

Wesleyan Theological Journal

Publication of the
Wesleyan Theological Society

WESLEY'S GENERAL RULES: PARADIGM FOR POSTMODERN ETHICS.....	7
Christopher P. Momany	
ELEMENTS OF A POSTMODERN HOLINESS HERMENEUTIC ILLUSTRATED BY WAY OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION	23
John E. Stanley	
JUSTIFIED BUT UNREGENERATE? THE RELATIONSHIP OF ASSURANCE TO JUSTIFICATION AND REGENERATION IN THE THOUGHT OF JOHN WESLEY.....	44
Scott Kisker	
CULTURE AND CONCUPISCENCE: THE CHANGING DEFINITION OF SANCTITY IN THE WESLEYAN/HOLINESS MOVEMENT, 1867-1920.....	59
Paul Merritt Bassett	
MISSION POLICY AND NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE: JAPAN, 1905-1965	128
Floyd T. Cunningham	
REVIVALISM: IN SEARCH OF A DEFINITION	165
Russell E. Richey	
THE MINISTRY OF MARY LEE CAGLE: A STUDY IN WOMEN'S HISTORY AND RELIGION.....	176
Stan Ingersol	
BOOK REVIEWS	199

Volume 28, Numbers 1 and 2
Spring-Fall, 1993

Digital text copyright 2008 by the
Wesley Center Online
<http://wesley.nnu.edu>

The Journal
of the
WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
A Fellowship of Wesleyan-Arminian Scholars

Editor and Chair of the Editorial Committee:

Paul M. Bassett, 1987-1993

Barry L. Callen, 1993 to present

All communications concerning editorial matters should be addressed to the editor, Barry L. Callen, c/o Anderson University, East Fifth Street, Anderson, Indiana 46012. Membership dues and other financial items should be addressed to the secretary-treasurer, William Kostlevy, c/o Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky 40390. Rate and application form are found at the end of this issue.

Publication Address: Wesleyan Theological Society, P. O. Box 144, Wilmore, Kentucky 40390.

WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
(Organized 1965)

The Society's mission is to encourage exchange of ideas among Wesleyan-Arminian theologians; to develop a source of papers for CHA (Christian Holiness Association) seminars; to stimulate scholarship among younger theologians and pastors; and to publish a scholarly Journal.

WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL



Published by the Wesleyan Theological Society
P. O. Box 144
Wilmore, Kentucky 40390

Prepared for PDF publication by the
Wesley Center Online
at Northwest Nazarene University.
<http://wesley.nnu.edu>
Copyright 2008

© Copyright 1994 by the
Wesleyan Theological Society

ISSN-0092-4245

Indexed with abstracts in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*, American Theological Library Association, Chicago. Available on-line through BRS (Bibliographic Retrieval Series), Latham, New York, and DIALOG, Palo Alto, California.

Available in Microform from University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Dept. I.R., Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Printed by
Old Paths Tract Society
Shoals, Indiana 47581

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Christopher P. Momany, Ph.D., D.Min. (Drew University); Pastor, Centenary United Methodist Church, Pentwater, Michigan

John E. Stanley, Ph.D. (Iliff School of Theology, University of Denver); Chair, Department of Bible, Warner Pacific College, Portland, Oregon

Scott Kisker, M.Div. (The Divinity School, Duke University); Associate Pastor, American Protestant Church, Bonn, Germany

Paul M. Bassett, Ph.D. (Duke University); Professor of the History of Christianity, Nazarene Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Missouri

Floyd T. Cunningham, Ph.D. (The Johns Hopkins University); Dean and Professor of the History of Christianity, Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary, Manila, Philippines

Russell E. Richey, Ph.D. (Drew University); Associate Dean for Academic Programs, The Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

Stan Ingersol, Archivist, Church of the Nazarene

EDITORIAL NOTES

With this double number of the *Journal*, the term of the undersigned editor comes to an end. Two three-year terms, in fact.

At the very outset, I approached the work with enthusiasm and a deep yearning to be of service—to the Wesleyan Theological Society in particular and to the wider world of theological scholarship in general. Enthusiasm for editing has abated, to be sure, but the concern to be of use grows apace.

Good Wesleyan that I aim to be, I am reporting to you an investment of 2100 hours in the *Journal* in those six years, much of it under difficult circumstances—personal and otherwise. So I reach the end of these terms in a rather bittersweet mood. Too many hopes lie unfulfilled; and yet, thanks to you, the quality of the articles appearing in the *Journal* continues to strengthen. And the *Journal* continues to grow in reputation as a major source for understanding the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement.

Thanks to changes in the format of the annual meeting of the Society; to vast, ready-to-hand changes in communications technology, many of which have taken place only in the last half-decade; and to changes in editorial policy and administrative matters on the part of the incoming editor, the *Journal* itself should be easier to produce in timely fashion and new features should be more feasible. I anticipate very good days ahead for our *Journal* under the editorial direction of Barry Callen.

Now, to turn to “old business”: I apologize to Dr. Stan Ingersol for having presented his fine article in two successive numbers. That error will perplex bibliographers and researchers for generations to come. And, I apologize to Prof. Mel Shoemaker, who teaches at Azusa Pacific, not Warner Pacific.

As to present business: It is at the request of the incoming editor, Barry Callen, that I have included an article of my own in this double number. It was not his request that it go on forever, as it does. But it is with his approval that it does appear in entirety.

And last: The Executive Committee of the Wesleyan Theological Society, publishers of the *Journal*, decided for reasons of schedule and finances to print Numbers 1 and 2 of Volume 28 under one cover. This is in line with contingencies noted in the original decision to publish two numbers per year.

P. M. B.

This issue concludes the editorial service of Dr. Paul M. Bassett to the *Wesleyan Theological Journal*. His skilled contribution to this scholarly endeavor officially spanned the years 1987 to 1993, with transitional work extending into 1994. It has been judged appropriate by the new editor that this historic issue carry a major article by Dr. Bassett. Gratitude is expressed to this gifted and insightful colleague in Christ's service.

B. L. C.

WESLEY'S GENERAL RULES: PARADIGM FOR POSTMODERN ETHICS

by

Christopher P. Momany

INTRODUCTION

Poised at the cusp of transition from premodernity to modernity, “The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies” (1743) bear postmodern ethical import. Wesley’s premodern emphasis upon “doing no harm” and “doing good” anticipates the modern debate between those ethical theories which stress either nonmaleficence (not inflicting harm) or beneficence (provision of benefit). In many respects, the story of modern ethics revolves around an extended process of presenting, critiquing, and then representing the dialogue, the tension, between doing no harm (nonmaleficence) and doing good (beneficence).

However, Wesley’s simple integration of these primitive Christian principles offers deeply promising postmodern possibilities for a coalescence of ethical emphases which have often been considered mutually exclusive. Could not a postmodern synthesis of the “General Rules” point contemporary Wesleyans toward an ethic which both protects the sacred individual and promotes the commonweal, an ethic which both aims to avoid harm and yet is highly cognizant of the public good? It is in this sense that John Wesley’s “General Rules” offer a paradigm for postmodern ethics.

THE ANTICIPATORY POWER OF PREMODERN PARADIGMS

Any consideration of Wesley’s “General Rules” as a premodern construct with postmodern significance must first articulate some typology of

modernity. While several credible delineations of modernity abound, none are perhaps as concise as that offered by Thomas C. Oden. Oden sees modernity best defined “first as a historical period, then as an ideological worldview, and finally as a malaise of the deteriorating phase of that worldview.”¹ In this schema, modernity is confined to the specific two-hundred-year period between 1789 and 1989, between the French Revolution and the fall of Communism. Whether such definitiveness will ultimately be ascribed these two events remains to be seen, and one might offer a more nuanced understanding of mid-eighteenth century antecedents of modernity, as well as post-communistic expressions of modernity. But in at least general terms, the years 1789 and 1989 best frame the chronological poles of modernity.

The ideological worldview of the period has been indelibly marked by scientific naturalism, hermeneutical deconstructionism, and moral iconoclasm. French rationalism, German idealism, British empiricism, and American pragmatism, while apparent epistemological foes, all share, in various forms, the presuppositions of modernity. One need not be unsophisticated or reactionary to identify in modernity a destructive tendency toward ethical nihilism. The often arrogant appeal to a hypercritical hermeneutic has left modernity convinced that its entanglement with relativism is something “objective.” Yet, as Oden points up, the Enlightenment’s dogmatic regard for relativism has left an almost unimaginable legacy of confusion and pain.²

Given this state of affairs, it is appropriate to ask what one means by a move beyond modernity to a postmodern consciousness. Such a movement does not, must not, imply an intellectual amnesia which denies that modernity ever happened. A postmodern awareness does not champion the nostalgic return to precritical constructs as ends in themselves. Rather, reference to a “critique of criticism” best exemplifies the constructive project of postmodern consciousness.³ Such a hermeneutic owes much to the prolific work of Paul Ricoeur and his emphasis upon the postcritical resilience of narrative, symbol, and metaphor.⁴ But it is Ricoeur’s oft-quoted reference to a “second naivete” which most directly captures the sense of postmodernism’s return to premodern sources.⁵

This second or “willed” naivete does not engage modern thinking by merely harking back to a time of literal understandings. It is not a reaction to critical thinking so much as a response to it and an attempt to move beyond the sophomoric claims of iconoclasm. This second naivete is a postcritical or postmodern acknowledgment that the most mature under-

standing still wears the flesh and blood of symbol. One cannot simply reduce the symbolic and longstanding to some conceptual certainty of critique. Even as traditional images and icons are subjected to criticism, they disclose renewed meaning in indispensable ways. They continue to speak through the modern world to the postmodern horizon. For Ricoeur, the aim of understanding is not to eliminate outmoded symbols and traditions but to journey with them through the rhythms of critique and willed naivete.⁶

Wesley's "General Rules" of 1743 offer a decidedly premodern ethical construct. Their simple integration of (1) doing no harm, (2) doing good, and (3) attending upon the ordinances of God is often dismissed as a hopelessly dated precritical formulation.⁷ Yet beyond such modern conceit lies promising postmodern significance. One can even argue that Wesley's practical moral formulation substantively anticipates the current revolution in postmodern consciousness. What if Wesley's "General Rules" were neither naively idolized nor critically discarded? What if the "General Rules" were appropriated out of an intelligent, postcritical second naivete? One might find a way beyond certain accepted dilemmas of modern ethics.

WESLEY AS CONJUNCTIVE THEOLOGIAN

Many will agree that there is little in the Wesley corpus which qualifies as a systematic ethic. However, Wesley embodied specific theological and moral predilections which expressed themselves ethically through the integration of principles often considered mutually exclusive by the modern world. James Fowler's thought-provoking 1982 piece, "John Wesley's Development in Faith," traced the dynamics of Wesley's spiritual journey and pointed up his later tendency to combine emphases customarily assumed to be polar opposites.⁸

Fowler's heralded work on faith development borrows key language from Paul Ricoeur in suggestive ways. Fowler argues that humans bear the potential for progressing through six stages of faith. The first and second stages ordinarily refer to the rudimentary levels of faith found throughout child development. The sixth and final stage of faith represents a rare level of maturity. Therefore, Fowler sees the adult journey through the third, fourth, and fifth stages as the most readily identifiable pattern of transformation and growth. He also associates this progression from stage three, through stage four, and on to stage five with Paul Ricoeur's language of first naivete, critique, and second naivete.⁹

Stage three is “synthetic-conventional faith” and it expresses itself through precritical apprehension of religious traditions, myths, and symbols. This is the first naivete of adult faith and represents perhaps the majority of contemporary Christians. Stage four is “individuating-reflective faith” and expresses itself through a more independently minded evaluation of both the validity and flaws found in conventional religious traditions and communities. This is the critique stage of adult faith and represents those maturing Christians who have achieved some level of self-understanding and analytical distance from the perfunctoriness of religious tradition. Though many might consider stage four to signify the highest level of human developmental functioning, Fowler makes it clear that this is by no means the terminus of Christian consciousness.¹⁰

Stage five or “conjunctive faith” represents the ability to move beyond analysis and critique. In Fowler’s manner of speaking, “This stage develops a ‘second naivete’ (Ricoeur) in which symbolic power is reunited with conceptual meanings. Here there must also be a new reclaiming and reworking of one’s past.”¹¹ This level of faith awakens to the truth that traditional symbols and constructs carry an ongoing residue of meaning which defies our modern analytical reductionism. Moreover, the terminology for “conjunctive faith” implies a rebinding or re-integration of that which has been separated.¹² Fowler finds proleptic signs of this dialectical consciousness in the premodern emphases of Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464) who identified a *coincidentia oppositorum*, a “coincidence of opposites,” in our apprehension of spiritual truth.¹³ Thus, stage five faith develops its willed naivete by acknowledging and integrating life’s polarities and paradoxes. One reappropriates traditional truths while not feigning false innocence. One clings to the hope for moral excellence while aware of the human capacity for self-deception. One struggles to grasp truth in the apparent contradictions of life.

Fowler sees John Wesley’s later theological integration as indicative of a stage five type faith. In the years following Aldersgate, Wesley managed to hold together a cadre of polarities: human bondage and human freedom, justification by grace through faith and the very real possibilities of sanctification, grace as the power of salvation and law as the gift of God’s grace.¹⁴ In Fowler’s words, “If there had been a theory of faith development (of the kind we work with) in the eighteenth century, certainly the theology of Wesley would have been a model for its version of conjunctive faith.”¹⁵ These conjunctive tendencies provide the grounding for Wesley’s significance to postmodern theology.

In 1991, James Fowler released his most recent study on faith development theory, *Weaving the New Creation*. This piece mirrors his earlier typology, with one important exception. In *Weaving the New Creation*, Fowler expands his discussion of stages three, four, and five to draw parallels with premodernism, modernism, and postmodernism. Thus, synthetic-conventional faith finds historical correlation with the precritical era prior to 1789. Individuative-reflective faith is linked to the critical Enlightenment tradition, and conjunctive faith stands as an emerging consciousness for the postmodern age.¹⁶ If Fowler's earlier identification of Wesley as a conjunctive thinker holds true, then his latest work would suggest that Wesley and his integrative constructs of faith might hold particular import for postmodern ethics.

WESLEY AS CONJUNCTIVE ETHICIST

One document where Wesley's conjunctive disposition finds concrete expression is "The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies" (1743). There were thirty-nine editions of these "General Rules" published during Wesley's life. At intermittent printings, Charles Wesley's hymn, "A Prayer for those who are Convinced of Sin," was added as an appendix. In some editions, the "Rules of the Band Societies," first published in 1738, were also included. These "General Rules" provided more detailed and structured direction for those in the Methodist Societies and were especially designed to elucidate how the three principles of "doing no harm," "doing good," and "attending upon the ordinances of God" must find expression in day-to-day life.¹⁷

Wesley's concern for the practical implementation of these three principles led him to list very specific injunctions within each category. "Doing no harm" emphasized the refraining from evil and directed Methodist Christians away from such destructive behaviors as profanity, drunkenness, fighting, buying or selling uncustomed goods, self-indulgence, and laying up treasure upon earth. While his concrete directions may at first appear entirely precritical and quaint, Wesley's emphasis upon this first principle had broader implications. He firmly grounded this passion for doing no harm in the Golden Rule and desired to keep his followers from "Doing to others as we would not they should do unto us."¹⁸ The negative formulation of this Biblical admonition anticipates Kant's categorical imperative by forty years.¹⁹ Moreover, the 1789 American edition of the "General Rules" placed an unqualified prohibition of slavery squarely within this section devoted to the doing of no harm.²⁰

Opposing and eliminating evil practices had decidedly far-reaching impact.

Wesley grounded his direction to do good upon Galatians 6:10 and emphasized two basic types of benevolence. First, he instructed his followers to do bodily good to other people “by giving food to the hungry, by clothing the naked, by visiting or helping them that are sick, or in prison.”²¹ This might be construed as a clear reference to Matthew 25:35-39. Second, Wesley urged adherents to work benevolence among the souls of others. Thus, even the positive command to do good offered an integration of body and soul, physical feeding and spiritual feeding.

The third category regarding the ordinances of God stressed both public and private practices of spiritual life. Specific direction called Wesley’s followers to observe communal worship, the ministry of the Word, and the Lord’s Supper. Family and individual prayer, personal Bible study, and fasting were also implored.²² Wesley’s juxtaposition of this third concern for the means of grace with the more strictly ethical emphases illustrates his unwillingness to dichotomize the active and contemplative life. For Wesley, there was no good reason why these three principles could not coexist as one integrated whole.²³

Since John Simon’s classic 1923 treatise on the Methodist Societies, it has been customary to cite Wesley’s reading of William Cave’s *Primitive Christianity* (1672) as the catalyst for the threefold structure of the “General Rules.” Wesley became conversant with Cave’s piece as early as the middle 1730s while in Georgia.²⁴ Cave portrayed the first believers with regard to their devotional and worship practices, their humility and harmlessness, and their benevolence toward others—a rough parallel to the “General Rules” triad.²⁵ Rupert Davies also suggests that among Reformation sources “there are important passages which give the same general sense, which Wesley may have summarized for his own purposes.”²⁶ Here, Davies is referring to the negative and positive thrusts Martin Luther gave to his interpretation of the fifth and seventh commandments.²⁷ Additionally, as early as 1611, the catechism in *The Book of Common Prayer* listed moral obligation under a twin concern for what is *not* to be done to one’s neighbor and what *is* to be done to one’s neighbor.²⁸ It is conceivable that Wesley drew upon all of these sources when enunciating the threefold instruction of his “General Rules.”

Time and again Wesley integrated the emphasis upon doing no harm and doing good both in theory and in responding practically to the pressing issues of middle-eighteenth century England. As early as 1742, Wes-

ley expressed the importance of both principles when he penned “The Character of a Methodist.”²⁹ This presentation is developed polemically in *An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, where Wesley states plainly: “Ought we not to do what we believe is morally good, and to abstain from what we judge is evil?”³⁰ While returning to his argument in *A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, Wesley applies this integration to the experience of spiritual renewal, when individuals “left off doing evil and learned to do well.”³¹ Wesley’s treatment of the Sermon on the Mount also embodies a consistent regard for the intricacies of both doing no harm and doing good.³² In this series, he expresses a particular concern that the entire “General Rules” triad originate from an inward work of the Holy Spirit.³³

Manfred Marquardt has shown how Wesley’s dialectical ethic issued in specific approaches to social issues. One example is prison ministry. Here: “Wesley did not confine his activity to providing pastoral and charitable help for prisoners. Publicly and with praiseworthy clarity, he protested against shocking abuses.”³⁴ Denouncing the infliction of harm without working positive good was unconscionable, but benevolent gestures, apart from condemnation of evil, were equally reprehensible.

Yet, in practical application, no other experience in the life of Wesley illustrates this coalescence of avoiding harm and doing good as clearly as the dual concern for both abstinence from alcohol and feeding those who hunger. His 1773 essay, “Thoughts on the Present Scarcity of Provisions,” integrates the avoidance of drink and a positive concern for the hungry. Wesley specifically sees a direct linkage between England’s grain shortage and the alcohol industry: “But why is food so dear? . . . To set aside partial causes, . . . the grand cause is, because such immense quantities of corn are continually consumed by distilling.”³⁵ Elimination of the systemic harm worked by alcohol was intimately related to a passion for the positive and equitable provision of resources. It would have been out of character for Wesley to dichotomize the avoidance of evil from the need to work positive good. His worldview simply did not consider such polarities mutually exclusive.

This is not to say that Wesley was oblivious to periodic conflicts of principle between doing no harm and doing good. Yet, he attempted to resolve such dilemmas without absolute violation of either emphasis. At times, Wesley appears dependent upon consequentialist solutions to conflicting claims, as when he responds to accusations that his preaching may encourage disorder and error. He grants that some ill consequences may

flow from a genuinely good thing but counters that “the good consequences, in the present case, overbalance the evil beyond all possible degrees of comparison.”³⁶ On other occasions, Wesley affirms certain intrinsic moral values which must not be transgressed, regardless of outcome. This is particularly the case in his sermon on “The Use of Money.” He argues that taking economic advantage of others through such practices as charging excessive interest or pawn-broking would be inconsistent with Christian life, even if one could argue that, on balance, some good results. In an intriguing reference to Romans 3:8, Wesley states that we “are not allowed to ‘do evil that good may come.’”³⁷ He might entertain certain teleological criteria but never at the expense of nonnegotiable deontological values. In this manner, Wesley sought to hold doing no harm and doing good in creative tension, even through perceived conflicts of principle.

A POSTMODERN WESLEYAN ETHIC

Wesley’s paradigmatic formulation of doing no harm and doing good has found modern expression in those ethical constructs which stress non-maleficence (not inflicting harm) and beneficence (provision of benefit). This distinction has been particularly well exercised in contemporary biomedical ethics. It is not my intention here to rehearse every nuance of the nonmaleficence/beneficence dialogue. Rather, I simply wish to frame the general contours of current discussion in a manner that suggests Wesley’s promise for forging a postmodern integration of these two emphases.

The principle of nonmaleficence or not inflicting harm has been typically associated with the maxim *Primum non nocere*, “Above all do no harm.” Contrary to popular assumption, this specific wording of the axiom does not exist within the Hippocratic oath, though nonmaleficence is accentuated within Book I, Chapter 11 of the *Epidemics*.³⁸ Beneficence, as an identifiable principle of ethical discourse, can be found in numerous texts. In fact, it is rather clearly expressed within the Hippocratic oath, where the physician promises to “follow that system or regimen which, according to my ability and judgment, I consider for the benefit of my patients.”³⁹ In Aquinas, the two emphases are held in creative tension: “Hence this is the first precept of law, that good is to be done and promoted, and evil is to be avoided.”⁴⁰ But such integrated premodern statements have become suspect within modern ethical conversation. One might even argue that contemporary biomedical discourse has been char-

acterized by competing claims about the logical priority of either non-maleficence or beneficence. Presuppositions regarding some inevitable conflict in principle have informed much of modernity's approach to philosophical ethics.

In a piece first published during 1967 (reprinted in 1980), Philippa Foot reinterprets the doctrine of double effect to de-emphasize a distinction between direct and oblique intention. Instead, she focuses upon a fundamental differentiation between avoiding injury and bringing aid. Avoiding injury is termed a negative duty, bringing aid a positive duty: "Let us speak of negative duties when thinking of the obligation to refrain from such things as killing or robbing, and of the positive duty, e.g., to look after children or aged parents."⁴¹ Foot suggests approaching moral dilemmas by first considering whether one is being enjoined to refrain from injury or to bring positive aid. She concludes that, while this strategy does not provide universal direction, it can offer a helpful distinction. Decision-making is thus clarified because one "does not *in general* have the same duty to help people as to refrain from injuring them."⁴² In short, Foot's argument rests upon delineating competing claims of nonmaleficence and beneficence, so that one may grant preeminence to refraining from harm.

Nancy Davis offers a closely reasoned rebuttal to Foot's priority of avoiding harm.⁴³ Among more rarefied criticisms, Davis counters that any assertion of absolute priority in moral principle ignores differences of degree within both negative and positive claims. The balance of obligation does not categorically relate to some difference in kind between positive and negative duties. Rather, obligation is affected by differences of degree among nonmaleficent and beneficent demands: "Though we might be inclined to agree that one may not violate very strict negative duties to act in accord with positive duties, we would surely allow that it is permissible to violate *some* negative duties in order to act on strict positive duties."⁴⁴ The shift in emphasis from kind to degree allows Davis to avoid the error of critiquing Foot through claiming some absolute priority for beneficence. This moves us somewhat away from rigid orderings which stress either nonmaleficence or beneficence, to the detriment of the other. But one still might ask the all-too-obvious question: are nonmaleficence and beneficence, by their nature, competing or complementary principles?

Refreshing attempts to integrate nonmaleficent and beneficent concerns do exist. One of the most promising can be found in the collabora-

tion of Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress, whose piece, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, juxtaposes the two emphases. Beauchamp and Childress do not ignore irreducible conflicts in principle, but neither are they prematurely willing to sacrifice one emphasis for the other. In dilemmas which pose competing claims, we can “expect nonmaleficence to be overriding on many occasions, but not on all occasions.”⁴⁵ Here, Beauchamp and Childress shift the focus toward distinctions of degree and suggest as an example that one might inflict a negligible surgical wound to prevent a major harm, such as death.⁴⁶ Ultimately, the two ethicists refuse to play the game of absolute logical priority and are adamant about not providing any “hierarchical arrangement of principles.”⁴⁷ We might summarize their position by stating that they (1) argue for a complementarity in kind, while (2) recognizing conflicts of degree. Such acknowledged conflicts do not obliterate basic complementarity and must be resolved on a case-by-case basis.

Nancy Davis suggests that traditional acceptance of irreducible conflict has often neglected one crucial element: the culpability of a second agent who has created or, at the least, contributed to circumstances considered unresolvable.⁴⁸ In this sense, the most critical concerns may not relate to kinds of principle or relative strictness of degree within respective principles. Here, focus is placed upon the agency of individuals responsible for creating dilemmas which are perceived as irreducible. We might tentatively extend Davis’s insight to explore the impact of institutional structures and systemic phenomena upon supposed dilemmas. What role do greed and exorbitant profits among the health care industry play in creating the perceived conflict between long-term care for the terminally ill and broader access for the poor? What identifiable role does societal injustice play in creating the perceived conflict between protection of the unborn and the economic well-being of women? These provocative questions deserve a much more detailed treatment than I am able to offer here. But suffice it to say that Davis has done us a great favor by suggesting that culpability among supposed conflicts in principle often hinges more upon the agency of an external party than upon the intrinsic dynamics of some dilemma.

These elaborate arguments are heartening for those who attempt to hold in tension the traditional ethical polarity of doing no harm and doing good. Yet, an even more instructive synthesis of nonmaleficence and beneficence might arise from a reappropriation of premodern ethical integrations.

Wesley's "General Rules" offer precisely such a model. The precritical coalescence of doing no harm and doing good anticipates current juxtapositions in significant ways. This premodern formulation may strike one as remarkably naive. Clearly, there is contemporary ethical territory where nonmaleficence (doing no harm) and beneficence (doing good) conflict. But one might also ask whether modernity has too readily accepted a mutual exclusivity of these emphases. Perhaps it is time to reenter Wesley's ethical construct out of a willed naivete. This postmodern consciousness would see unresolved conflicts between nonmaleficence and beneficence as the exception, not the rule.⁴⁹ This approach would refuse simplistic denial of those instances when either nonmaleficence or beneficence claim priority, but this approach would also free itself from the modern presupposition that one or the other principle must necessarily be violated.

The postmodern appropriation of Wesley's "General Rules" does not entail neglect of critical ethical distinctions and differentiations developed throughout the modern age. Rather, this willed naivete seeks merely to move beyond the institutionalization of conflicts in principle, to a more integrated and consistent respect for both nonmaleficence *and* beneficence. As a start, Wesleyan ethicists might explore the naming of those ways in which external agents and structures have affected perceived conflicts between positive and negative duties. Perhaps it is prophetic, as well as philosophically valid, to assert a fundamental complementarity in principle. Wesleyans may initially claim such complementarity out of a naive regard for premodern constructs, but they will also be faced with the critical, modern identification of real and imagined conflicts in principle. It is my hope that one might hold the sensibilities of these two eras in creative tension, out of a postmodern, second naivete. This willed naivete is only possible through a *koinonia* permeated by the ordinances of God. Admittedly, such conjunctive thoughts are more suggestive than definitive. Yet, highly creative ethical dialogue awaits those prepared to live within the means of grace and within the dialectic of nonmaleficence and beneficence. As Biblical scholar, Walter Wink, reminds us, ". . . creativity involves the capacity to allow a perceived contradiction to reach its very limits and then be reordered at a higher level of integration into a new whole."⁵⁰ It is in light of this awareness that John Wesley's "General Rules" offer a highly resilient, integrative, and promising paradigm for postmodern ethics.

NOTES

¹Thomas C. Oden, *Two Worlds: Notes on the Death of Modernity in America and Russia* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 31-32. I resist the urge to cite some extended litany of postmodern diagnosis. Emerging understandings of “postmodernity” are still so varied that, for the sake of this investigation, I limit discussion to the particular issues raised by Professor Oden’s typology.

²*Ibid.*, 38-40.

³Thomas C. Oden, *After Modernity . . . What?: Agenda for Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990), 111. Thomas C. Oden, *Two Worlds: Notes on the Death of Modernity in America and Russia*, 71-89.

⁴See especially Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas Christian University Press, 1976). For an insightful treatment of more specific metaphorical issues: Paul Ricoeur, “The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling,” in *On Metaphor*, ed., Sheldon Sacks (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), 141-157. I accept that some may balk at my correlation of symbol with crucial Christian constructs. It might seem that a truly postmodern hermeneutic would root itself within something more substantial than “mere” symbol. To this, I respond that there is no such thing as “mere” symbol. Rather, in the most incarnational sense, symbol is mediated reality and therefore stands as the requisite bearer of truth. Ricoeur writes: “Thus, contrary to perfectly transparent technical signs, which say only what they want to say in positing that which they signify, symbolic signs are opaque, because the first, literal, obvious meaning itself points analogically to a second meaning which is not given otherwise than in it.” Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, trans., Emerson Buchanan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), 15.

⁵Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, 351-352.

⁶*Ibid.* See also Paul Ricoeur, “The Hermeneutics of Symbols and Philosophical Reflection,” in *The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, ed., Charles E. Reagan and David Stewart (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978), 36-58.

⁷Even the United Methodist Church’s Office of Covenant Discipleship has chosen an alternative construct for its class meeting ministry, claiming that the model found in Wesley’s “General Rules” does not meet the rigors of a “post-Marxian and post-Freudian age.” See David Lowes

Watson, *Covenant Discipleship: Christian Formation through Mutual Accountability* (Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 1991), 77-78.

⁸James W. Fowler, "John Wesley's Development in Faith," in *The Future of the Methodist Theological Traditions*, ed., M. Douglas Meeks (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985), 172-192.

⁹James W. Fowler, *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning* (San Francisco: Harper, 1981), 187.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 183.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 197.

¹²*Ibid.*, 198.

¹³James W. Fowler, *Faith Development and Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 71-73. Jasper Hopkins, *Nicholas of Cusa's Dialectical Mysticism: Text, Translation, and Interpretive Study of "De visione Dei,"* (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 1985), 93, 159. Hopkins adds that, "In opening the door to Modernity, Nicholas does not surrender his pre-Modern standpoint" (96-97). See also Jasper Hopkins, *A Concise Introduction to the Philosophy of Nicholas of Cusa* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978), 11-12, 21-22, 160 n22.

¹⁴James W. Fowler, "John Wesley's Development in Faith," 190. Manfred Marquardt makes reference to Wesley's "theological dialectic" in Manfred Marquardt, *John Wesley's Social Ethics: Praxis and Principles*, trans., John E. Steely and W. Stephen Gunter (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992), 101.

¹⁵James W. Fowler, "John Wesley's Development in Faith," 190.

¹⁶James W. Fowler, *Weaving the New Creation: Stages of Faith and the Public Church* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991), 16-24.

¹⁷*The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Rupert E. Davies, Vol. 9, *The Methodist Societies: History, Nature, and Design* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989), 61.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 70-71.

¹⁹Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, trans., H. J. Paton (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964), 88.

²⁰Warren Thomas Smith, *John Wesley and Slavery* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1986), 116.

²¹*The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Rupert E. Davies, Vol. 9, *The Methodist Societies: History, Nature, and Design*, 72.

²²*Ibid.*, 73.

²³This point has been well argued in David Lowes Watson, *The Early Methodist Class Meeting: Its Origins and Significance* (Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 1985), 108. Here, Watson describes worldly service as “ineffectual without the power of the Holy Spirit.”

²⁴John S. Simon, *John Wesley and the Methodist Societies* (London: The Epworth Press, 1923), 105.

²⁵William Cave, *Primitive Christianity: or, the Religion of the Ancient Christians in the First Ages of the Gospel*, ed., Henry Cary (London: Thomas Tegg, 1840). See also H. Ray Dunning, “Ethics in a Wesleyan Context,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 5 (Spring 1970): 6-7, and *The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Rupert E. Davies, Vol. 9, 67.

²⁶Rupert E. Davies, Letter to Christopher P. Momany, 1 January 1992.

²⁷Martin Luther, *Small Catechism: A Handbook of Christian Doctrine* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1943), 67-69. Martin Luther, *The Large Catechism*, trans., Robert H. Fischer (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), 43.

²⁸*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, According to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944, 579-583. Reference to the 1611 prayer book is found in Rupert E. Davies, Letter to Christopher P. Momany, 1 January 1992.

²⁹*The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Rupert E. Davies, Vol. 9, 40-41.

³⁰John Wesley, *An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion* (Newcastle Upon Tyne: John Gooding, 1743; reprint, Nashville, Tennessee: The United Methodist Publishing House, Library of Methodist Classics, 1992), 7.

³¹John Wesley, *A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, Part III (London: W. Strahan, 1745; reprint, Nashville, Tennessee: The United Methodist Publishing House, Library of Methodist Classics, 1992), 84.

³²Sermons XXI-XXXIII; in *The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Thomas Jackson, Vol. V, *First Series of Sermons (1-39), A Life of John Wesley* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1986), 268, 325, 404, 425, 426, 429, 430.

³³*Ibid.*, 325.

³⁴Manfred Marquardt, *John Wesley's Social Ethics: Praxis and Principles*, 84.

³⁵*The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Thomas Jackson, Vol. XI, 54.

³⁶Letter XLIII: To Mr. John Smith, 22 March, 1747-48, in *The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Thomas Jackson, Vol. XII, 98.

³⁷*The Works of John Wesley*, ed., Thomas Jackson, Vol. VI, 128. John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, Vol. II, *Romans to Revelation* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1983), Romans 3:8. Wesley almost wrenches this text from its theological context to make a philosophical point. See also L. D. Hulley, *To Be and To Do: Exploring Wesley's Thought on Ethical Behaviour* (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1988), 68, 72-73.

³⁸Albert R. Jonsen, "Do No Harm: Axiom of Medical Ethics," in *Philosophical Medical Ethics: Its Nature and Significance*, ed., Stuart F. Spicker and H. Tristram Engelhardt, Jr. (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1977), 27. Jonsen traces with particular thoroughness the sources of this maxim. Still, its exact origin is the subject of conjecture.

³⁹"The Oath of Hippocrates," in *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, trans., Francis Adams, with an Introduction by Emerson Crosby Kelly (Huntington, New York: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1972), viii.

⁴⁰Thomas Aquinas, *ST I-II*, Q. 94, art. 2. Cf. *Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, ed., Anton C. Pegis (New York: Random House, 1945), II, 114.

⁴¹Philippa Foot, "The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of Double Effect," in *Killing and Letting Die*, ed., Bonnie Steinbock (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980), 162.

⁴²*Ibid.*

⁴³Nancy Davis, "The Priority of Avoiding Harm," in *Killing and Letting Die*, ed., Bonnie Steinbock (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-

Hall, Inc., 1980), 172-214. Davis suggests at the outset that Foot obfuscates moral discourse by claiming some absolute distinction between negative and positive duties.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 187. Appeals to differences of degree within both negative and positive duties are not without their problems. Weighing the relative strictness of beneficent claims can collapse into consequentialism, while more nebulous intrinsic criteria may be employed when evaluating the relative weight of nonmaleficent obligations.

⁴⁵Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 122. The correlation between Beauchamp/Childress and Wesley's "General Rules" suggested here has its roots in Kenneth L. Carder, *Doctrinal Standards and Our Theological Task: A Leader's Guide* (Nashville: Graded Press, 1939), 50-51.

⁴⁶Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, 122.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 125. Beauchamp adds the further comment that, "It is risky to come up with some lexical ordering of principles." Tom L. Beauchamp, Personal Conversation with Christopher P. Momany, 25 September 1992.

⁴⁸Nancy Davis, "The Priority of Avoiding Harm," 201-210. Davis terms this a "doctrine of the intervening agent" and identifies it with the legal doctrine of *novus actus interveniens*. How such technical arguments of secondary agency may or may not relate to systemic culpability is an issue worthy of further exploration.

⁴⁹Lowell O. Erdahl, *Pro-Life/Pro-Peace: Life-Affirming Alternatives to Abortion, War, Mercy Killing, and the Death Penalty* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1986). See especially the chapter entitled, "When the Exceptions Become the Rule," 24-28.

⁵⁰Walter Wink, *Transforming Bible Study*, 2nd ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989), 21.

ELEMENTS OF A POSTMODERN HOLINESS HERMENEUTIC ILLUSTRATED BY WAY OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION

by

John E. Stanley

Utilizing the Biblical book of Revelation to illustrate its thesis, this paper explores some features of a postmodern Wesleyan/Holiness hermeneutic. However, rather than beginning with abstract definitions of modernity and postmodernity or with outline-accounts of their origins, I will describe my personal pilgrimage in Biblical studies from the precritical stage through modernity and on to postmodernity. In the process, I will define modernity and postmodernity as these terms relate to Biblical studies.

I. A PERSONAL PILGRIMAGE THROUGH MODERNITY TO POSTMODERNITY

My initial introduction to academic study of the Bible occurred between 1961 and 1965. Although most of my Bible professors did not deliberately intend for their courses to be baptisms into modernity, in retrospect that is how I experienced my studies. In courses such as “Literature of the Old Testament” and “Literature of the New Testament,” we read significant articles in the introductory sections of *The Interpreter’s Bible*.¹ Although the professors exposed us to the “salvation-history” movement,² the primary methodological approach was that of the historical-critical method. So, I was taught to ask five questions of a Biblical text: Who wrote it? When was it written? To whom was it written? Why was it written? Whence was it written and to what place? Implicitly, these

five “W” questions were teaching me to approach the Biblical text as an historical object to be placed in an ancient context. So much effort was spent investigating these “five ‘w’ questions” that I seldom seriously asked the sixth question, “What does the text say and mean?” Now I understand that I was experiencing what Edgar V. McKnight portrays as “. . . the attempt to make history the context for understanding the Biblical text.”³

But an uneasiness accompanied my historical study of the Bible. I found that some questions were unanswerable. For instance, who were the various authors named John in the New Testament? Was Galatia a northern political territory or a southern region of cities? Was Luke a physician and a companion of Paul? What was the nature of the resurrection? At best all I could do was list various options of scholars on historical issues. Exploring all these possibilities, I concluded that I could not know very much for certain in Biblical studies.

