tentativeness concerning the project.

Since there is a great deal of controversy centered around the interpretation of many of the symbols of this difficult book, the author submits this writing with reserve. It is hoped that those who differ with him 'will have as tolerant an attitude as the writer has toward their differences.⁸⁸

Linn's "reserve" was well-taken. Rather than following the church-historical method, Linn took a preterist or historical critical approach. Concerning the 1260 days of Revelation 11:3, Linn rejected the dating systems of the Seventh-Day Adventist and earlier Church of God writers.⁸⁹ Instead, he rooted John's message in the first century and contended that "this fiery prophet was not passing dispassionately over the life and death struggles [of that day] to meander through the divinely charted course of ages to come."⁹⁰ The leopard beast of Revelation 13:110 symbolized Emperor Domitian, and the lamblike beast of Revelation 13:11-18, Linn identified as the priests of the first-century emperor cults.⁹¹ Linn confronted the church-historical interpretation of Babylon directly and polemically: "By some queer method of reasoning some people have explained this profligate woman as the papacy and her daughters as the Protestant denominations."⁹² Instead, said Linn, Babylon "refers unmistakably to [imperial] Rome."⁹³

An analysis of Linn's seventy-three pages on the book of Revelation suggests that Linn was deliberately attacking the pillars of the church-historical approach. His treatment of the book of Revelation is polemical; his treatment of the other New Testament books more nearly devotional. He takes a strictly unwavering, hard-line, historical-critical/preterist approach to Revelation which contrasts noticeably with his treatment of the historical-critical issues found in other books e.g., such questions as the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, the use made of Paul's activities by the author of the Acts, and the composition of the Synoptic Gospels.

Many who had difficulties with the church-historical method found Linn's interpretation valuable, especially as it was grounded in modern Biblical scholarship; and some made him a "patron saint." Certainly his brief commentary on the book of Revelation became a watershed for Church of God Biblical interpretation, for which the church has come to owe him much.

What may not be properly appreciated is the overreaction involved in this episode, an overreaction of which Linn was both an expression and a source. It became fashionable for those who disagreed with the church-historical approach to praise the scholarship and abilities of Otto F. Linn

at the expenses of the exegetical and theological abilities of F. G. Smith, principal architect and advocate of the older method in the Church of God. Overlooked was the creativity of Smith's work in adapting earlier views to the unique character of the Church of God. Especially disparaged were Smith's lack of formal education, alleged lack of originality, and intransigence. But these charges usually came without due regard being given to Linn's corresponding doggedness and lack of originality in simply accepting, apparently uncritically, the exegetical method advocated by his teachers at the University of Chicago. Would Linn have been more conciliatory had he given himself time to internalize his learning before sharing it with the church?

But the story does not end with Linn and his followers on one side and F. G. Smith and C. E. Brown and their followers on the other. Although Warner Press did not publish Linn's studies on Revelation in 1942, they did publish Adam W Miller's *An Introduction to the New Testament*⁹⁴ in 1943 an act which shows how quickly an institution can legitimize a new idea.

Adam Miller grew up in Maryland and eventually served as a pastor in Baltimore. Later, he would be a missionary; then Secretary of the Missionary Board of the Church of God; and ultimately, the second dean of the Anderson School of Theology.

In 1916-17, at the age of twenty, Miller began attending public lectures sponsored by the Johns Hopkins University. Through these lectures, he learned of the diverse views on the composition of the Pentateuch and of emerging fundamentalism. In an interview in 1979, he recalled, "The debate gave me in my early years the feeling that one must approach Biblical and theological studies with an open mind."⁹⁵

Miller's master's thesis (1941) at Christian Theological Seminary was on the interpretation of apocalyptic literature, which practically guaranteed interest in it among his fellow-believers and a place on the shelves of the Anderson College library; However, Miller's prudence in the face of then-rising controversies concerning his interpretation of Revelation in the Church of God removed his thesis from circulation. Instead, he wrote his Introduction to the New Testament, which was published in 1943 in the heat of the responses to Linn's third volume.