In his 1983 article “The Impact of Modern Thought Upon Biblical Interpretation,” John Culp discussed three dominant perceptions of reality in modern thought. Culp stated that reality is historical, secular, and pluralistic.⁴ My study of the Bible in college led me to perceive reality as historical and pluralistic. Two facts reminded me that reality is not secular—my Christian experience and the confessions of professors and ministers who, “when push came to shove,” affirmed the priority of their theological understanding of the Bible over their attempts to comprehend the Bible historically.

When I listened to outstanding preachers, including my professors, I noticed that their sermons did not spend a lot of time addressing the “five ‘w’ questions.” I wondered, “Why am I spending so much time addressing these questions?” My personal intellectual pilgrimage since 1965 has sought to understand the Bible in light of the doubts regarding Biblical faith raised by the historical-critical method. I resonate with Robert Morgan and John Barton’s observation that “modern historical scholarship on the Bible is rooted in the eighteenth-century rationalist attacks upon Christianity.”⁵ Barton and Morgan contend in their chapter entitled “Criticism and the Death of Scripture”⁶ that Biblical criticism created the death of Scripture as the Bible ceased to be authoritative when studied as the object of historical investigation.

My initial response was to move from a Biblical paradigm for my personal faith to a theological paradigm. Thus I read Reinhold Niebuhr, Rudolph Bultmann, Paul Tillich, Jürgen Moltmann, and others. I learned

to think and preach theologically. But parishioners in my first parish pressed me to preach the Bible rather than theology. So I turned to the descriptive approach of the Biblical Theology Movement. I preached what I understood the Bible to say, even while I was personally struggling with the historical uncertainties and the pluralisms among Biblical scholars. In my third year of pastoring I began a Master of Sacred Theology degree with an emphasis in New Testament at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, which I completed in 1976. During my twelve years of pastoring I read widely in the areas of Bible and theology. Thus in the early seventies I discovered the Bible-based Black theology, Latin American liberation theologies, and the holiness roots of Biblical feminism. I began building an exegetical approach and hermeneutic related to these emerging theologies. And I found that preaching from a Biblical paradigm began to produce conversions and new life in the church.

Imagine my delight when I began doctoral studies in 1980, to be formally introduced to the diverse methodological approaches then being used in Biblical studies. My doctoral program enabled me to formally evaluate in the academy the openness to diverse approaches which I had been forced to discover as a parish pastor in Maryland and in the inner city of Detroit. I believe my pilgrimage illustrates the transition from pre-criticism to modernity to postmodernity. Wesleyan-Holiness scholars in other disciplines may have experienced similar sojourns in their disciplines.

II. DEFINITIONS OF MODERNITY AND THE HISTORICAL-CRITICAL METHOD

My understanding of modernity features four traits. Descartes' dictum, "I think, therefore I am," established two of them: the twin priorities of the individual self and autonomous reason as the foundation stones of modernity. The rise of technology led to a belief in scientific, moral, and material progress. As Reinhold Niebuhr noted,

either by a force immanent in nature itself, or by the gradual extension of rationality, or by the elimination of specific sources of evil, such as priesthoods, tyrannical government and class divisions in society, modern man expects to move toward some kind of perfect society.⁷

The fourth trait of modernity, even as it anticipated progress in the future, was a glorification of present knowledge. Ernst Troeltsch's three principles, which he believed should guide our approach to history (viz.,

analogy, correlation, and criticism), enabled modern thinkers to understand the past in light of the present, which was given priority.⁸

After defining modernity as the ongoing effect of the Enlightenment, David Harvey states:

Enlightenment thought embraced the ideal of progress, and actively sought that break with history and tradition which modernity espouses. It was, above all, a secular movement that sought the demystification and desacralization of knowledge and social organization in order to liberate human beings from their chains.⁹

Likewise, Albert Borgmann defines modernism as “the conjunction of Bacon’s, Descartes’, and Locke’s projects, as the fusion of the domination of nature with the primacy of method and the sovereignty of the individual.”¹⁰

If distinguishing traits of modernity include an emphasis on autonomous reason, the detached self, assumed objectivity, the primacy of the historical method, and understanding the past in light of the present, these elements took root in historical criticism and established historical criticism as modernity’s exegetical method in Biblical studies. A glance at the methodological presuppositions of Wilhelm Wrede (1897), Krister Stendahl (1962), and Walter Kaiser (1981) reveals the methodological arrogance of some advocates of historical criticism.

Wilhelm Wrede wondered if the scientific study of New Testament theology “must be considered and done as a purely historical discipline.”¹¹ Answering affirmatively, Wrede said, “My comments presuppose the strictly historical character of New Testament theology.”¹² For Wrede,

. . . anyone who wishes to engage scientifically in New Testament theology . . . must be capable of interest in historical research. He must be guided by a pure disinterested concern for knowledge. . . . He must be able to keep his own viewpoint, however precious, quite separate from the object of his research and hold it in suspense. Then he will indeed know only what really was.¹³

The appropriate name for the discipline of Biblical study, for Wrede, is “early Christian history of religion, or rather, ‘the history of early Christian religion and theology.’”¹⁴

In 1962, Krister Stendahl continued the legacy of Wrede in his now classic article, “Biblical Theology, Contemporary.”¹⁵ Stendahl depicted

the assignment of Biblical theology as a descriptive task that can be done by the agnostic as well as believer. Like Wrede, Stendahl understood the objective of Biblical theology to be to state what a text meant in its original context, or as he put it, “. . . from the point of view of method it is clear that our only concern is to find out what these words meant when uttered or written by the prophet, the priest, the evangelist, or the apostle.”¹⁶ A descriptive theology “yields the original in its own terms, limiting the interpretation to what it meant in its own setting.”¹⁷

Walter Kaiser is a respected evangelical scholar outside the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition. Kaiser and Stendahl posit identical goals for exegesis as is evidenced by Kaiser’s dictum:

The sole object of the expositor is to explain as clearly as possible what the writer meant when he wrote the text under examination. It is the interpreter’s job to represent the text, not the prejudices, feelings, judgments, or concerns of the exegete.¹⁸

Kaiser advocates a single-meaning hermeneutic because “the author’s intended meaning is what a text means.”¹⁹

III. THE DEFINITION OF POSTMODERNITY

Stephen Toulmin is one among many voices announcing the demise of modernity: “Today the program of Modernity—even the very *concept*—no longer carries anything like the same conviction. If an historical era is ending, it is the era of Modernity itself.”²⁰ Likewise Nancy Murphy and James William McClendon, Jr. believe that “there is a growing awareness today that the modern era, ushered in by Descartes and the Enlightenment, is passing.”²¹

If modernity represented the legacy of the Enlightenment, to what does “postmodern” refer? Thomas Oden says, “Postmodernity in my meaning is nothing more or less complicated than what follows modernity.”²² Harvey, developing an argument similar to Oden, says, “No one exactly agrees as to what is meant by the term, except perhaps that ‘post-modernism’ represents some kind of reaction to, or departure from, ‘modernism.’”²³ Tightening up the definition, Angus Heller recommends “that the term post-modern be understood as equivalent to the contemporary historical consciousness of the modern age. Post-modern is not what follows after the modern age but what follows after the unfolding of modernity.”²⁴ I contend that a self-consciousness regarding the aims, achievements, and shortcomings of modernity characterizes postmodernity. In

one sense, postmodernity is still emerging. It is hard to characterize an epoch in its infancy. However, we might postulate that as the dominant influence and acceptance of the historical-critical method represented the zenith of modernity in Biblical studies, five assumptions inform a postmodern holiness hermeneutic. Using the book of Revelation, the remainder of this paper will explore elements of such a holiness hermeneutic.

IV. A HOLINESS HERMENEUTIC IS CONFESSIONAL AND COMMUNAL, PRESCRIPTIVE AND DESCRIPTIVE

John wrote Revelation that its words might be read, heard, and kept (Rev 1:3; 22:9-10). John sent the Apocalypse to seven churches in Asia Minor (Rev 1:11; 2:1-3:22). His confession, “I, John, your brother who share with you in Jesus the persecution and the kingdom and the patient endurance, was on the island called Patmos because of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus,” attests his relational bond with his readers. John claimed to have heard and seen a voice that communicated a message from God and Jesus Christ to him. John’s words constitute his confessional claim that he is transcribing an account of his personal experience with God to the churches. John’s confession is a faith statement designed to strengthen the church, as is indicated by Rev. 14:12: “Here is a call for the endurance of the saints, those who keep the commandments of God and hold fast to the faith of Jesus.” The Apocalypse is a prescription for endurance.

An historical-critical approach emphasizes scientific detachment from and historical scrutiny of the text. On the contrary, a postmodern holiness hermeneutic values the faith commitment of the exegete who interprets the Bible for the church as a community of believers. A distinctive of the postmodern era is statement of one’s presuppositions. Wesleyan/Holiness exegetes can state how their heritage informs their exegesis. Also, we can correlate our exegesis and our Christian experience. J. Christiaan Beker offers wise counsel: “Unless the experiential factors of our life’s itinerary are taken into account—unless we attempt to integrate the New Testament text with our personal experience—both our theological analysis and our pastoral activities will become vacuous.”²⁵

Historical-critical study of the Bible will continue in some academic settings. However, Robert W. Wall, in his *Revelation: New International Biblical Commentary*,²⁶ articulates a purpose for exegesis which should suit Wesleyan/Holiness interpreters. Wall states, “The ultimate aim of

Biblical interpretation is to acquire knowledge that determines and shapes the identity of God's people in history."²⁷ Wall correctly maintains that "the proper hermeneutical judgment . . . is that Revelation is useful in forming Christian faith for today."²⁸ Thus, just as John penned Revelation to fortify faith in the first century, contemporary Wesleyan/Holiness expositors interpret the Bible in relationship to the church and Christian experience rather than as a mere description of what the text meant in earlier historical settings.

A prescriptive reading of the Bible takes into account the diversity *within* the Bible. Revelation's rejection of the state and society, a Christ versus culture approach, must be read in light of three other New Testament teachings on the relationship of the Christian to the state. These diverse teachings appear in Mark 10:13-17, Romans 13:1-7, and 1 Timothy 2:1-2. In formulating ethical actions and policies, the Christian begins with the Biblical witness, even its diverse witness, and allows that witness to inform ethical decision-making. "Prescriptive reading" means that the Bible is the first source to which the Christian and the church look for guidance. The Bible must be supplemented by other influences such as tradition, experience, prayer, and deliberation. Exegesis can prescribe a life style for contemporary Christians as well as describe ancient life styles.²⁹

V. A HOLINESS HERMENEUTIC IS COMPREHENSIVE IN METHODOLOGY

Several texts in the Apocalypse demonstrate the inadequacy of the historical-critical method for explaining some of John's historical references. For example, who are the Nicolaitans? (Rev. 2:10, 15). Does "Nicolaitans," from the Greek words *nikao* and *laos*, have the symbolic reference of "people conquerors," or does it refer to incipient gnostics?

To what does the mysterious number "six hundred sixty-six" of Rev. 13:10 refer? No less a scholar than Elisabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza acknowledges that the meaning of the number 666 "must have been well known to Revelation's original audience, but it is no longer known to us."³⁰ Elsewhere she concludes, "Despite centuries of puzzling over the problem, scholars have yet to agree on whether 666 refers to Nero, Caligula, Domitian, or any other historical referent."³¹ These two examples show that in spite of their faith in historical-critical research and reason, exegetes such as Wrede, Stendahl, and Kaiser cannot always determine the original context for a given text and therefore cannot always tell what that text meant.

This would apply to Scripture in general and to the book of Revelation in particular.

But, having indicated some limitations of the historical-critical method, it is essential to remember that the historical-critical method has corrected some dogmatic and denominational readings of Revelation. For instance, Uriah Smith, a Seventh-Day Adventist expositor, and F. G. Smith, a Church of God (Anderson) interpreter, followed some earlier scholars and taught that the tripartition of “the great city” spoken of in Rev. 16:19 referred to a tripartite division of history into the age of Paganism, the age of Catholicism, and the age of Protestantism, after which ages their respective traditions were to emerge in reforming power. Their ecclesiologies determined their exegeses and hence their eschatologies. But we see scholars such as Mulholland helpfully utilizing the historical-critical method to show that the reference is not to stages of history but to the fragmentation of the “entire human structure of the rebellion (Fallen Babylon) . . . , and [the crumbling of] its historical particularization (‘the cities of the nations’). . . .”³² So it is an ongoing positive aspect of the legacy of modernity in Biblical studies that the historical-critical study of the Bible can loose Biblical interpretation from the often theologically dogmatic approaches of the pre-critical era. But historical-critical study also constricts, as we have noted (and will note further).

David Harvey insists that the aim of “the postmodern theological project is to reaffirm God’s truth without abandoning the powers of reason.”³³ This implies an inclusive methodology which can use confessional, communal and prescriptive exegesis without abandoning the historical research intrinsic to the historical-critical.

Examples of cases in which Wesleyan/Holiness exegetes have minimized the historical-critical approach and emphasized instead the clarification of the contemporary theological significance of the Apocalypse in particular may be found in the work of M. Robert Mulholland, Jr. and Robert Wall. Interpreting the leopard-like beast of Rev. 13:1-10, Mulholland mentions no historical figures, such as Nero or Domitian, and simply interprets the beast as “a perceptual framework of life that is in total rebellion against God.”³⁴ Wall, interpreting the same passage, also writes without historical referent(s) and simply interprets the beast as “a universal symbol for secular power and cultural idols with historical counterparts in every age.”³⁵

These interpretations are too abstract! In their commitment to clarifying the contemporary theological significance of Revelation, Mulhol-

land and Wall minimize the historical background which enables readers to understand that general and universal theological truths emerge from specific historical situations. And, they contribute to another problem: their work makes it clear that they know well the issues and “going” theses in historical-critical studies of the Apocalypse, and that they simply chose to muffle their influence; but less skilled exegetes than Mulholland and Wall may need the constraints of the historical-critical method to control possible idiosyncrasies.

I prefer a both/and approach which states the probable historical meaning of Revelation and its ongoing theological meaning. For me, then, the leopard-like beast initially refers to Domitian and it continues to refer, throughout history, to any ruler who places the claims of the state above those of Christ and the church.

To speak more nearly at the level of principle, we note that one might see in *Interpreting God’s Word Today*, published in 1982, some chapters which mark the end of an era in Wesleyan/Holiness Biblical scholarship, an era distinguished by a methodological commitment to a historical paradigm. There, Wesleyan/Holiness scholars Wayne McCown, John Culp, and Robert Lyon explore the relationship between a holiness hermeneutic and historical criticism,³⁶ and Frank Spina contributes a chapter on canonical criticism.³⁷ The post-1982 publications of scholars within that tradition evidence considerable methodological diversity.³⁸

However (still at the level of principle, rather than at the level of specific focus on the book of Revelation), there is one area of methodology in Biblical studies in which the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement reflects continued entrapment in modernity, and that is in its sexism. Modernity arrogantly, and falsely, claimed that the heritage of the Enlightenment constituted the true center of culture. White North Atlantic males have dominated this heritage (i.e., “modernity”), of course—determining its issues, setting its priorities and standards, and controlling its social structures. Postmodernity recognizes and legitimates spheres of influence, of which there are many in any culture, rather than submitting any culture to any single dominant center or even to any single sphere of influence, such as that controlled by white males. As Borgmann reminds us, “Communities of memory and practices of commitment still have animating power at the margins of society. These we must learn to recover and respect.”³⁹ Scanning the list of contributors to *Interpreting God’s Word Today* and the *Asbury Bible Commentary*,⁴⁰ one realizes that Wesleyan/Holiness Biblical scholarship remains centered among white males. Despite our professed

openness to women in ministry, the holiness movement has not affirmed and nurtured the call of women to Biblical scholarship. That is to say, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement has kept on the margins or ignored the resources in exegetical insight of this particular “community of memory,” with its own unique “practices of commitment.” The Wesleyan/Holiness tradition needs to include and hear the voices and methodologies of women and minorities in Biblical scholarship.

Exegesis involves exploring the literary, historical, and theological contexts of a text. Diverse methodologies, including the controls of historical research, can guide the process. Even as we move into the postmodern perspective, with its recognition that the varying cultural situations of readers provide meanings for texts, we should continue to consider the meaning of a text in its historical context. Here, Jürgen Moltmann’s observation is potent and useful: “History is undoubtedly the paradigm of modern European times, but it is not the final paradigm for humanity.”⁴¹ And Tremper Longman III, after surveying various literary approaches to Biblical interpretation, offers guidance for retrospection and future projections: “The best approach is an eclectic one.”⁴² Eclecticism rather than historicism is the postmodern mode.

VI. A HOLINESS HERMENEUTIC VALUES INTERTEXTUALITY

In contradistinction to modernity’s emphasis on determining the single meaning intended by a Biblical author, a holiness hermeneutic values intertextuality—i.e., the process whereby Spirit-influenced writers and readers discover new meanings in texts as they enter into relationships with them. W. S. Vorster defines the significance of intertextuality:

[All texts] are related to other texts and their meanings, in a network of intertextuality. The meaning of a text is the result of the similarities and differences between other texts. Intertextuality refers to the fact that one text is irrevocably influenced by other texts, and that its meaning is determined by its similarities with and differences from other texts.⁴³

Elsewhere, Vorster says, “All texts can be regarded as the rewriting of previous texts, and also as reactions to texts.”⁴⁴

Texts relate to each other in a backward and forward manner. Thus, for Ellen van Wolde:

The exegete or textual analyst is the reader who informs other readers about the possible worlds of a text, or the person who

on the basis of intertextual study actualizes the possible textual relationships so that the “universe of discourse” becomes visible.⁴⁵

In his monumental work, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*,⁴⁶ Richard Hayes observes: “No longer can we think of meaning as something contained by a text; texts have meaning only as they are read and used by communities of readers.”⁴⁷ Edgar McKnight agrees that “meaning is in part a result of the creative involvement of the reader.”⁴⁸ From this perspective on intertextuality, it may be said that a writer of a Biblical text stood in a creative relationship with prior written texts, with the immediate readers being addressed, and with the illuminating and imaginative influence of the Holy Spirit. Once the text is written, it becomes a source of referral and creativity for future readers. It gains a voice and, as Hayes points out, “the text is reckoned as having a knowing voice that has the power to address the present out of the past—or to address the past about the present, in such a way that readers, overhearing, may reconceive the present.”⁴⁹

The concept of intertextuality provides a vehicle for exploring the relationships between Scripture, reason, tradition, and experience in the interpretive process. It implies relationships with texts. It disallows any perspective which makes texts into objects to be dissected and analyzed from a distance. It invites interpreters into relationships with texts on the premise that legitimate meanings emerge from these relationships.

Albert Gray’s understanding of Biblical inspiration shows that the concepts of intertextuality and reader-response criticism are at home in Wesleyan/Holiness traditions. Gray, a thoughtful teacher and theologian, and founding president of Pacific Bible College, now Warner Pacific College, wrote a systematic theology in which he entitled the section on Biblical inspiration “It Is the Person That Is Inspired.”⁵⁰ Gray believed that “the inspiration of the Holy Spirit is not directed toward the papyrus, the pen, or the ink, but toward the persons inspired.”⁵¹ Elsewhere, he had said: “It is not the Bible, that is the book itself, that was inspired, but the writers. The inspiration of the Spirit of God had its direct contact with the mind and spirit of the writers. It was the men who were inspired.”⁵²

This Wesleyan/Holiness statement of Biblical inspiration is at least congenial to the concept of intertextuality and it allows us to return to and utilize the book of Revelation, where intertextuality abounds, as our “illustration” for postmodern hermeneutics within the holiness tradition.

And again, in true intertextual fashion, I speak autobiographically for a moment in order to set the stage even more postmodernly.

My doctoral dissertation explores the way in which the social situations of three first-century writers—John, IV Ezra, and Josephus—influenced them to interpret differently the visions of the four world empires of Daniel 2:31-45 and Daniel 7.⁵³ And, it was my own personal concern, my need, generated by the diverse understandings of the book of Revelation operant in my Church of God (Anderson) heritage, which prompted my sociological study of Rev. 13 and Dan. 7. I was not familiar with the concept of intertextuality in the early 1980s, when I did my dissertation. In retrospect, however, I see intertextuality at work in that process. I, as a “text,” was interacting with the written texts of Revelation and Daniel in order to define myself in relationship to the various interacting “texts” presented by my heritage.

VII. A HOLINESS HERMENEUTIC IS OPEN TO THE SPIRIT

Bearing in mind, then, my own experience, the methodological comprehensiveness of Wesleyan/Holiness hermeneutics, and the congeniality of at least one Wesleyan/Holiness understanding of Biblical inspiration to intertextuality, we return to the question of a postmodern Wesleyan/Holiness hermeneutic, utilizing the book of Revelation as our “illustration.”

Commenting on Revelation, John Wesley wrote that John was “overwhelmed with power and filled with the light of the Holy Spirit.”⁵⁴ The phrase “in the Spirit” appears four times in the Apocalypse: at John’s call (1:9-10); when he looks into heaven and beholds a vision of God the Creator (4:2); as he prepares to announce the judgment of Babylon (17:3); and when he surveys the New Jerusalem (21:10). Three of these visions are positive as the Spirit empowers John to see and share what God has in store for the church. And the vision of the judgment of Babylon was so traumatic that John needed the enabling of the Spirit to describe it. The phrase “in the Spirit” suggests that John experienced periodic renewal throughout the writing of the Apocalypse. His references to the experience at critical junctures of his narrative correspond to Larry Shelton’s understanding of what constitutes a Wesleyan view of inspiration: “[such a view] should reflect a cooperative, redemptive, interpersonal process that is validated by an existential encounter with the Holy Spirit.”⁵⁵

To illustrate the difference that such an understanding of inspiration makes in hermeneutics and, as a corollary, to illuminate the distinction

between the modern historical-critical method and postmodern method, we may compare an article of F. F. Bruce, published in 1973 under the title “The Spirit in the Apocalypse,”⁵⁶ with Robert Mulholland’s *Revelation: Holy Living in an Unholy World*, a Wesleyan/Holiness commentary published in 1990.

Bruce described what John wrote. He functioned as an historian of ideas and related John’s references to the Spirit to other ancient texts. Like Stendahl, Bruce delineated the first-century meaning of the text without commenting on its meaning in 1973. I suspect that Bruce’s commitment to the historical-critical method restrained him from combining historical study and contemporary prescription. In *Revelation: Holy Living in an Unholy World*, Mulholland issues a strong challenge to modernity by insisting that “[in order to] develop a more holistic understanding of Revelation, the reality and nature of visionary experience must be taken seriously as a primary factor in interpretation.”⁵⁷ Mulholland maintains that to overlook or otherwise refuse to recognize the visionary character of the Apocalypse and to interpret it solely in terms of historical criticism, anthropology, sociology and literary criticism, “is to develop a sophisticated description of the shell of the vision and to miss the reality of the vision itself.”⁵⁸ Mulholland aptly employs historical, literary, and sociological criticisms, but he insists that it is fundamental to remember “that John is reporting a genuine visionary experience, an enhanced state of consciousness, a mystical encounter with profound spiritual realities that moved John into a fuller dimension of perception and experience.”⁵⁹

For Mulholland, to be “in the Spirit” is to be open to the possibility of experiencing the heightened consciousness intrinsic to existence in the spiritual realm. He asks readers to consider whether their modern and naturalistic worldviews prevent them from understanding Revelation as a vision; more particularly, as the vision which John experienced.⁶⁰ Further, Mulholland, as Wall, asks contemporary readers of Revelation to consider whether their values and commitments are those of the New Jerusalem, symbolized by the faithful saints, or those of Fallen Babylon.

The commentaries of Mulholland and Wall bear three characteristics of postmodernity: they depart from a solely historical-critical method; they invite the reader to relate to the conflict between competing values—a conflict between the New Jerusalem and Fallen Babylon; and, they affirm the role of the Spirit, both in John’s life as writer and in the contemporary reader’s perusal and appropriation of the text. The idea that the Spirit continues to influence readers individually and corporately is a very significant idea basic to Wesleyan/Holiness hermeneutics.

VIII. A HOLINESS HERMENEUTIC IS UNEASY WITH DOMINANT CULTURAL PARADIGMS: BEYOND MODERNITY AND POSTMODERNITY

Bible scholars often refer to Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, and Ephesus as the centers of early Christianity, as loci of influential Christian communities.⁶¹ To this list of cities we might add the island of Patmos. From Patmos emanated the apocalyptic message inherent in Jesus and Paul.⁶² As apocalyptic theology, Revelation affirms God's intention to culminate history in a cosmic redemption—a point of view suggested by Paul in Romans 8:18-25 and I Corinthians 15. This apocalyptic theology directly contradicted the claims of the Roman Empire that as continuator of "the realm of Troy" and heir of Hellenism, she was an eternal empire—in Virgil's words, "boundless in time and power."⁶³ Thus, I would submit, the conflict between the Hellenism of the Roman Empire and John of Patmos was a first-century clash between tradition and modernity.⁶⁴ Further, I would submit that the book is a critique of the modernity represented by Hellenism within the emerging church, a Hellenism which, by 96 C.E., the date of the composition of the book of Revelation, was instrumental in reducing apocalyptic theology to a secondary role in the church's message.

Ironies abound in John's critique of the modernity represented by Hellenism. He challenged Rome's claim to be eternal by declaring that God is "the Alpha and the Omega . . . who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1:8). To an Empire which sees itself as the very essence of the future, John relays the thrice-repeated, climactic announcement of Jesus: "I am coming soon" (Rev. 22:7, 12, 20). The letters to the seven churches, apocalyptic as they are, are informed by John's insight into the culture and commerce of Asia Minor—the seven churches are in seven very real earthly cities.⁶⁵ Babylon/Rome's wealth and power are not to be denied, fallen though she be, and that in part because she values things over people (Rev. 18), but the wealth and power of the New Jerusalem, John tells us, far surpass that of Rome. The fierce and apparently indomitable beast, who initially represented Emperor Domitian, is outmatched and conquered by "the Lamb who was slain." Greek, the literary language of pervasive and seductive Hellenism and its attendant imperialism, flows from John's pen as a powerful instrument for telling of the collapse of that culture; and the very genre of John's work, a letter, is turned from its usual conveyance of worldly wisdom to an apocalyptic vehicle.⁶⁶ John knew Hellenism inside out, and now he appropriates that knowledge to challenge, to attack, Hellenism's modernity.

Wesleyan/Holiness exegetes can learn from John's dual strategy of attack and appropriation. We can positively appreciate modernity's emphases: rationality, the worth of the individual, scientific inquiry. At the same time, we abhor its arrogance. We need to understand, as McKnight counsels us, that "a dialectical relationship exists between the modern and postmodern; the postmodern 'advance' utilizes the assumptions and strategies of the modern in order to challenge them."⁶⁷

As modernity has come and gone,⁶⁸ so will postmodernity come and go. Postmodernity is currently fashionable, a trend. But it will eventually fade and its former luster will be criticized by proponents of some new era. Like John of Patmos, we need to understand our culture thoroughly. Our holiness heritage, a heritage which emerged as the reform of an established religion, implies that we should not wed our hermeneutic to the dominant cultural paradigm. A holiness hermeneutic which affirms an apocalyptic understanding of history can never be comfortable with dominant cultural paradigms. Amid inevitable transitions, our relationship to culture will alternate between attack and appropriation as we await the One who claimed to be coming soon.

NOTES

¹George Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), 1:1ff.

²G. Ernest Wright, *God Who Acts* (London: SCM Press, 1952), and G. Ernest Wright and Reginald H. Fuller, *The Book of the Acts of God* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1957). Brevard S. Childs provides a critique of the Biblical theology movement in *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970).

³Edgar McKnight, "A Biblical Criticism for American Biblical Scholarship," in Kent Harold Richards, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1980* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), p. 123. David Bartlett shares a similar experience in "Biblical Scholarship Today: A Diversity of New Approaches," *The Christian Century* 98 (October 20, 1991), p. 1090.

⁴John Culp, "The Impact of Modern Thought Upon Biblical Interpretation," *Wesleyan Theological Perspectives*, Vol. I: *Interpreting God's Word Today* (Wayne McCown and James Earl Massey, eds., Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1962), pp. 112-118.

⁵Robert Morgan with John Barton, *Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1900), p. 20.

⁶Morgan and Barton, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 44-61. David Harvey portrays the Enlightenment as “. . . a secular movement that sought the demystification and desecralization of knowledge and social organization in order to liberate human beings from their chains.” Cf. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1909), pp. 12-13.

⁷Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), I.24.

⁸See Laurence Wood's discussion of Troeltsch in “The Bible and Truth,” *Asbury Bible Commentary*, Eugene Carpenter and Wayne McCown, eds. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), pp. 67-68. John Wilson says, “Modernism entails a kind of explicit and self-conscious commitment to the modern in intellectual and cultural spheres,” in Mircea Eliade, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987), 10:18; also, Thomas Oden, *Two Worlds: Notes on the Death of Modernity in America and Russia* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992), p. 82. (Hereinafter, *Two Worlds*.)

⁹David Harvey, *Condition of Postmodernity*, pp. 12-13.

¹⁰Albert Borgman, *Crossing the Postmodern Divide* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 25.

¹¹William Wrede, “The Task and Methods of ‘New Testament Theology,’” in Robert Morgan, *The Nature of New Testament Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1973), p. 69. (Hereinafter, Wrede, “Task and Methods.”)

¹²Wrede, “Task and Methods,” p. 69.

¹³Wrede, “Task and Methods,” p. 70.

¹⁴Wrede, “Task and Methods,” p. 116.

¹⁵Krister Stendahl, “Biblical Theology, Contemporary,” in George Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), I: 418-432. (Hereinafter, Stendahl “Biblical Theology.”)

¹⁶Stendahl, “Biblical Theology,” p. 422.

¹⁷Stendahl, “Biblical Theology,” p. 425. Commenting on Stendahl's descriptive approach in 1991, Bruce Birch observes, “This approach still dominates. . . .” Cf. Bruce Birch, *Let Justice Roll Down: The Old Testa-*

ment, Ethics, and Christian Life (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), p. 61. Heikki Raisanen illustrates Birch's observation. After surveying New Testament theology since J. P. Gabler, Raisanen concludes, "I have opted for Wrede's version in a modified form." Cf. Heikki Raisanen, *Beyond New Testament Theology* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), p. 120.

¹⁸Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *Toward an Exegetical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981), p. 45.

¹⁹Kaiser, *ibid.*, p. 33; also, see pp. 46-47. Gerald Sheppard criticizes Kaiser's approach in *The Future of the Bible* (Toronto: The United Church Publishing House, 1990), p. 55.

²⁰Stephen Toulman, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), p. 3. Albert C. Outler concurs in "Toward a Postliberal Hermeneutics," *Theology Today* 42 (1985), pp. 281-291.

²¹Nancey Murphy and James Wm. McClendon, Jr., "Distinguishing Modern and Postmodern Theologies," *Modern Theology* 5 (April 1989), p. 191. Darrell Jodock outlines eight events leading to the demise of modernity and the emergence of postmodernism in *The Church's Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 72-73.

²²Oden, *Two Worlds*, p. 44. Oden dates the modern era as 1789-1989. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 12 and 32.

²³Harvey, *Condition of Postmodernity*, p. 7. Harvey roots the emergence of postmodernism "somewhere between 1968 and 1978." Cf. *ibid.*, 38.

²⁴Angus Heller, *Can Modernity Survive?* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), p. 169. Borgmann contends, "*Postmodern* is now the vocable favored to invoke a sense of closure and transition. Whatever its faults, the term reminds us of what needs to be understood before it can be overcome, namely, the modern period, its character, and its boundaries." Cf. Borgmann, *Crossing the Postmodern Divide*, p. 20. Similar to Oden, Harvey and Borgmann, I do not limit the term "postmodern" to structuralism as does Joey Earl Horstman in "Postmodern Christianity: Saussure, Derrida, and the Definition of God," *Perspectives* 6 (October 1991), pp. 19-20.

²⁵J. Christiaan Beker, "Integration and Integrity in New Testament Studies," *The Christian Century* 109 (May 13, 1992), p. 516. Jean-Pierre Jossua begins with the "lived, commented and interpreted experiences

of believers . . . known as narrative theology.” Cf. Jean-Pierre Jossua, “A Crisis of the Paradigm, or a Crisis of the Scientific Nature of Theology?” in Hans Küng and David Tracy, eds., *Paradigm Change in Theology*, Margaret Kohl, tr. (New York: Crossroad, 1989), p. 256.

²⁶Robert W. Wall, *Revelation: New International Critical Commentary* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991). (Hereinafter, Wall, *Revelation*.)

²⁷Wall, *Revelation*, p. 37. One can accept Wall’s thesis without accepting all the ramifications of the canonical criticism he espouses. For an evaluation of Wall’s canonical approach see my “Some Words on the Bible’s Last Word: An Assessment of Four Recent Commentaries on Revelation,” *Christian Scholar’s Review* (forthcoming).

²⁸Wall, *Revelation*, p. 55. Stephen E. Fowl and L. Gregory Jones also affirm that “the aim of Scriptural interpretation is to shape our common life in the situations in which we find ourselves according to the characters, convictions, and practices related in Scripture.” Cf. Stephen E. Fowl and L. Gregory Jones, *Reading in Communion: Scripture & Ethics in the Christian Life* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann’s, 1991), p. 20; also, pp. 37, 59, 63-64.

²⁹Contrary to Robert Alter’s claim that the Bible is not read prescriptively except by fundamentalist groups. Cf. Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature* (New York: Basic Books, 1992), p. 196.

³⁰Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation: Vision of a Just World*, in *Proclamation Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), p. 86. (Hereinafter, Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation*.)

³¹Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation*, p. 16.

³²Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and Revelation* (Battle Creek: Review & Herald, 1882), pp. 185-186, 667-706; F. G. Smith, *The Revelation Explained* (Anderson, IN: The Gospel Trumpet Company, 1908), pp. 235, 258-261. Also see M. Robert Mulholland, Jr., *Revelation: Holy Living in an Unholy World* (Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury/Zondervan, 1990), p. 273. But, see *infra*, n34.

³³Harvey, *Condition of Postmodernity*, p. 41; likewise, David Tracy states, “The hope of reason must be defended in any philosophy worthy of the name.” Cf. David Tracy, “On Naming the Present,” *ibid.*, p. 72.

³⁴M. Robert Mulholland, Jr., *ibid.*, p. 226.

³⁵Wall, *Revelation*, p. 168.

³⁶Wayne McCown, "Toward a Wesleyan Hermeneutic," pp. 1-30; John Culp, "The Impact of Modern Thought Upon Biblical Interpretation," pp. 111-134; and Robert W. Lyon, "Evangelicals and the Critical Historical Method," in McCown and Massey, *ibid.*, pp. 135-164.

³⁷Frank W. Spina, "Canonical Criticism: Childs Versus Sanders," in McCown and Massey, *ibid.*, pp. 165-194.

³⁸For instance, Spina, Robert Wall, and Eugene Lemcio of Seattle Pacific University use canonical criticism. A sampling of diverse methodologies among Church of God writers appears in Barry Callen, ed., *Listening to the Word of God* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1991). Michael Cosby uses rhetorical criticism in *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989). For sociological analysis, see John E. Stanley, "The Apocalypse and Contemporary Sect Analysis," in Kent Harold Richards, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers Series*. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), pp. 411-421.

³⁹Borgmann, *Crossing the Postmodern Divide*, p. 57. Thomas Oden's "Women in the Pastoral Office," in *Pastoral Theology* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), pp. 35-46 is much more supportive of women than his diatribe against feminism in *Two Worlds*, pp. 39-40. Contrary to Oden's claim, feminism is not dead. Actually, given cultural lag, contemporary feminism's positive influence on the holiness movement is just coming into full force as evidenced by the women in ministry conference sponsored by five holiness groups in 1994. A text that demonstrates the diverse spheres of influence typical of postmodernity is *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis*, David Jobling, Peggy Day, and Gerald T. Sheppard, eds. (Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 1991).

⁴⁰Cf. *supra* 36, 38.

⁴¹Jurgen Moltmann, tr. Margaret Kohl, *The Way of Jesus Christ* (San Francisco: Harper, 1990), p. 215.

⁴²Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987), p. 49.

⁴³W. S. Vorster, "'Genre' and the Revelation of John: A Study in Text, Context and Intertext," *Neotestamentica* 22 (1988), p. 110.

⁴⁴W. S. Vorster, "Intertextuality and *Redaktionsgeschichte*," in Sipke Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings. Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersell* (Kampen: Uitgeverij Maatschappij J. J. Kok, 1989), p. 20.

⁴⁵Ellen van Wolde, "Trendy Intertextuality?" *Intertextuality in Biblical Studies*, p. 48.

⁴⁶Richard B. Hayes, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

⁴⁷Hayes, *ibid.*, p. 189.

⁴⁸Edgar V. McKnight, *Postmodern Use of the Bible: The Emergence of Reader-Oriented Criticism* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1988), p. 68.

⁴⁹Hayes, *ibid.*, p. 107; Eduard Schillebeeckx further explains the act of finding new meanings in texts: “The Christian *perception* of meaning takes place *in* a creative process of *giving* meaning, a re-reading of the tradition from within new situations. Interpretation produces new traditions, in creative faithfulness. This is what it means to hand on the tradition of faith in a living way to future generations.” Cf. Eduard Schillebeeckx, “The Role of History in What Is Called the New Paradigm,” in Küng and Tracy, *Paradigm Change in Theology*, p. 313.

⁵⁰Albert F. Gray, *Christian Theology*. Vol. 1 (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1944).

⁵¹Gray, *Christian Theology*, p. 80.

⁵²Albert F. Gray, *Basic Christian Theology*, Book 1 (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, n.d.), p. 16.

⁵³John E. Stanley, “The Use of the Symbol of Four World Empires to Inspire Resistance to or Acceptance of Hellenism in Daniel 2, Daniel 7, 4 Ezra 11-12, Revelation 13, and *Antiquities of the Jews*: Insights from the Sociology of Knowledge and Sect Analysis,” (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Denver/Iliff School of Theology, 1986).

⁵⁴John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testamen*, 18th ed. (New York Eaton and Mains, n.d.), p. 654.

⁵⁵Larry Shelton, “Nature, Character, and Origin of Scripture,” *Asbury Bible Commentary*, p. 28.

⁵⁶F. F. Bruce, “The Spirit in the Apocalypse,” in Barnabas Linders and Stephen S. Smalley, eds., *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 333-344.

⁵⁷Mulholland, *ibid.*, p. 17.

⁵⁸Mulholland, *ibid.*, p. 44.

⁵⁹Mulholland, *ibid.*, p. 342.

⁶⁰Mulholland, *ibid.*, p. 12. Unlike Mulholland, I am not convinced that one can determine where John used vision as a literary category to communicate his apocalypse and where he reports his actual vision. To say this does not mean I am using a naturalistic interpretation.

⁶¹As in Raymond Brown and John Meier, *Jerusalem and Rome* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983).

⁶²Ernst Käsemann spoke of apocalyptic as “the mother of Christianity,” in “The Beginnings of Christian Theology,” W. J. Montague, tr., in *New Testament Questions for Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 102. J. Christiaan Beker states, “Paul is an apocalyptic theologian.” Cf. J. Christiaan Beker, “The Relationship Between Sin and Death in Romans,” in Robert Fortna and Beverly Gaventa, eds., *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul & John* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), p. 56; also, Beker’s *Paul’s Apocalyptic Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), and his “Paul’s Apocalyptic Theology: Apocalyptic and the Resurrection of Christ,” *Paul the Apostle* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), pp. 135-181. Ben Witherington III offers an apology for apocalyptic in *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), pp. 9-12 and 232-242.

⁶³Virgil, *The Aeneid*, tr. James Rhoades in *Great Books of the Western World*, ed. Robert Hutchins (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952), II.278-280. David Flusser notes that the Roman historian Aemilius Sura regarded the Roman Empire as the fourth and final world kingdom, “The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972), p. 159, n. 43.

⁶⁴Carolyn Osiek agrees that the clash between Hellenism, Judaism, and Christianity was an encounter between tradition and modernity. Cf. Carolyn Osiek, *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), p. 14.

⁶⁵Colin J. Hemer, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1986).

⁶⁶Recent commentators such as Wall, Mulholland, and Schüssler Fiorenza concur that the Apocalypse is a mixture of the three genres: letter, prophecy and apocalypse.

⁶⁷McKnight, *Postmodern Use of the Bible*, p. 25, n. 1.

⁶⁸Peter Berger, Brititte Berger, and Hansfried Kellner argued that modernity is not “an inexorable destiny” and that its processes may turn out to be somewhat reversible, in *The Homeless Mind* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), pp. 19 and 229.

JUSTIFIED BUT UNREGENERATE? THE RELATIONSHIP OF ASSURANCE TO JUSTIFICATION AND REGENERATION IN THE THOUGHT OF JOHN WESLEY

by

Scott Kisker

INTRODUCTION

Assurance of salvation has occupied a definite place in the history of the Wesleyan movement and in Wesleyan theology. Most major Wesleyan theologians have dealt with the topic to some extent, especially when articulating a Wesleyan understanding of salvation. The importance of this place within Wesleyan theology, or even within John Wesley's own understanding of salvation, is disputed, however. This study relates assurance to justification and regeneration. It takes its initial cue from Edward Sugden's observation and evidence presented in a footnote in his edition of Wesley's "The Almost Christian." Although Wesley says in this sermon that assurance is necessary to full Christianity, he later contradicts this opinion.¹ At the base of both opinions lie Wesley's earlier and later analyses and assessments of his own spiritual state as it related to his well-noted experience of May, 1738, in Aldersgate Street.

Early in his evangelical career, Wesley had held that, before his experience at Aldersgate, he was a "child of wrath." He wrote in his *Journal* for February 1, 1738:

That "alienated" as I am "from the life of God," I am "a child of wrath," and heir of hell; that my own works, my own suffer-

ings, my own righteousness, are so far from reconciling me to an offended God, so far from making any atonement for the least of those sins, which “are more in number than the hairs of my head,” that the most specious of them need an atonement themselves or they cannot abide his righteous judgment.²

As Wesley saw it at that time, he believed he did not have that faith which would grant him pardon from all of his sins. He was relying on his own righteousness. Then at Aldersgate he was justified before God, given an assurance of that fact, and made regenerate. From there he could go on to entire sanctification.

In the 1774 edition of the *Journal*, Wesley corrected that statement. In a footnote to the line which reads, “I am a child of wrath,” Wesley added, “I believe not.” By making this correction, Wesley indicated that, at least by 1774, he believed he was already reconciled to God when he went to Georgia (although he had no perception of it himself). It is clear from Wesley’s writings that he did not feel a peace with God when he was in Georgia. He says of his good works (in his *Journal* entry of February 1, 1738) that, “all these things, though when ennobled by faith in Christ they are holy, and just, and good, yet without it are ‘dung and dross,’ meet only to be purged away by ‘the fire that never shall be quenched.’ ”³ This is not a description of a peaceful and joyful spirit.

And yet in another footnote on the same page of this *Journal* (again added in 1774) Wesley wrote that he “had even then the faith of a servant, though not the faith of a son.”⁴ Wesley was rescued from the “wrath of God” when he had but “the faith of a servant,” and not “the faith of a son.” This seems to imply that Wesley now believed (in 1774) that he had been justified (that is, he had received pardon for his sins and thus escaped God’s wrath) prior to Aldersgate. He did not know it, then, nor did he possess the fruits of such a pardon.

The broader theological implication of these corrections which Sugden noted is that Wesley came to believe that while assurance is a gracious gift of God, it is not “essential” to being a Christian. This development of Wesley’s thought was largely ignored by William Cannon in his *The Theology of John Wesley*. In a chapter on “Redemption and Assurance,” Cannon simply describes assurance, but does not mention Wesley’s waffling on the issue.⁵ Nevertheless, the development was recognized by Colin Williams⁶ and later by Albert Outler.⁷ Theodore Jennings, and others who

wish to diminish the role of assurance experiences within Methodist theology, point to this development as evidence for their position.⁸

Current scholarship generally argues, convincingly, that Wesley changed his opinion sometime in the 1740s, coming to hold that assurance is not necessary to justification. This is not to say, however, that assurance is not necessary to the Christian life. Christianity involves both justification and regeneration. In Wesley's *ordo salutis*, justification and the new birth (the Latinate term being regeneration) occur concurrently.⁹ This paper will argue that the two may be separated temporally and that Wesley continued to hold that assurance and regeneration are linked. One might be justified (without assurance) without being regenerate (with assurance). One cannot, however, be "born again" and not know it.

A clear separation between "justification" and "regeneration" is at some points difficult. Even after the 1740s, Wesley used the term justification, "broadly defined," in such a way as to include regeneration. Furthermore, in at least one place Wesley stated plainly that justification and regeneration occur simultaneously.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the evidence that Wesley consistently linked regeneration and assurance, even after the 1740s, is convincing, and this distinction may clear up some supposed inconsistencies in Wesley's thought.¹¹

To make this argument, this article will first establish what Wesley meant specifically by the term "assurance." Second, this article will look at Wesley's understanding of "justification" and "regeneration." Third, this article will examine the relationships between justification and assurance and between regeneration and assurance in Wesley's writings.

THE NATURE OF ASSURANCE

Even prior to his 1738 experience at Aldersgate, Wesley had an understanding of experiential religion although he knew that he himself did not possess it. This has been aptly demonstrated by Colin Williams in John Wesley's *Theology Today*.¹² Wesley was convinced by Moravian Peter Bohler that the notion of assurance was scriptural.¹³ After this had been demonstrated to him, Wesley asked to interview people who could attest to the experience of the type of faith that implies assurance in their own lives. Peter Bohler then brought to Wesley a group of these people, and they testified "of their own personal experience that a true living faith in Christ is inseparable from a sense of pardon for all past, and freedom from all present sins."¹⁴

In this context, assurance is understood to be composed of two primary elements. First, assurance implies a sense of pardon for all past sins.

This is not an understanding which is arrived at through reflection. It is “sensed”—known to the heart of the recipient apart from outward or even inward signs. Second, assurance implies power over sin.¹⁵ This is properly an outward sign of a fundamental change that has taken place within the believer. The believer notices alterations in character, and can take stock of them, and feel assured that what is sensed has actually happened.

This twofold understanding of the nature of assurance is the framework within which Wesley interpreted his Aldersgate experience in the months immediately after it.¹⁶ Furthermore, this understanding continued consistently throughout his life. Wesley made these same distinctions in his most extensive treatment of the nature of assurance, his sermon entitled “The Witness of the Spirit, I,” which was written in 1746. In this sermon Wesley divided assurance into two categories. The first is the “witness of our own spirit.” This witness is “that God hath given us to be holy of heart, and holy in outward conversation.”¹⁷ This witness of our own spirit includes having a loving heart toward all humankind as well as for God, and that we do the things which are “pleasing in his sight.”¹⁸ The witness of our own spirit corresponds to the experience of power over sin referred to by the Moravians, though including inward as well as outward signs.

The second category Wesley described is the “witness of God’s Spirit.” In describing this category, Wesley said this:

It is hard to find words in the language of men to explain “the deep things of God.” Indeed there are none that will adequately express what the children of God experience. But perhaps one might say . . . the testimony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly “witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God”; that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God.¹⁹

This corresponds to the Moravian understanding of a sense of pardon for all past sins.

Wesley continued to view assurance in this twofold way even into later life. In the second sermon he writes on this subject, “The Witness of the Spirit, II,” he says, “After twenty years farther consideration I see no cause to retract any part of [my earlier sermon on the witness of the Spirit]. Neither do I now conceive how any of these expressions may be altered so as to make them more intelligible.”²⁰

Thus Wesley can be said to have been consistent throughout his ministry in his understanding of the two general aspects of assurance. This

permits us to turn to the relationship of justification and regeneration with some hope of consistency.

JUSTIFICATION AND REGENERATION IN WESLEY'S THOUGHT

In one of Wesley's early sermons, "Salvation by Faith," written in 1738 (just after his Aldersgate experience), he made little distinction between "justification" and, what he was most concerned about in this sermon, being "saved." Being saved to Wesley implied that a sinner has been "saved (to comprise all in one word) from sin."²¹ Being saved from sin assumes what is generally thought of as "justification." Justification (taken in and of itself, apart from the rest of God's saving acts) occurs when a "sinful man find(s) favor with God."²² The sinful man has been pardoned for all of his sins. But, in 1738, Wesley took "justification" to include the inward change as well as deliverance from wrath, or pardon.

"Justification," which taken in its *largest* sense, implies a deliverance from guilt and punishment, by the atonement of Christ actually applied to the soul of the sinner now believing in him, and a deliverance from the power of sin, through Christ "formed in his heart."²³

Note that this is "justification taken in its largest sense." This becomes important later.

As early as 1740, Wesley said he believed that there might be degrees of justifying faith, and that these degrees were at least efficacious enough for sinners to permit them to attend the Lord's supper. In a preface to the second *Extract* of Wesley's *Journal*, Wesley wrote in opposition to the Moravians:

In flat opposition to this I assert: (1) "that a man may have a degree of justifying faith before he is wholly freed from all doubt and fear, and before he has (in the full proper sense) a new clean heart"; (2) "That a man may use the ordinances of God, the Lord's supper in particular, before he has such a faith as excludes all doubt and fear, and implies a new, a clean heart."²⁴

Here again, a distinction is made between having a degree of justifying faith, and having a new and clean heart which Wesley claims is implied in being born of God.

In the 1746 sermon which Wesley preached explicitly on the doctrine of justification, he narrowed his definition of "justification." Here he

delineated exactly what is meant by the term, but he did not take it in its “largest sense.” In “Justification by Faith” he defines justification this way:

The plain scriptural notion of justification is pardon, the forgiveness of sins. It is that act of God the Father whereby, for the sake of the propitiation made by the blood of his Son, he “showeth forth his righteousness (or mercy) by the remission of the sins that are past.” This is the easy, natural account of it given by St. Paul throughout his whole Epistle.²⁵

Wesley was careful in this sermon not to confuse “justification” with “sanctification.” “The one implies what God *does for us* through his Son; the other what he *works in us* by his Spirit.”²⁶ Sanctification, which begins at the point of the new birth, is not the same thing as justification.

The idea of degrees of justifying faith, as well as this distinction between what God does *for us* and what God does *in us*, is carried on throughout the later writings of Wesley, at least implicitly. It is through the understanding of this implicit meaning that one can make sense of Wesley’s writings concerning justification, regeneration, and assurance.

The confusion stems from the close link made between these two concepts in Wesley’s 1760 sermon, “The New Birth.” In the preface to the body of this sermon, Wesley writes:

If any doctrines within the whole of Christianity may properly be termed fundamental they are doubtless these two—the doctrine of justification and that of the new birth: the former relating to that great work which God does *for us*, in forgiving our sins; the latter to the great work God does *in us*, in renewing our fallen nature. In order of time neither of these is before the other. In the moment we are justified by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Jesus we are also “born of the Spirit”: but in order of thinking, as it is termed, justification precedes the new birth. We first conceive his wrath to be turned away, and then his Spirit to work in our hearts.²⁷

Here the separation between the two aspects of Christian life is maintained in thought, but linked in time. That this is Wesley’s consistent view on the subject has largely been taken for granted by scholars with viewpoints as diverse as Colin Williams and Kenneth Collins.²⁸ It is this temporal link that I wish to call into question. Although Wesley here explicitly states the temporal relationship between the two, it is also clear that the

type of justification he is describing is that which assumes one can “conceive” of God’s wrath being turned away—thus implying some sort of assurance. We again have a seeming contradiction, with Wesley one place assuming assurance with justification and later saying the two are not linked. I intend to show in what follows that the statement found in “The New Birth” is more the exception than the rule in Wesley’s thought.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JUSTIFICATION, REGENERATION, AND ASSURANCE

As we saw in the discussion of Wesley’s understanding of justification, he did not at first separate justification from sanctification, which includes new birth and victory over sin. Wesley interpreted his Aldersgate experience as his having, at that time, been pardoned by God. His initial *Journal* entry reporting about his Aldersgate experience reads, “I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me that he had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved me from the law of death.”²⁹ Wesley assumed, at this early point in his career, that since he “felt” his sins were taken away at that time, that it was actually at that time that he was “saved from the law of death.”³⁰

As we saw earlier, by the 1740s Wesley had begun to make a distinction between a “degree of justifying faith,” and that faith which “implies a new, a clean heart.”³¹ He made this distinction in the context of the controversy he had with the Moravians over the means of grace. This distinction did not mean that Wesley abandoned the importance of assurance. As can be seen from the following excerpt from Wesley’s *Journal*, assurance is required for Christian life. This is because Christian life implies living a new life in Christ, which is impossible without regeneration. On January 25, 1740, John Wesley tells of this encounter he had with a grieving sinner.

Fri. 25 . . . One came to me in the evening to know if a man could not be saved without the faith of assurance. I answered, (1) I cannot approve of your terms because they are not scriptural. I find no such phrase as either, “faith of assurance” or “faith of adherence” in the Bible. Besides you speak as if there were two faiths; whereas St. Paul tells us there is but *one faith* in the Lord. (2) By “ye are saved by faith” I understand, ye are saved from your inward and outward sins. (3) I never yet knew one soul thus saved without what you call “the faith of assurance”; I mean a sure confidence that, by the merits of Christ *he* was reconciled to the favor of God.³³

Note that Wesley here defined what it meant to be “saved” not as being saved from the wrath of God, but as being saved from sin. Wesley meant that one cannot be regenerate without the faith which implies assurance. He does not necessarily rule out the possibility that one could be justified without assurance. Thus, if Wesley is using his terms carefully, he is not referring to the relationship between justification, narrowly defined, and assurance. It is quite probable that in dealing pastorally with the woman who came to him, Wesley saw that she needed to be spurred on towards regeneration. In the following paragraph of his account he wrote that, in fact, she did receive assurance.

That is not to say that Wesley was always consistent in his use of the term “justified” after 1740. In the *Minutes* of 1744, Wesley again writes as if the term “justified” implies being saved from sin.

That all true Christians have this faith, even such a faith as implies an assurance of God’s love, appears from Rom. 8:15, Eph. 4:23, II Cor. 13:5, Heb. 8:10, I Jn. 4:10 and 19. And that no man can be *justified* and not know it appears farther from the very nature of things—for faith after repentance is ease after pain, rest after toil, light after darkness—and from the immediate as well as distant fruits.³³

Wesley must have been using the term “justified” here to include being saved from the power of sin. “That no man can be justified and not know it appears from the nature of things . . . and from the immediate as well as distant fruits.”³⁴ Justification here implies the “immediate and distant fruits.” He is not using the term here in the same way he used it in 1740, where a person could have a degree of justifying faith without having fruits, such as removal of doubts and fears, and a clean heart. For this reason, he makes assurance implied in justification. If justification is taken in its broadest sense, it includes regeneration, and for Wesley it is impossible for a person to be regenerate without knowing it.

Not using the word “justification” consistently got Wesley in a good deal of trouble. Apparently, a member of the society, one who had not professed that he had received assurance, died sometime before the 1745 annual conference. Wesley had to clarify his understanding of justification in the minutes of that year.

Q1. Is an assurance of God’s love absolutely necessary to our being in his favor, or may there possibly be some exempt cases? A. We dare not positively say there are not. Q2. Is such an assurance absolutely necessary to inward and outward holi-

ness? A. To inward, we apprehend that it is: to outward we apprehend that it is not.³⁵

This is not a complete departure from what Wesley had written in 1744; rather, it is a clarification. Although in this statement he avoided use of the word justification, it is clear that he was referring to justification when he talked about a person being in favor with God. This was Wesley's *narrow* definition of justification. Assurance is not absolutely necessary for this. However, assurance is necessary for inward holiness, and inward holiness is, of course, the result of regeneration

This rejection of the necessity of assurance for justification, while maintaining its necessity for regeneration, can be seen further in a letter Wesley wrote to his brother Charles in 1747. In this letter, Wesley attempted to clarify his position regarding the issue of the relationship between justification and assurance.

By justifying faith I mean that faith which whosoever hath is not under the wrath and the curse of God. By a sense of pardon I mean a distinct, explicit assurance that my sins are forgiven. I allow: (1) that there is such an explicit assurance: (2) that it is the common privilege of real Christians; (3) that it is the proper Christian faith, which purifieth the heart and overcometh the world. But I cannot allow that justifying faith is such an assurance, or necessarily connected therewith.³⁶

A very interesting implication of what Wesley says here is that, although one may no longer be under the wrath of God without assurance, yet assurance is the *common* privilege of real Christians. Wesley is emphasizing his belief that assurance is the common privilege. It is something which real Christians have in common. Furthermore, Wesley is limiting "real Christians" to those who have experienced the new birth—those who have hearts that have begun to be purified. This is consistent with Wesley's emphasis on holiness of heart and life as part of what is entailed in being a Christian. Finally, assurance *is* that proper Christian faith which "purifieth the heart."³⁷ Thus, the importance of assurance is in no way diminished as it relates to being a Christian.

We can see in another letter, written in 1755 to Mr. Richard Thompson, that Wesley does see assurance implied in the type of faith which is an "evidence of things unseen." This is a reference to Hebrews 11:1, and is a definition of faith which Wesley uses at this time when he is talking about regeneration.

As to the nature of [assurance], I think a divine conviction of pardon is directly implied in the evidence, or conviction, of things unseen. But if not, it is no absurdity to suppose that, when God pardons a mourning broken-hearted sinner, His mercy obliges him to another act—to witness to his spirit, that he has pardoned him.³⁸

That it is clear that Wesley is here not writing about a faith by which a sinner is removed from the wrath of God, can be seen from the very next paragraph in the letter.

I agree with you, that a justifying faith cannot be a conviction that I am justified; and that a man who is not assured that his sins are forgiven may yet have a kind or degree of faith, which distinguishes him, not only from the devil, but also from a heathen; and on which I may admit him to the Lord's supper. But still I believe the proper Christian faith, which purifies the heart, implies such a conviction.³⁹

Justifying faith is here explicitly contrasted with that faith which purifies the heart. Assurance is not required for the former; it is for the latter.

This point is further illustrated in Wesley's 1765 sermon, "The Scripture Way of Salvation." In this sermon Wesley describes that faith by which a person is saved. He again makes a reference to Hebrews 11:1 in defining faith, in general, as a divine evidence. It must be remembered though that when Wesley earlier wrote about being saved, he was referring to salvation from the "power" of sin, and not from the "wrath" of God. Again, this is the sense in which Wesley uses salvation in this sermon.

Faith is a divine evidence and conviction . . . that Christ "loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*." It is by this faith . . . that we "receive Christ"; that we receive him in all his offices, as our Prophet, Priest, and King. It is by this that he "is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."⁴⁰

It is a statement so obvious: faith which is defined as an "evidence" requires that there be an evidence. The type of faith described in Hebrews 11 *must* imply assurance. Furthermore, it is through this type of faith that a person is brought into a new life which involves wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.

It appears that Wesley has made a distinction between two types of faith. The one type of faith results in a sinner's being justified, while the

other (that of Hebrews 11) results in a person under conviction being made regenerate. This sounds a lot like the old distinction between the faith of adherence and the faith of assurance, a distinction which Wesley explicitly rejects. In a letter to Dr. Rutherford, written in 1768, Wesley writes, in effect, that there is only one faith—that which results in fear of God and working righteousness. He writes that those who have such faith *generally* have assurance.

I believe a *consciousness* of being *in the favour of God* . . . is the common privilege of Christians fearing God and working righteousness. Yet I do not affirm, there are no exceptions to this general rule. Possibly some may be in the favour of God and yet go mourning all the day long. . . . Therefore I have not for many years thought a consciousness of acceptance to be essential to justifying faith.⁴¹

Both the justified and the regenerate fear God and work righteousness, and generally have assurance. However, there are exceptions. Wesley's own life, before his own Aldersgate experience of assurance, is an example. Although there is only one type of faith, there are degrees of that faith, and only the final degree results in assurance.

In his 1788 sermon "On Faith," Wesley spells out what he believes about degrees of faith. He clearly distances himself from the condemning opinions he held on degrees of faith at the start of his evangelical career. Wesley discussed the types of faith which are "saving," but he no longer reserved the term as a synonym for being "saved from sin." The term now means, strictly, being saved from wrath. For this type of saving, even a faith that does not imply assurance is enough (though it implies a person is not properly regenerate). He goes on to say that justifying faith even in small degrees, is the "faith of a servant," while regeneration results in the "faith of a son."

But what is the faith which is properly saving? Which brings eternal salvation to all those that keep it to the end? It is such a conviction of God and of the things of God as even in its infant state enables everyone that possesses it to "fear God and work righteousness." And whosoever in every nation believes thus far the Apostle declares is "accepted of him." He actually is at that very moment in a state of acceptance. But he is at present only a *servant* of God, and not properly a *son*. Mean-time let it be observed that the wrath of God no longer "abideth on him."⁴²

This concept of faith allows Wesley to be true to his understanding that there is only *one* faith. However, different degrees of that *one* faith have different implications for the recipient.

CONCLUSION

I am convinced that, for Wesley after about 1740, assurance was never implied in justification “narrowly” defined. Furthermore, after 1745, he generally uses the term narrowly. Wesley’s more mature understanding was that justification, like sanctification, involves a process. At the beginning of conviction, one receives a “degree of justifying faith.” Although it is only a degree, it is nonetheless *justifying* faith. That is, it is still faith by which a sinner is pardoned by God and removed from His wrath. The sinner is justified. However, that sinner does not necessarily perceive that fact, either by the direct witness of the Spirit or by evidences which stem from the new birth. The sinner sees God (which is the condition of faith) as a man may “see” the sun in degrees even though his eyes are closed.⁴³ Thus the sinner is continually under conviction of sin and fear of God. Within this conceptual framework, my guess would be that Wesley’s own justification took place sometime after his decision to enter the priesthood—perhaps when he joined the Holy Club.

The sinner would continue in this state of conviction and repentance until God saw fit to grant him full justifying faith. At that point, the sinner has his eyes fully opened and truly “sees” God. He realizes that his sins are forgiven by the “testimony of God’s Spirit.” He has that inward assurance. He is now free to love God and he begins to see the fruits of being forgiven (faith, hope, and love). And thus by the “witness of his own spirit” he has the assurance that he had been born from above. The sinner is now properly “saved,” not only from the wrath of God, but more importantly (at least in Wesley’s understanding) from the power of sin.

We can now understand how Wesley (in the 1774 footnote) could have conceived of himself as justified prior to Aldersgate, although he did not then have assurance. Furthermore, assurance remained an essential and fundamental aspect of living the Christian life. Although assurance was not implied in justification, it was implied in the true Christian faith—being born again. A person cannot truly live the Christian life without assurance because without it he or she does not truly “love God,” nor does he or she have “power over sin.” Colin Williams has a section in the seventh chapter of *John Wesley’s Theology Today* which is entitled “Assurance—not necessary to salvation.”⁴⁴ As I see it, this heading is

quite false. For Wesley, salvation is not only being saved from the wrath of God, but it implies being saved from sin, and salvation from sin, as shown above, is not possible without assurance.

What are the implications of this understanding? First of all, the possibility that a sinner will be content simply to know that he or she has been justified, and will thus remain an outward sinner who is under conviction, is ruled out. The terms “content,” and “under conviction” are mutually exclusive. A person who has received even a degree of justifying faith will be in agony over his or her sin, and therefore anxious to be out of that state. Further implications stem from the pastoral concerns which caused Wesley to doubt the accuracy of his early formulation of justification and assurance. The first implication is that people who are under conviction are certainly suitable guests at the Lord’s supper. If the Lord has given them a degree of justifying faith and pardoned them, even if they do not yet know it, it is not for the church to reject them. The second is that, in the event of a death within the society, one may console the grieving by pointing out that the departed brother’s or sister’s grieving over sin was itself a sign of justification.

It is true, I think, that Wesley would have considered himself primarily a pastor. However, the effect this has on his theology, at least in this case, is not to excuse inconsistency. Rather, the pastoral aspect of his theology provided a critique of his theological formulations. Wesley’s theology is truly practical. He did not try to fit the issues he faced within the societies to preconceived theological constructions. Rather, he allowed those issues to challenge and to nuance his thought.

NOTES

¹Edward Sugden, ed., *Wesley’s Standard Sermons*: vol. 1 (London: Epworth Press, 1921), p. 61.

²Richard P. Heitzenrater and W. Reginald Ward, eds., *The Works of John Wesley: Journal and Diaries*, vol. 18 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), p. 215 (*italics added*).

³Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 18:215.

⁴Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 18:215.

⁵William Ragsdale Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley: with Special Reference to the Doctrine of Justification* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), pp. 201-220.

⁶Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley's Theology Today* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), pp. 112-114.

⁷Albert C. Outler, ed., *John Wesley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 59.

⁸Theodore Wesley Jennings, Jr., "John Wesley Against Aldersgate," *Quarterly Review* (Fall 1988), pp. 3-22. For a Reformed evaluation, see Mark A. Noll, "John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance," *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April 1975), p. 173.

⁹Albert C. Outler, ed., *The Works of John Wesley: Sermons, vol. 2* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985), p. 187, and Williams, p. 99.

¹⁰In "The New Birth," Outler, *Sermons*, 2:187.

¹¹I am indebted to Dr. Ted Campbell for his helpful critiques and aid in formulating this argument.

¹²Colin W. Williams, pp. 102-4.

¹³Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 18:248.

¹⁴Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 18:248.

¹⁵Kenneth J. Collins, *Wesley on Salvation: a Study in the Standard Sermons* (Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press, 1989), p. 78.

¹⁶Wesley interpreted his Aldersgate experience thusly in his Journal entry describing the experience. Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 18:249-250.

¹⁷Outler, *Sermons*, 1:273.

¹⁸Outler, *Sermons*, 1:273.

¹⁹Outler, *Sermons*, 1:274.

²⁰Outler, *Sermons*, 1:287.

²¹Outler, *Sermons*, 1:121.

²²Outler, *Sermons*, 1:118.

²³Outler, *Sermons*, 1:124 (*italics added*).

²⁴Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 18:220.

²⁵Outler, *Sermons*, 1:189.

²⁶Outler, *Sermons*, 1:187.

²⁷Outler, *Sermons*, 2:187.

²⁸Williams, p. 99, and Collins, p. 69.

²⁹Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 66.

³⁰Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 66.

³¹Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 18:220.

³²Heitzenrater, *Journal and Diaries*, 19:136.

³³Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 137 (*italics added*).

³⁴Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 137.

³⁵Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 149.

³⁶Frank Baker, ed., *The Works of John Wesley, Letters*, vol. 26 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 254-5.

³⁷Baker, *Letters*, 26:255.

³⁸Baker, *Letters*, 26:575.

³⁹Baker, *Letters*, 26:575.

⁴⁰Outler, *Sermons*, 2:161-2.

⁴¹Outler, *Sermons*, 2:161-2.

⁴²Outler, *Sermons*, 3:497.

⁴³Albert Outler, *John Wesley*, p. 149.

⁴⁴Williams, p. 112.

CULTURE AND CONCUPISCENCE: THE CHANGING DEFINITION OF SANCTITY IN THE WESLEYAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT, 1867-1920¹

by

Paul Merritt Bassett

INTRODUCTION

In the 1880s, consonant with the custom of many in the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, the ministers and many laypersons in Daniel S. Warner's Church of God Reformation Movement refused to wear neckties. Many believed them to be signs of the "superfluity of naughtiness" (James 1:21 KJV) or of sheer pride. Many, but not all. Warner and most of his cadre of preachers saw no evil in them but removed theirs simply because the sacrifice of the necktie to the cause of holiness and unity seemed small. Now, however, some of the saints urged the brethren to true consistency—they should dispose of shirt-collars as well (collars were detachable then). The brethren shucked their formal collars for the sake of holiness and unity only to find that perspiration and body oils which had once rubbed off on one's detachable, washable shirt-collar now soiled and rubbed into and ruined one's suit. So, the shirt-collar came back, though the necktie did not.

But problems never cease, for all could now see one's collar button, which was usually brass, and brass looks like gold. All agreed that the Bible forbids the wearing of gold, and it advises that we avoid the very appearance of evil (I Peter 3:3; I Thess. 5:22). Only plain white buttons would do,

said the critics. But buttons were costly, for they were made of bone in those days, and they were difficult to find. The answer was very high-cut vests. But, ironically, such modesty made its wearer look very much like a Roman Catholic priest, or at least like a Mennonite or Free Methodist preacher, each of whose sects Warner's people felt called to reprove.

Little by little, and not without controversy, the brethren returned to the wearing of neckties. By the mid-1920s, the circle was nearly completed.²

The return of the necktie did not mark any declension in the concern for those "superfluities of naughtiness." That concern surged powerfully. But it did take a turn.

In earlier years, Wesleyan/Holiness people had expressed that concern in ways which included both male and female. Neckties were as fair game as feathered hats. But by the first decades of the twentieth century, while someone would now and again launch a broadside against the necktie or some other supposed sign of pride in male clothing, the really severe criticism fell on female dress. And pride, once *the* culprit, now became merely *a* culprit.

This happened because, sometime in the 1880s, Wesleyan/Holiness people began to believe that they had descried an even more insidious and pervasive foe than pride. By the 1910s, they were sure of it.

Increasingly, in the years between 1880 and 1920, Wesleyan/Holiness preachers did battle with the newly (re)discovered enemy, and they made its identity ever clearer by creating ever longer lists of its specific manifestations. So, for example, Opal Brookover writes in the *Gospel Trumpet*, the principal periodical of the Church of God Reformation Movement, in 1908: "What I wish to mention will more particularly concern the sisters, because it is regarding dress, and they have more temptations on this line than the brethren."³

THESIS

Wesleyan/Holiness people as a whole, in the period between the late 1860s and the late 1910s, shifted the rationale for certain of their behavioral rules and customs—even while retaining most of those rules and customs. They did this not because they had lost the passion to be holy. Rather, they did it because, in responding to changes in the culture (and to their location in it), they had re-defined some of the most critical elements in their theology. Most important were the nuances of the understandings of original sin/inherited depravity, and, by implication, entire sanctification.

More precisely, in the 1860s and 1870s, Wesleyan/Holiness people believed that original sin/inherited depravity characteristically manifests itself in “worldliness.” By the 1880s, they began to believe that the characteristic manifestation of original sin/inherited depravity is pride. By around 1900, the grassroots of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, if not its theologians, had come to believe that lust is that characteristic mark.

In each period, largely in response to their perceptions of cultural issues, Wesleyan/Holiness people tended to define sanctity in terms antipodal to the dominant characteristic of the given period’s perceived manifestation of original sin/inherited depravity. So, in the 1860s and 1870s, they usually defined sanctity as Christlikeness. In the 1880s they began to define it as entire consecration, or as absolute submission to the divine will, as obedience. By about 1900 the grassroots were defining sanctity most often in terms of (sexual) purity.⁴

This paper will trace this development as a case study in the ways in which cultural change affects doctrinal and behavioral or ethical change, even in a tradition which hopes to see to the transformation of culture but expresses that hope from a countercultural stance. More specifically, we will show how this development practically destroyed the commitment of the earlier Wesleyan/Holiness Movement to full equality and full rights, including the right to clerical ordination of the women among them.

THEOLOGICAL GROUNDWORK

The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement in North America⁵ has consistently taught that Christian perfection is a gift of grace for this life, made possible by the atoning work of Jesus Christ. It believes that this gift is given instantaneously, subsequent to regeneration, and is received by faith. While the Movement has traditionally, and maddeningly, used its technical theological terms synecdochically and metonymically, the instantaneous initiation into this experience is properly denominated entire sanctification. It is popularly called “the second blessing.” Considered as a whole—i.e., as the instantaneous entry into the life of perfection and the continuing spiritual progression in it—the experience is referred to as “holiness.”

Holiness people believe that the gift of entire sanctification completely resolves the problem of original sin/inherited depravity in the already-justified believer. In the period covered by this paper, this resolution was usually referred to as a cleansing or, with some debate about the term, as an eradication. Holiness people have continually insisted that this

religious experience does not entail intellectual, physical, moral or ethical perfection. Rather, they have insisted that the experience is a grace-given, grace-maintained perfection in love. It is an unconditional love of God and neighbor which is ever liable to flawed practical expression in this life. Therefore, restitution and correction, even rebuke and reproof, as well as begging for, receiving, and tendering forgiveness, are always in order. Maturation is to be expected.⁶

The dependence of this point of view upon the thought of John Wesley is quite obvious. And obvious, too, is the fact that, theologically, much depends upon the definitions of Christian perfection and original sin, with the latter's corollary, inherited depravity. Their meanings are absolutely interdependent.

To maintain appropriate definitions, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, in time, drew upon the mutations of Wesley's thought developed by nineteenth-century Methodist theologians and revivalists, and upon ideas developed in New School Reformed revivalism, especially by Charles Finney and Asa Mahan.⁷ And by the 1910s the Movement had begun to develop its own theological resources, resources which sometimes stood at odds with that which had gained credence in the grassroots. So, what had evolved by the period of the Great War was a tension between those working with more formal theological categories and those working with more popular. On the eve of World War I, the more popular categories were clearly in the ascendancy, and thereby hangs our tale.

John Wesley had drawn up his doctrine of original sin/inherited depravity in conscious reaction to deism. The most dangerous aspect of deism, as Wesley saw it, was its denial of revelation, of even the need for revelation. So, in turning to Biblical declarations concerning human nature and the human condition, Wesley was quite deliberately refusing to ground his understanding of original sin/inherited depravity in empirical evidence or in reason. He asks questions in a manner quite sure to elicit responses contradictory to dogmae dearly loved by the Enlightenment: "Is man by nature filled with all evil? Is he wholly fallen? Is his soul totally corrupted? . . . is every imagination of the thoughts of his heart only evil continually?" And he harbors no doubt of the answers. Whatever the evidence from experience or reason, the Spirit, through the Bible, is the ultimate authority.⁸

As Wesley saw it, none of us is sufficiently moral that our goodness could be capitalized into salvation. In good Protestant form, Wesley declares that salvation is all of grace. But the fact that salvation is *sola*

gratia, does not imply either a solely imputed righteousness nor what has been called “limited atonement.”