Miller took an evenhanded approach. He identified and summarized six methods of interpreting the book of Revelation, including those of F. G. Smith and Otto Linn. And at the end of the chapter on Revelation, in his "Suggestions for Further Study," Miller guided readers to works by F. G. Smith, Otto Linn, Shirley Jackson Case, Ernest Finley Scott, R. H. Charles, and Gerhard Kittel.⁹⁶

Of course, Miller's bibliography did "stack the deck," as it were, against the church-historical method. And the Church of God, in publishing Miller's work, not only in 1943, but in re-publishing it in 1946, and again publishing it in a still-in-print revised edition in 1959, under the title *Brief Introduction to the New Testament*, committed itself to the historical-critical method as one more among several acceptable ways of interpreting Revelation. That method now took its place alongside the church-historical method taught by D. S. Warner and F. G. Smith, and several others, as an optional interpretive approach.⁹⁷

In 1926, some within the Church of God had chastised Russell R. Byrum for merely explaining an alternative to the church historical method of

interpretation. Less than twenty years later, at least five other methods were now added to the list of acceptable exegetical tools.

What had generated the change? In the first place, one must mention the importance of the original universal vision of D. S. Warner. However much the church-historical interpretation of Daniel-Revelation had created an exclusivism that obscured that vision, many pastors and leaders all along the way had experienced a unity of fellowship with Christians of other church groups that could not be gainsaid. And that experience squared quite well with Warner's vision. Second, people began to see that the principal stumbling-block to the experiencing of the unity which Warner had envisioned, the creator, in fact, of exclusivism, was the church-historical interpretation of Revelation. Third, academically prepared leaders, who were obviously also committed to the historic principles of the Church of God, enabled the church to accept other interpretations with increasing confidence in their utility and spiritual value. But all was not easy or settled yet in the mid 1940's.

IV. The Interpretation of Revelation in the Church of God Since 1943

Some hopeful reconciliations did occur in the mid 1940's. F. G. Smith and John A. Morrison healed their breach prior to Smith's death,⁹⁸ and Russell Byrum found H. M. Riggle to be a loyal friend and visitor.⁹⁹ But the words "uneasy truce" describe the situation best. Peace had not broken out. The Church of God affirmed diversity with respect to the interpretation of the book of Revelation but seemed uncomfortable with it. During the sixteen years that Harold Phillips served as editor of the *Gospel Trumpet/Vital Christianity* (the periodical changed its name during Phillips' tenure), few submitted anything relating to the interpretation of Revelation to him.¹⁰⁰

In fact, the truce was being enforced by a policy of silence, as the following story illustrates.

F. G. Smith's mantle had fallen on Lillie McCutcheon, pastor in Newton Falls, Ohio. She was widely recognized as having taken the lead in the Church of God in the continued advocacy of the church-historical interpretation. By 1964, she had finally published her book, *The Symbols Speak*,¹⁰¹ but did so under her own imprint, for Warner Press had refused to publish it.

On March 3, 1966, Ms. McCutcheon, responding to an invitation from Barry Callen, Robert Reinhart, and me, spoke in John W.V. Smith's class, "Church of God Backgrounds," at Anderson School of Theology. It was the first time that she had been invited to share her interpretation of Revelation at the Anderson institution or Warner Press, though she had been advocating the traditional interpretation for a number of years, to some considerable effect, and was everywhere recognized as the leader of those continuing to hold it.

That particular visit did serve to reopen discussion of the book of Revelation in a number of places. Ms. McCutcheon, speaking at ministers' meetings since, in which various leaders have presented various views of Revelation, has often said, "The Church of God is big enough for more than one view of Revelation."¹⁰²

Under the editorship of Arlo Newell, the editorial policy of Warner Press seems to be one of openness to the expression of diverse viewpoints within the church, especially in *Vital Christianity*. This periodical has, thus, printed articles representing differing interpretations of the book of Revelation.¹⁰³

In general, then, it may be said that the Church of God finally reached the point where various understandings of Revelation were tolerated in the 1940's; but it must also be said that only since 1966 has the church openly encouraged discussion between those of her members holding diverse views on the topic. Since then, several have taken opportunity to present at least selected aspects of their understandings of Revelation. Among these have been: Lillie McCutcheon, Marie Strong,¹⁰⁴ Samuel Hines, Gilbert Stafford, Kenneth Jones,¹⁰⁵ Gene Miller,¹⁰⁶ and I.¹⁰⁷

The renewed willingness to discuss the issues has emerged from the quest for unity, for the Church of God has recognized the need to affirm the desire for unity while admitting that there are differing theological emphases. Recent dialogues on Revelation relate to our experience of the church as a non-creedal fellowship which accepts diversity in doctrine while affirming unity in Christian experience.

An incident from 1985 illustrates this commitment to diversity which arises from the desire for unity.