In his sermon, “The Scripture Way of Salvation,” Wesley makes clear his belief that our salvation involves imparted as well as imputed righteousness:

And at the same time that we are justified, yea, in that very moment, *sanctification* begins. In that instant we are “born again,” “born from above,” “born of the Spirit.” There is a *real* as well as a *relative* change. We are inwardly renewed by the power of God. We feel the “love of God shed abroad in our heart by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us” . . . in a word, changing the “earthly, sensual, devilish” mind into “the mind which was in Christ Jesus.”⁹

On the implication of “limited atonement,” Wesley declared himself an Arminian.¹⁰

Wesley took up with Arminius at the point of Arminius’ doctrine of the universality of the atonement. His nineteenth-century American namesakes, no less convinced of the validity of that doctrine and also avowed Arminians, nonetheless turned first to Arminius’ understanding of divine justice, which implies his doctrine of free will. Arminius had argued that our ability to respond positively to the grace of God, though we are totally corrupt, is a gift of God’s justice, the same justice which holds us accountable for our sins. It is true justice, said Arminius, for God not only holds us accountable for our sins; God also provides a remedy for our sinful condition. Grace, in this case, operates through the divine justice.¹¹ Wesley, on the other hand, kept strictly to the notion that any ability which we might have to respond to saving grace would have to be a gift of grace alone, not of grace working through or by or in some other divine characteristic or quality. And since all gifts of saving grace are ultimately consequences (“benefits”) of the atoning work of Christ, even our ability to choose or to reject salvation is precisely and essentially a benefit of the Atonement. It follows then that, since Christ died for all, all have been given this ability, though, of course, all do not exercise it in the same way or to the same effect.¹²

DEFINING SANCTITY

Wesley developed his behavioral rules, then, as a means of expressing positive response to grace. And to be sure that he included all who might be responding—seekers after salvation, the converted but not sanc-

tified, the sanctified, and those reluctant to define precisely their state of grace—he stated the role of the rules in terms of the Methodist society’s least common denominator: they are for those “who desire to flee from the wrath to come, to be saved from their sins.”¹³

As Wesley saw it, these rules have no special function for the entirely sanctified that they do not have for all others. Entire sanctification is grounded in grace and in the Atonement, not in human freedom nor in the exercise of free will nor in good works.¹⁴ Wesley believed that the behavioral dimension of entire sanctification should be determined and judged altogether in terms of what grace has wrought, not in terms of some human activity having (or not having) taken place. For him, the basic question is this: “Is the Love of God ‘shed abroad in our hearts’? Is it this for which this or that is done or not done?” So it is that deeds and words and thoughts in themselves harmful might not be accounted against one as sin, and deeds and words and thoughts in themselves good might be accounted against one as sin. While behaviors manifest desire, they are neither means of attaining nor means of maintaining grace, especially not saving, sanctifying grace.¹⁵

Wesley’s thought lay in the background, at the foundation of Wesleyan/Holiness Movement theological understandings and commitments. Those of its leaders who were Methodists or had Methodist roots never thought of themselves as anything but orthodox Wesleyans and therefore orthodox Christians.¹⁶ But true to commonly received Methodist theology, they did not see, as much of Methodism itself did not then see, the differences among their own theologians and the differences between their theologians and Wesley.¹⁷ This blindness would have critical consequences, specifically at the point that Methodists began to debate the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification and the ethic which this doctrine and experience entailed. Earlier differences in understandings of original sin/inherited depravity especially, when compounded by differences in theological method, led to vast incompatibilities and contradictions by the late 1890s. And all of this fell under the influence of radical cultural changes, which added further frustration and confusion.¹⁸

From c. 1860 to c. 1880: Worldliness Vs. Christlikeness

In the earliest days of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, until the 1880s, most holiness people, following the “standard” Methodist theologians, agreed that original sin/inherited depravity involves both deprivation and depravation, with the emphasis falling upon the latter.¹⁹ In the human character, deprived of the saving presence of the Holy Spirit, origi-

nal sin/inherited depravity is active, aggressive, and intelligent in its manifestation, and in its own way it is sovereign. It is actually an anti-Holy Spirit, a spiritual counterpole and counterfeit, as it were. That is to say, it may express itself through means and modes which at least superficially seem attributable to the Holy Spirit, but their root is in our fallenness and their end is to continue the rebellion against God.²⁰

Understanding original sin/inherited depravity as dynamic and positive—Adam Clarke, following Wesley, called it “a contagion . . . the grand hidden cause of all transgression”²¹—tended to make it difficult to identify any particular behavior as a clear manifestation of its activity or presence. Nonetheless, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement believed that the basic character of the contagion was usually readily detectable in thoughts, words, and actions. These would evince a certain essential compatibility with the world, a certain lack of “spirituality.” They would evince a spirit clearly opposed to the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit.²² So, any such evidence of original sin/inherited depravity could be called “worldliness,” and this understanding of the matter did allow for some cataloging of behaviors acceptable and unacceptable.²³

The actual list of do’s and don’t’s upon which the holiness people agreed differed little from the lists of many Protestants of that era. It especially resembled the lists of those affected by revivalism. In fact, the Methodists in the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement simply took as their ethical basis the “General Rules” of the *Discipline*. They differed from their non-Holiness Movement Methodist compatriots only in their greater strictness in keeping those rules and in their willingness to follow them out to logical (not to say legalistic) behavioral conclusions.²⁴ Further, the holiness people seem to have assumed, as the Methodist *Discipline* certainly assumed, that behaviors prohibited are prohibited to both the justified and the entirely sanctified and that behaviors commended are behaviors commended to both those Christians who have not “attained unto holiness” and the entirely sanctified.²⁵

But by the 1880s, Wesleyan/Holiness people were asking themselves whether those who were “saved” but not yet “sanctified” were obligated to keep the same behavioral rules as those sanctified. Some even asked whether the merely saved even *could* keep those rules.²⁶ After all, if “worldliness” be the expression of original sin/inherited depravity, and if original sin/inherited depravity be destroyed in the entirely sanctified but not in the “merely” saved, then one should not expect the same level of behavioral purity of the “merely” saved as of the entirely sanctified.²⁷

The idea that “worldliness” is the expression of original sin/inherited depravity reflected the common understanding that Christlikeness defines the character of the entirely sanctified.²⁸ But by the 1870s, if not earlier, Wesleyan/Holiness people were using pneumatological language to put the case for the this-life possibility and reality of the experience of entire sanctification. The fact that the “result” was christological was lost in the great cloud of pneumatological descriptions of the process of getting there.

Fallen human nature, deprived of the sanctifying presence of the Holy Spirit, is hag-ridden by an active, aggressive, intelligent “sin principle” (which bore many names). This sin principle dynamically contradicts the influence of the Holy Spirit. It is in the power of the Evil One and is therefore profoundly profane or worldly. So, “worldliness” defines the character of the unsanctified. But the term applied as much to the inner bent or propensity as to deeds and words.²⁹ In fact, it was firmly held that good deeds and good words could arise from a “worldly” character, albeit their intention would not be good in any Christian sense of the term; and it was understood that harmful deeds and words could come from a Christlike character, unintentionally.³⁰

This behaviorally vague definition of the character of original sin/inherited depravity, and its implied opposite, purity or sanctity, did not satisfy the early holiness people. In responding to their theological opponents, they came to agree, in part, with an ethical point made by those opponents: entire sanctification must have behavioral consequences and these consequences must be at least quantitatively, if not qualitatively, different from those issuing from justification alone.³¹ This conviction, as it came to maturation (or at least as it came to gain general consensus), necessitated a “paradigm shift” with respect to the doctrine of original sin/inherited depravity and the notion of sanctity.

One can see the most striking example of this shift in Samuel Wakefield’s *Complete System of Christian Theology*, which was printed in the Civil War year of 1862.³² Wakefield originally intended only to abridge in his own words Watson’s *Theological Institutes*, which had appeared in their first American edition in 1825—published by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Instead, he built his own “system” around Watson, while clearly showing the influence of American Methodism’s generation-long tussle with Calvinism, especially New School Calvinism (a tussle barely begun when Watson’s work had first appeared in the United States), and its even longer involvement in revivalism.³³ In particular, precisely at the

point of Watson's doctrine of original sin/inherited depravity, Wakefield the abridger becomes Wakefield the American Methodist theologian. Watson had placed his chapter on original sin between his chapters on the Holy Spirit and redemption. Wakefield, levying Watson heavily in his own section on original sin, nonetheless puts that section between his sections on creation and divine providence and the sections on "Man's Moral Agency."³⁴

In his section on original sin, Wakefield is especially concerned to meet four objections to the doctrine which were current in the mid-nineteenth-century: first, that the human fall cannot be reconciled with the divine goodness if we can assure that God foresaw it; second, that the command which Adam and Eve disobeyed was arbitrary and petty; third, that if the serpent was simply an instrument of Satan, its punishment was unjust; and fourth, that the punishment for disobedience was out of proportion to the "crime." In each case except the third, Wakefield responds with reference to human free moral agency. This throws great emphasis on willful human complicity in manifesting original sin, which, in turn, moves Wakefield away from talk of "worldliness" to talk of pride as the quintessential expression of that sinful state.³⁵ And rather than defining entire sanctification first and foremost in terms of love to God and neighbor, as Wesley and his British successors do, and as antebellum North American Methodists at least tended to do, Wakefield immediately defines it as "an entire conformity of heart and life to the will of God, as made known to us in his word."³⁶ In fact, in his section on entire sanctification, Wakefield makes no reference at all to passages absolutely critical to Wesley's understanding of entire sanctification such as Matthew 22:37-40.

It is not that Wakefield saw no connection between love and entire sanctification. He simply brought his understanding of the doctrine, including his understanding of the place of love within it, under the rubric of uncoerced (or unpredestined) obedience or conformity to the divine will. As he later shows, he understands even love to God and neighbor to be expressions of conformity to the divine will, not vice versa.³⁷

As has been noted above, Wakefield understands original sin to be behaviorally manifested in pride. "But then," we may ask him, "what may we expect of those in whom such pride has been destroyed—i.e., those enjoying entire sanctification?" At first glance, Wakefield appears to respond in terms proposed by Watson, his model. Both write of the duties of the Christian toward God and neighbor, and both write at length about

worship, prayer, and sabbath-keeping, justice and mercy. But where Watson clearly grounds his list of duties in a love made possible by Christ's atoning work,³⁸ Wakefield grounds his in obedience to the law of God, in submission of our will to the will of God.³⁹ This enables Wakefield to be much more specific and detailed than Watson can be concerning the manifestations of pride and (conversely) entire sanctification.⁴⁰ Not only are anger, hatred, revenge, implacability, censoriousness, evil-speaking and adventitious distinctions proscribed, so also are duels, suicide, gambling (including lotteries), and interference with property rights or liberty (including interference with freedom of the press and of speech). Positively, Wakefield enjoins such attitudes and behaviors as patriotism, obedience to civil law, paying taxes and other imposts, and respecting and praying for rulers.⁴¹

In Wakefield, then, we have a striking example of a departure from Wesley and Wesley's British and earlier American theological successors on the matter of the definition of sanctity. For Wakefield, it is obedience; for Wesley and his British and earlier American successors, love. Not that either would have denied the other's definition. For Wakefield, grace-given love is of the very nature of true sanctity, but it is given in response to obedience and it expresses itself in obedience; Wesley and company would have love governing obedience.⁴² Wakefield saw entire sanctification as the antidote to pride and he saw pride as the self-will which refuses to submit to the divine will; Wesley and his more nearly immediate explicators, such as Watson, saw and would see entire sanctification as the antidote to self-love.⁴³

Here was the nuance which opened the door to and shaped such phenomena as the Necktie Controversy and struggles over the wearing of bright-colored clothing, and gold in any form, including wedding rings and even gold-rimmed eyeglasses. Among Wesleyan/Holiness people, the positive appreciation for behavioral rules which characterized revival-influenced American Protestantism in general and Methodism in particular now, in the 1860s and 1870s, became a passion. Of the making of rules and of debates over them there was no end in the generation from the "founding" of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement in 1867 to about 1900.⁴⁴

While the terms "worldly" and "worldliness" still implied condemnation, Wesleyan/Holiness people increasingly used them now to refer to activities and things seen, decreasingly to refer to a basic bent of spirit. Instead, they now referred to that bent of spirit as "pride." And all—

worldliness, as well as the “bent” (pride), and sanctity—was thought now to be measurable. So the rules opposed “worldliness” and “pride,” and their keeping was at least a putative sign of sanctity. By keeping them, the sanctified manifested the destruction of sinful pride, and sanctified leadership used them to curtail the expression and increase of pride among the justified not yet sanctified. And sanctified leadership also used them to heighten the sense of the need for entire sanctification.⁴⁵

The rules which were developed by the holiness people in the period from 1867 to about 1885 express precisely that perspective, though older rules were neither dropped nor modified. Conspicuous among the newer rules were those prohibiting any kind of ostentation in dress, in manner, in possessions, and even in church architecture and worship. Holiness people were to be the plainest of “plain people.”

This created considerable legalism and fanaticism, which many Wesleyan/Holiness leaders early recognized as a special problem in their Movement. They steadily worked against such attitudes, knowing quite well that much of it was caricature and that over-zealous piety could actually engender pride. They also knew the tendency of that sort of pride to run to excess.⁴⁶

However, by 1880, still another shift in the understanding of original sin/inherited depravity, and thus of sanctity, was underway—one which would narrow the definitions of both among the grassroots. By about 1900, it bore clear and well-developed implications for behavior.

From c. 1880 to c. 1900: Pride Vs. Submission

Wakefield and his American contemporaries had profoundly modified the position of Wesley and the earliest British Wesleyan theologians with respect to the doctrine of original sin/inherited depravity by reversing the categories of the older theological system and by making free will instead of unlimited atonement (free grace) the governing doctrine. Still, they had kept much of the language of Wesley and his early disciples and they too had looked to Arminius for their doctrine of free will. But by about 1880, early Remonstrants such as Stephanus Curcellanaeus (1586-1659) and Philip von Limborch (1633-1702) had largely replaced Arminius in the Movement’s explication, description, and analysis of the implications of original sin/inherited depravity. This shift in foundation seriously affected the doctrine of entire sanctification, of course. American Methodism, including the Holiness Movement, thus took another long step away from the thought of its original theologians, though not without their (unwitting) complicity.⁴⁷

A representative Methodist theologian for the period, one who shows the shift and one important to the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, was Miner Raymond (1811-1897). Raymond, who taught at Garrett Biblical Institute in 1877-1897, published a three-volume systematic theology which he believed to be thoroughly Wesleyan.⁴⁸ In fact, on the matter of original sin/inherited depravity and, by implication, on the definition of sanctity, it does not align well with what had been called Wesleyan to that time.

Raymond's sections on the Fall and original sin come between chapters on the "government of God" and original righteousness and his section on soteriology.⁴⁹ While he does not neglect the significance of the atonement to the discussion of original sin/inherited depravity, the doctrine of free will or "moral agency" plays a controlling role.⁵⁰ The distinctive expression of original sin/inherited depravity is understood to be pride, usually described in terms of self-will or willfulness.⁵¹

With this as the controlling category, the behavioral rules are (again) augmented and there is a subtle change in the rationale for making and keeping them. As long as the idea of the atonement held a large role in defining original sin and its effects—and in defining the possibilities of gracious release from them—the opposite of pride was taken to be humility or Christlikeness. But now that self-will or willfulness had become near-synonyms for pride, rules concerning apparel and appearance tended to lose their character as means of witnessing to a cleansing of the heart from what was by now commonly called "inbred sin." Rather, rules were now matters of discipline; keeping them meant giving witness to the fact that one had submitted one's will to God and to the community of faith.⁵² Submission to discipline was now the fundamental proof that pride had been rooted out.⁵³

Organizations having the propagation of the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification as their reason for being proliferated in this period, and in their rejection of institutional administrative (usually Methodist Episcopal) discipline they often took up "spiritual" discipline as the superior cause. The Church of God Reformation Movement, which was concentrated in Indiana, Ohio, and West Virginia; and the Independent Holiness People, concentrated in Missouri, Kansas, and southern Iowa, stand at one end of a spectrum as striking examples of this phenomenon. These branches of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement were home to some of its most Tertulianesque folk, and they were the Movement's most vocal critics of any but radical congregational polity. Each related both to its concern for holiness and the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification.⁵⁴

The point of it all was the war on pride. One wanted to give expression to submission to spiritual discipline, for that was proof that sinful pride had been eradicated, that the “bent to sinning” had been “taken away,” that the “old man” had been destroyed. Not that the Holiness Movement had neglected the theme earlier. It had not. In fact, revivalistic Protestantism at large had given attention to it, and Methodism had usually led the way.⁵⁵ But now, in the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, it came to define sanctity.

Theologically, the new or renewed emphasis on submission to spiritual discipline as the sign of the destruction of original sin found especially significant and influential support in the teachings of the generation which had passed off the scene by the 1880s, in Phoebe Palmer and her associates and followers particularly.⁵⁶ But they found that support by reading their predecessors’ works in ways that may not originally have been intended.

Unlike Wesley and those theologians who followed a strictly Protestant paradigm in insisting that the experience of entire sanctification is strictly a work of grace received by the gift of faith, Mrs. Palmer had spoken of the need to consecrate oneself in preparation for receiving the experience. By this, she seems to have meant nothing more than that the believer must deliberately exercise the gift of faith by holding back nothing at all from divine possession, and open him/herself to sanctifying grace.⁵⁷ But in time, many took this teaching in an entirely disciplinary sense and understood consecration as submission in a way that tended to make entire sanctification the consequence of the destruction of original sin (pride) rather than understanding entire sanctification as the very destruction itself.⁵⁸ This, in turn, led to widespread preaching on submission to spiritual discipline as the way into the experience. “Entire consecration” became the necessary door to entire sanctification.⁵⁹

And now the Wesleyan/Holiness people began to create a whole new range of behavioral rules, based on those already listed in the Methodist Episcopal *Discipline(s)* (both North and South). “Entire” consecration had come to mean “consecration of life in detail.”⁶⁰ In about fifty years, the Wesleyan/Holiness people had moved from seeing the life of Christian perfection as a life of love manifesting itself in attitudes as well as deeds and disciplines, with due recognition that inconsistencies in behavior are not necessarily evidences of inconsistency or inconstancy in love, to seeing the life of Christian perfection as the product or consequence of a life of consistency-seeking discipline.

Perhaps no work demonstrates this more clearly than J. A. Wood's *Perfect Love*, a book first published in 1861, which became a *vade mecum* of Wesleyan/Holiness people for a century or more.⁶¹ Wood wrote *Perfect Love* as much for the entirely sanctified as for the unsanctified, so it is as much didactic, and corrective, as it is apologetic. Its very title deliberately reflects the older Methodist understanding of holiness and reminded Wesleyan/Holiness people of a fundamental aspect of their distinguishing tenet which they tended to neglect. At the same time, however, Wood's descriptions of how one enters the experience of entire sanctification and how one retains it tend to make entire consecration the one necessary means to both and to preach the gospel of consistency in discipline.⁶²

The conditions of *retaining* perfect love . . . are the same as those by which it was *obtained*; namely, a *complete submission* of the soul to God, and *simple faith* in Christ for present salvation. This submission and faith, graduated by increasing light and grace, must continue through life if perfect love be retained.⁶³

Wood is not as explicit as many of his contemporaries were in listing disciplinary rules. His standard device was to appeal to the Pauline admonition to abstain from all appearance of evil (I Thess. 5:22). But it is clear that he did this intending wide and strict application of the Apostle's word. He has not at all forgotten the behavioral and attitudinal catalogue.⁶⁴ It surfaces several times in *Perfect Love*, in most detail at the close of the work where Wood raises several questions: "Is it proper for Christians to be governed by the laws of fashion?" "Are worldly amusements sinful?" "Are Fairs, Festivals, Tableaux, or Theatricals proper means of raising money for church purposes?"⁶⁵ So, Wood's appeal to Scripture is not a signal of disciplinary vagueness nor of a concern to leave such matters to individual consciences. And it is certainly not an expression of some kind of diplomacy.

Methodists in particular and revival-influenced Protestants in general had been "plain people" from the beginning in matters of apparel. Wesley himself had preached often upon the topic. Expensive or "fancy" clothes do bad things to us, he said. They engender or increase pride; they breed and increase vanity; they tend to "beget anger, and every turbulent and uneasy passion"; they tend to "create and inflame lust"; and they tend to cause us to neglect the cultivating of "the mind of Christ"; and further, their cost prohibits the doing of good works and giving to the poor.⁶⁶

Some sixty years after Wesley's death and for the next twenty years, Phoebe Palmer, the teacher of so many in the early Wesleyan/Holiness

Movement, spoke and wrote often and sharply to the “dress question.” With Wesley, she believed that the Bible opposed the wearing of costly and fancy array, and, like Wesley, she believed that it testified to pride and poor stewardship. But in Palmer’s writings, we see the earliest adumbrations of the disciplinary theme which the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement would emphasize in its campaign against worldliness: she insisted that the wearing of costly and fancy clothing and jewelry, once one knows of the Biblical injunctions, is conscious rebellion against God and the Biblical word and that it therefore puts one in danger of losing one’s soul. We must submit to the Biblical word, she insisted; such submission is the very heart of true sanctity.⁶⁷ And, as early as 1868, Phoebe Palmer, as a leader among others, was identifying the desire for “amusements,” among which she includes theater attendance and the reading of novels, as a manifestation of original sin.⁶⁸ Enter the experience of entire sanctification, she says, and the yen for such amusements will be washed away.⁶⁹

Methodists and other Protestants had fretted over such matters at least since the earliest days of frontier revivals. But after the Civil War, so it seemed to many (especially to many now identifying with the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement), northern Methodism, at least, had given up the struggle. So what had in ante-bellum days evoked an occasional sermon or editorial addressed to all pious persons now became a near-preoccupation of the holiness folk. As they looked about them, they were tempted to believe that they were the only ones seriously committed to the disciplinary list—and with some good reason.

By the 1880s, amusements joined fashionable dress, conspicuous consumption (as we now call it), elaborate ritual, expensive church buildings, and “sabbath-breaking” as behaviors which put one’s soul in jeopardy.⁷⁰ But as the list grew, the proportion of Christians who took it seriously shrank. And the conviction grew among holiness people that the decreasing interest in spiritual discipline and the decreasing interest in entire sanctification, and the increasing signs of material prosperity, advancement in social standing, and cultural accommodation, were of a piece.⁷¹ So they carried the battle into the church itself, fighting on both the behavioral and doctrinal fronts with their own brothers and sisters in the faith. More and more, the behavioral list took on a clearly counter-cultural appearance. And more and more, it appeared to be aimed at (presumed) self-indulgence among Christians themselves.

In effect, another step had been taken in the re-definition of original sin/inherited depravity. If by the 1880s sanctity had come to be defined as

submission to spiritual discipline—as entire sanctification had come to be defined primarily as entire submission or entire consecration—original sin/inherited depravity had now come commonly to be called the “carnal nature,” the “carnal mind,” or even “the old man” (following Romans 6:6).⁷²

This redefinition occurred at precisely the time that the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement began to run afoul of episcopal Methodism’s machinery, primarily on two specific issues: the refusal of its Methodist Episcopal evangelists to secure proper clearance (either by courtesy, custom, or church law) before holding holiness revival meetings here and there; and the vigor with which the Methodist editors of the Movement’s independent papers took to sanctified muckraking. The un-cleared meetings sometimes embarrassed local Methodist pastors and leaders (sometimes intentionally); and the independent “rags” seemed often to smack of the newly popular “yellow journalism,” with all that such an identification implied concerning social status and political stances.

Two radical Methodist denominations, the Wesleyan Methodist Connection and the Free Methodist Church, already identified with the Movement; and now numbers of other holiness people began to organize themselves into additional denominations and other bodies. Most holiness people felt compelled to say that they were not “come-outers”; they insisted that they had been chased off. They were “pushed-outers.” And “carnality” in the mainline churches (especially in the two Methodist Episcopal churches) was what had pushed them out.

This view of events gave “carnality” a sharp empirical definition that it might not otherwise have had. “Carnality” was what those wealthier Methodists and their social-climbing imitators and admirers, including all too many clergy, were doing (or not doing).⁷³

Of course, the Wesleyan/Holiness people did not confine their battle with sin to sin in the church. They took on “the world” through deep involvement in attempts to resolve some of the social issues of that era and in the development of “foreign missions” from both evangelistic and philanthropic directions. And they engaged in such activities precisely because of their theology.⁷⁴ But on these fronts, they saw the need for conversion, not “carnality,” as the immediate problem. Theologically, they linked “carnality” with the matter of sanctification, not with justification or conversion, so individualized had their definition of sanctification become.⁷⁵

The denominationalizing process also affected the battle against sin in the body politic at home and on “foreign” fields, which, in turn, added

another dimension to the alterations in the definitions of original sin/inherited depravity and (thus) of sanctity. And here lay the seeds of that which in later years would grow almost to the point of choking out some venerable and valuable sources of vitality in the Movement, especially (in keeping with the concern of this paper) the full and free participation of women in every aspect of the Movement's life.

For one thing, in the press to denominationalize (holiness people called it "organizing holiness"), the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement tended to cut itself off from sources of broad theological reflection and to rest content with propagating well its one doctrinal specialty: "second-blessing holiness."⁷⁶ As long as the National Campmeeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness (NCAPH) served as the rallying body for the Movement, it had a theologically well-educated leadership, by late nineteenth-century standards. That leadership had at least come through the rigors of the official Methodist Episcopal courses of study, and most of the Association's evangelists had far more education than that. Further, most of the Association's preachers held, or had held, pastoral charges that demanded an educated ministry.⁷⁷ But as the Movement organized, the relationship to NCAPH slowly but surely weakened, not least because NCAPH admitted none but Methodist preachers in good denominational (they would have said "connectional") standing into its membership until well after 1900.⁷⁸ The Movement could still count among its pre-World War I leaders a majority with more than minimal theological education and sensitivity, but from about 1890 to the early 1920s, at least, the proportion of persons in the ministry of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement which could claim more than minimal theological education dropped ever farther away from what it had been before the Movement had begun forming denominations and other bodies in earnest.⁷⁹

Moreover, the new denominations and other groups tended to call on those who were better educated or who had broader perspectives to give themselves over to holiness evangelism and to administration. Broader theological perspectives and concerns lay nearly neglected for want of time and energy on the part of the able and for want of interest on the part of the Movement at large.⁸⁰ At the same time, a large and growing phalanx of holiness evangelists, travelling widely (many of the railroad companies offered free travel passes to clergy) and preaching day after day and night after night, came to shape the perspective of holiness people in matters of sanctified living every bit as deeply as the Movement's recognized leaders (and pastors) were doing.⁸¹

A significant proportion of these evangelists had not obtained formal higher education.⁸² And as the proportion of holiness pastors which had such education dropped, evangelists increasingly burlesqued it. By the 1910s, such burlesquing was common. They measured their success, as their hearers measured it for them, by their skill in convincing persons to seek and obtain “the second blessing” and by the wit with which they defended it—and by little else.⁸³ In fact, many believed that preaching “the second blessing” was a general spiritual curative—that it would encourage the unconverted to conversion, backsliders to repentance, and entirely sanctified folk to higher plains of holy living.⁸⁴ So, holiness people in general were encouraged to focus narrowly, and what had been a doctrinal “specialty” in the pre-denominational days now became the whole gospel in fact, though in theory it certainly was not. A certain classical orthodoxy was assumed, and assumed to be necessary and appropriate, concerning the essential rubrics of Christian faith, such as trinity, christology, atonement, etc. And Wesleyan/Holiness people took this orthodoxy to be of the *esse* of the faith, and not simply of its *bene esse*; but this classical orthodoxy took no major role in the preaching and teaching of the majority of holiness preachers and teachers.⁸⁵

At the same time that holiness people were practically narrowing their theological concern in the interests of denomination-formation, they faced what they took to be a very dangerous enemy—dangerous because it bore some strong theological affinities to the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement.⁸⁶ The new enemy was Pentecostalism, and one point at which this enemy affected the theology of the Movement was precisely that of the notion of sanctity.

Pentecostals emphasized the aspect of spiritual power in their definitions and descriptions of the work of the Holy Spirit in believers. Wesleyan/Holiness preachers, who had said much about such power in the period prior to the rise of Pentecostalism, now made it clear that they had always insisted that “cleansing” (from “inbred sin” or from “the carnal nature”), not power, is the *fundamental* characteristic of the sanctifying work of the Spirit.⁸⁷ Spiritual power was still a desideratum among the holiness people, but they severely criticized the Pentecostals for seeking a gift rather than the Giver of all spiritual gifts. Sanctity, for the Pentecostals, said the holiness preachers, is a matter of external demonstrations of what they call spiritual power—speaking in unknown tongues being the principal demonstration. For us holiness people, they said, sanctity is living a clean, pure, holy life.⁸⁸

These developments—the practical narrowing of the theological concern of the holiness people to an almost exclusive attention to their distinguishing tenet as it was presented in fervent, often inadequately informed, evangelism, and their opposition to the Pentecostals—threw much of the weight of holiness preaching and reflection on considerations of “carnality.” And, as has been noted, advocates of Wesleyan/Holiness had come to define “carnality” primarily in terms of the behaviors of those in their former churches who, as they saw it, resisted or ignored the holiness message.⁸⁹

Especially obvious as carnal to these believers were attendance at theaters and dances and concern with fashion among the women. In fact, a change then underway in the thinking of young women, both within and outside of the churches, made such behaviors topics of lively conversation throughout the whole culture.⁹⁰

From c. 1900 to c. 1920: Lust Vs. Purity

Amusements and dress had long been issues for holiness people, as we have seen. But almost suddenly, about 1900, a veritable revolution had broken out which made them issues in the entire country—in fact, in the entire English-speaking world. In the United States, educated young middle class women, Christian or no, seemed almost suddenly to attack directly the notion of self-denial, especially as it had been defined as humility, obedience, and self-sacrifice in the interests of husband and family, and especially as it had been enforced in terms of amusements and dress.⁹¹ On its positive side, this “women’s movement,” as it was called, emphasized “self-development.”⁹²

This phenomenon made for severe tensions in most of the older denominations, at least in their urban congregations and administrative structures, for by now they had committed almost two generations to the process of *embourgeoisement* and had largely completed the task. And they had generally supported those women who had taken up the moral politics of progressivism in the 1890s.⁹³ Being “behind the times” appalled them on theological grounds, for it hindered the march to the millennial kingdom.⁹⁴ And the notion of “self-development” fit perfectly the various theories of progress which now filled the air and had generally been reconciled (so thought many) with the Biblical message.⁹⁵

But the popular public symbols of this new revolution boded ill. They seemed to contradict, not to extend or develop, the values only recently fully adopted and adapted. *Embourgeoisement* was threatened, and it was being threatened by the daughters and granddaughters of those who had made it their earthly hope and cause. How to respond?

Gradually, the older denominations attempted to christen the popular public symbols—to hold “theatricals” and to sponsor dances and fashion shows—in an attempt to retain their own and to evangelize. Consequently, they found themselves countenancing, even sponsoring, that which they had formerly condemned, while at the same time (so it seemed to the holiness people) they shoved aside, or even cast out, the truly pious.⁹⁶

The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, now (i.e., c.1900) denominationalizing rapidly, clearly felt compelled to respond to this turn-of-the-century women’s movement, but it found itself in an unusual position. It had traditionally taken a liberal (or at least relatively liberal) stance with respect to the role of women in religion and in society, a stance more liberal than those of most of the denominations from which its original leadership had come.⁹⁷ But it tended to regard this new women’s movement quite unfavorably. The public symbols of the new women’s movement’s were all wrong and it seemed all too obvious that it was seeking to destroy whatever spirituality the “old-line” churches might still have.

The themes of “self-development” and “self-assertion,” as the early twentieth-century women’s movement developed them, set as they were (for the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement) in the context of the struggle with Pentecostalism over the meaning of “spiritual power,” hit a sour note among holiness people.⁹⁸ The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement had long since learned to preach absolute submission to the will of God and “entire consecration” in ways which encouraged freedom and creativity and consequently it had developed a blind spot where it might have seen how a culture, or dominant persons or groups within a culture, had used such themes as instruments of subjugation, especially the subjugation of the poor and of minorities and of women.⁹⁹ It appears that the doctrine of entire sanctification was only rarely used consciously or deliberately as a tool for gaining or retaining institutional or personal power at the expense of the rights of others, though, of course, we have few ways of really knowing this. But the very structures of the holiness bodies testified to their concern along these lines—they were deliberately democratized.¹⁰⁰ So, holiness people had difficulty hearing the notions of “self-development” and “self-assertion” as cries for female freedom, which they were. Or, if they did hear them thus, they tended to wonder what all of the fuss was about.¹⁰¹ What most holiness people heard in those notions instead were self-centeredness and pride. That is to say, they heard such themes as “self-development” being touted in terms that made them the precise antitheses to their doctrine of entire sanctification; they heard them as

expressions of the very disease which their medicine would cure.¹⁰² And here, unfortunately, the symbols chosen by “new” women to express themselves only exacerbated the blindness and deafness of the holiness people. Those symbols did not speak to holiness folk of freedom but of bondage to sin and of “carnality.”¹⁰³ They were behaviors which the Movement had condemned long before anyone had conceived of them as signs of self-assertion or self-development. For the church to countenance them in any way seemed to the sanctified to be unconscionable.

The response of the Wesleyan/Holiness people to the newer women’s movement, and to the churches which had opened themselves to accepting its public symbols and popular vocabulary, was to redouble the attack on carnality and to leave no uncertainty as to what constituted it. This brought almost the entire weight of practical “holiness” preaching to bear on precisely those behaviors which the women’s movement utilized as public symbols of their freedom. Theater attendance, dancing, and interest in being fashionable, which had always been targets for holiness preachers, now took continuous bombardment, but with this difference: before about 1895, they had been targets primarily because they encouraged the squandering of time and money. Now they were targets primarily because they were believed to endanger morality, both male and female. But, more critically, holiness people believed that they encouraged exploitation of and by women as no other activities and interests ever had.¹⁰⁴ Now, even smoking and drinking, formerly eschewed simply because of what they did to one’s health, social relationships, and budget, took on the opprobrium of sexual seduction—an advertising innuendo that the holiness people did not let go uncommented.¹⁰⁵

The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement had not meant to oppose the early twentieth-century women’s movement as such. In fact, holiness people had positively and actively supported its late nineteenth-century predecessor and continued to support those causes earlier taken up which had not yet met their goals.¹⁰⁶ But, whatever the convictions of the holiness people toward the fundamental intentions and goals of the women’s movement as it developed in the early twentieth century (and they seem to have been largely positive), they often found themselves unable to accept some of the most important public symbols and the popular self-descriptive vocabulary of that movement as they had developed by the 1910s. Those symbols and that vocabulary simply cut cross-grain of the personal behavioral ethic long since adopted by holiness people. Further, that ethic, now that its practitioners had decided to form denominations, not only

defined sanctity on a personal level, it also served to identify those denominations behaviorally and to aid in making clear *apologias* for their refusals to remain with the older religious bodies.¹⁰⁷ An ethic once designed by holiness people as a means of keeping the attention of the sanctified and those “going on to perfection” on that which makes for “perfect love” now became a means of sectarian identity. And, in the process, that ethic went a significant distance in the direction of oppressing women.

Of signal importance in all of this was the rather common belief that the principal expression of original sin/inherited depravity is lust. Concupiscence had not replaced self-will, pride, or worldliness where the quintessential expressions of original sin are listed in the lexicon of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, but it was now the dominating motif.¹⁰⁸ Only pride could claim anything like nearly equal attention.

In part, the elevation of concupiscence, as it were, seems to have come about in consequence of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement’s renewed emphasis on entire sanctification as a cleansing, as over against the Pentecostals’ emphasis on power. The natural question was, “Cleansing from what?” The Biblical response which almost habitually fell from the tongues of holiness people was from Ezekiel 30:25-29, a favorite holiness prooftext used by Wesley himself: “. . . from all your filthiness.” And not far behind in frequency of reference were such passages as: Ezekiel 37:23—“Neither shall they defile themselves anymore with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions; but I . . . will cleanse them . . .”; and Ephesians 5:26, “. . . that he might sanctify and cleanse it (i.e., the Church—believers) by the washing of water by the word,” a passage which is set in the context of an essay on purity of marriage.¹⁰⁹

Further, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, like early Wesleyanism in general, had tended to gravitate more toward the Johannine than the Pauline literature of the New Testament. In the 1910s, sermons and comments on such passages as I John 2:15-17, especially 2:16 (“For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world”) became noticeably popular.¹¹⁰ And added to this was an exponential increase in conservative Protestant preachments in the 1910s declaring the United States to have become a Sodom.¹¹¹

Whether or not the now commonly cited Biblical passages had originally intended to relay a fundamental preoccupation with sensuality and sexuality, cultural change in the nation in the first two decades of the twentieth century had almost guaranteed that their exegetes would find such a preoccupation there. To cite but two elements in the culture which before 1900 had almost no cultural influence, but which, between about 1900 and 1920 took dominant roles in shaping American mores, we note psychology/psychiatry and the theater—stage and screen. Both were pre-occupied with sexuality.

Freud's work had not yet seeped into popular American thinking by 1920, but it was well-known and frequently discussed in educated circles by 1910. (Freud gave his first lectures in the U.S. at Clark University in 1909. Carl Jung lectured at Clark in 1909, as well.) And while Freud's theories concerning human sexuality were complex and professionally serious, many of his epigones had other interests, good and ill, so that by the late 1910s, Freud was the putative reference for the complete separation of sexuality from issues of morality.¹¹²

This way of thinking was abetted by the rise of behavioristic psychology, which held that sex is but one more set of stimuli and responses, one more need to be fulfilled; to repress it is to live with the frustration of stimuli unresponded to and that is unhealthy; one feels guilty about expressing sexuality simply because one has been conditioned to feel guilty about it; to continue to feel guilty about expressing sexuality only warps the personality; the more complete the fulfillment, the healthier the individual. This sounded to holiness people like an invitation to licentiousness. On the stage and screen, actors, actresses, and writers put the new sensual freedom into the new naturalistic language of the grassroots. The stage had been sufficiently careless of the moral norms of revivalist Protestants to find itself off limits to such folks, and the movies promised no greater, and probably less sensitivity to the concerns of pious folk. And, worse, it was immediately obvious that the movie would be more nearly universally available than the stage play had been.

It took little time for trouble to begin. Already in 1909, New York City had ordered all movie theaters closed, saying that they were an "immoral influence." But then the film companies themselves had established the National Board of Censorship and it appeared that reasonable standards would be set.

At first, most Wesleyan/Holiness leaders simply advised viewer discretion,¹¹³ but by the mid-1910s it was obvious that the industry itself, led

by such directors as Cecil B. de Mille and actors as Mary Pickford and Theda Bara, had decided that sensuality was a lucrative business. The establishment of the Hayes Office, a movie industry move toward renewed self-censorship which was just one jump ahead of public demands for government regulation, was just around the corner. It finally came in 1922.

The tendency of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement of the 1910s to consider lust to be the quintessential expression of original sin/inherited depravity, far from being an anachronistic, prudish, defensive maneuver, was thus a direct response out of its own resources to a culture which it perceived to have developed an obsession with sex and sexuality.¹¹⁴ But in this response, its fervent desire to meet practical issues was betrayed by the fact that for almost a generation it had distanced itself from broader theological reflection.

Traditionally, the theological issue of concupiscence had developed about two foci: the doctrine of creation and the doctrine of original sin. Christian theology had traditionally placed discussions of human sexuality in that context.¹¹⁵ But now the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, having tended to focus on original sin almost exclusively in terms of its doctrine of entire sanctification, put sexuality in those terms as well.¹¹⁶ Human sexuality as an aspect of the creation itself was a theme nearly forgotten among holiness people for better than a generation.