In 1980, the organization, Women of the Church of God, published a Bible study on Revelation written by Marie Strong. Strong did not take a church-historical approach to interpretation and departed from the teaching of F. G. Smith. Consequently, some pastors urged Women of the Church of God not to distribute the study.

Doris Dale, Executive Secretary of Women of the Church of God, refused to be intimidated. She explained:

The confusion has occurred because more than one interpretation of Revelation is taught within the Church of God. The WCG does not promote Dr. Strong's teaching as the standard Church of God teaching; but as one of the valid interpretations within our movement.¹⁰⁸

Continuing, Dale verbalized the approach of the Church of God to scripture interpretation.

As a movement we have taught that the Spirit of God gives each believer the power to interpret scripture for himself/herself. Allowing each believer to interpret scriptures places the responsibility on the believers. .. we jealously guard the personal freedom to read and interpret as each of us see (sic) fit. This is a heritage taught by our early leaders and still valued.¹⁰⁹

In summary, the experience of the church has shaped the eschatology of the Church of God. The original church-historical interpretations of D. S. Warner and F. G. Smith complemented their experience of the church as an exclusive movement. As long as the pioneer views were the only legitimately recognized interpretations, Church of God doctrinal boundaries were clearly defined. But coincidental with a transition to a more inclusive understanding and experience of the church, Russell Byrum, Otto Linn, and Adam Miller supplied alternative interpretations of the book of Revelation which stretched the church's doctrinal boundaries and self-understanding. Since the late 1970's, the quest for internal unity has been accompanied by discussion between proponents of diverse views of Revelation. Doctrinal unity has been subordinated to a unity of Christian experience.

In an era in which other denominations, such as the Southern Baptists, are tightening their doctrinal statements and stifling theological freedom, the penchant for experiential unity has prevailed within the Church of God and taken it in quite another direction. Nowhere is this better seen than in the fact that, historically, in the Church of God, ecclesiology has shaped eschatological thinking, and in the ways in which that has transpired.

NOTES

1. This paper was written for the Wesleyan/Holiness Study Project, sponsored by Asbury Theological Seminary and founded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. The author wishes to express his gratitude to the Pew Trusts for their generosity and did interest in his work.

2. Joseph Coleson, "Toward a Wesleyan Understanding of Prophecy," *Kardia* 4 (1989), p.40, insists that "our holiness distinctives ought to inform our eschatology." He also encourages an exploration of the relationship between ecclesiology and eschatology within the Holiness

Movement. Stanley Walters, "The World Will End in 1919. Daniel among the Victorians," *Asbury Theological Journal* 44 (1989), p.44, notes that the history of the interpretation of Biblical apocalyptic "has yet to be fully documented." Also important as background to this paper is James Alan Patterson, "Changing Images of the Beast: Apocalyptic Conspiracy Theories in American History," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31(1988), pp.443-452. On nomenclature, cf. John Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia* 14 (1979), pp.120. Because early Church of God interpreters spoke of the church as the fulfillment of the eschatology of the book of Revelation, I will retain their term, though, as a Biblical exegete, I understand both Daniel and Revelation to be apocalyptic, not eschatological, literature.

3. Cf. John W.V. Smith, *The Quest for Holiness and Unity* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1980), pp.94-98; and Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1980), pp.283-284. Not being a professional historian, one hesitates to venture into the history of the Holiness and Adventist traditions. I wish to thank Susie C. Stanley, who is a church historian, for her counsel.

4. Robert Reardon, *The Early Morning Light* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1979, p.87.

5. Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical on the Book of Daniel* (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald Press, 1873). Hereinafter abbreviated as U. Smith, TCPD.

6. Uriah Smith, *The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1877). Hereinafter abbreviated as U. Smith, SC

7. Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical on the Book of Daniel and Revelation* (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Press, 1882). Hereinafter abbreviated as U. Smith, TCPDR.

8. Uriah Smith, *Daniel and Revelation* (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Press, 1897). Hereinafter abbreviated as U. Smith, DR.

9. Eugene Durand, *Yours in the Blessed Hope*. Uriah Smith (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Press, 1980), p.206.

10. U. Smith, *SC*, 97.

11. U. Smith, *TCPDR*, 210261.

12. U. Smith, *TCPDR*, 185188, 677706; *DR*, 519, 604605.

13. Durand, *op. cit.*, 161; Cf. U. Smith, *TCPDR*, Plate I, "The Image of Daniel II," between pp.48 and 49; Plate II, "Symbols of Daniel VI I," between pp.144 and 145; and Plate X, "Symbols of Rev. XIIII," between pp.676 and 677.