From the standpoint of what are now called feminist concerns, this move was a disaster, however laudable the motives which produced it. Now it was the women who would have to bear the burden of piety, for their very presence presented temptations to revert to the basest expressions of sinfulness. They would have to be especially protected, but they would also have to take special care not to tempt.¹¹⁷ So, the advice now became rules.¹¹⁸ While holiness literature filled up with praises to mothers and to motherhood, female leadership in the organizational structures fell under unprecedented restraints, most of them unwritten.¹¹⁹

By 1920, a rather complex interplay of popular piety and grassroots theology had brought about another shift in the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement's understanding of original sin/inherited depravity and thus of its understanding of sanctity. The elements in the complex were: an emphasis on entire consecration and submission to the will of God as necessary preludes to entire sanctification;¹²⁰ a preference for defining entire sanctification (negatively) in terms of freedom from the "carnal nature"; an

increasing tendency to limit the definition of sin to Wesley's epigrammatic dictum: "sin properly so-called [is] a voluntary transgression of a known law of God";¹²² and a marked tendency to understand "free moral agency" as a natural capacity rather than as a gift of grace granted as a benefit of Christ's atoning work.¹²³

Formally, John Miley's theology was the basic text for the ministry of most of the Wesleyan/Holiness bodies. Then, customarily, the candidate for ministry was instructed to go to others for an understanding of the doctrine of entire sanctification.¹²⁴ But, in fact, it was neither Miley nor the others who were shaping the theology of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, generally. Rather, the evangelists and those pastors who modeled their preaching after that of the evangelists were the Movement's most influential theologians. So, while official statements of belief and official reading courses for ministry presented rather classical definitions of original sin/inherited depravity and sanctity, the sermons and written works of the time narrowed those definitions and tended to hang orthodoxy upon near-caricatures of them, caricatures which arose from the exigencies of revivalistic preaching, especially the profound concerns of preacher and congregation that believers be sanctified here and now, before it was too late.¹²⁵

The doctrines of original sin/inherited depravity and entire sanctification underwent just such caricaturing. Earlier Methodism and the early Wesleyan/Holiness Movement had debated whether entire consecration and submission to the will of God preceded or followed on the experience of entire sanctification. Now the former position became official dogma, or at least quasi-official dogma, and, in consequence, such consecration became essentially a matter of initiating something, of "doing" something to initiate entire sanctification, rather than being essentially an offering of one's whole being to serve as an instrument of divine purpose, now and across a lifetime, in response to grace. Original sin/inherited depravity, originally thought to be destroyed only by the gracious cleansing work of the Spirit, was now thought to be destroyed by a two-fold synergistic process: the believer's entire consecration and the Spirit's gracious cleansing. Overlooked was the profound difference between offering oneself in gratitude for being made holy and offering oneself in order to be made holy—the two were thoroughly confused. Wesleyan/Holiness theology thus opened itself to *do ut des* (I give in order that you [God] may give).¹²⁶

Cultural, or least sub-cultural norms defined the *do*. Entire consecration most often took the form of some sort of deprivation or promise of

deprivation. One would leave the comforts of home to be a missionary or a poor holiness preacher. Almost invariably, entire consecration was put in terms of personal indifference to social position and material well-being.¹²⁷

Further, the Wesleyan/Holiness press and pulpit now regularly defined original sin/inherited depravity as “the carnal mind,” and entire sanctification was, or least involved the “eradication” of the “carnal mind.”¹²⁸ Not that these were new terms. They had, in fact, been used in this way for a half-century before the 1910s. But originally such use had been a bit unusual and somewhat eccentric; now it had become commonplace—even a shibboleth.¹²⁹

The description of original sin/inherited depravity as “the carnal mind” expressed a deliberate anti-Pelagianism, at least on one level.¹³⁰ But it lured the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement away from the profound sense of the power and pervasiveness of sin which it had traditionally borne. The Movement continued to speak of the universality of sinfulness, but now it tended to be understood as the universality of personal sinfulness. The corporate character of sin and what would come to be called “systemic evil” fell between ideological brackets. The Movement stoutly resisted the social optimism of Protestant liberalism, but it did so simply by ignoring the social dimensions of either sin or salvation.¹³¹

Defining entire sanctification as the destruction of the carnal mind or as cleansing from the carnal nature, then, enabled adherents of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement to exempt themselves from implication in societal ills and sinfulness. At the same time that they became deeply sensitive to personal moral responsibility for a very narrow range of personal behaviors, they came to be almost blind to any notion of personal moral responsibility for the sinfulness of “the world” and its structures. So it is that they could rejoice in the conversion of African-Americans or Black Africans, but increasingly support racial segregation; and so it is that they could enjoin a rather rigid dress code upon the women without reflecting on what we would now call its chauvinistic or sexist dimensions.¹³² One could somehow come into an experience of perfect love to God and neighbor without reflection on God’s concern for societies and structures in and of themselves and without seeing oneself as an individual in a system which might be exploiting that same neighbor.¹³³

Exacerbating this “personalization” and “privatization” of sin was the Movement’s predilection for understanding one particular Wesleyan definition of sin to cover all sin of every sort. Wesley had defined sin

“properly so-called” as “a willful transgression of a known law of God.”¹³⁴ But what Wesley had intended as a pastoral response to questions from the socially powerless about personal culpability, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement took to be a generic definition, one which circumscribed both the personal responsibility and the personal liability of all, always.¹³⁵

To a movement whose constituency was now largely poor and working-class, who felt powerless in the politics and social machinery of their day, such a definition made good sense. It had the power to free people from certain kinds of guilt feelings. But it also had the power to excuse indifference to social ills as social ills and to limit the reach of entire sanctification to a narrow range of personal pieties.

One major theological casualty of this shift was traditional Methodist “post-millennialism,” with its conviction that the Church is to prepare the world for the return of Christ, not by gathering together bands of the pure and isolating them from the world but by “spreading scriptural holiness” so as to “reform the nation.”¹³⁶ Early twentieth-century holiness people still called for sweeping revivals of religion which would “bring the nation back to God,” but these pious hopes pointed to no programs or agendas of social or political reform, as indeed they had among their spiritual ancestors.¹³⁷ Ironically, by limiting its definition of sin in the way that it had, a movement which had risen to proclaim “full salvation,” both personal and societal, was now undercutting that very message.

Under this narrow definition of sin, Wesleyan/Holiness people in the late 1910s and early 1920s came to understand entire sanctification to be primarily a matter of purified motives.¹³⁸ Always, of course, the Movement had argued that perfect love is at the heart of the matter, but this new emphasis was psychological in structure, not theological.¹³⁹ And, it was quickly in tension with the Movement’s long attention to behavioral rectitude as testimony to the destruction of carnality.

The problem cut two ways. The question was: Do good motives make an activity licit? Holiness people answered, “NO!” regarding those things forbidden by Scripture and by the practice of the Movement itself. On the other hand, holiness people answered, “YES!” regarding a vast, vaguely defined range of activities. So, one could not lie or drink liquor as a beverage, but if one acted “with good intention,” one could knowingly preach an exegetically irresponsible sermon (it might be regretted by some, but it was not condemned) or one could habitually ignore the normal rules for rest and exercise. The tension between defining entire sanc-

tification as essentially purity of motive and defining it as essentially unexceptionable behavior “tended to limit the behavioral reach of the experience to a narrow range of personal traits and habits.”¹⁴⁰

Further, Wesleyan/Holiness preachers and writers of the 1910s heavily emphasized the theme of “free moral agency.”¹⁴¹ They certainly intended no Pelagianism, but Pelagianism is precisely what the grassroots of the Movement made of it. The practical definition of “free moral agency” became “the natural capacity of the human will to make free moral decisions.”¹⁴²

The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement’s academic or technical theologians clearly saw the problem here and worked to resolve it. But three factors made it difficult for them to gain a hearing. The most formidable of these to document lies in the fact that the Movement’s evangelists were also the Movement’s *de facto* theologians. The received homiletical wisdom said that people who had come to hear a sermon would not sit still for theological fine-tuning; so, even the academic theologian-evangelist usually “preached for decision,” not comprehension. Then, on the one hand stood the long-term influence of revivalism, with its emphasis on decision-making; on the other stood the belief that conversion and entire sanctification are instantaneous experiences, with a unique interpretation being given to instantaneousness—i.e., that they occur in a moment, and that the specific moment is the one in which we make up our minds to receive them. Then too, in a rather quiet, but important, debate which had begun around 1900, several of the academic theologians who had shut the door on Pelagian interpretations of “free moral agency” walked off into Pelagianism on the matter of the nature of faith. They argued that while it must be granted that faith may become saving faith only by the operations of grace, faith is essentially a human quality, even a natural human quality.¹⁴³

By the 1910s, then, the doctrine of original sin/inherited depravity, and, by implication, the doctrine of entire sanctification, had been vitiated amongst the grassroots of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement. The developments noted in the understanding of free moral agency and faith, the developments noted in the understanding of entire consecration, the growing tendency to define entire sanctification negatively (as freedom from carnality) at the expense of its positive definition, and the limiting of the definition of sin were all significant aspects in that vitiation. Of course, holiness evangelists and others still said much of “the carnal nature” or “the old man” or “the bent to sinning,” but these terms were given referents which tended to trivialize them.¹⁴⁴

Not that the referents were in themselves trivial. From the perspective of the evangelical Protestant tradition, some were, some were not. But as appropriate as they might be, none of them separately, nor all of them together, could communicate the depth and mystery and pervasiveness of sinfulness nor the wonder and sovereignty and grandeur of the grace which rescues from that sinfulness.

Further, by about 1920, holiness people had come to understand the quintessential character of original sin/inherited depravity to be lust or concupiscence, in a narrow sense. Even pride (usually called “carnal pride”), long understood to be at least one of two basic elements in original sin, if not the very root itself, was now often defined in terms of concupiscence.¹⁴⁵

But while this perspective has had long influence in the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, it was dominant for perhaps a decade, no more. Both its short “reign” and its power appear to be tied to the cultural context. In addition to the cultural pre-occupation with sexuality which began to grow in the previous stage, American culture had, by 1920, become fascinated with the theory of biological evolution, which was now academically well-developed and was being applied in well-publicized ways to any number of institutions and disciplines by such persons as Herbert Spencer, Lester Ward, L. T. Hobhouse, Thorsten Veblen, and John Dewey.¹⁴⁶ The Movement could hardly ignore it.

In fact, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement had not, early on, opposed the evolutionary theory out of hand.¹⁴⁷ But two factors seem to have dictated its eventual enlistment on the conservative “side” of the fray.

First, the popularizing and generalizing of the evolutionary hypothesis took place just as the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement began to concern itself with affording liberal arts education to its youth. This came at high material cost and demanded the widest support of the constituency. Here, the Movement followed a characteristic strategy: whenever broad support is needed, yield as much as may be necessary to the demands of the doctrinally and ethically most conservative folks, for the more liberal people will still go along, whereas if too much be yielded to the more liberal people, the more conservative will withdraw.¹⁴⁸

This strategy guaranteed that the Movement would be kept astir about evolutionary theory, for the agents for the colleges went about assuring everyone that their schools would be up-to-date as to the issues and that they would not fall into the traps now holding captive the colleges of the mainline denominations and the state institutions.¹⁴⁹

Second, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement took to the conservative side in the fray because it tended to see only two alternatives possible, and it could not agree at all with Protestant modernism. So, the Movement moved closer to fundamentalism (at least in its sympathies, if not in its theological method and dogma) and holiness people began to take to the pulpit and lectern to excoriate all of the offspring of Darwin.¹⁵⁰

So, while the cultural context seemed to bespeak naturalism at every turn, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, increasingly reading itself as counter-cultural, took on that naturalism as the instrument and expression of Satan himself.¹⁵¹ And since sexuality bulked large in that naturalism, the Movement took it as the most significant and most pernicious expression of the whole.¹⁵² Here, holiness people would take their stand!¹⁵³

So it is that in the 1920s the various denominations and other bodies of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement hardened older legalisms and developed newer ones, most of which had to do with expressing “spirituality” as over against “the flesh,” and there is little room to doubt that “the flesh” is intimately linked with sexuality.¹⁵⁴

In this process, the women came to bear the burden of piety, for Wesleyan/Holiness people (male and female) believed that women were uniquely tempted and uniquely tempting at precisely that point at which they had now come to believe the human race to express most clearly its fall from grace. And, they came to believe as well that sexuality was also the point of greatest moral vulnerability.¹⁵⁵ They believed that it was the strategy of the Enemy to seek to destroy women in order to destroy everything else.¹⁵⁶ So it was that holiness people filled their songs and sermons and testimonies with paeans to Mother, for a saintly woman was a saint indeed. But so it was also that holiness people were increasingly reluctant to give the woman freedom of movement and the power to lead. As they saw it, there was too much to lose.

NOTES

¹Historically, those inside and outside of the religious movement described in this study have called it “The Holiness Movement.” However, its adherents are ever more aware that all orthodox Christians seek holiness. Hence the search for a more accurate name. All agree that John Wesley’s doctrine of Christian perfection, passed through North American Protestant revivalism, is what galvanizes the Movement. So, “Wes-

leyan/Holiness Movement,” awkward and inadequate as it is, serves as a generic “handle” here.

²Cf. John W. V. Smith, *The Quest for Holiness and Unity: A Centennial History of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)* (Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1980), pp. 194-204 for a full account of the Necktie Controversy. Almost every holiness group has had its analogous strifes.

³Opal F. Brookover, “On Dress,” *Gospel Trumpet*, Feb. 27, 1908, p. 133. For another statement of the same sentiment from within the holiness circles of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, see *Pentecostal Herald*, vol. 32, no. 6 (Feb. 11, 1920), *passim*. Editor Henry Clay Morrison devotes the entire issue to what was called “The Dress Question.”

⁴The periodization is approximate, not absolute. The shifts noted were gradual; the tempo varied, and they spread unevenly across the country. The terminology remained fairly constant throughout the period covered in the paper, but both great and subtle changes occurred in the relative importance, systematic placement, and connotations of terms.

⁵The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement in the period covered by this paper may be defined at the center as a self-nominated “coalition” of three religious families which hold in common the belief that the atoning work of Christ has made possible in this life an experience of Christian perfection—best defined as unconditional love of God and neighbor—which begins in a second definite work of divine grace which is received instantaneously, by faith, subsequent to regeneration. The three families are: 1. those religious bodies and persons which belonged to the National Campmeeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness (NCAPH), which officially took the name National Holiness Association (NHA) toward the end of our period; 2. those religious bodies such as the Church of God (Anderson) which were clearly committed to the doctrine of Christian perfection as stated and recognized themselves as part of the Movement but chose not to affiliate with the NCAPH/NHA; and 3. significant numbers among the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Methodist Protestant Church, African Methodist Episcopal Church, African Methodist Episcopal, Zion Church, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, and other groups who identified themselves as belonging to the Holiness Movement though their denominations as a whole did not. Also to be included in the Movement in the period covered here are those groups which claimed and retained Wesleyan perfectionism though their central interest became

charismata, especially glossalalia—among them those who coalesced into the Church of God (Cleveland), the Pentecostal Holiness Church, and, to a lesser and less clear degree, the Church of God in Christ. Then there are noteworthy individuals who identified with the Movement whose denominations had little or no interest in it: Hannah Whitall Smith and her spouse, Robert Piersall Smith; Asa Mahan and Charles Finney; Thomas Cogswell Upham; David Updegraff; Charles Cullis; A. B. Earle; and A. B. Simpson, being outstanding leaders among them.

⁶Generally, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement has taken John Wesley's *Plain Account of Christian Perfection* as the paradigmatic statement of its distinguishing doctrine. For the edition of the *Plain Account* . . . cited in this paper, cf. Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley* (3d ed., reprinted; 14 vols.; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1959), vol. XI:366-466. On the specific issue of maturity, cf. pp. 394-406. For examples of popular Wesleyan/Holiness Movement treatments of this specific doctrine, cf. George Peck, *The Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection Stated and Defended* (7th ed., rev.; New York: Carlton and Phillips, 1854); Randolph S. Foster, *Christian Purity: Or, the Heritage of Faith* (rev. ed.; New York: Phillips and Hunt; Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1884); Aaron Merritt Hills, *Holiness and Power for the Church and for the Ministry* (Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1897); and J. A. Wood, *Perfect Love: Or, Plain Things for Those Who Need Them, Concerning the Doctrine, Experience, Profession and Practice of Christian Holiness* (rev. and enlarged; Chicago: Christian Witness Co., 1915). Cited here are not the earliest but the most easily accessible editions.

⁷E.g., Peck, *ibid.*, pp. 24-41; Daniel Steele, *Milestone Papers, Doctrinal, Ethical, and Experimental, on Christian Progress* (New York: Hunt and Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1876), pp. 11-35; Foster, *ibid.*, pp. 93-98, 118-128; Hills, *ibid.*, pp. 31-46 (of special interest are pp. 41-46, where Hills analyzes "Oberlin Theology"); William Baxter Godbey, *Carnality* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing, 190?), *passim*; and B. W. Huckabee, *The Carnal Mind* (n.p.; n.d. [c.1900]), pp. 3-28.

⁸John Wesley, Sermon XXXVIII: "Original Sin," III.2, in E. H. Sugden, ed., *Wesley's Standard Sermons* (2 vols.; London: Epworth, 1921) II:223. Also cf. Wesley, *The Doctrine of Original Sin According to Scripture, Reason, and Experience*, "Part I: The Past and Present State of Mind," in *Works* (ed. cit.) IX:192-238.

⁹John Wesley, Sermon L: "The Scripture Way of Salvation" I.4 in Sugden, *ibid.*, II.446.

¹⁰E.g., “The Question, ‘What Is an Arminian?’ Answered by a Lover of Free Grace,” in *Works* (ed. cit.) X:358-361; also Sermon I: “Salvation by Faith,” intro. 1-3, in Sugden, *ibid.*, II.37-38.

¹¹For Arminius’ understanding of the universality of the Atonement, see, e.g., James Nichols and W. R. Bagnall, trs. and eds., *The Writings of James Arminius, D.D.* (3 vols.; Auburn and Buffalo: Derby, Miller, and Orton, 1853; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956) III.451-474; for his understanding of the justice of God as it applies to free will, see, e.g., I.251-254, 523-531.

¹²Cf. Wesley, Sermon I: “Salvation by Faith,” *passim*, in Sugden, *ibid.*, 5:37-52; Sermon V: “Justification by Faith”, *passim*, in *ibid.*, I.114-130; and Sermon LXXXV: “Working Out Our Own Salvation,” I:1-3 and III:3-5, in *Works* (ed. cit.) VI.508, 511-512.

¹³John Wesley and Charles Wesley, “The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies . . .” in *Works* (ed. cit.) VIII.269-271.

¹⁴Cf., for instance, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* 19, in *Works* (ed. cit.) XI .394-406; Sermon L: “The Scripture Way of Salvation” III.1-18, in Sugden, *ibid.*, II.451-460.

¹⁵Cf. , for instance, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* 25, in *Works* (ed. cit.) XI.414-441.

¹⁶To cite examples over the time span covered by this paper: cf. George Peck, *The Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection Stated and Defended: With a Critical and Historical Examination of the Controversy Both Ancient and Modern; Also Practical Illustrations and Advices, in a Series of Lectures* (New York: Lane and Sanford, 1842). Citations from this work in this paper are from the 7th ed., rev.; New York: Carlton and Phillips, 1864. Cf. *supra*, n6. This work constantly and specifically appeals and refers to writers from across the whole history of Christianity, though, typical of its time, it cites very few from the Middle Ages or the post-Chalcedonian East. Also see, George Peck, *Appeal from Tradition to Scripture and Common Sense* (New York: Lane and Sanford, 1844); Randolph S. Foster, *ibid.*; Daniel Steele, *A Defense of Christian Perfection; Or, A Criticism of Dr. James Mudge’s Growth in Holiness Toward Perfection* (New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1896); and J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, pp. 265-269. The confessional articles of nearly all of the holiness denominations indicate the same awareness and concern.

¹⁷It should be remembered that the popular literature of the Methodists and the holiness people far outsold their academic literature. Authors

such as Phoebe Palmer, William Broadman, William Arthur, and (a bit later) Hannah Whitall Smith had very wide followings. But theological texts did not suffer from disinterest. By 1900, Methodists in general, and the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement in particular, were reading the following Methodist theologians (their works listed here in chronological order of their appearance):

Richard Watson, *Theological Institutes: Or, A View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity* (3 vols.; New York: N. Bangs and J. Emory, 1825). This was the first American edition and is from the second London edition. The edition most popular in the United States, and the one known and used by the early Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, was edited by John M'Clintock (New York: Carlton and Lanahan; Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1850), who added to it his own theological analysis.

Adam Clarke, *Christian Theology* (London: Thomas Tegg and Son, 1835). The edition best known to the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement was probably the revision done by Thomas O. Summers (Nashville: E. Stevenson and F. A. Owen, 1856). This work is actually a selection from Clarke's writings more or less skillfully arranged in the form of a systematic theology by Samuel Dunn, whose biography of Clarke is printed with it.

Thomas Neely Ralston, *Elements of Divinity: Or, A Course of Lectures. Comprising a Clear and Concise View of the System of Theology as Taught in the Holy Scriptures; With Appropriate Questions Appended to Each Lecture* (Louisville: Norton and Griswold, 1847). The more popular edition of this work among Wesleyan/Holiness people has been the second edition (Cincinnati: Poe and Hitchcock, 1861)—not in itself, however, but in the form prepared by T. O. Summers under the title, *Elements of Divinity: Or, a Concise and Comprehensive View of Bible Theology; Comprising the Doctrines, Evidences, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity; With Appropriate Questions Appended to Each Chapter* (Nashville: A. H. Redford, 1871).

Amos Binney, *A Theological Compend: Containing a System of Divinity* (Cincinnati: Swormstedt and Poe, 1856). This work was best known in the form of a revision by Binney's son-in-law, Daniel Steele (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1874; republished as *Binney's Theological Compend Improved* . . . [New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1902]). Thomas O. Summers also edited and published it in 1885 (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House).

Samuel A. Wakefield, *A Complete System of Christian Theology: Or, A Concise, Comprehensive, and Systematic View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals and Institutions of Christianity* (2 vols.; New York: Carlton and Porter; Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1862). None of the standard Methodist biographical sources lists Wakefield. Yet this theology seems to have circulated widely and to great effect until the 1890s.

William Burt Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology: Being Analytical Outlines of a Course of Theological Study* (3 vols.; London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1875). The edition best known to the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement was the “second edition, revised and enlarged” printed in London in 1880 and then in New York and Cincinnati, by Phillips and Hunt, and Walden and Stowe, respectively, without date.

Miner Raymond, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols.; Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1877).

Thomas Osmond Summers, *Systematic Theology: A Complete Body of Wesleyan Arminian Divinity* (2 vols.; Nashville: Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1888).

John Miley, *Systematic Theology* (2 vols.; New York: Hunt and Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1892, 1894).

¹⁸Cf., for instance, Robert E. Chiles, *Theological Transition in American Methodism: 1790-1935* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), pp. 115-136, for an interpretation of the differences between the theologies of John Wesley, Richard Watson, and John Miley. For a more specific example, cp. Pope, *ibid.*, II.83-84 and J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, pp. 41-43. Pope is convinced that depravity is truly sin; Wood is convinced that it is not. Both writers enjoyed exceptional popularity among Wesleyan/Holiness people.

¹⁹E.g., cp. Watson, *ibid.*, II.3-87, Peck, *ibid.*, pp. 242-278, and Foster, *ibid.*, pp. 333-344. (Foster here quotes a tract by an author whom he does not identify but with whom he generally agrees.)

²⁰E.g., Daniel Steele, *Mile-Stone Papers, Doctrinal, Ethical, and Experimental, on Christian Progress* (New York: Hunt and Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1876), Chapter XVIII: “How the Guidance of the Spirit May Be Discriminated,” pp. 197-228.

²¹Adam Clarke, *ibid.*, p. 101. Also see John Wesley, “The Doctrine of Original Sin,” *Works* (ed. cit.) IX.197.

²²It is largely under this rubric that the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement developed the notion of entire sanctification as the “eradication” of

the “carnal nature.” Whatever the force or dynamism of spirit within the believer that contradicted or countermanded the will of God had to be evicted before the Holy Spirit would dwell in that believer’s heart. In this way, original sin/inherited depravity was hypostatized, or, at least reified. See, for example, Beverly Carradine, *The Old Man* (Louisville: Kentucky Methodist Publishing Company, 1896). Also see Stephen S. White, *Eradication Defined, Explained, Authenticated* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1954). I cite White here because his is the last comprehensive work in roughly a century of extended arguments for the eradicationist position.

²³See, for instance, Wakefield, *ibid.*, II.515-537; George Peck, *ibid.*, pp. 457-461; and Daniel Wise, *The Path of Life: Or, Sketches of the Way to Glory and Immortality. A Help for Young Christians* (New York: Carlton and Porter, 186?), *passim*.

²⁴Episcopal Methodism, following Wesley, had traditionally advised that the sole condition for entering the Methodist societies is “a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from [one’s] sins.” To continue in the societies, Methodists were to “evidence their desire of salvation” by “doing no harm, by avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is most generally practiced”; “doing good; by being in every kind merciful after their powers; as they have opportunity, doing good of every possible sort, and as far as possible, to all . . .”; and “attending upon all the ordinances of God.” These three rules, with their specific references and stated examples, became standard in one form or another for most of the ecclesial bodies of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement. However, the Wesleyan/Holiness bodies tended to put them forward as prerequisites to joining their groups as well as requirements for continued membership. In several of these bodies, the rules were (are) customarily read to congregations when new members were (are) received. And, pastors in some of these bodies, the Church of the Nazarene, for example, are constitutionally required either to read the rules to their gathered congregations or to have them printed and distributed to the membership annually.

²⁵None of the larger Wesleyan/Holiness bodies and very few of the smaller ones require(d) an experience of entire sanctification for entry into or continuance in membership. But (cf. *supra*, n24), fidelity to the rules was/is expected of all members. See, for example, J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, p. 305: “In the outward life [of the entirely sanctified as compared with the justified who are not yet entirely sanctified] there is no marked differ-

ence, as the distinction is not so much in the outer life as in the inner life and experience.”

²⁶The usual approach was to insist that once the believer was entirely sanctified, the rules would be kept without tension. E.g., Phoebe Palmer, *Guide to Holiness* 53 (1868), 29-30. Here, Palmer reasons that if folks were entirely sanctified they would not longer yearn for “pious amusements,” i.e., church-sponsored or church-approved activities which were not directly contributory to spiritual edification.

²⁷G. D. Watson and W. B. Godbey, among others, press this logic to the point of concluding that only the entirely sanctified (not the “merely” saved) will go to heaven. Cf. G. D. Watson, *A Holiness Manual* (Boston: Christian Witness, 1882), pp. 50-52; and W. B. Godbey, *Holiness or Hell?* (Louisville: Kentucky Methodist Publishing Co., 1896).

²⁸This principle was understood to have been enunciated by Wesley himself. Cf. John Wesley, “The Character of a Methodist,” *Works* (ed. cit.) VIII.339-347, esp. ¶17, p. 346; and *Plain Account of Christian Perfection* ¶15, *Works* (ed. cit.) XI.383-387. For the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement itself, see, for instance, Daniel Steele, *ibid.*, pp. 238-261; and Matin Wells Knapp, *Christ Enthroned Within* (Cincinnati: God’s Revivalist Office, 1886), *passim*.

²⁹On the matter of the definition of “worldliness” as proclivity rather than as activity, see, for example, Daniel Steele, *ibid.*, pp. 208-221; and George Peck, *ibid.*, pp. 457-461.

³⁰The increasing tendency of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement to express the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification in pneumatological rather than christological terms, while at the same time insisting that its basic definition is “Christlikeness,” may be grasped by examining the titles in the bibliography of holiness apologetics by William Charles Miller, compiler and ed., *Holiness Works: A Bibliography* (Kansas City, MO.: Nazarene Publishing House, 1986). Of 1400 titles listed (including reprints, new editions, etc.), some 240 (not counting reprints, new editions, etc.) mention or allude to the Holy Spirit, outnumbering titles mentioning or alluding to Jesus Christ by about 17:1, with only four of the christological titles appearing since 1910; six between 1880 and 1910.

³¹See, for instance, Beverly Carradine, *The Sanctified Life* (Cincinnati: M. W. Knapp, 1897), pp. 77-88. Carradine dedicates this work entirely to the making of this point. Also see, W. B. Godbey, *God’s*

Nazarite (Nashville: Pentecostal Mission Publishing Co., n.d. [after 1902, before 1915]), *passim*.

³²Cf. *supra*, n14.

³³Cf., for instance, II.371-387, which contains two chapters under the title “The Extent of the Atonement.”

³⁴Cp. Watson, *ibid.*, II.2-86 and Wakefield, *ibid.*, I.275-307.

³⁵Cf. Wakefield, *ibid.*, I.298-303. It must be noted that while Wakefield rarely uses the term “pride,” the concept is certainly here.

³⁶Cp., for instance, George Peck, *ibid.*, 24-65, in much of which Peck, who first published his work in 1852, is content to quote and paraphrase Wesley, Watson, and Clarke, with Wakefield, *ibid.*, II.446-454, in which Wakefield does quote Wesley but only to show that entire sanctification “does not differ in essence from regeneration” and that it “does not imply a state of indefectibility.”

³⁷Cf. Wakefield, *ibid.*, II.451-452, 486-491.

³⁸Cf. esp. Watson, *ibid.*, II.468-474.

³⁹Cf. esp. Wakefield, *ibid.*, II.467-471.

⁴⁰Cf. Watson, *ibid.*, II.524-571. Most of his ethical discussion is limited to broad principles. He is more detailed and specific than one would expect where he works with the marriage relationship, however. But he is there citing “an extract . . . made from an old writer. . . .” Cf. *ibid.*, II.548-550. (Simply for purposes of rough comparison: Watson devotes about 2.5% of his text to ethics; Wakefield, 3.1%.)

⁴¹Cf. Wakefield, *ibid.*, II.515-537.

⁴²Cp., for instance, Watson, *ibid.*, II.480-483, and Wakefield, *ibid.*, II.486-491.

⁴³Cp., for instance, John Wesley, Sermon IV: “Scriptural Christianity” I:¶1-10, in *Sermons* (ed. cit.) I.94-98; and Sermon XLVII: “The Repentance of Believers” I:¶1-20 and III.¶1-4, in *Sermons* (ed. cit.) II.379-391 and 394-397, respectively; George Peck, *ibid.*, 441-444; and Wakefield, *ibid.*, II.446-447, 453-454.

⁴⁴E.g., Jeremiah Dodsworth, *The Better Land: Or, The Christian Emigrant's Guide to Heaven* (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1861; Columbia, SC: L. L. Pickett, n.d.), *passim*; Frank Stowe

Heath, *Soul Laws in Sexual, Social, Spiritual Life* . . . (“Pentecostal Holiness Library,” vol. 2, no. 10; 2d ed. rev.; Cincinnati: M. W. Knapp, 1899), *passim*; C. E. Orr, *Christian Conduct* (Anderson, IN: *Gospel Trumpet*, 1902), *passim*. Pastors, evangelists, and writers launched frequent warnings against “fanaticism” and “enthusiasm” in this period precisely because of the surge of legalism among holiness folk. Numbers of books were published in the period absolutely opposing such things as the use of tobacco, dancing, the wearing of wedding rings, belonging to lodges, and attendance at the theater, as well.

⁴⁵Cf., for instance, Phoebe Palmer, *Guide to Holiness* 68 (1875), 43; B[ushrod] S[hedden] Taylor, Sermon in S. B. Shaw, ed., *Echoes of the General Holiness Assembly: Chicago, May 3-13, 1901* (Chicago: S. B. Shaw, 1901), pp. 193-206; and A. M. Hills, *Pentecost Rejected and the Effect on the Churches* (Cincinnati: Office of God’s Revivalist, 1902), esp., pp. 90-103.

⁴⁶Cf. for instance, Randolph S. Foster, *ibid.*, 282-310. Foster draws heavily upon John Wesley, *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, sec. 25, qq. 32-37 in *Works* (ed. cit.) XI.427-441. Also see, for further example, Carradine, *ibid.*, 158-166; and A. M. Hills, *Holiness and Power for the Church and for the Ministry* (Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1897), pp. 352-354.

⁴⁷George Peck, *ibid.*, 136-147, cites von Limborch at length and comments upon the differences between Arminius, von Limborch, and Episcopius. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1872-1873), II.329-330, notes the difference between the Wesleyans at that date, who followed Arminius rather than the later Remonstrants. Cf. H. Orton Wiley, *Christian Theology* (3 vols.; Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1940-1943), II.96-140, who develops the doctrine of original sin/inherited depravity in full awareness of the two streams that have flowed within the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement and of the later tendency to swim in the Remonstrant waters rather than the strictly Arminian.

⁴⁸Miner Raymond, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols.; Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden; New York: Nelson and Phillips, 1877-1879). Cf. “Introduction,” I.9-16.

⁴⁹Cf. *ibid.*, II.50-174. To be quite precise, the chapter on the Fall follows that on original righteousness, which, with the chapters on the Fall

and original sin, constitute his theological anthropology. Raymond writes with rather full awareness of then-recent developments in paleontology.

⁵⁰Cf. *ibid.*, II.59-63. “Sin originated in the abuse of free-will; it was an act of an unconstrained first cause, a creation *de nihilo* of a free moral agent” (II.63).

⁵¹Cf. *ibid.*, II.64-97. The direct practical response to this understanding of what was the quintessential expression of original sin/inherited depravity was the emphasis on the “surrender” of the will. But this emphasis became quite problematic for a while because of the teaching of Thomas Upham that there is a work of grace beyond entire sanctification (but predicated upon it) which annihilates the human will. Cf. Thomas Upham, *Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life; Designed Particularly for the Consideration of Those Who are Seeking Assurance of Faith and Perfect Love* (3d ed.; Boston: Waite, Pierce and Company, 1845), pp. 364-365: “We have no pleasure of our own; we have no desires of our own; we have no will of our own.” Phoebe Palmer, who had been Upham’s mentor in the way of holiness and who emphasized entire consecration in such a way as to encourage “surrender” talk, struggled at length with Upham’s notions. Cf. Charles Edward White, *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist, and Humanitarian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press/Zondervan Publishing House, 1986), pp. 113-117 for an account of the debate. For one of Mrs. Palmer’s own responses to Upham, see her letter of 30 April, 1851, to the Uphams in Richard Wheatley, *The Life and Letters of Mrs. Phoebe Palmer* (New York: W. C. Palmer, 1881), pp. 518-523.

⁵²E.g., W. B. Godbey, *God’s Nazarite* (Nashville: Pentecostal Mission Publishing Company, n.d.), *passim*, but esp. cf. pp. 13-22, 42-43; M[ilton] L[orenzo] Haney, *The Inheritance Restored: Or, Plain Teaching on Bible Holiness* (4th ed., rev. and enl’d.; Chicago: Christian Witness, 1904), pp. 228-236. (Haney first published this work in 1881.) This was certainly the attitude of Daniel Warner and his associates at the outset of the already-noted Necktie Controversy. Cf. *supra*, n2.

⁵³Perhaps one of the most striking examples of this occurs in the story of the entire sanctification of Samuel Logan Brengle (1860-1936), who became Commissioner of the Salvation Army. Cf. Clarence W. Hall, *S[amuel] L[ogan] Brengle: Portrait of a Prophet* (New York: Salvation Army National Headquarters, 1933).

⁵⁴Cf. 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 Anti-Scriptural Character of the Modern Church of Sect* (Columbia, MO: Herald Publishing House, 1891), *passim*, but see esp. Chapter XIII: Observations on Discipline, pp. 203-216; and Chapter XVI: Anti-Holiness Character of the Church of Sect, pp. 267-283. And also see D[aniel] S[idney] Warner and H. M. Riggle, *The Cleansing of the Sanctuary: Or, The Church of God in Type and Antitype, and in Prophecy and Revelation* (Moundsville, WV: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1903), esp. pp. 230-279. Warner died in 1895. Riggle incorporated a Warner MS as pp. 74-276 of this work. Warner and his spiritual heirs rejected denominationalism as stoutly as did Brooks and his spiritual heirs, but Warner's people held from the beginning a much stronger sense of confederation among themselves than did Brooks'.

⁵⁵E.g., George Peck, *ibid.*, 443-444, says (in 1842) that submission to the will of God is "a state of mind which will always accompany entire sanctification." In 1876, Daniel Steele, *ibid.*, 267-279, puts the matter of submission to spiritual discipline in terms of freedom. Commenting on Rom. 7:6, he says (pp. 270-271): "This death of the believer unto the law must be twofold: first, as the ground of acceptance by reason of his perfect obedience. The penitent sinner in this sense dies to the law when he abandons the plea of perfect obedience, and relies only on the blood of Christ, and obtains justification by faith. A second step brings him into perfect freedom. This is when love toward the Lawgiver is so fully shed abroad in the heart as to effect a perfect release from the fear of the law as a motive to obedience. This takes place when the Holy Spirit fills the soul, and exhibits Jesus to the eye of faith . . . and gives an assurance of his love to me so strong as to exclude doubt, and to awaken love toward him responsive to his mighty love. Duty is transformed into delight. . . . Love knows no burdens in the service of its object. The law still remains as the rule of life and the measure of sin, but it is divested of its terrors."

⁵⁶Cf. for instance, Phoebe Palmer, "Consecration Must Precede Faith," *Guide to Holiness* LX (1871), 183; "How Entire Sanctification May Be Received Now," *Guide to Holiness* LXVII (1875), 162-164. (The latter article was published posthumously.)