14. Cf. Durand, *op. cit.*, 202203. Also cf. *ibid.*, 214n1, for a citation of Uriah Smith, Key to the Prophetic Chart (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1864). And see U. Smith, *TCPDR*, Chart: "The 70 Weeks and 2300 Days," between pp.254 and 255.

15. J. W V~ Smith, *op. cit.*, 98. Also see Ron Can; Milan Dekich, Bob Preston, and David Van Norman, unpublished paper, class in "Church of God Backgrounds" (John W V. Smith, instructor), Anderson School of Theology, March 1, 1978, for a list of eight articles written by D. S. Warner prior to September 15, 1887, on the church in the book of Revelation.

16. Dieter, *op. ciL*, 251.

17. D. S. Warner, *Journal*, Nov. 2125, 1874.

18. *ibid.*, Dec.27, 1874.

19. Cf. D. S. Warner's personal copy of U. Smith, *TCPDR*, in Archives, Church of God (Anderson), Anderson University, Anderson, Indiana Warner's remarks may be found on pp.211, 215, 220, 225, 228, 235, 239, 266, 267; marginal markings may be seen on 211, 213, 215225, 235, 262263, 266267; the page-long comment is inserted between pp.228 and 229. Warner expresses strong disagreement with Smith on pp.235, 239, and 267. All of these page references are within Smith's discussion of the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 89.

20. *ibid.*, 211.

21. Daniel S. Warner and H. M. Riggle, *The Cleansing of the Sanctuary or The Church of God in T'pe and Antitype, and in Prophecy and Revelation* (Moundsville, WV: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1903). The quotation is from p.279. Hereinafter this work is abbreviated as Warner, CS.

22. Cf. Warner, CS, 8182 for specific notice of U. Smith; for criticism of Adventist doctrines, cf. pp.3839, 41, 7475, 77, 79, 80, 208, 209, 224.

23. E.g., H. M. Riggle, "Adventism Refuted," *The Gospel Trumpet* 19 (July 27, Aug. 3, and Aug.24, 1899). Also cf. Riggle, *The Sabbath and the Lord's Day* (Moundsville, WV: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1904), iv: "No other peo-

ple ever met with more disappointments during their existence, or so many blunders as the Adventists].... Many have been led into infidelity as a result of the mistakes of Adventism. The whole system is a yoke of bondage. To counteract this influence, this book has been written."

24. Cf. D. S. Warner, "Questions and Answers," *Gospel Trumpet* 9 (Sept. 15, 1887), 4. Also see Warner, "Question #3," *Gospel Trumpet* 10 (Dec. 1, 1890), 1 for a full exposition. See as well, Henry C. Wickersham, "The Cleansing of the Sanctuary," *Gospel Trumpet* 10 (Nov. 15, 1890), 1, 4.

25. Cp. U. Smith, *TCPDR*, diagram of Daniel 2, insert between pp.4849, and Church of God diagrams of Daniel 7 ,which appear in many publications.

26. Cp. U. Smith, *TCPDR*, 684685 and the references in n23 *supra*.

27. Church of God pioneers referred to other churches as sects, but in doing so were neither connoting nor denoting modern technical or sociological definitions. Rother, they seem to have meant that which is now understood in the use of the word "denomination." In its first twenty years, the Church of God itself bore the traits of "sect" in the technical, sociological sense. Cf. Val Clear, *Where the Saints Have Trod. A Social History of the Church of God Reformation Movement* (Chesterfield, IN: Midwest Publications, 1977), for an analysis of the sociological development of the Church of God from sect to church. Clear's work is a revision of his Ph.D. dissertation ("The Church of God: A Study in Social Adaptation," University of Chicago, 1953).

28. U. Smith, *DRD*, 650, 653.

29. Andrew Byers, *Birth of a Reformation or the Life and Labors of Daniel S. Warner* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1921), 271272.

30. Warner, *CS*, 267.

31. Dieter, *op. cit.*, 254.

32. Byers, *op. cit.*

33. *ibid.*, 248.

34. E. E. Byrum, "Settle It By the Word," *Gospel Trumpet* 9 (June 1,1889), 4.

35. John W V. Smith, *op. cit.*, 94.

36. *ibid.*, 98.