⁵⁷E.g., Phoebe Palmer, *Incidental Illustrations of the Economy of Salvation, Its Doctrines and Duties* (Boston: H. V. Degen; Binghampton,

N.Y.: B. W. Gorham, 1855), p. 131. Mrs. Palmer's view, oft-presented, was hotly disputed, fairly and unfairly. Generally fair were Nathan Bangs, as in his *The Present State and Prospects, and Responsibilities of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Lane and Scott, 1850), pp. 58ff., for whose position also, cf. Able Stevens, *Life and Times of Nathan Bangs, D. D.* (New York: Carlton and Fisher, 1863), pp. 395-402; and Randolph Foster, *ibid.*, 56-58. Finally unfair is Hiram Mattison, *Thoughts on Entire Sanctification* (New York: Lane and Scott, 1852), and *A Calm Review of Dr. Perry's Late Article . . .* (New York: John A. Gray, 1856). Cf. the review of the issues in Charles Edward White, *ibid.*, 52-58, 142-144.

⁵⁸Cf. Randolph Foster, *ibid.*, 180-220, esp. 203-206; and Beverly Carradine, *ibid.*, 17-19, for examples of sensitivity to the issue. Carradine also helps to perpetuate the problem, however, by defining entire sanctification in terms of an answer to "perfect consecration, unswerving faith, and importunate prayer" (p. 17). For an example of the caricature itself, cf. the sermon preached on Friday afternoon, 10 May 1901, at the General Holiness Assembly in First M. E. Church, Chicago, Illinois, by W. B. Shepard, in S. B. Shaw, *Echoes of the General Holiness Assembly: Held in Chicago, May 3-13, 1901* (Chicago: S. B. Shaw, 1901), pp. 250-263. Holiness preaching was much more inclined to present the doctrine and experience in this way than was holiness literature.

⁵⁹E.g., Henry Clay Morrison, *Baptism with the Holy Ghost* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Co., 1900), Chapter VIII; and Wilson Thomas Hogue, *The Holy Spirit: A Study* (Chicago: W. B. Rose, 1916), pp. 271-275. It is of interest to note that the matter of the ordo of entire sanctification, especially the matter of the place of entire consecration in that ordo, remained sufficiently debatable among the Nazarenes that they resisted any too-specific statement upon it in their "Articles of Faith" until 1928, when the (quadrennial) General Assembly voted to recommend for inclusion in the article on entire sanctification (Article X) the theological proposition that entire consecration necessarily precedes entire sanctification. The requisite number of (annual) district assemblies affirmed the recommendation and the proposition was written into the article, where it remains.

⁶⁰E.g., Phoebe Palmer, *The Way of Holiness with Notes by the Way: Being a Narrative of Religious Experience Resulting from a Determination to be a Bible Christian* (2d ed.; New York: G. Lane and C. B. Tippet,

1845), pp. 30-31; Wheatley, *ibid.*, 38-41, which simply quotes from Phoebe Palmer's Diary for 27 July 1837. Phoebe Palmer's point of view and mode of expression became almost prototypical. Cp. J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, 106-108. Also see W. E. Shepard, *ibid.*, *passim*, esp. 260. Here we find reference to "the unknown bundle," the "unrevealed will of God," i.e., the specific details of life as it unfolds from this moment. "Putting the unknown bundle on the altar," the entire consecration of the future in the present, remains a staple of the phraseology of revivalistic holiness preaching.

⁶¹J[ohn] A[llen] Wood, *Perfect Love: Or, Plain Things for Those Who Need Them. Concerning the Doctrine, Experience, Profession and Practice of Christian Holiness* (Philadelphia: Samuel D. Burlock, 1861). This work underwent several editions without any fundamental change in its essential content. The edition cited for this paper was published in Chicago by Christian Witness Company in 1915. It was registered with the Library of Congress in 1880. It says on the title page, "Fifty-fourth Thousand Revised and Enlarged," apparently a reference to this particular edition. As late as 1959, Nazarene Publishing House, Kansas City, Missouri, was publishing an abridgement of the work, done by John Paul.

⁶²J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, 95-113, 227.

⁶³Cf. J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, 227 for the quotation; also see 96-100, 227-231.

⁶⁴E.g., Wood, *ibid.*, 231. Comparison with earlier Methodist usage of the Pauline principle is instructive. Cp., for instance, George Peck, *ibid.*, 457-461, which pages constitute the very end of the book, and Wood, *loc. cit.* Where Peck uses the principle primarily with reference to "appearances of evil (which) develop themselves when no evil is intended, or even suspected by us" (p. 457), Wood uses it with respect to evils with which no compromise is to be made: "To retain (perfect love), you must oppose sin of every name and kind, without any compromise."

⁶⁵Cf. Wood, *ibid.*, 301-303.

⁶⁶E.g., John Wesley, Sermon LXXXVIII: "On Dress" in *Works* (ed. cit.) VII:15-26.

⁶⁷E.g., Phoebe Palmer, *Entire Devotion to God* (14th ed.; New York: n.p., 1853; reprint; Salem, OH: Schmull Publishing, 1979), pp. 58-59, has an especially lurid story about the consequences of disobedience to the Biblical word—in this case, disobedience with respect to injunctions

against ostentation in clothing. The story is atypical of Palmer only in its sensationalist tone. *Entire Devotion to God* was more commonly known as *A Present to My Christian Friend*. Its more common title was *A Present to My Christian Friend on Entire Devotion to God*. It was originally published in New York in 1847 (publisher not indicated). Later editions enlarged the original but changed the essential content almost not at all.

⁶⁸For representative statements from Phoebe Palmer, see Wheatley, *ibid.*, 600-610. Wheatley has chosen examples which represent well Mrs. Palmer's views but which tend to be unrepresentative of her tone, for she wrote with deep feeling and often with pungency. Cf. White, *ibid.*, 150-154.

⁶⁹E.g., Palmer, *Guide to Holiness* 53 (1868), 29-30.

⁷⁰See, for instance, S. M. Vernon, *Amusements in the Light of Reason, History, and Revelation* (Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe; New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1882).

⁷¹This is the fundamental point of A. M. Hills, *Holiness and Power for the Church and the Ministry* (Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1897). Cf. esp., pp. 17-82. Hills (pp. 24-25) quotes in support of his point Randolph S. Foster and Jesse Peck, both Methodist Episcopal bishops. Also see John Brooks, *ibid.*, esp. 203-283. On pp. 273-275, Brooks, too, quotes at length from Foster. Seth C. Rees, *The Ideal Pentecostal Church* (Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1897), approaches the matter positively, attempting to rally believers. (The term "pentecostal" in Rees' title is typical of Wesleyan/Holiness Movement usage at the time. Only with the rise of the glossolalic Pentecostal Movement around 1900 did the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement develop reservations about the use of the term in identifying themselves. By 1920, they had deliberately ceased to use the term in that way.)

⁷²Also cf. I Cor. 3:1-3. Holiness preachers found a principle ethical "exposition" of Romans 6:6 and I Cor. 3:1-3 in I John 2:15-16. While this passage did not often serve as the text for sermons, it is found everywhere in sermons and the literature, cited as the guideline for sanctified behavior, along with the older Pauline guideline already noted. On the matter of the use of the terms "carnal nature," etc., as synonyms for original sin/inherited depravity, it must be noted that such usage appears almost suddenly, though Methodist scholars such as Foster had brought the indicated passages to bear in their discussions of entire sanctification. Pope, *ibid.*, III.97, uses the term "carnal mind" as a synonym for "inbred sin,"

but seems to warn the reader away from understanding either term to be the theological equivalent of original sin/inherited depravity. By 1900, the terms under discussion were commonly used in Wesleyan/Holiness circles precisely as synonyms for original sin/inherited depravity. A very popular example of this usage was Beverly Carradine, *The Old Man* (Louisville: Kentucky Methodist Publishing Co., 1896). Another widely circulated work was B. W. Huckabee, *The Carnal Mind* (publication data not noted, but necessarily published before June, 1907. Cf. Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness. The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years* [Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962], p. 217). Also see James Morgan Taylor, *The Carnal Mind* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Co., 1909).

⁷³E.g., L[eander] L[ycurgus] Pickett, *A Plea for the Present Holiness Movement* (Louisville: Pickett Publishing Co.; Garland, TX: M. A. Smith, 1896); A. M. Hills, *Pentecost Rejected: and the Effect on the Churches* (Cincinnati: Office of God's Revivalist, 1902), *passim*, but esp. pp. 90-103. One of the most scathing attacks from within Methodism itself was L. W. Munhall, *Breakers! Methodism Adrift* (Chicago: Christian Witness Co., 1913). For a statement clearly linking the "Natural Man" (which, to holiness people, meant "carnal humanity") and an undesirable state of affairs in the Church, cf. esp. pp. 159-165. Also see pp. 179-182, for Munhall's analysis of the influence of wealth on the Church. Munhall, something of an "insider" for a number of years, brooded long over what he saw as spiritual declension in the Methodist Episcopal Church before he wrote this book.

⁷⁴E.g., Seth C. Rees, *ibid.*, 20-34, 82-85; *idem*, *Miracles in the Slums: Or, Thrilling Stories of Those Rescued from the Cesspools of Iniquity, and Touching Incidents in the Lives of the Unfortunate* (Chicago: Seth Cook Rees, 1905). Also see, Norris Magnuson, *Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work, 1865-1920* (ATLA Monograph Series, No. 10; Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press and American Theological Library Association, 1977). The word "evangelical" in this subtitle refers in very large part to groups and persons associated with the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, the most conspicuous being the Salvation Army.

⁷⁵This is to say, their understanding of what had been done for them in entire sanctification led them into contexts of human oppression and suffering, but their first concern in those contexts was not to preach entire sanctification. It was to alleviate physical and emotional need and to

accompany that alleviation with the invitation to salvation (i.e., to conversion). Examples could easily be multiplied. Cf., for instance, Lue Miller, "Thanksgiving for Our Rescue Work," *Herald of Holiness* 28 Nov. 1917, p. 7. Seth C. Rees, *Miracles in the Slums* is typical in approach and describes typical work and attitudes and motives behind that work. Also see *Herald of Holiness* 19 Mar. 1913, p. 16, which has in the left-hand column an article by C. J. Kinne, "A New Rescue Journal," and in the right-hand column nine one-inch notices for "homes" for "erring girls" run by various groups of Nazarenes and other holiness people. Kinne's article asks readers whether they had any interest in combining the papers and newsletters of the many such "homes" runs by such groups. "Erring girls" were simply one of the rescue interests of holiness people.

⁷⁶Adherents to the early Wesleyan/Holiness Movement apparently read much, and the Movement's leaders tended to be writers (of varying skill). Each group of any size, whether remaining within Methodism or separated from it, and each project of any size printed a regular paper. For instance, four papers with wide constituencies in the Movement lie behind the *Herald of Holiness*, which was established in 1912, as the "official organ of the Church of the Nazarene." And behind each of these four lay a series of mergers, for each of the four had at least two direct ancestors. These papers were militantly "second-blessing." They assumed general Christian orthodoxy on the part of their readers, so only occasionally would there appear articles on theological topics other than conversion and entire sanctification and their corollaries in personal and social ethics. Even such topics as were pressing the consciousness of the evangelical camp in general, such as evolution, the inspiration of Scripture, and pre-millennialism found only fitful attention in most of these papers before about 1920. Candidates for ministry were expected to read formal systematic theology. In the Church of the Nazarene, John Miley's *Systematic Theology* appeared on the very first (1911) Course of Study for Licensed Ministers (i.e., the reading and examination regimen for persons proceeding toward ordination). It remained there until 1932, although from 1915 to 1932, it was listed with Ralston's *Elements of Divinity* as an alternative. Also recommended, but not required, were Samuel Wakefield, *ibid.*, and Benjamin Field, *The Student's Handbook of Christian Theology*, with intro. by Luke Tyerman, ed. with extensive additions by John C. Symons (New ed.; New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1887). The original edition of this work appeared in Britain some twenty years earlier. No comprehensive systematic theology came from within the Movement until

Russell Raymond Byrum's *Christian Theology; A Systematic Statement of Christian Doctrine for the Use of Theological Students* (Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Co.) appeared in 1925; but since the 1840s literally thousands of books and booklets on entire sanctification appeared, several of them rather extended theological treatments. Cf. William Charles Miller, *ibid.*, (*supra* n36) for a useful bibliography of this literature. Much more extensive, and not limited to theology, is Charles Edwin Jones, *A Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press and the American Theological Library Association, 1974).

⁷⁷As yet, there is no comprehensive, critical study of any period in the history of the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness as it evolved into the present-day Christian Holiness Association. For very useful accounts and critical assessments of its beginnings, which include helpful insights into the personalities involved, see Melvin Easterday Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (ATLA Studies in Evangelicalism, No. 1; Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1980), chapter 3; and Charles Edwin Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936* (ATLA Monograph Series, No. 5; Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974), chapter 3.

⁷⁸Until 1939, the presidents of NCAPH (and its successors) were always Methodist Episcopal ministers; and from 1939-1942, Methodist ministers. The official periodical of the Association—variously, *Advocate of Christian Holiness* (1870-1881); *Advocate of Bible Holiness* (1882); *Christian Witness* (1882-1859)—carried frequent avowals of loyalty to the Methodist Episcopal churches well into the early twentieth century. Episcopal support for the Association's camp meetings was actively sought and noted. In late 1900 or early 1901, 7 of the 19 active M. E. bishops signed the call for the General Holiness Assembly, which subsequently met in Chicago in May, 1901. Four others were active supporters of the Movement, though their names were not on the call. Two A. M. E. bishops signed. The list of sponsors is in S. B. Shaw, ed., *ibid.*, 11-14.

⁷⁹E.g., of the 137 who signed the call for the General Holiness Assembly of 1901, 50 were U.S. or Canadian Methodist Episcopal clergy. Of the 50, as well as can be determined, 38 had some education beyond secondary level. At least 26 had some sort of baccalaureate degree and at least 15 had graduated from an advanced theological seminary program.

⁸⁰As noted (*supra*, n76), the first comprehensive systematic theology written from within the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement was Russell Ray-

mond Byrum's *Christian Theology*: . . . (1925), but Byrum's aggressive restorationist (anti-denominational) stance, typical of his tradition, the Church of God Reformation Movement, limited its circulation. In effect, though certainly not in fact, the first comprehensive theology written from within the Movement was A. M. Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology* (2 vols.; Pasadena, CA: C. J. Kinne, Pasadena College, 1931). This work rapidly gained approval for the courses of study of most of the Wesleyan/Holiness bodies, especially those with a strong Methodist root. An earlier comprehensive outline, the first within the Movement, was Edgar P. Ellyson, *Theological Compend* (Chicago and Boston: Christian Witness Publishing, 1908). Also of prominence among holiness people, though not directly a product of the Movement, was Solomon Jacob Gamertsfeider, *Systematic Theology* (Harrisburg, PA: Evangelical Publishing House, 1921). The late dates here—around ninety years after the establishment of the Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness in the New York City home of Phoebe Palmer and around fifty years after the establishment of NCAPH—seem to demonstrate the point that the Movement tended to limit its theological agenda quite severely. Only two theological issues beside entire sanctification received major attention in the period 1880-1920: premillennialism and “tongues.” Holiness people debated premillennialism from about 1880 to about 1910, with most of them deciding that since respected persons in the Movement held each of the common understandings (pre-, post-, or a-) and each still clearly enjoyed the “second blessing,” they should not make millennialism an issue over which to unite or divide. However, it should be noted that pre-millennialism gradually replaced post-millennialism as the dominant position. The great majority of the Movement rejected “tongues” as a necessary evidence or accompaniment of the experience of entire sanctification. A divine healing vs. scientific medicine debate interested some in the period from c.1900-c.1920, but most holiness people held that modern medicine was a not-to-be-slighted, God-given means of healing. Theological liberalism received almost no attention in holiness circles until well after the onset of the Fundamentalist Controversy. In fact, they tended to see so-called Christocentric liberalism more as an eccentric friend than as an enemy, as the popularity of Sheldon's *In His Steps* testifies. Only after about 1920 did Fundamentalism significantly affect the Movement. Cf. Paul M. Bassett, “The Fundamentalist Leavening of the Holiness Movement: 1914-1940 . . .,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (Spring, 1978), 65-91.

⁸¹Cf. Charles Edwin Jones, *A Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement*, 567-797. Of the approximately 1800 personal names listed in

this biographical section, 288 (16%) are listed as having served as itinerant evangelists at some point in their careers. Of these 288, about half appear to have closed their careers by 1930, and about 40 of these pre-1930 holiness evangelists devoted almost their entire ministry to itinerant evangelism. The others served also as pastors, administrators and teachers. Few Wesleyan/Holiness periodicals were without lists of “evangelist’s slates”—i.e., the evangelists’ itineraria for a given month or two—and the news columns of these periodicals were largely given over to reports of the work of the evangelists, especially in revival meetings in local congregations and in camp meetings.

⁸²While complete biographical information concerning the education of most of the 288 evangelists listed in Jones’ work is very difficult to find within any reasonable amount of time, especially for those serving before 1930, we do have some revealing data. About 70% of the 288 had either attended college or Bible school, or had come through the Methodist Course of Study for Traveling Preachers. Of the approximately 40 who appear to have devoted most of their careers to evangelism, only half seem to have had that much education. This is to say, most of those evangelists who do not seem to have completed some kind of educational curriculum in theology were full-time, career evangelists.

⁸³This is readily apparent in the reports of revival meetings and camp meetings in the news columns of the holiness periodicals. They are full of numbers.

⁸⁴E.g., J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, 306-308. This became a common theme after about 1900. E.g., see the listings under “Smith, Joseph Henry,” and “Watson, George Douglas,” in Miller, *ibid.*, for ana, sermons, and essays on this theme.

⁸⁵See, for instance, Church of the Nazarene, “Articles of Faith,” *Manual . . .*, 1908. For an example of the tendency to assume a general Protestant orthodoxy while emphasizing several doctrines quite precisely, cf. “Address to the Holiness People, from the General Holiness Convention in Fort Scott, Kansas, June 27th 1888,” in C. E. Cowan, *A History of the Church of God (Holiness)* (Overland Park, KS: Herald and Banner Press, 1949), “Appendix A,” pp. 219-222.

⁸⁶Cf. Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press/Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), pp. 35-113; also see pp. 185-186 for a very useful bibliographical

note on the debate over Dayton's position to 1987. The debate has not really advanced since then, and to date, Dayton's interpretation of the relationship of early Pentecostalism and the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement seems to me the most satisfactory of the several proposed.

⁸⁷E.g., Alma White, *Demons and Tongues* (Bound Brook, NJ: Pentecostal Union, 1910), *passim*; W. B. Godbey, *Bible Theology* (Cincinnati: God's Revivalist Office, 1911), pp. 185-206; G. W. Ridout, *The Deadly Fallacy of Spurious Tongues* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Co., c.1912), *passim*. An earlier, related controversy had led the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement to consider many of the exegetical issues raised by Pentecostalism before Pentecostalism actually became an issue. By the 1880s, most holiness people identified Acts 2:1-4 as the story of the entire sanctification of Jesus' disciples, and they often referred to entire sanctification as "the baptism with the Spirit," or "Spirit-baptism." They believed this "baptism with the Spirit" to be the "second crisis experience," the "second blessing," for the earliest Christians and for themselves. Exegetically, they saw Acts 2:1-4 as the fulfillment of Matt. 3:11-12 (Luke 3:16-17). By the late 1880s, however, some holiness people were reading the given texts quite literally. They saw in the gospel passages the promise of two works of grace beyond justification or conversion, for the passages promised a "baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire" (KJV), and they saw in the imagery of the Acts narrative a literal confirmation of the gospel promise, for the text reported both "the sound as of a mighty rushing wind," and "cloven tongues like as of fire that sat on each of (the 120)." Here was baptism with Spirit and baptism with fire. So, they taught that there were three works of grace, usually referring to the last of them simply as "the fire." And "the fire" surpassed even entire sanctification in power. They taught that entire sanctification cleanses the believer from "inbred sin"; and "the fire" confirms the cleansing and brings spiritual power. The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement generally turned its back to these people, so they went their way and came to be known as the Fire-Baptized Holiness People. Many of them later entered the Pentecostal Movement. Cf. E. P. Ellyson, *ibid.*, 82-87, 118-128, for a rather typical Wesleyan/Holiness rejoinder to the "fire-baptized." Cp. with W. B. Godbey, *Tongue Movement. Satanic* (Zarephath, NJ: Pillar of Fire, 1918), *passim*, which, though it is in Godbey's eccentric style, repeats typical Wesleyan/Holiness Movement anti-tongues arguments. This tract may also be found in W. B. Godbey, *Six Tracts*, in a 1985 reprint edited by D. William Faupel in the series edited by Donald W. Dayton, "The Higher Christian

Life': Sources for the Study of the Holiness, Pentecostal, and Keswick Movements" (48 vols.; New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1985-).

⁸⁸See, for instance, W. B. Godbey, *ibid.*, 9-11, 23-27.

⁸⁹See, for instance, B. S. Taylor, Sermon of Wednesday evening, 8 May, 1901, in S. B. Shaw, ed., *ibid.*, 193-206. Taylor does not use the term "carnality," but the concept is clearly operant. He argues that "holiness," by which he means "entire sanctification," will enable his hearers to obey the "commands" in Matthew 5. He believes that Jesus is speaking here to those already converted and he both implies and avers that much of the church is converted but not entirely sanctified, as may be judged by its behavior. In fact, most of the sermons at the 1901 General Holiness Assembly in Chicago carry or imply this kind of critique of the Church—especially of the Methodist Episcopal Church. More directly critical, and taking on the author's own denomination, but from the same theological salient, is G. W. Ridout, *Present Crisis in Methodism* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Co., n.d. [but before 1920]). This theme occurs constantly in the holiness periodicals of the time. E.g., G. W. Wilson, "A Few Reasons Why, as Methodists, We Have Not Succeeded Better," *The Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness* 22 Mar. 1900, 9.

⁹⁰E.g., an article by an exceptionally able Harvard undergraduate named Walter Lippmann, "In Defense of Suffragettes," *Harvard Monthly* 11 (1909), quoted in Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century* (New York: Atlantic-Little, Brown, 1980), p. 26: "They are unladylike, just as the Boston Tea Party was ungentlemanly, and our Civil War bad form. But unfortunately in this world great issues are not won by good manners." On the matter of fashions, the 11 February 1920 issue of H. C. Morrison's *Pentecostal Herald* is almost entirely devoted to what the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement called "the dress question." For then-contemporary general discussion of the behavior of the "New Woman" (the popular term about 1910), see, for instance, E. Martin, *The Unrest of Women* (New York: Appleton, 1913), and E. K. Key, *The Woman Movement* (New York: Putnam, 1912).

⁹¹See, for instance, Lydia Kingsmill Commander, *The American Idea* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1907; reprint, New York: Arno, 1972), and Charlotte (Parker) Stetson Gilman, *Our Man-Made World: Or, Androcentric Culture* (New York: Chariton, 1911).

⁹²This is a strong note in such works as Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (New York: Phillips/Macmillan, 1910), for instance. Also see Ida M. Tarbell, *The Business of Being a Woman* (New York: Macmillan, 1912).

⁹³One is not for as moment saying or implying here that American Protestantism in the period under study generally supported the women's movement. In fact, the record shows more opposition than support. (The Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal movements were marked but quite inconsistent exceptions to this dismal record even then.) This has been documented in a number of then-contemporary works, among which see, for instance, Charlotte (Parker) Stetson Gilman, *His Religion and Hers: A Study in the Faith of Our Fathers and the Work of Our Mothers* (New York: Century, 1923). The encouragement of women's organizations within and among denominations for carrying forward missionary and philanthropic enterprises sometimes arose from male desires to keep the women from the levers of denominational power and to divert their energies from the tasks of reform within the ecclesiastical structures themselves; and sometimes it arose from the understandings of the women themselves that here were avenues of service and bases from which reform of even those ecclesiastical structures could be launched. (Careful studies of these matters in all of their complexity now abound.) But for all of that which could produce cynicism in the contemporary reader, for a short period, from about 1885 to about 1900, church leadership generally supported women engaged in progressivist causes for the purpose of serving the causes themselves. However, after the general election of 1900, progressivism became more and more the instrument of professional politicians, and the women were either set aside or encouraged to channel their activities in ways unthreatening to male control of the society at large. The churches, increasingly reflecting the culture, especially reflecting cultural understandings of what makes a leader, followed suit. Important both as illustration and as model here is Theodore Roosevelt, whose Senior Dissertation at Harvard, presented in June, 1880, was entitled "The Practicability of Equalizing Men and Women Before the Law," in which he argued the progressive case. By the time he was President, he was taking a much more conservative stance, largely, he argued, because of his concern for preserving the traditional family (he especially abhorred the notion of a deliberately childless marriage). In his 1912 campaign to regain the Presidency, he advocated women's suffrage, but as a political ploy more than as a "cause."

⁹⁴The rise of millenarianism in North America created a spirit and a vocabulary which allowed no room for reverent agnosticism or theological neutrality regarding the question, "What is the chronological relationship of the Second Coming of Christ to the Millennium?" By the end of the nineteenth century, the Methodists, who had always believed that by the grace of God they really were winning the battle to establish scriptural, social holiness, and that by the grace of God they were actually preparing the world for the Lord's Return, were pushed to define their position as "post-millennialism," but they were impatient with all of the conservative concern for labels and theological nicety. They intended to win the modern world, the "new day," just as they had won nineteenth-century America. The commitment of Methodist writers to proclaiming the faith in "our modern day" in an up-to-date fashion produced a spate of books and articles on that and related topics. Most of them were thoroughly melioristic, believing that the Gospel has seasoned and will continue to season society for the better and that Methodists should not tolerate the kinds of ideological or theological conservatism which produce (and are produced by) a pessimism about history and about the future which simply does not square with the data since the Incarnation nor with the Biblical promises about the coming of the kingdom. But it takes some time before this perspective finds systematic expression in a Methodist theologian. Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics: A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments*, Vol. II of "The Library of Biblical and Theological Literature," George R. Crooks and John F. Hurst, eds. ("New ed., thoroughly revised"; New York: Hunt and Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston and Curts, 1894), pp. 374-378, roundly rejects pre-millennialism, which Terry calls "Chiliasm," largely because it simply fails to recognize the progress in religion and civilization which the work of the Church in preaching the Gospel has wrought since the Incarnation. Miley, writing his systematic theology a year earlier did not treat Millennialism, for it was then only beginning to force its way into Methodist circles. Olin Alfred Curtis, *The Christian Faith Personally Given in a System of Doctrine* (New York: Eaton and Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham, 1905), pp. 445-447, refers to the millennial question briefly, with keen awareness of its exegetical complexity. He salutes, without arguing for, post-millennialism and refers us to Terry's work (cited above) and to Stephen Merrill, *The Second Coming of Christ* (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1879). Merrill does not really work with the millenarian issue because it did not yet exist. The first considered treatment of it from

within Methodism is in Henry C. Sheldon, *System of Christian Doctrine* (Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham; New York: Eaton and Mains, 1903), pp. 540-551. Sheldon is, of course, clearly post-millennial, though he tends to avoid labels and to describe his own perspective without being forced to raise or answer questions in terms set by the increasingly vocal and powerful pre-millennialists. Like Terry, Sheldon believes that since the Incarnation earthly life and civilization have bettered, thanks to the leavening influence of the Gospel. He also believes that millenarian doctrine will only destroy the progress already made toward the full expression of the kingdom of God on earth and retard future progress toward that goal.

⁹⁵Some leading and influential Methodist theologians believed that several of the modern theories of progress had been reconciled with the Biblical message. In part, this had been done by redefining the Biblical message, of course. To cite a specific example, we note the general influence of personal idealism or personalism on Methodism as it came from Bowne, Brightman, and others. Cf. Robert S. Chiles, *Theological Transition in American Methodism: 1790-1935* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 62-75, esp. p. 64nn45-46, for critical data on the point.

⁹⁶E.g., as early as 1891, John P. Brooks, *ibid.*, 273-275, quotes extensively from an uncited work of Methodist Episcopal Bishop Randolph S. Foster. One of Foster's charges: "The ball, the theatre, nude and lewd art, social luxuries, with all their loose moralities, are making inroads into the sacred enclosure of the Church . . ." (p. 273). Also see J. A. Wood, *ibid.*, 303-304; the scathing attack of evangelist L. W. Munhall, *ibid.*, esp. 166-178; and Beverly Carradine, *ibid.*, 200-219, where Carradine draws a sharp distinction between "comeoutism" and "putoutism," condemning the former, sympathizing with the latter. Carradine himself remained in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as an influential pastor.

⁹⁷E.g., Luther Lee, *Women's Right To Preach the Gospel: A Sermon, Preached at the Ordination of the Rev. Miss Antoinette L. Brown* (Syracuse: by the author, 1853); B. T. Roberts, *Ordaining Women* (Rochester, NY: Earnest Christian Publishing House, 1891); Catherine Booth [title page has Mrs. Booth], *Female Ministry; or, Women's Right To Preach the Gospel* (London: Morgan and Chase, n.d.); and Fannie McDowell Hunter, *Women Preachers* (Dallas: Berachah Printing Co., 1905). Each of these is reprinted in Donald W. Dayton, ed., *Holiness Tracts Defending the Ministry of Women* in "The Higher Christian Life": Sources for the Study of

the Holiness, Pentecostal, and Keswick Movements” (48 vols.; New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1985-). Also see Phoebe Palmer, *Promise of the Father: Or, A Neglected Speciality of the Last Days* (Boston: Henry V. Degen, 1859), *passim*; Seth C. Rees, *The Ideal Pentecostal Church*, 40-41; W. B. Godbey, *Woman Preacher* (Atlanta: Office of the Way of Life, 1891), *passim*.

⁹⁸Wesleyan/Holiness preachers and writers seem to have renewed very powerfully the related themes of submission and surrender to Christ and of self vs. Christ around the beginning of the new century. Especially noteworthy is the unexpectedly warm welcome received in the more strictly Wesleyan sectors of the Movement of works by those of Keswick persuasion, given the emphasis placed upon the differences between them. Keswickians had long made the themes of submission or surrender central to their message of entire sanctification, while for Wesleyans it had been a sub-theme (albeit an important sub-theme) of consecration. Now, the Wesleyans moved it closer to the center of their message and made it much more prominent. Among the works of the Keswickians which now found great usefulness among Wesleyan/Holiness people were F. B. Meyer, *The Directory of the Devout Life: Meditations on the Sermon on the Mount* (New York: Fleming Revell, 1904); Andrew Murray, *The School of Obedience* (London: Nisbet, 1883); and A. B. Simpson, *The Self Life and the Christ Life* (New York: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1897). The Wesleyan/Holiness press advertised these heavily and Wesleyan/Holiness preachers cited them often. Also signal of the new importance of the theme of submission and of the rejection of any secular notions of self-assertion is the decade-long debate among the Nazarenes over the place of entire consecration in the chronology of entire sanctification. Must it precede or does it follow entire sanctification? The official decision of the denominational General Assembly (1928) was that entire consecration must precede entire sanctification. Cf. Church of the Nazarene, *Manual*, Articles of Faith, Article X.

⁹⁹E.g., B. Carradine, *The Sanctified Life* (Cincinnati: M. W. Knapp, Pentecostal Publisher, The Revivalist, 1897), pp. 77-88; Seth C. Rees, *ibid.*, 40-41; H[annah] W[hitall] Smith, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* (Boston and Chicago: Christian Witness, 1885), pp. 119-132; Daniel Steele, *Mile-Stone Papers . . .*, 262-279. This is not to say that the themes were not used within the Movement as instruments of subjugation or that women in the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement did not face sexist discrimi-

nation. It is only to say that within the nineteenth-century Wesleyan/Holiness Movement itself, such discrimination was comparatively rare, and it almost never went uncriticized. E.g., see Harold Raser, *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought* (Vol. 22, "Studies in Women and Religion"; Lewiston and Queenstown: Edwin Mellen Press, 1987), pp. 364-365nn162-163, for sources pertaining to Palmer; also see Magnuson, *ibid.*, 112-117, for an apropos discussion of Catherine Booth.

¹⁰⁰The most radical positions on this matter were taken by John P. Brooks, *ibid.*, 103-109; and D[aniel] S[idney] Warner, *The Church of God: What the Church of God Is and What It Is Not* (Moundsville, WV: Gospel Trumpet Company, 1902[?]). Almost all of the principal legislative assemblies of the holiness bodies included laity as elected representatives. Few of them set any rule concerning gender. Also important in this regard was the Holiness Movement's absolute rejection of any ethical "double standard" with respect to gender. Cf. for example, B. F. Haynes, "But One Standard" (editorial) in *Herald of Holiness* Dec. 11, 1912, p. 1.

¹⁰¹From no later than about 1891, it becomes clear that the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement will firmly commit itself to affirming the right of women to participate in the legislative/executive life of the holiness bodies and in its ordained ministry. Several works appeared about then defending the latter proposition and they appear to speak as much, if not more, to opposition outside the Movement as to opposition within. See, for instance, the sources noted *supra*, n97. By 1905, the Movement as a whole had answered the question in the affirmative. The principal denominational "hold out" was the Free Methodists, but feeling against ordaining women was hardly unanimous there. B. T. Roberts himself, as much as anyone the founder of the denomination, stoutly advocated throughout his career the right of women to ordination. The widespread support in the Movement for women in ordained ministry made it difficult for the Movement's grassroots to have much feeling for those outside it who believed themselves to be oppressed in this regard. The Movement was intensely evangelistic and simply invited all who would to join them, which meant that they saw themselves as offering an alternative to that kind of oppression. A. M. Hills' "Introduction" to Fannie McDowell Hunter, *Women Preachers* is very telling in this matter. Hunter intended her work as an *apologia*; Hills saw it as an encouragement to women contemplating ordained ministry. So, he ends his commendation of Hunter, her work, and her book, by saying, "May many saintly women be encour-

aged by the reading of these pages to be obedient to their Heavenly vision.” Almost simultaneously, then, the Holiness Movement came to accept almost without any demur the full right of women to participation in the legislative/administrative processes of the various ecclesiastical bodies and to ordination to the ministry and to a certain reluctance to support much of the new social feminism. Yet, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement did support much of the feminist political agenda: e.g., B. F. Haynes, “Material Millennialism” (editorial) in *Herald of Holiness* May 15, 1912, pp. 1-2. [As was noted earlier, the *Herald of Holiness* was the product of a merger of several smaller holiness periodicals. Its initial year was 1912, which makes its espousal of then-radical causes all the more remarkable.] Also see E. A. Girvin, *Domestic Duels: or, Evening Talks on the Woman Question* (San Francisco: E. D. Bronson and Co., 1898). This work was written too early to treat the newer feminism directly, but it anticipates many of the issues raised by that movement and the responses that it would elicit from the Holiness Movement.

¹⁰²Cf. Bernard Bailyn, *et al.*, *The Great Republic: A History of the American People* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1977), pp. 959-967 for an overview which admirably sums up research into “the rise of social feminism” in the context of the post-Gilded Age American culture. Esp. cf. p. 960: “The new social feminism, fed by the ideas of European artists and intellectuals like Ibsen, Nietzsche, and Bergson, postulated a new kind of individualism and self-realization. The Western revolt against positivism and the discovery of the irrational that swept across the Atlantic in the last years of the nineteenth century provided women as well as men with new standards of social and sexual behavior not fully legitimized by the moral politics of progressivism. It was precisely here that the challenge of feminism seemed so disquieting. The revolt began inauspiciously as an uprising of young educated women against the concept of self-denial.” Also see Elizabeth Holding, *Joy, the Deaconess* (New York: Dutton, n.d.), which offered a mild critique of the secular feminist themes of “self-development” and “self-assertion.” It found general favor in the Holiness Movement. Nazarene Publishing House offered it for sale. *The Herald of Holiness* March 19, 1913, p. 14, advertised it as: “A beautiful story of mercy and help as manifested in the life of an orphan girl, who chose to serve others rather than self.”

¹⁰³Cf., for instance, three editorials by B. F. Haynes, “Dress and Devilry,” *Herald of Holiness* August 28, 1912, p. 2; “Secular Press to the

Rescue," *ibid.*, p. 3; "The Tyranny of Fashion," *Herald of Holiness* October 16, 1912, p. 3. The Wesleyan/Holiness Movement had long opposed smoking and the drinking of alcohol as a beverage, and now the secular feminists seemed to them to be urging that these two practices in particular be made identifying public marks, even *the* identifying public marks, of what was being called "The New Woman," thereby earning the Movement's censure of even the nomenclature. In 1912 alone, the *Herald of Holiness* carried at least 43 editorials or extended editorial comments on tobacco and 54 on alcoholic beverages; at least 15 of those on tobacco and at least 18 of those on liquor express concern over increased public indulgence by women. Almost always Haynes and other writers in the *Herald of Holiness* referred to both smoking and drinking as forms of addiction or slavery. Also cf. B. F. Haynes, "Freedom and Slavery," *Herald of Holiness* December 13, 1916, p. 3, which does not mention anything in particular but works with a perceived reversal of the meanings of the terms in the 1910s. Haynes' readers would have had little difficulty in applying his article to the secular women's movement and several other matters at the time, given Haynes' record of concerns. Probably even more critical in describing the Holiness Movement's attitude toward women's public indulgence in these habits is the Movement's tendency to relate that indulgence to the so-called "white slave trade" then rampant in some American cities. Cf. March 19, 1913 issue of *Herald of Holiness*, which is devoted entirely to "rescue work." Cf. esp. Jennie A. Hodgkin, "Traps for Girls," p. 10.

¹⁰⁴Cf. , for instance, N. B. Herrell, "Our Stand on the Dress Question," *Herald of Holiness*, February 25, 1920, pp. 12-13; see esp. the section entitled "Women Commercialized" (p. 12). Also see C. F. Wimberly, "'Sartorial Monomaniacs,'" *Pentecostal Herald*, February 11, 1920, p. 4; A. Sims, "The Goddess of Fashion," *ibid.*, 5; Mrs. Barrett, "An Enemy of Spiritual Life," *ibid.*, 9 ("One of the worst sins of this world is fashion"). On the matter of dancing, cf. G. W. Ridout, "Shall We Let Down the Bars?" *Pentecostal Herald*, January 28, 1920, p. 4; Andrew Johnson, "The Dance Devil Is Doing Things Up Brown," *Pentecostal Herald*, January 14, 1920, p. 4. For a general ethical analysis, cf. I. H. Dawson, "High Cost of Living. Who's to Blame?" *Pentecostal Herald*, February 25, 1920, pp. 10-11. *The Pentecostal Herald*, published at Wilmore, Kentucky, by H. C. Morrison, prominent Methodist Episcopal Church, South, pastor and evangelist, and president of independent Asbury College, commented continuously in early 1920 on the upcoming General Conference of the

Methodist Episcopal Church (North), particularly because the Conference would discuss dropping ¶69, the rule against dancing, theater-going, and games of chance. Cf. G. W. Ridout, "Open Letter to Dr. John L. Brasher, Delegate to General Conference," *Pentecostal Herald*, March 10, 1920, pp. 3, 7.

¹⁰⁵Cf. B. F. Haynes, "A Center for Debauchery" (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, December 13, 1916, pp. 2-3. Also see Seth Cook Rees, *Miracles in the Slums: or, Thrilling Stories of Those Rescued from the Cesspools of Iniquity, and Touching Incidents in the Lives of the Unfortunate* (Chicago: Seth Cook Rees, 1905). In almost all of the stories reported by Rees, alcohol, tobacco, and a concern for fashion are listed as elements in the basic social problem, which is usually prostitution. Of course, the truly fundamental problem is sinfulness, or, as Rees and others would have said it, "carnality." Also see the entire issue of the *Herald of Holiness*, March 19, 1913.

¹⁰⁶Cf. E. A. Girvin, *ibid.*, *passim*; Emily Ellyson, *Woman's Sphere in Gospel Service* (Kansas City, Mo: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, n.d.), *passim* [the date would perforce be between 1912 and 1919]; B. F. Haynes, "Cruelty to the Most Needy and Helpless" (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, August 14, 1912, p. 2. Haynes argues for absolute equality for women before the law. He makes the same point again in "The Double Standard" (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, May 2, 1917, p. 1.

¹⁰⁷In late 1919 and early 1920, almost every issue of the *Pentecostal Herald* expressed concern for what the editor understood to be upcoming discussion concerning the status of ¶69 in the *Discipline* of the Methodist Episcopal Church (North). Cf. *supra*, n104. Cf. esp. G. W. Ridout, "To Arms . . . Ye Methodists," *Pentecostal Herald*, March 31, 1920, p. 3. The *Herald of Holiness*, too, showed considerable interest in the General Conference and its discussion, but presented only a very short item on it every other week or so. Often the approach was one of comparison with Methodism, which was seen as decaying while the Nazarenes were holding steady along the "old lines." E. g., B. F. Haynes, "Immoral Dressing," *Herald of Holiness*, March 2, 1921, p. 3. This is an editorial commentary on an editorial in the *Pacific Christian Advocate* which severely criticized the dress of American women in general and Methodist women in particular. Haynes' comment is essentially that Methodism has acted too weakly and too late. Cf. for instance, John Matthews, *The Rise and Fall of*

the Church of the Nazarene (n.p., 1920), in which the author excoriates the denomination for compromise with evil, which, to him, was a matter of refusing to press behavioral rules on the membership and too much concern for administrative machinery. That is to say, as Matthews sees it, the identity of the denomination should lie precisely in its ethic, which must be more consistent and stricter than that of the (now corrupt) tradition from which it originally came. For the Free Methodists, see Benson Howard Roberts, compiler, *ibid.*, in which B. T. Roberts assumes that the Free Methodists are the true Methodists and identifies true Methodists as those who maintain behavior conformable to the *Discipline*.

¹⁰⁸The theological leadership of the Movement struggled with this shift. In works written to its own constituency, the holiness press actually gave much attention to refuting the idea that the principal expression of original sin/inherited depravity is lust or concupiscence. The degree of attention given the matter indicates the popularity of the notion among the grassroots. Cf. for instance, V. E. Ramsey, "Un-Methodistic Teaching," *Pentecostal Herald*, March 30, 1898, p. 7, and April 17, 1898, p. 2. This is a response to the notion of a J. W. Cunningham that "sanctification means chastity and nothing more." Also see B. W. Huckabee, *ibid.*, 106-109, 116-119; and A. B. Simpson, *Wholly Sanctified* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications, 1925), pp. 73-95. (Published posthumously; Simpson died in 1919). But for examples of theological statements which gave reason for the grassroots to identify original sin with lust, cf. Edgar P. Ellyson, *Theological Compend* (Chicago and Boston: Christian Witness, 1908 [preface is dated 1905]), pp. 104-106; and J. W. Gillies, "To What, in Humanity, Does Temptation Appeal?" *Herald of Holiness*, April 24, 1912, pp. 7-9.

¹⁰⁹Cf. for instance, B. Carradine, *The Old Man* (Louisville: Kentucky Methodist Publishing Co., 1897), pp. 55-82; Benson Howard Roberts, compiler, *ibid.*, pp. 1-12.

¹¹⁰The library of Nazarene Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Missouri, maintains a "Sermon Text File," which lists texts, preachers, and sources of printed sermons in the library's holdings. By checking these texts over against the content of the sermons themselves and the copyright dates and other dates of publication and presentation, I was able to determine, roughly, that in the period up to 1900, Johannine texts appear to have been utilized approximately twice as frequently as Pauline texts in holiness sermons. In the 1910s, such texts as I John 2:15-17 and John

17:17, appear to have been utilized at least twice as often, proportionately, as they had been used in the entire three decades prior to that time, even when an allowance is made for the fact that the file lists almost three times as many sermons for the later period as for the earlier. It should be noted that Romans 7 and Hebrews 12:14 also gained great popularity in the same period, though it was not so great as that of the Johannine texts noted.

¹¹¹There was, of course, a curious ambivalence about the moral status of the United States, especially as the clouds of the Great War gathered. Perhaps no nationally known preacher expressed it so well as Billy Sunday. Cf. Bernard A. Weisberger, *They Gathered at the River: The Story of the Great Revivalists and Their Impact upon Religion in America* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Co., 1958), esp. pp. 255-265, the account of Sunday's April-June, 1917 campaign in New York City. For an earlier expression, from within the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement, see B. F. Haynes, "Shall Rome's Fall be Repeated?" (editorial comment on Guiglielmo Ferrero, "Is Extravagant America Riding to a Roman Fall?" *The World of Today*), *Herald of Holiness*, August 28, 1912, p. 3; *idem*, "Colossal Opportunity About To Be Lost" (editorial comment on article in *Herald* and *Presbyter* claiming that the U.S. is being converted "into Sodom"), *Herald of Holiness*, March 4, 1914, pp. 3-4.

¹¹²E.g., Basil W. Miller and U. E. Harding, *Cunningly Devised Fables: Modernism Exposed and Refuted* (n.p., n.d.), pp. 89-91. (This work was published in Kansas City for the authors by the Nazarene Publishing House in about 1921 and it was advertised widely in the Wesleyan/Holiness press.)

¹¹³E.g., Charles Franklin Wimberly, *The Moving Picture: A Careful Survey of a Difficult Problem* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing, 1917). In 1912 and 1913, scattered favorable references appear in the *Herald of Holiness*; however, by 1914, if not sooner, the editor, B. F. Haynes, is warning against the movies. By the end of 1916, he is sharply opposed to them, but seems to be arguing a bit with some who are saying that they should not be condemned outright. Cf. B. F. Haynes, "A Center and Source for Debauchery" (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, December 13, 1916, pp. 2-3. Haynes, drawing from a number of ecclesiastical and secular sources, states that he simply will listen no more to those in the Church who would suggest that the movies might do church people good. He goes on to pan the movie industry's National Board of Censorship as

unable and unwilling to do the necessary correcting simply because the industry has learned that lurid and lewd make money. The character of the industry is set, says he. The very titles and advertising devices it uses give it away. It is clearly in the Devil's control. From that point, the Church of the Nazarene moved ever closer to an absolute proscription (which it never achieved) of all movies but those produced for educational purposes. It simply interpreted its original rule against the theater as applying to the cinema. The Wesleyans and the Free Methodists and several smaller Wesleyan/Holiness groups were even stricter than the Nazarenes. The general complaint against the theater, including the movies, was their flagrant sensuality, especially their demeaning of women. Until the 1960s it was common for Wesleyan/Holiness colleges to prohibit student dramatic productions.

¹¹⁴See, for instance, H. C. Morrison, "The Blind Leading the Blind" (editorial), *Pentecostal Herald*, March 10, 1920, p. 8; N. B. Herrell, *ibid.*; B. F. Haynes, "The Growing Curse of the Age" (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, January 26, 1921, pp. 1-2.

¹¹⁵While few of the Methodist theologians upon whom the nineteenth-century Wesleyan/Holiness Movement drew even addressed the question of sexuality, this was the case with those who did. See, for instance, William Burt Pope, *ibid.*, I. 421-436 and III. 237-245.

¹¹⁶In some sense, this shift also appears to have been a maneuver which would allow holiness people to admit, with wonted charity, that many non-holiness folk were indeed Christians. Those folk did not follow the behavioral rigors of the Movement only because they were not entirely sanctified. More important at this point is the constant flow of reminders to holiness people that entire sanctification did not curtail sexuality, and that the fact that it did not was not to be regretted. On this issue, as on the matter of identifying carnality with lust, the holiness grassroots seem to have taken the more simplistic position, and the Movement's writers and scholars sought to correct it. See, for instance, B. W. Huckabee, *ibid.*, 106-119, in which Huckabee discusses "What we do not lose in sanctification" and "What we do not lose in eradication." Also see *supra*, n108.

¹¹⁷See, for example, Anonymous, "Heart of the Rose," *Herald of Holiness*, June 11, 1913, pp. 8-9; E. J. Marvin, "Purity and Loyalty," *Herald of Holiness*, October 11, 1916, pp. 5-6; N. B. Herrell, *ibid.*; and B. F. Haynes, *ibid.*

¹¹⁸Cf. Timothy L. Smith, *ibid.*, 294-296. Smith recounts the story of the decision of the 1928 General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene to disapprove mixed public “bathing” (i.e., swimming) but without putting it in the “General Rules” of the *Manual* and thus making it church law. Later, the General Superintendents decided to put it among the Appendices of the *Manual*, apparently meaning to say that it was not law but was at least advice from a General Assembly and thus a significant word to the conscience of the denomination. But this only exacerbated an already decades-long debate—a debate that only surfaced when Nazarenes from one geographical region met Nazarenes from another—over the nature of the “General Rules,” which were not in an appendix but were part of the denominational constitution: Are they rules or advices?

¹¹⁹A favorite altar call song at the time was “Tell Mother I’ll Be There”; the *Herald of Holiness* carried a page which first bore the title “Mother and the Little Ones” and, later in the period, “The Home”; a popular song of the period was “My Mother’s Old Bible Is True.” The Nazarenes developed an interesting strategy. From the beginning, in addition to women preachers, they had commissioned deaconesses. The *Herald of Holiness*, from the late 1910s, is nearly silent on the matter of women entering the ordained ministry (significant numbers still were), but it turns with some vigor to encourage the development of a strong corps of deaconesses. Cf. Mrs. N. B. Welch, “The Deaconess in History,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 20, 1920, pp. 7-9; October 27, 1920, pp. 6-7, 9. Apparently a book with the same title was proposed and sent to the publisher, but there seems to be no record of its being printed. Cp. Elsie Ridout, “Women in the Work of the Kingdom,” *Herald of Holiness*, November 26, 1919, pp. 6-7. Says she: “Hand in hand, man and woman build the home; hand in hand they ought to build State and Church.” But she ends her article by citing a poem (whose author I do not know): “Not she, with trait’rous kiss her Saviour stung/ Not she denied Him with unholy tongue./ She, while apostles shrank, could longer brave,/ Last at the cross and earliest at the grave.”

¹²⁰Cf. *supra*, nn49-62.

¹²¹Cf. *supra*, nn72-75, 89.

¹²²Cf. *infra*, nn134-139.

¹²³Cf. *supra*, nn9-14, 30-35, 47.

¹²⁴Required reading for candidates preparing for ordination in almost all holiness groups: John Wesley, *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*

(ed. cit.) XI. 366-446 and reprinted under separate cover many times and places; William Arthur, *Tongue of Fire: Or, The True Power of Christianity* (London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co., and John Mason; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1856), also many reprints and editions; A. M. Hills, *Holiness and Power for the Church and the Ministry*; and Daniel Steele, *Mile-Stone Papers. Doctrinal, Ethical, and Experimental on Christian Progress*.

¹²⁵Each of the works listed here is an example of caricature or near-caricature of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement's formal doctrines of original sin/inherited depravity and sanctity. However, none of the works cited here was thought at the time to be eccentric, and all were quite popular and effective. Probably the best-known and most popular holiness evangelist in the first four decades of the twentieth century was Reuben (Bud) Robinson (1860-1942), a self-educated cowboy who began his evangelistic career in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, then served very briefly in the Salvation Army and a bit longer in the Methodist Episcopal Church (North) before settling with the Church of the Nazarene. Cf. Reuben (Bud) Robinson, *A Pitcher of Cream* (Louisville: Pickett Publishing, 1906); *The Story of Lazarus* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing, 1909); *The King's Gold Mine: Or, The Conversion and Sanctification of the Disciples* (Peniel, TX: Pentecostal Advocate, n.d.); William Edward Shepard, *How To Get Sanctified* (Cincinnati: Revivalist Press, 1916); *idem*, *Holiness Typology* (San Francisco: W. E. Shepard, Publisher, 1896); C. W. Ruth, *Bible Readings on the Second Blessing* (Chicago: Christian Witness, 1905); *idem*, *The Second Crisis in Christian Experience* (Chicago: Christian Witness, 1913). H. A. Baldwin, *Holiness and the Human Element* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1919), p. ii, simply states that he and others writing on holiness are not appealing to the intellect but to the soul.

¹²⁶Cf., for instance, Beverly Carradine, *The Old Man* (Louisville: Kentucky Methodist Publishing Co., 1897), pp. 178-187; Edgar P. Ellyson, *ibid.*, 163-168; B. W. Huckabee, *ibid.*, 139-156; W. E. Shepard, *How To Get Sanctified*; E. E. Shelhamer, *Popular and Radical Holiness Contrasted; or, Holiness, What It Is, How Obtained and How Retained* (Atlanta: E. E. Shelhamer, 1906), pp.28-32, 34-53. In Carradine, one finds a transitional writer. He begins by saying, "(the great deliverance) being a divine work and deliverance, it is not an attainment, but an obtainment." But his commitment to the phraseology of Phoebe Palmer finally contradicts this statement. See also Carradine, *Revival Sermons* (Chicago:

Christian Witness, 1897), pp. 196-224, his sermon on entire sanctification, esp. pp. 216-224. On p. 220: "In a word we are to live the sanctified life before we get the sanctified blessing. This very thing is to prove to God the fact and measure of our desire for the grace." Huckabee and Shepard are typical in their statements of "how to get the blessing." Another transitional figure who understands the problem but really seems not to know his classical Wesleyanism well enough to escape it is A. M. Hills, *ibid.*, 126-179.

¹²⁷E.g. B. Carradine, *The Sanctified Life*, 89-105, where Carradine has a chapter on "The Loneliness of the Life"; also cf. Hills, *ibid.*, 248-256. Hills is careful to say (245): "The act of consecration is to recognize Christ's ownership and to accept it." But some of the testimonies of others which Hills presents undo his own theological carefulness.

¹²⁸E.g. Delos F. Brooks, *What Is the Carnal Mind?* (Chicago: Christian Witness Co., 1905), *passim*; W. B. Godbey, *Carnality* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Co., 190?), *passim*; A. M. Hills, *Dying to Live* (Cincinnati: God's Bible School, 1905), *passim*; B. W. Huckabee, *ibid.*, esp. 29-35; E. E. Shelhamer, *ibid.*, 34-53.

¹²⁹Cf., for example, A. M. Hills, *Eradication of Carnality: Why We Teach It* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, n.d.); B. W. Huckabee, *ibid.*, 29-30: "This is a distinctive position taken by the Holiness Movement, and is, after all, the battle ground of the future. Much depends upon the maintenance of this doctrine." Also see H. C. Morrison, *The Baptism with the Holy Ghost* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Co., 1900), pp. 35-36. And, see, Charles Edwin Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 84-86 (I would only disagree with Jones' opinion that "adoption of new terms signalled no significant theological change" [p. 85]); and Stephen S. White, *Eradication. Defined, Explained, Authenticated* ("Studies in Holiness No. 2"; Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1954). White's work is late, but it treats the issue in and on the terms set in the 1910s, when White began his long, and distinguished, career.

¹³⁰Cf., for example, B. F. Haynes, "What Has It Done?", *Herald of Holiness*, February 5, 1912, p. 2.

¹³¹E.g. from April, 1912-June, 1916, one in every 1.5 numbers of the *Herald of Holiness* carries approximately one editorial on a social issue (labor unions, prohibition, war and peace, social justice, etc.). For the period July, 1916-December, 1920, the ratio drops to approximately 1:2.5.

Not counting the articles on prohibition, the ratios are 1:2 and 1:4.3, respectively. The *Pentecostal Herald* is yet more conservative: for April, 1912-June, 1916, about 1:2.6; for July, 1916-December, 1920, about 1:4.5.

¹³²E.g., N. B. Herrell, "Our Stand on the Dress Question," *Herald of Holiness*, February 25, 1920, pp. 12-13: "Woman's natural weakness toward the dress question makes her an easy prey for the money interests that make her wearing apparel. . . . Christian women are to be delivered from the slavery of fashion as much as men are saved from the bondage of drink." The *Herald of Holiness* did not work with "The Dress Question" much in the 1910s, but of the approximately 30 articles and editorial comments that do treat it, not one is by a woman. The *Pentecostal Herald* treats the question much more frequently in the same period, though, in fairness it must be said that about 20% of approximately 50 articles in the 1910s come on the eve of the 1920 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (North). Mrs. H. C. Morrison and two other women wrote at least six of the fifty.

¹³³Research for this part of this essay, the period 1900-1920, took me into about 165 books (some were little more than tracts) published by Wesleyan/Holiness Movement authors. Of these, only six were, or contained, extensive theological treatments of what some would call "systemic evil," or societal problems.

¹³⁴Cf. John Wesley, Letter: To Mrs. Bennis, June 16, 1772 (John Telford, ed., *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley*, A. M. [8 vols.; London: Epworth Press, 1931] V.322); *idem*, *Plain Account of Christian Perfection* (ed. cit.), 19.

¹³⁵Again, the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement's formal theologians and thinkers were more circumspect than the grassroots. But they still tended to give room to a generic use of the definition, a much broader applicability than Wesley gave it. See, for instance, A. M. Hills, *Holiness and Power* . . . , 82-85; Edgar P. Ellyson, *ibid.*, 105-107.

¹³⁶Cp., for instance, G. W. Wilson, *The Sign of Thy Coming; or, Pre-millennialism, Unscriptural and Unreasonable* (Boston: Christian Witness Co., 1899), and W. B. Godbey, *Bible Theology*, 279-295. (The reference to Godbey's work is to a chapter entitled "The Post-millennial View of Our Lord's Second Coming, Untenable").

¹³⁷Cf., for instance, Godbey, *ibid.* Also see *supra*, n133.

¹³⁸Cf. William McDonald, *Saved to the Uttermost* (Boston: McDonald and Bill, 1885), pp. 25-32; F. B. Meyer, *The Soul's Pure Intention* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1906), *passim*; C. W. Ruth, *The Second Crisis in Christian Experience* (Chicago: Christian Witness Co., 1912), pp. 109-111. Meyer, as noted before, belonged to the Keswick Movement, but this particular work of his, among others, was enormously popular among North American Wesleyan/Holiness people.

¹³⁹A number of works came off Wesleyan/Holiness presses in the 1910s which treated the relationship between human nature and entire sanctification. The general approach was to write about what entire sanctification would not or could not do for the human personality. E.g., H. A. Baldwin, *Holiness and the Human Element* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1919); Wilson Thomas Hogue, *The Holy Spirit: A Study* (Chicago: W. B. Rose, 1916), pp. 264-281, esp. 275-281.; C. W. Ruth, *ibid.*, *passim*; W. E. Shepard, *Problems of the Sanctified* (Kansas City, MO: Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene Publishing House, 191?), *passim*.

¹⁴⁰Study of the behavioral rules for any of the holiness bodies in the period 1900-1920 reveals this narrow range. E.g., "faithful attendance upon the means of grace" is commonly, almost universally, enjoined, but no theological or ethical standards are set for the purpose or quality of worship. Profanity is proscribed, but nothing is said of ostentation. A minister would have to surrender his credentials immediately if found drinking an alcoholic beverage but not for aggressive racial prejudice.

¹⁴¹Cf. A. M. Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology* (2 vols.; Pasadena, CA: C. J. Kinne, 1931), I.337-375. We direct the reader to Hills' theology because it presents the case precisely as much of the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement had been understanding it for several decades before he wrote on it at this length. Also see Amos Binney and Daniel Steele, *Binney's Theological Compend Improved* (New York: Nelson and Phillips; Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1875), pp. 111-113, for the treatment of free moral agency most influential in the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement before Hills'.

¹⁴²Cf. Hills, *ibid.*, I.370-373; W. B. Godbey, *Bible Theology*, 136-144. This doctrine was, of course, critical to nineteenth-century Methodist theology. For discussion based on the sources, see Chiles, *ibid.*, 144-175.

¹⁴³E.g. A. M. Hills, *ibid.*, II.173-182, esp. 179: "All sinners have the ability to believe God's truth revealed to them, and to exercise faith in

Christ unto salvation. And faith is a gift of God, only as a crop of wheat is a gift of God. God gives the seed and the ground and season, and man makes the crop. So, and only so, does God give faith.”

¹⁴⁴E.g., a principal “evidence” of “the carnal nature” or “the old man” was anger, but not anger as ardent wrath; rather, anger as asperity or hard feelings. Really deep resentments were left untouched by such talk. A yen for tobacco or alcohol or for the dance was seen as a much more serious sign of “the old man” than was racial prejudice or a knowingly manipulative spirit.

¹⁴⁵E.g., E. J. Marvin, “Purity and Loyalty,” *Herald of Holiness*, October 11, 1916, p. 6; B. F. Haynes, “From What State Is Man To Be Brought?” (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, October 27, 1915, pp. 1-2; F. M. Messenger, “Lusts of the Flesh,” *Herald of Holiness*, March 24, 1926; J. J. Ballinger, “Social Purity,” *Herald of Holiness*, February 24, 1915.

¹⁴⁶Cf. John C. Greene, *The Death of Adam* (Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1959), pp. 305-332.

¹⁴⁷E.g., A. M. Hills, *ibid.*, I. 315-325, esp. 315-317. Hills finally does oppose evolution, but on scientific, not on theological ground. He agrees with Miley, *ibid.*, I. 358, that the empirical evidence simply does not allow an evolutionary conclusion. He sees no incompatibility between some form of theistic evolution and Biblical religion. Also see E. P. Ellyson, *Is Man an Animal?* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1926).

¹⁴⁸Cf. *infra*, n152 for an example. Also, a personal interview, September 6, 1964, Montgomery Bell State Park, TN, with A. B. Mackey, President of Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville, Tenn., (1937-1963). Mackey and his predecessors deliberately courted the support of the large and very conservative congregation of Chattanooga First Church of the Nazarene and other congregations in the southeast which looked to it as a model by maintaining a very conservative social ethic on campus, especially in the matter of the relationships between sexes. At the same time, Mackey and his predecessors retained support from the much more cosmopolitan and equally large congregation of Nashville First Church of the Nazarene by serving as active and faithful members.

¹⁴⁹Almost every number of the *Herald of Holiness* from May, 1912 to December, 1920, has at least one news/solicitation item from one of the Nazarene schools. Many of these carry the point being made here, especially from 1916 on.

¹⁵⁰E.g., Miller and Harding, *ibid.*, 37-60, 115-129.

¹⁵¹*Ibid.*

¹⁵²E.g., Arthur C. Zepp, *Walking as He Walked; or, Holiness in Action* (Chicago and Boston: Christian Witness, 1912), pp. 22-24; E. P. Ellyson, *Bible Holiness* (Kansas City, MD: Beacon Hill, 1938), pp. 92-94; E. A. Fergerson, Sermon VI: "God's Temple Cleansed and Filled," *Pentecostal Pulpit* (Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Co., n.d.), pp. 87-91.

¹⁵³So the ferocity of the attack upon the dance by the Wesleyan/Holiness Movement at large and so the decision of the 1928 General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene to go on record against "promiscuous mixed bathing"—i.e., all mixed swimming. The decision created confusion, for, strictly speaking, it was the voice of a specific General Assembly, not the legislating voice of the denomination. The decision never became part of the "General Rules." Prior to 1928, Nazarenes in such places as California and Michigan had often gathered "at the beach" for a day of relaxation and inspiration. The Michigan District Camp Meeting Ground was on Indian Lake, Vicksburg, Michigan, and up until the 1928 General Assembly, Nazarenes of both genders swam together in the lake. From 1928 until well into the 1950s a wire fence was placed in the water out to considerable depth and on one side swam the women and small children of both sexes, the males on the other. In addition to the fence, separate hours for male and female "bathing" were attempted from time to time. Examples from other districts can be multiplied.

¹⁵⁴E.g., A. C. Rose, *Helps to Every-Day Holiness and Thoughts on Purity* (Louisville, KY and Greenville, TX: Pickett Publishing, n.d.); A. M. Hills, *ibid.*, I. 401-402.

¹⁵⁵E.g., H. C. Morrison, "The Dress Question" (editorial), *Pentecostal Herald*, February 11, 1920, p. 1; N. B. Herrell, "Our Stand on the Dress Question," *Herald of Holiness*, February 25, 1920, pp. 12-13; B. F. Haynes, "The Growing Curse of the Age" (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, January 26, 1921, pp. 1-2.

¹⁵⁶E.g., H. C. Morrison, "The Holy War" (editorial), *Pentecostal Herald*, January 14, 1920, p. 1; *idem*, "Times of Testing" (editorial), *Pentecostal Herald*, April 7, 1920; (Mrs.) Clara McLeister, "Dress," *Pentecostal Herald*, April 7, 1920, p. 2; B. F. Haynes, "Movies and Sex Appeal" (editorial), *Herald of Holiness*, February 23, 1921.

MISSION POLICY AND NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE: JAPAN, 1905-1965

by

Floyd T. Cunningham

The Church of the Nazarene in Japan was firmly grounded on partnership between American, or “foreign” missionaries and Japanese, or “home” missionaries. The American missionaries who dominated the scene for the first decades, Minnie Staples and William Eckel, were partners with Japanese leaders Hiroshi Kitagawa and Nobumi Isayama. Both of these men lived and studied in the United States before returning to Japan, as had J. I. Nagamatsu, who became the first Japanese District Superintendent. Both Kitagawa and Nagamatsu graduated from Pasadena College, and the denomination commissioned and paid both as missionaries.

From the 1910s through the 1930s, a volatile and hurtful struggle between Eckel and Staples fueled sentiments within the Japanese church that its own leaders were as capable as—indeed were more capable than—the missionaries in intellect, diligence, and spirit. By the 1930s Eckel himself and many of the Japanese leaders believed that he would be the last missionary which the denomination would send to Japan. The Japanese church was in nearly every way self-sufficient, and it was beginning to share responsibility for the Nazarene work in both China and Korea.

World War II, however, entirely changed the scenario. At its close, the church in Japan seemed as debilitated as the country as a whole, and Kitagawa and Isayama seemed to be drawn and weary men rather than

vigorous leaders. So the denomination renewed its missionary impetus in Japan and concentrated especially on the education of both pastors and laypersons and on the building and rebuilding of churches. A new generation of Japanese leaders emerged, some of whom also studied at Pasadena and other colleges in the United States. But the pioneering spirit and “partnership” of earlier years could not be regained.

A. Setting the Foundations

The Holiness Church of Christ had missionaries in Japan when it united with the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene in 1908. Lulu Williams and Lillian Poole had ventured there on faith and worked under the Oriental Missionary Society (O.M.S.). They arrived in Tokyo in 1905 and transferred to Kyoto in late 1907. In Kyoto, they established a Sunday School which, with them, presumably became part of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene when their respective home churches became part of the denomination.¹

Other Nazarene missionaries arrived in 1910 and soon Williams and Poole went on furlough. One of the new group, Minnie Upperman, had served earlier with Williams and Poole in Tokyo under another mission board, and knew some Japanese. She soon married another of the party, J. A. Chenault. A Mr. Taniguchi assisted the work for a time. When Mr. Taniguchi left the mission, the missionaries tried to carry on with an English Bible class, but this was ineffectual. By 1912, when the Chenaults returned to the United States, the Nazarenes had established little.²

Shortly before the Chenaults' return, Cora Snider and Minnie Staples, Nazarenes from California, arrived in Japan as emissaries of Phineas Bresee, a founder of the Church of the Nazarene. Staples had worked with Japanese migrants in Upland and Los Angeles and could preach some in the Japanese language. She visited Kumamoto, the hometown of her Japanese protege, Hiroshi Kitagawa, who was still studying at Pasadena College, and made some converts among members of his family and others who belonged to the Russian Orthodox faith. Bresee requested that Snider, who had been principal of the academy at the Nazarene University in Pasadena, provide a report on the promise of the work in Japan (and, if possible, on the prospects for Korea). When all the other missionaries departed, Snider agreed to remain alone to carry on the mission of the church. Staples vowed to return. Snider stayed in Kyoto, and Bresee appointed her Superintendent of the Japan work. He told her to organize a church whenever possible, but advised her wisely: “Now do not take upon

you the burden of the Japanese Empire, nor of all the heathen you ever can see or hear of, but simply try to do the little that one little mortal can do, and rest at that.”³ Out of necessity as well as philosophy, Snider considered close contacts with the Japanese most advantageous to accomplishing the task given her. “To secure and retain the best workers,” she wrote, “there must be such constant companionship as will enable the young workers and prospective helpers to take on the burdens, hopes and ideals of the missionaries.”⁴

Bresee also commissioned a co-laborer, Rev. J. I. Nagamatsu, whom he ordained shortly before his departure for Japan on January 4, 1913. While studying at the Pasadena school in preparation for his ministry, Nagamatsu became well acquainted with both Minnie Staples and Leslie Gay. Gay was chiefly responsible for boosting foreign missions work in the California wing of the church. The Japanese man’s salary was at first paid by Gay. Both Gay and Bresee recognized that Nagamatsu would need about as much salary as any missionary, and that is what they considered Nagamatsu, a missionary to his own people. Gay believed that Nagamatsu rather than Snider would be the true leader of the work. Soon, following Gay’s arrival in Japan, Nagamatsu and Snider transferred the mission station to Fukuchiyama, in the mountains northwest of Kyoto, where Nagamatsu had contacts. Snider took residence there. Nagamatsu’s ministry centered on children.⁵

Snider worried that Staples had established such ties with Nagamatsu in the United States that it would be she who most strongly influenced the work. Apparently Staples gave Nagamatsu money so as to enable him to marry after his return to Japan. She also advised him in letters. Snider felt that Staples was undercutting her authority from afar and she tried to secure a promise from Bresee that Staples would not return as a missionary. Though Bresee told Snider that it was not his intention to appoint Staples to the field, he offered Snider a position at the Pasadena college.⁶

Such was the situation when Hiram F. Reynolds arrived in Japan in January, 1914, for a three-week visit. Accompanying him were Rev. and Mrs. L. H. Humphrey, Lillian Poole, and Lulu Williams, both of whom were returning for second terms. L. H. Humphrey came ready to take over from Snider as Superintendent. Reynolds found Snider and Nagamatsu conducting a lively Sunday school program and a Bible training school in which two were enrolled—Misters Namba and Tanada. Reynolds preached with Nagamatsu translating, and claimed that twenty-

five became Christian, and that twenty-five additional ones, already Christian, were sanctified wholly. The church's site, the caliber of the congregation (which included teachers, merchants and other prominent citizens), and Nagamatsu himself all impressed Reynolds. He toured several other Japanese cities in the company of Nagamatsu and came to esteem him as a "Christian gentleman, a man of vision, culture and power for good."⁷ Reynolds' only reservations about Nagamatsu were that he did not press people hard enough toward conversion or sanctification, and that he was too cautious in what Reynolds considered to be normative displays of "freedom and liberty and unction of the spirit."⁸ The personal relation established between the two men proved important to future events. Reynolds instructed Cora Snider to furlough immediately and assigned the Humphreys along with Poole and Williams to Kyoto. He wanted Kyoto to be the headquarters for the mission, and Nagamatsu could carry on in Fukuchiyama quite well by himself.⁹

Before departing, Reynolds drafted with the workers, including Nagamatsu, a policy to govern the work of the Church of the Nazarene in Japan. Preceding by a few months the policy set for India, and dated January 17, 1914, it began by placing the work under the *Manual*. Reynolds conceived of this as the international constitution for the church because, as the policy went on to assert, the "manifestations of the Holy Spirit are practically the same in all countries." The primary role of the missionaries was to "get souls saved and sanctified, and trained for the work of the Kingdom of God on earth." Entire sanctification was to be "kept to the front." Methods of evangelism were to be virtually the same as in America: visiting house-to-house, organizing Bible classes, establishing Sunday schools, opening preaching stations, and distributing literature.

Upon these presuppositions of similarity between the situations in Japan and America, local churches, whenever Nazarenes established them, should assume as much of the support of the work as possible. A local church reaching self-support could call for and retain a pastor as provided in the *Manual*. When the district as a whole achieved self-support and (indefinitely-defined) measures of self-government, "all missionary control [would] be relinquished except such superintendency as is provided in the *Manual*." That is, the work would always remain under the General Assembly and the General Superintendency.

Though the church gave missionaries front-line roles in the beginning, general leaders never questioned that their stay was temporary, not permanent. Until the district achieved self-support the church gave the

appointed Missionary District Superintendent a firm position of authority over the national church, but instructed him or her to place important decisions before the General Board.¹⁰

Reynolds preached in Japan with the same sort of messages, methods and successes as he had in America. And given his limited awareness of cultural differences in creating missions strategies (he seemed not widely read in mission theory), Reynolds assumed that the same sort of church could be established, using the same sort of means in Japan as in America. As a matter of policy, thus, the mission work began with confidence in both national leadership and the universal applicability of Nazarene doctrines, methods and administration.

The policy mentioned no important institutional aspects of the work. At the time, evangelical Christians were at work in Japan's slums and were active in combatting prostitution and other social evils. However, Reynolds' only desire was to raise up sanctified, "thoroughly equipped" Japanese pastors. In a report to the General Board he argued for educational work. He wanted a Bible training school, and, later, other schools to be "hot spiritual centers" from which strong Japanese leaders would emerge. From the beginning Reynolds saw that maintaining a large force of missionaries was neither necessary nor expedient in Japan.¹¹

B. Leadership Crises

Isaac and Rev. Minnie Staples, along with Hiroshi Kitagawa, arrived in Japan in January, 1915; Nobumi Isayama came later the same year, and young Rev. William and Florence Eckel early the next year. This set the stage for the next developments in the Japanese church, which involved a struggle over leadership.

Minnie Staples' attitude of spiritual maternity toward Hiroshi Kitagawa lasted decades. Staples, born in Tyler, Texas, in 1880, never finished grammar school. She was active as an evangelist for five years in the Friends Church before joining the Church of the Nazarene at Upland, California, in 1906. By that time she had married a widower, Isaac B. Staples, seventeen years her senior, a birthright Quaker, and former railroad worker. During their years in Upland, Minnie Staples became burdened for the Japanese migrant workers on the surrounding farms. Wanting to preach to them, she secured Hiroshi Kitagawa as her translator. Later he became her tutor in Japanese. She won the Japanese workers, including Kitagawa, by her kindness as well as by her sermons. In January, 1910, Kitagawa was converted. Staples and Kitagawa began a Japanese church

in Upland, but soon both moved to the Los Angeles area—he to study at the Nazarene college and she to take charge of the Nazarene mission for Japanese in the city. With the support of her friends in California, who included Leslie Gay, Seth Rees and W. C. Wilson, the foreign missions board could scarcely refuse her application for missionary service in Japan. Upon his wife's calling to Japan, Isaac Staples felt it his duty to follow her.¹²

Kitagawa also returned as a missionary to his own people. Born in Kumamoto, on Kyushu island, in southern Japan, in 1888, he was the son of Russian Orthodox parents. He went to America at age nineteen to seek his fortune. After his conversion he entered the Nazarene college, where he finished both his high school and theological programs while ministering in the Japanese mission in Los Angeles. He became friends with both J. I. Nagamatsu, a fellow student, and Nobumi Isayama, who was converted at the mission. Before leaving with the Stapleses for Japan he toured churches in America and H. F. Reynolds ordained him at the Chicago District Assembly in 1914. The church at Kumamoto, which he and Staples organized within a few months after his return to Japan (and which was the first organized Nazarene Church in the country), included his brother Shiro Kitagawa and, apparently, others with whom Staples had established contact on her earlier visit. Members of the church in Kumamoto included school teachers, a post office worker, a banker, and college students. Soon Kitagawa began a Bible school there. This began his decades of work in ministerial education.¹³

Meanwhile, Staples devoted her energies to revivalism. She was not eager to establish schools in Japan which would turn out “high collared folks,” and “cold, proud preachers.”¹⁴ She held many tent meetings over the next years. This stout woman evangelist, who could preach in Japanese fairly well, was a curiosity and crowd-drawer. Within two years she baptized 130 persons, all converted through her ministry. Her husband drove the car and helped to pitch the tent under which she preached. As well, he tended to the financial records of the mission.¹⁵

Almost immediately after Eckel's arrival, early in 1916, he and Minnie Staples became embroiled in personal quarrels which affected the direction of the mission in Japan. Eckel, born in 1892, attended both Olivet College in Illinois, and the Pasadena school. Phineas Bresee ordained him in 1912. He was the son of the Rev. Howard Eckel, formerly a Methodist circuit rider in Pennsylvania, who had joined the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America and afterward pastored in

Havervill, Massachusetts. A closeness with H. F. Reynolds developed during these days before the merger of the APCA with Bresee's Church of the Nazarene in 1907. In 1915, Howard Eckel accepted the superintendency of the Southern California district. He brought his son William, who felt a calling to the mission field, to lead the Japanese work when the Stapleses went to Japan.¹⁶

Howard Eckel played a prominent and controversial role in February, 1917, in officially disorganizing the University Church of the Nazarene in Pasadena, then pastored by Seth Rees. The ensuing struggle nearly tore the entire denomination apart. Eckel and other leaders were afraid of the excessive "freedom of the Spirit" in the Pasadena church. In their minds, Pentecostalism loomed as a danger. But the real matter of contention became the authority and powers of the superintendency to so control local congregations that they could arbitrarily close them—as Eckel, with the approval of General Superintendent E. F. Walker, had done. Rees left the denomination.¹⁷

Minnie Staples was a friend of Rees, who was, like her, a former Quaker. Both enjoyed freedom of expression in worship and neither liked episcopal control. Staples was a member of the University Church and the events in Pasadena disturbed her. Upon a return trip to California for an operation in 1917, Staples spoke at the "Pentecost-Pilgrim" church which Rees organized in Pasadena after he was ousted from his pastorate by Eckel. She also joined him in criticizing the actions of both Eckel and E. F. Walker, the latter since 1911, a General Superintendent in the Church of the Nazarene and formerly pastor at both Los Angeles First and Pasadena First. She moved her local church membership to Kansas City First Church, where a friend of Rees pastored. But her base of support remained in Southern California.¹⁸

Throughout her ministry in Japan these experiences and others led Staples to circumvent general church leadership as she felt led by the Spirit. She could not help but instill the same feelings in Kitagawa. Eckel, on the other hand, naturally carried his father's Methodist heritage of respect toward superintendency. Both Staples and Eckel carried across the ocean their attitudes about the issues of authority over which the Nazarenes fought in these early years.