37. Reardon, *op. cit.*, 39.

38. John W. V. Smith, *op. cit*, 100.

39. *ibid.*, 444.

40. F. G. Smith, *Journals*, vol.1.

41. Cf. F. G. Smith, *Prophetic Lectures on Daniel and Revelation* (Anderson, IN; Gospel Trumpet Company, 1941), p.252. Hereinafter this work is abbreviated as F. G. Smith, *PL*

42. F. G. Smith, *The Revelation Explained* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1908), p.6. Hereinafter this work is abbreviated as F. G. Smith, *RE*.

43. Cf. n42 *supra*.

44. F. G. Smith, *What the Bible Teaches* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1913).

45. F. G. Smith, *The Last Reformation* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company). Hereinafter this work is abbreviated as F. G. Smith, *LR*.

46. Cf. n41 *supra*.

47. Cp. U. Smith, *DR*, 519, 604605 and F. G. Smith, *RE*, 235, 260.

48. Cp. U. Smith, *DR*, 650653 and F. G. Smith, *RE*, 273, 331, 356.

49. Cp. U. Smith, *DR*, 408 and F. G. Smith, *RE*, 108.

50. Cp. U. Smith, *DR*, 626635 and F. G. Smith, *RE*, 165170. Uriah Smith dates the Ottoman Empire from 12991840; F. G. Smith seems to date it from 12811672. Neither writer states his dates precisely or clearly.

51. F. G. Smith, *RE*, 146.

52. U. Smith, *DR*, 462.

53. U. Smith, *DR*, 524525; F. G. Smith, *RE*, 237238.

54. E.g., cp. U. Smith, *TCPDR*, chart between 254255, n16, and F. G. Smith, Chart: "The Church of God in Prophecy and History"

55. G. Smith, *PL*, 8687.

56. Cp. U. Smith, *DR*, 191 and F. G. Smith, *RE*, 235.

57. U. Smith, *DR*, 539.

58. Cp. U. Smith, *DR*, 641656 and F. G. Smith, *RE*, 290334.

59. David Kelsey, *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), *passim*.

60. J. W. V. Smith, *op. cit*, 249.

61. Reardon, *op. cit.*, 53.

62. *ibid.*, 51.

63. Marcel Desgalier, "Evangelism, A Demand Upon Youth," *Select Camp Meeting Sermons. Preached at the International Camp Meeting of the Church of God, Anderson, Indiana, June 1624, 1928* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1928), pp.359369.

64. Bessie Byrum, "The Toronto Convention, International Council of Religious Education," *Gospel Trumpet* 50 (Aug.21, 1930), 1314.

65. W. V. Smith, *op. cit*, 267269.

66. Russell Byrum, interview with John W V. Smith, Anderson, IN, (no day, no month) 1974, p.16. Copy of transcript in Archives, Church of God, Anderson University, Anderson, Indiana.

67. This paragraph summarizes the interview noted in n66 *supra*.

68. Russell Byrum, *Christian Theology...* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1925).

69. *ibid.*, 536552.

70. *ibid.*, 552.

71. *Scripture Readings and Sermon Outlines*, Russell Byrum, ed. (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1922).

72. Byrum/Smith interview, 1617 (cf. n66 *supra*).

73. John A. Morrison, *As the River Flows* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1962), p.168.

74. C. E. Byers, letter to Russell Byrum, Feb. 3, 1928.

75. Russell Byrum, letter to C. E. Byers (Springfield, OH), Feb. 2 and 3, 1928. Mso see Russell Olt (Anderson, IN), letter to R. C. Caudill (Middletown, OH), Feb. 6, 1928, and Russell Olt, letter to James W. RueMe (Toledo, OH), Feb. 8, 1928. Olt, Dean of Anderson College, wrote to both Caudill and Reuhie in defense of Byrum. For Byrum's views on church, reformation, and future punishment, see Russell Byrum, *Christian Theology...*, 507555 and 657660.

76. Byrum/Smith interview, p.18; J. W V. Smith, *The Quest for Holiness and Unity*, 250.

77. Byrum/Smith interview, p.18 (cf. n66 *supra*).

78. J. W. V. Smith, *The Quest for Holiness and Unity*, p.250.

79. *ibid.*, 253.

80. Byrum- Smith interview, pp.1920 (cf. n66 *supra*).

81. Otto F. Linn, 'Apocalyptic Enemies of Christ,' unpublished M.A. thesis, Phillips University, 1930.

82. *ibid.*, 112.

83. Otto F Linn, *Studies in the New Testament: 1. The Gospels and Acts* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1941).

84. Otto F. Linn, *Studies in the New Testament: 2. Romans to Philemon* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1942).

85. Otto F. Liun, *Studies in the New Testament: 3. Hebrews to Revelation* (Anderson, IN: Commercial Service Company, 1942).

86. J. W V. Smith, *The Quest for Holiness and Unity*, 313. Mso see Harold Phillips, *Miracle of Survival* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1979), 249, who says of the decision not to publish Linn's volume *Hebrews to Revelation*: "His

interpretations, particularly of the Book of Revelation, differed from traditional Church of God publications, especially those authored by F. G. Smith. Because of irreconcilable differences in the Publication Committee... the third of the Linn volumes came out privately under the imprint of Commercial Service Company, a subsidiary of Gospel Trumpet Company." Among members of the Publications Committee, Phillips, along with A. F. Gray and Earl Martin, favored publishing Linn's book under the auspices of Warner Press.

87. Letters from R. L. Berry in Missouri to Linn in Dundalk, Maryland, Feb.20, and April 29, 1942, are typical. Berry encouraged Linn to "put into your book just what you wish to say and do not pussy foot." Berry went on to express his feeling in the matter: "The fact that a particular interpretation of Revelation has been permitted to become a sort of cornerstone under the reformation work has weakened it tremendously."

88. Linn, *Studies in the New Testament: 3. Hebrews to Revelation*, p.v.

89. *ibid*, 108110.

90. *ibid.*, 110.

91. *ibid.*, 123125.

92. *ibid.*, 135.

93. *ibid.*, 131.

94. Adam W Miller, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Anderson, IN: Warner, Press, 1943).

95. Adam W Miller, letter to John E. Stanley, January 26, 1979.

96. Adam W Miller, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, p.235.

97. Still to be assessed is the role of C. W. Naylor in the debate over the book of Revelation in the Church of God. Like Russell Byrum and Otto Linn, Naylor was a child of the Church of God Reformation Movement. From 1896, he lived at the Gospel Trumpet Home. *The Hymnal of the Church of God* (1971) contains twenty-four hymns and songs by Naylor. John W V. Smith, as reported by Barry Callen in a telephone conversation interview with John E. Stanley, January 18, 1990, believed that Naylor was author of a paper, written in the 1940's, but undated, entitled, "The Teachings of D. S. Warner and His Associates," which rejects Warner's "comeouter" approach to Christian unity and the church-historical interpretation of Revelation. The Committee on Distribution for the paper noted in the Preface: "About thirty representative ministers have read this paper and it has been judged to be of sufficient importance to warrant a wider study."

98 Harold Phillips, telephone interview with John E. Stanley July 19, 1898.

99. Byrum/Smith interview, 13 (cf. n66 *supra*).

100. Phillips/Stanley interview (cf. n98 *supra*).

101. Lillie McCutcheon, *The Symbols Speak* (Newton Falls, OH: Lillie McCutcheon, 1964).
102. Quotation is attributed from conversation between Ms. McCutcheon, Gilbert Stafford, and Samuel Hines at planning session for Central States Mimsters Meeting, early 1980's, in which the topic was the interpretation of Revelation. The remark is consistent with Ms. McCutcheon's actions.
103. E.g., Oral Withrow, "A New Look at Last Things," *Vital Christianity* 102 (October 10, 1982), 912; and Lillie McCutcheon, "The Revelation of Prophecy," *Vital Christianity* 102 (October 10, 1982), 68.
104. Marie Strong, *Basic Teachings from Patmos* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1980).
105. Kenneth Jones, "Babylon and the New Jerusalem: Interpreting the Book of Revelation," *Listening to the Word: A Tribute to Boyce W Blackwelder*, ed. by Barry Callen (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, forthcoming).
106. Gene Miller, "Studies in Revelation," in *Vital Christianity* 105 (Dec. 12, 1985), 1519; 106 (Jan.12, 1986), 1519; 106 (Jan.26, 1986), 1519; 106 (Feb.16, 1986), 1518; 106 (Mar. 9, 1986), 1518; 106 (Mar.30, 1986), 1517; 106 (April 13, 1986), 1519.
107. John E. Stanley, "Revelation," *Asbury Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, forthcoming).
108. Doris Dale to Members of the Board of Women of the Church of God, May 29, 1985.
109. *ibid.*