For the nearly forty years of his ministry in Japan, Eckel worked side-by-side with Nobumi Isayama, ten years his senior. Isayama had come to the United States in 1898 to seek his fortune, and stayed for seventeen years. He became a Christian in 1913 after attending some English

classes at the Japanese Nazarene mission in Los Angeles. Staples, at that time head of the mission, was instrumental in his conversion. When she left for Japan in 1914, Isayama welcomed Eckel and served as his Japanese language teacher. Indeed for a time he lived in the mission with the Eckel family. Isayama returned to Japan in 1915 only with the intention of marrying and then going back to America. But L. H. Humphrey tapped him to be the key national worker for the Kyoto area, and he agreed to remain in Japan. Isayama thus was there to greet the Eckel family when they arrived in February, 1916.¹⁹

Eckel and Isayama at first concentrated upon work at Kure. Eckel was determined from the beginning not only to learn Japanese but to think and act Japanese. He also was tenacious. Though other missionaries left Japan for various reasons after short periods during the early years of the Nazarene work, Eckel remained. He was also determined that Staples not hold sway over the affairs of the church.²⁰

At this stage, Nazarene work in Japan, as in other areas around the world, was organized under a district assembly rather than under a missionary council. In fields such as India this made little difference, since no Indian workers were yet ordained and thus eligible for participation in such an assembly. But in Japan two nationals already were ordained and were thereby entitled to full participation in the administration of the missionary district. Furthermore, the General Missionary Board and individual donors paid Nagamatsu, Kitagawa and Isayama at a scale about equal to that of the American missionaries—considerably higher than other Japanese workers.²¹ Dissension brewed on the status of Japanese workers, and other animosities among the missionaries caused further polarization. Moreover, each of the stations, Fukuchiyama, Kumamoto, Kyoto and Kure, operated virtually autonomously, allowing for, if not encouraging, factional development.

In March, 1917, Reynolds appointed Eckel to preside over a District Assembly planned for later that year. In Eckel, then only twenty-five and with only one year on the field, Reynolds had a man (like Leighton Tracy in India) in whom to trust. But Staples refused to cooperate with Eckel's leadership even after Reynolds clarified that he had indeed appointed Eckel as "Acting" District Superintendent for the entire empire of Japan. Reynolds planned to be present at the Assembly to solve disputes which also had arisen between Staples and Lulu Williams, who was involved in an urban mission work in Kyoto, and between Staples and the Paul Thatchers, who had recently arrived on the field. When the First World

War and other pressing matters delayed Reynolds' scheduled trip that year, the situation deteriorated even further.²²

The Japanese District held an Assembly, finally, in July, 1918, without Reynolds, but Staples refused to attend it. Both Nagamatsu and Kitagawa participated and voiced their opinions on matters along with the others, as equal partners. Discussion at the Assembly centered on whether to consider the Japanese workers as full participants in the decision-making body of the mission. The official policy at this time was so to recognize them, but Lulu Williams and several other missionaries strongly opposed this. Eckel himself recommended that they be called "home missionaries" as distinguished from "foreign missionaries." The participants elected Paul Thatcher, then stationed at Omuta, District Superintendent. However, since the Assembly exacerbated rather than solving the problems plaguing the field, Reynolds placed each station under the direct control of the General Board, and refused to accept the election of Thatcher. Rather, he reappointed Eckel as Missionary District Superintendent. He agreed, though, that Eckel would not visit—or interfere with—Staples' work.²³

At long last Reynolds arrived, in May, 1919, and held another District Assembly. Already he had asked Nagamatsu to translate the *Manual* into Japanese, an indication that Reynolds was eager for more national involvement. Lulu Williams, however, was against this. Reynolds heard her complaints and those of four other missionaries, all stationed in Kyoto, who opposed the involvement of the Japanese leaders in the District Assembly. They told Reynolds plainly that either the Japanese leaders must be treated as subordinates or they themselves would leave. Reynolds forthrightly accepted the resignations of Lulu Williams, and newer missionaries Ethel McPhearson, Helen Santee and Rev. and Mrs. H. H. Wagner. The latter couple in particular also had opposed the work and leadership of Eckel. They had, Reynolds felt, such deep animosity toward the General Board's policy in promoting the nationalization of districts that he felt that they could no longer work effectively with the Japanese. To Reynolds there were two issues precipitating the resignations: (1) that the missionaries would not accept the Japanese as having equal rights and privileges with themselves; and (2) that they had contempt toward the policy of the church. Their resignations took effect May 19, 1919.²⁴

Reynolds moved Eckel from Kure, where he had been stationed, to Kyoto, in order to preserve the work there. And before departing

Reynolds ordained Nobumi Isayama. He reappointed Eckel as “Acting” District Superintendent, but freed him from duties as such, ostensibly so that he could pursue language study. Actually he probably saw the necessity of keeping Eckel and Staples from infringing upon one another. He made Minnie Staples District Evangelist and Isaac Staples District Treasurer. Nagamatsu remained in Fukuchiyama. He assigned the Thatchers to Okayama, but they returned to America because of health problems the same year.²⁵

Nagamatsu praised Reynolds for saving the work in Japan as a result of these actions and through letters the Japanese pastor advanced in the esteem of both Reynolds and E. G. Anderson, general treasurer and foreign missions secretary. Reynolds took a bold and yet strategic move on his next visit to Japan, in the fall of 1922—he appointed Nagamatsu as District Superintendent. (The Stapleses were on furlough at this time, and the Eckels were due theirs shortly). By this action Reynolds reaffirmed his commitment to the advancement as quickly as possible of both national leaders and mission fields as a whole to regular district status. Japan was in some ways an experimental field, since its leadership was ahead of most others in educational attainments. This was also a way of solving the leadership jealousies between Eckel and Staples without alienating either one of them or their constituents in America. Nagamatsu was not as closely allied with either one of them as either Kitagawa or Isayama.²⁶

E. G. Anderson proceeded to consult with Nagamatsu on various matters, treating him with the same respect as he would any missionary superintendent. Nagamatsu charted the course for the district. Anderson noted his recommendations regarding the stationing of missionaries. He listed for Anderson the essential characteristics of missionaries for Japan: (1) good Bible teachers who could preach well in English, for he felt that missionaries lost their “unction” when they tried to preach in Japanese; (2) musicians; (3) “intellectual,” rather than “sentimental” persons; and, (4) persons who are able to pray with and encourage the Japanese.²⁷ (The type fitted Eckel better than Staples). Nagamatsu complained, however, that though he was Superintendent, the General Church [the general denominational offices in Kansas City] left finances out of his control. This kept him ignorant of how much money was available for Japan and so prevented him from budgeting accordingly. The recording of general finances sent to Japan remained with Isaac Staples.²⁸

The handling of finances, however, led to Nagamatsu’s downfall. He received funds directly from individuals and local churches in America as

well as from the mission for the Fukuchiyama station. This went to support children enrolled in the kindergarten and several Sunday schools there, the primary focus of his ministry. The Stapleses accused him of financial mismanagement in regard to these funds. Nagamatsu transferred from the Fukuchiyama work to Kyoto.²⁹ Finally, with remorse, Nagamatsu sent to Anderson notice of his resignation from the superintendency:

Alas! I confess you I have betrayed your confidence on me. . . . I was entirely fell in the Devil's trap. I am very sorry that I sinned against God, against Christ and lost your confidence on the money sake. . . . I pray you would not distrust my countrymen because of me. My heart is broken because I have contaminated the Glory of God.

He stated his plans to repay the church and to go to America.³⁰

Reynolds proceeded to appoint Hiroshi Kitagawa as Superintendent in Nagamatsu's stead. His faith in Japanese leadership was not—as Nagamatsu had hoped it would not be—shattered by the failings of one man. Kitagawa moved from Kumamoto to Kyoto in 1922, since Reynolds wanted to keep the headquarters of the work in Kyoto, and Kitagawa relocated the Bible School there also.³¹

The missionaries suffered accusations as well. When the Stapleses took another furlough in 1924, charges against Minnie Staples on matters relating to her independency circulated in Southern California. These, coupled with financial problems in the General Church in the mid-1920's, prevented her return to Japan under regular status. Her supporters nevertheless succeeded both in sending her back and in pressuring the church to remove Eckel from full-time missionary salary. The events were as follows.

The denominational General Assembly of 1923 instituted the office of Regional Superintendent, an intermediary between the General Superintendency and the District Superintendency of missionary districts. Chosen for the Orient was J. E. Bates. Before being appointed to this position Bates had served as District Superintendent in Southern California for four years. Perhaps that experience provided a background for his dealings with her. At any rate, he opposed Staples. Bates wrote to the General Superintendents that Asians would not accept a woman, especially one so brazen as Staples. She brought embarrassment, Bates said, to the church.³²

Reynolds also initially opposed her return, believing that there might be some validity not only on this point but in the other charges eventually brought against her. These were that: (1) she had made statements to the

effect that the reason that the church could not afford to return her was that it had invested and lost money in real estate schemes with a well-known evangelist; (2) she had without permission from the department raised money both in and out of the denomination in order to return to Japan on an independent basis, if the church would not or could not send her back; and, (3) she had some affiliation with the Pentecostal (tongues) movement.

The church appointed an investigating committee which included Reynolds, Bates, Gay, and two others. Eventually it exonerated her of all charges. Nevertheless, the Department of Foreign Missions still decided that it was in such financial difficulties that it could not return her at this point. The decision must have been made also in the light of both the controversies in which she had been entangled with Eckel and the needs of the field in Japan.³³

But Staples had powerful supporters. Leslie Gay believed a scheme had developed between Eckel and Bates to keep her from returning. In fact, he stated to the foreign missions department of the church that she would be returned to Japan whether or not it was under the official auspices of the church.³⁴ Gay, eighty years old, was still an influential figure, having served continuously on the general foreign missions board from 1907 until 1923. Anderson also supported Staples. He justified her return to Japan on “faith” on grounds that any district in the denomination, including the Japan District, had the right to call for an evangelist. As District Superintendent, Kitagawa had made such a call, so Staples needed no permission from the foreign missions department in order to accept the position of District Evangelist. Leslie Gay secured from his own pocket, from pledges among members of the Los Angeles First Church, and from other supporters enough money both for her passage to Japan and for her needs on the field for a year. Thus circumventing normal channels, Staples returned to the field in late 1925. She and her husband resided in a modest apartment fixed for them adjacent to the Honmachi Church in Kyoto, pastored by Hiroshi Kitagawa. The Eckels lived in the same city. Staples worked in one part of the city and Eckel worked in another.³⁵

Meanwhile, Anderson, who encouraged the Staples’ return, decided that if the Department did not have enough money for them, it did not have enough for the Eckels either. Anderson sent Eckel a letter of recall, and cut off his salary. Even while he knew that Staples was on her way, Anderson stated that it was the plan of the Board to have no missionaries

in Japan. This was, he said, not only a policy on which the church had previously decided in regard to Japan; it was general policy due to the necessity of world-wide retrenchment.

Of course, Eckel knew of Anderson's support for Staples, and of her imminent arrival, and would not accept defeat. Eckel rallied his own supporters and found a job teaching in a government school in order to remain in Japan with his family. The Miami, Florida, church, where his father now pastored, sent him one thousand dollars. The New York District Missionary Society agreed to take up regular support for him. Eckel worked twelve hours a week teaching in a commercial school. His salary for this job alone was greater than what he had been receiving from the Missionary Board. Florence Eckel also worked, teaching music and English. But Eckel consistently expressed to the denominational Foreign Mission Secretary his deep desire to return to the regular employ of the church.³⁶

Reynolds knew and approved of the channels of support being offered Eckel. So Eckel remained the recognized missionary in Japan despite Anderson's desire for him to return home. But from 1925 until 1934, when Eckel was re-employed full-time, the church had no regularly-appointed missionaries in Japan.³⁷

In apparent harmony during the year that Staples was away, Kitagawa toured each of the churches with Eckel. Actually Kitagawa wanted to see Eckel move out of Kyoto to do pioneer work. He believed that as District Superintendent he should decide such matters as the stationing of missionaries as well as other workers. He also told Reynolds of his plan to station the Stapleses in Osaka if they were able to return. Ultimately, however, both missionaries remained in Kyoto.³⁸

When Staples returned she immediately engaged in a whirlwind of revival activity—holding meetings in every local congregation except the one in Kyoto pastored by Isayama. Emotion-filled seekers testified to entire sanctification amid tears. Restitution followed. Some even claimed visions. She held eighty-nine tent revival crusades from 1925 to 1937.³⁹

Church growth continued, and so did aspirations for greater autonomy from the General Church. Tent evangelism produced local churches. So did contacts made in various localities by laypersons or Bible college students.

From the beginning local churches had aimed toward self-support and so were somewhat prepared when the General Church drastically cut its financial support to Japan late in 1925. The church greatly reduced

pastors' and workers' salaries, but growth had continued. The salaries of Kitagawa and Isayama remained significantly higher than those of the other Japanese workers. Money continued to come into the District through Staples' sources, independently of the Foreign Missions Office in Kansas City. Yet Kansas City and Eckel, as missionary superintendent, still tried to maintain control. Knowing this, the Japanese church petitioned the 1928 General Assembly to allow it full, regular district status, by which it hoped to gain autonomy. The denomination's *Manual*, however, gave no guidelines on the granting of such to a missionary-field district. So the Assembly referred the matter back to J. G. Morrison, by this time Foreign Missions Secretary, and the Department of Foreign Missions of the General Board. The Department proceeded to recommend that Japan be listed along with other fully-organized districts, but at the same time it recognized Japan's need for continued financial assistance.⁴⁰

Kitagawa's position as superintendent was strong in the district, though there were occasional difficulties relating to Eckel. There was ambiguity because there were few foreign fields with national district superintendents and the lines of authority between Kitagawa and Eckel were not always clear. For the most part Kitagawa corresponded directly with the successive foreign missions Secretaries—Anderson, Reynolds and then, after 1928, J. G. Morrison. Along with Staples he represented Japan at the 1928 General Assembly. (Eckel also attended.) Isayama, meanwhile, remained as pastor of his strong church in Kyoto, where the Eckels usually worshiped. Isayama had difficulty submitting even his annual reports to Kitagawa, and refrained from most district activities.⁴¹

The work of Staples contributed greatly to the District, despite her ambiguous connections to the mission. She attempted to transfer her own membership to the Japan Missionary District, but a ruling by the General Superintendents that no missionary was so eligible prevented this. Nevertheless, between 1926 and 1934 she personally received and spent over \$26,000 for her work in Japan. Some came through contacts she made while speaking at interdenominational holiness camp meetings during her furloughs, but most seems to have come from Nazarene contributors in California. She distributed the money for church buildings and Japanese Nazarene workers' salaries as well as for her own living.⁴² In 1934, against the wishes of the General Church, she brought Pearl Wiley, daughter of theologian H. Orton Wiley, to Japan as her co-worker, on "faith."⁴³

Kitagawa meanwhile attempted to achieve unity among Japanese holiness leaders. The Nazarenes helped to sponsor a holiness convention in

Kyoto in 1929, with Isayama uniting with Kitagawa for once in an effort to reach the entire city. Another revival in Kyoto took place with General Superintendents Goodwin and Williams in October of the same year and this affected all of the holiness churches.⁴⁴ The visit of the two general leaders, incidentally, did not change the status of either Staples or Eckel, though they met separately with both. Kitagawa was close friends with both Bishop Nakada of the Holiness Church of Japan and Bishop Tsuchiyama of the Free Methodist Church. Nakada had helped arrange Kitagawa's marriage soon after his arrival in Japan and the Holiness Church which he headed was among the fastest growing denominations in the country at this time. Tsuchiyama was formerly a Nazarene and had attended the Nazarene school in Pasadena. In late 1930 these men drew up a creed of faith and resolutions of union that would bring together the Nazarene, Free Methodist, and Holiness groups. Staples favored the plan of union, perhaps because she retained contacts with supporters of the O.M.S. work. But most of the Japanese Nazarene pastors were not in favor of union.⁴⁵

Education remained a primary consideration for the workers in the 1930s. Eckel laid plans for a Japan extension of Pasadena College. He envisioned a four-year liberal arts college, with twelve departments, and corresponded with school administrators at Pasadena College, who decided that finances for the Japanese school should be shouldered by the Japan branch, and that Pasadena would appoint the religion professor. The requirements for other faculty members were that they be evangelical Christians and that they have master's degrees. Morrison favored the project, but it persisted only in planning stages throughout the 1930s.⁴⁶

The General Superintendents and the Department of Foreign Missions remained convinced that Japan needed neither missionaries nor money as much as other fields. In 1935, from afar, J. Glenn Gould saw the indigenous character of the Japanese work:⁴⁷

The future of our Nazarene work in Japan, in common with every other similar undertaking, is in the hands of these Japanese leaders. . . . And the missionary and the native leaders must labor on side by side if this vast land is to be evangelized and won for Christ. But the missionary who succeeds in Japan today must be the self-effacing, John-the-Baptist type, who is willing to decrease that Christ and the Japanese servants of Christ may increase.

The Japanese themselves acknowledged this. Some understood that the Eckels would be the last missionaries sent to them.⁴⁸

Another crisis in leadership developed in relation to Kitagawa in 1934 and 1935. The Bible school had not operated for several years when Rev. Frank B. Smith, formerly a District Superintendent in Northern California, volunteered his services to the mission and arrived in Japan in 1931. He was appalled to discover the divisions in the Nazarene Church between the Eckel and Staples factions. He seemed especially perturbed with Staples' "irregular" means of support. What embroiled Kitagawa with Smith was a twenty-dollar money order, payable to Smith, which Kitagawa cashed after Smith returned to America in May 1933. Kitagawa used the money for rent for the Southern Mission Hall in Kyoto, where one of the translators whom Smith had used worked for a time, and for his translator's salary. Kitagawa contacted Smith regarding these actions and Smith did not bring up the matter until February, 1934. Smith received a letter of apology from Kitagawa but nevertheless planned to take Kitagawa to court over the issue. He wanted the Japanese superintendent's immediate resignation, and brought the matter to the attention of Morrison.⁴⁹

Morrison polled General Board members in early 1935 as to whether Kitagawa should be asked to resign from office. All but two responded that he should. On June 13, 1935, Morrison telegraphed both Kitagawa and Isayama, demanding Kitagawa's resignation and appointing Isayama as District Superintendent. Immediately Japanese pastors on the District Advisory Board wrote to the General Superintendents, expressing both their dismay at the request for resignation and their support of Kitagawa. With such backing, Kitagawa refused to resign. On the basis of letters between Morrison and Isayama, it is clear that Morrison did not consider the charges against Kitagawa serious enough to warrant his removal from office. Rather, Morrison simply saw this as an excuse to change the district leadership. He believed that Kitagawa had too long been dominated by Staples. He also realized that the General Church's move against Kitagawa might cause schism.⁵⁰ In fact, he told Isayama, "we will let it split." As far as Morrison was concerned, the Staples faction could form its own organization separate from the Church of the Nazarene. The General Board would continue to support those loyal to it. Morrison wrote: "We want someone who will conduct our work hereafter in full harmony with the church and yet entirely free from any contact with the influence, activity and the personal and financial relations of Sister Staples." Since he could do little, however, until Kitagawa resigned, Morrison laid plans to deal with the matter at the next District Assembly, at which General Superintendent J. B. Chapman would preside.⁵¹

The situation was tense, then, when Chapman led the Japan District Assembly in October, 1935. The Japanese leaders were already upset that Kansas City was interfering in the business of their district. Chapman told them plainly that until the District was fully self-supporting it should expect to be guided by the General Foreign Missions Secretary. On the matter of the election of a District Superintendent, the Assembly refused to follow the dictates of the general leadership and elected Kitagawa Superintendent. Then Chapman met privately with the pastors to explain that the legal situation regarding the money order of Frank Smith made Kitagawa an unacceptable choice. However, Kitagawa had enough supporters to prevent the election of Isayama. After further consultation with Chapman, both Kitagawa and Isayama announced their unwillingness to serve as Superintendent. The delegates then elected the only other ordained minister among them, Shiro Kitagawa. Born in 1896, Shiro Kitagawa had been converted under Staples' ministry. He had pastored at Kure briefly before being transferred to Kumamoto, where he stayed for many years. Goodwin and Williams had ordained him in 1929. He could neither read nor speak English. After Shiro Kitagawa's election as District Superintendent Hiroshi Kitagawa remained head of the Bible school and pastor of the Honmachi church in Kyoto. The Assembly also elected him to represent Japan at the 1936 General Assembly. In effect, if not in name, Hiroshi Kitagawa remained as District Superintendent. Little changed. There were thirty-three organized churches at this time and about 1600 members. Thirteen of the churches were fully self-supporting. But only in four cases did the churches own property, and the deeds of these were in the name of Hiroshi Kitagawa, as per Japanese law, which prevented land being held in the name of the church. Before leaving, Chapman declared the 1935 Assembly as Japan's first as a regular district. Almost immediately after Chapman's departure, with desires to assert nationalist prerogatives which mirrored the political aspirations of their fellow citizens, the Japanese pastors drew up notification to Kansas City that as of January 1, 1936, the district would be self-supporting.⁵²

In January, 1936, the General Board, which functions as the General Assembly ad interim, officially gave the Japan District regular status while at the same time, and without the prior consent of the Japan District, creating a second, "missionary" district to the northeast, to be centered in Tokyo. Morrison, who was disappointed at the way the District Assembly had turned out, appointed Eckel to lead the new work, assisted by Isayama. He expected those pastors discontent with the leadership of

Kitagawa and Staples to transfer to the Tokyo area. Isayama moved to Tokyo in August and Eckel joined him there when he returned from furlough later that year. There was but one church in Tokyo, having begun in 1933 through contacts made by one of Isayama's former church members.

The Western or Kwansai District would be the regular district, with all the rights and privileges of any of the American districts, subject to the *Manual* and the General Assembly. The General Church would support the undeveloped local churches on the regular district for five years, with support diminishing proportionately each year, and it would continue to finance the Bible school. Bertie Karns was transferred from China to Japan (where she had worked many years before) in order both to handle the funds sent by the General Church to the Kwansai District and to teach in the Bible school. But it was clear to Morrison that after May 1, 1936, the General Church no longer considered the Kwansai District a "mission field."⁵³

Meanwhile, Minnie Staples' years in Japan came to a close. Frank Smith published a pamphlet severely denouncing her work in Japan. Though he did not specifically mention Staples, the implications were clear. Meanwhile, Isaac Staples, past seventy, was in failing health. In 1937, as part of the Japanese government's increased control over religion and all areas of public and private life, the government placed restrictions on the holding of tent meetings. Revivals could still be held in churches, but the use of tents had been Staples' main means of evangelism. Finally, she resigned her commission as District Evangelist and returned to California late in 1937. She fully expected to return some day. In sending her off, Kitagawa remarked that only God knew what the Stapleses had meant to the work in his country. "Sister Staples is needed in evangelistic work and [as a] mother to our workers."⁵⁴ She continued to correspond with Kitagawa after her return to California and in so doing remained influential. Her husband lingered in ill health until his death in 1940. By that time the political situation prevented her return to Japan.⁵⁵

Under Isayama and Eckel the work in the new district expanded phenomenally in Tokyo and reached into Korea. In part this was due to the tensions of the social and political environment. Within one year ten churches were planted and by the end of two there were over five hundred members on the new district. There were problems in sending prospective ministers to Kyoto to attend Bible school (Eckel complained that they tried to keep them there to work on that district), so they began another Bible school in Tokyo. As the result of contacts with Koreans in the city,

Eckel and Isayama strengthened the work in Korea, which had begun in 1932. By 1938 there were two Nazarene churches in Korea under the superintendence of Eckel and Isayama.⁵⁶

C. The Social Crisis and the Church

The expansion of the Japanese Empire into other areas of Asia brought both opportunities and hardships for Nazarenes. Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. In July, 1937, war between China and Japan began full-scale in northern China and within a few months the Japanese army took virtual control of the area around Damingfu in Shandong Province, which was the center of Nazarene work in the country. Insofar as the Japanese were concerned, they desired to rid Asia of Western dominance—to liberate the Chinese and eventually the Philippines and other countries from foreign control. They believed that they would be hailed as liberators by their fellow Asians. For that reason the Japanese government encouraged Japanese Christians to allay the fears of Christians in China and elsewhere by visiting conquered territories. If it became necessary for Americans and other Western missionaries to leave the sphere, the Japanese church was ready to take their places for the maintenance and furtherance of the Christian work.⁵⁷

During the late 1930's the government drafted several Japanese Nazarene pastors, who were subscribed to serve the war effort either on the front lines or in industries in the homeland. This prevented much work from being carried on in local congregations, of course, but the war itself opened Japanese Nazarene minds to their responsibilities both at home and abroad. Kitagawa became eager to spread the work among Japanese in Formosa, China, Korea and Manchuria. One Nazarene pastor, Mr. Kaku, began holding meetings among the Japanese in Tientsin, China, while stationed in the city with the army. He returned there to pastor when the army discharged him. The church in Tientsin was self-supporting and began to reach out to Chinese. This encouraged Kitagawa to take an offering for the entire Nazarene church in China. Japanese Sunday school children as well as others contributed sacrificially.

Hiroshi and Shiro Kitagawa travelled to China in 1939 to personally present the money and to meet the Chinese Nazarenes. Though the trip to Damingfu was dangerous—Chinese were fighting Japanese in the area—the brothers arrived with their donation of three hundred yen. Missionary L. C. Osborne translated from Hiroshi Kitagawa's English into Chinese. As instructed, Kitagawa said nothing of a political nature, but simply gave

his testimony. The brothers stayed but one day in Damingfu before departing, and visited the Nazarene church in Handan, the site of the nearest railway station, on their way south. They also saw Kaku's work in Tientsin and met Japanese Nazarenes in different stops along their route. They assured both Chinese and Japanese Christians wherever they went that the church in Japan was praying for them. Later, upon learning that Japanese bombs had destroyed the Chao-cheng Nazarene church in China, Japanese Nazarenes took an offering for its rebuilding. Such charity evidenced both a sense of Japanese responsibility for the repercussions of the war in China, and a willingness to assume leadership for mission work in Eastern Asia.⁵⁸

Shiro Kitagawa himself became eager to go as a missionary. He applied for such service through the East Asia Christian Mission, a Japanese mission organization, which sent him to Soochow, near Shanghai, in mid-1939. Hiroshi Kitagawa explained the missionary call of his brother and the Japanese Nazarenes:⁵⁹

We are yet weak but we must have a missionary spirit and we felt that we must begin missionary work while we are yet weak. Japanese preachers can help solving problems between Chinese and Japanese officers, beside preaching them both this wonderful gospel of salvation.⁶⁰

Naturally with Shiro Kitagawa in China it became necessary for the Church to choose another district superintendent. C. W. Jones, now Foreign Missions secretary, asked that Eckel preside over a specially-called District Assembly. But when Eckel notified Kitagawa that he was too ill to come, Kitagawa proceeded in August, 1939, with the assembly anyway—and found himself, unsurprisingly, elected District Superintendent on the first ballot. In a sense Kitagawa became what he had been in fact during his brother's tenure. Upon learning of the assembly and of Kitagawa's election, Jones was not at all happy; but there was little he could do.⁶¹

The social and political situation heightened the sense of urgency in preaching the gospel. Eckel himself interpreted Japan's rise to world power apocalyptically: "Yes, out of the very armies of the Kings of the east, the Church of the Nazarene of the Orient is to gather that number to hasten the coming of the Lord!"⁶² The Korean work was especially heartening. Both Eckel and Isayama spent several weeks there in 1939 and, according to Eckel, "found the door wide open to us."⁶³ "With a little encouragement," Eckel concluded, "that field would outgrow all of

Japan.”⁶⁴ In fact, he thought that throughout the Orient the times were ripe for the Gospel. He hoped for the early entrance of the Church of the Nazarene into both Hong Kong and the Philippines.⁶⁵

But the “thrill” of watching the supposed last days of the world soon turned to anxiety. Eckel found himself watched at every corner. Mail was read. Basic rights were denied to Japanese citizens. “The strain,” confessed Eckel, “has been hard.”⁶⁶ Of more pressing concern to the Japanese church was a religious question as to whether a Nazarene might bow before a state shrine. Apparently it was becoming necessary to assure the government that the church would not oppose this practice, a sign of loyalty to the state and in government annals a civil rather than a religious function. The common people, however, associated the shrine with the Shinto religion. In a letter to Jones, Eckel asked, “Could we as Christians go there and take off our hat and bow because we are told to do so, but in our heart we resent it and have no spirit of worship and yet be a Christian?”⁶⁷ By such reasoning Japanese Nazarenes followed societal dictates and were not so ostracized as those on the more radical fringes of Protestantism.⁶⁸

In late 1939 the Japanese government pressed each denomination to have a single representative or leader to represent it in a kind of Christian parliament being set up under civil control. Kitagawa interpreted this as meaning that the government would never recognize two Nazarene districts or superintendents. He requested that Kansas City move to once more consolidate the work into one district. He believed himself to be the best man for the position of superintendent—especially as the government would never allow a foreigner to serve as such. The Kyoto district, he also reminded Jones, had several times the membership of the Tokyo district. Nonetheless, Jones clearly preferred Isayama. But he wondered if Kitagawa would cooperate with him should he appoint Isayama to the office. Pearl Wiley, though she originally had gone to Japan to assist Staples, was now disillusioned with Kitagawa’s leadership. She urged Jones to appoint Isayama as district superintendent, even if that meant a major schism in the church. In the long run, she thought, the church would be better rid of the “irregular elements” and the “dominance of Mrs. Staples.”⁶⁹ Jones appointed Isayama as District Superintendent in March, 1940, and he ordered the districts to be reunited. Likely it was a union only in name. Kitagawa initially accepted the decision but he began to fear that Isayama would rule with an “iron hand.” Soon he urged the General Church to call for a district assembly so that the Japanese could once more have the privilege of electing their own superintendent. Clearly he thought he would be chosen.⁷⁰

Kitagawa along with Eckel and Isayama attended the 1940 General Assembly. The realization that the political tension might very soon rend the relation between the church in Japan and America led to the church's placing responsibility for whatever accommodations might be necessary in the future upon the shoulders of both Kitagawa and Isayama.⁷¹

Immediately upon returning from America after the General Assembly, Isayama and Kitagawa found that the religious situation had indeed changed drastically in Japan. The government now demanded that various denominations combine into several blocks or minor unions within the Christian Church of Japan. Each group was to have at least 5,000 members and fifty churches. This was more than the Church of the Nazarene had, and the Free Methodists were in the same predicament. Even before the arrival of the two Nazarene leaders, Free Methodist Bishop Tsuchiyama had consulted with the church's pastors and had made preliminary plans. Certainly the close friendship between the Free Methodist and Nazarene leaders as well as the union talk of previous years helped in this situation.

The Nazarenes held a District Assembly in September, 1940, meeting for the first time as a united district since 1935. Isayama presided. A district missionary convention held in conjunction with the assembly evidenced the burden of the Japanese church for China. Delegates also agreed on the necessity of joining the Free Methodists. A union assembly representing the two sects met in April, 1941. Joining the Free Methodist and the Nazarenes were two other holiness groups, the Scandinavian Missionary Alliance and the World Missionary Society. The assembly chose Tsuchiyama as leader, and he proceeded to ordain thirty ministers, most of whom were Nazarenes. There was certainly pride in this—not having to have an American General Superintendent do the ordaining. The delegates also chose Kitagawa to lead a united Bible College at Osaka, where the Free Methodists had their school and compound. The leaders wanted the Nazarenes to finance a building on the Osaka campus and to station a missionary teacher there. Isayama remained in charge of the Nazarene segment and continued to strengthen the churches in Tokyo. He also maintained contact with the Korean and Chinese work. Both Tsuchiyama and Isayama served on the Executive Council of the Christian Church of Japan.⁷²

The General Church kept in contact as long as possible with the Japanese leaders. The Eckels left for their scheduled furlough in 1940 and Pearl Wiley and Bertie Karns in early 1941. Jones was able to send in one

lump sum a portion of the money designated from the General Budget for Japan to cover the next two years.⁷³ In one of his last letters before the outbreak of war Isayama wrote: "Whatever may be the developments in the future, [the missionaries] have laid the foundation, and it is my prayer that we may be enabled to build thereon a superstructure that will stand the test of fire."⁷⁴

Though under dire circumstances, the Church of the Nazarene in Japan now was completely in Japanese hands. The leadership crises across the years had brought to the fore strong-willed and forceful leaders. With both Staples and Eckel gone, and with the social condition as it was, the leaders evidenced cooperation. To a certain point the social and political situation even furthered the growth of the church by appealing with apocalyptic images to anxiety-ridden minds. In a sense there was no crisis of loyalty among the Japanese leaders between their American supporters and the Japanese cause. While ardent defenders of Christ and His church, the leaders at the same time were as always deeply and fervently Japanese.⁷⁵ Certainly there was no trauma among them with the prospect of no missionaries among them. They were ready not only to carry on the work in Japan proper, but to expand the work of the church wherever the Empire might extend.

The Nazarene churches in Korea continued under the care of Japanese pastors. Tei Ki-sho, a Nazarene pastor stationed by the Japanese government in Korea, made contacts with one of the churches in Pyongyang and even opened an outstation at Tonsanri. In 1940 he began yet another work at Shinri. He maintained contact with the Seoul church as well, and expected the Japanese church to help in building construction projects for the congregations in Korea.⁷⁶

D. The War and Post-War Years

During the war the church in Japan faced increasing problems. The government conscripted those under sixty years of age, including pastors, for the war effort. Government informants visited churches in order to make sure that religious leaders did not criticize the war effort. Some in the holiness movement put so much emphasis on the Second Coming of Christ as King that the government mistook this as either some veiled reference to America or as a sign of disloyalty toward the Emperor. In fact officials told Kitagawa that he must not preach about the Second Coming at all. They suspected Isayama of being spy because of his previous American contacts. Nazarenes were willing to bow toward the East, in the

direction of the Emperor, but assured themselves that this was only out of respect and not worship.⁷⁷

Increasingly it became impossible to carry on as normal. Members scattered away from the cities to the provinces. The Allied bombing of Japan late in the war destroyed churches as well as factories and homes. Pastors subsisted along with others on sweet potatoes or pumpkins. Even Kitagawa's family bartered clothing for food. They also dug a bomb shelter between their home and the church in Kyoto. Isayama's church in Tokyo remarkably escaped harm from a fire which destroyed nearby buildings, but part of it was then taken over by the military for offices. After a bombing raid it was used as a place to treat the wounded. The church floor became stained with blood. The church in Hiroshima was left standing after the nuclear attack there, but the pastor, Rev. Kikuo Nagase, soon succumbed to the bomb's radiation.⁷⁸

Nazarene chaplains with the U. S. Armed Services were the first to make contact with the church in Japan after the war. After a long search through the rubble of Tokyo, Joseph S. Pitts and Orval J. Nease, Jr., finally found Isayama. The pastor's wife had Pitts take off his muddy boots before entering the home. Not only was the action a sign of deference to Japanese custom, but to Japanese dignity. Only with resentment did Pitts comply with this request or to the bowing toward Isayama which accompanied his greetings.

After Pitts and Nease made their report to Kansas City, the General Church undertook financial support for the Japanese leader. In addition, Pitts brought much-needed food and arranged for Isayama's employment as a translator. In Kyoto, after difficulty, Nazarene Clinton Mayhew found Kitagawa's church, which was still open. Soon food, clothing and other supplies came to Kitagawa's family and neighbors through this and subsequent contacts with Nazarenes serving in the military.⁷⁹

Eckel arrived in January, 1947, and rehabilitation work began. He found only two of the ten Tokyo churches still functioning, and only three others nationwide. In the spring he conducted a preachers' meeting in the Honmachi church in Kyoto, and twenty-six pastors attended. The pastors agreed to withdraw from the Christian Church of Japan. On a return trip to Kansas City to report to the General Board in 1948, Eckel expressed great optimism. Indeed the church began to send missionaries to Japan in greater numbers than ever before.⁸⁰

But it was not until 1949, when General Superintendent Orval J. Nease was in Japan, that the District was officially reorganized. There

was no desire among either the Japanese or the General Church to return to the division of the District. The Japanese elected William A. Eckel as Superintendent. Thus Japan reverted to the status of a “missionary district,” though both Isayama and Kitagawa were on the Advisory Board.

By this time Eckel had secured forty-five sites for churches through the offices of the American occupation forces. Eventually each became the location of a Nazarene church. For a time it appeared that the unexpected benevolence of the American forces coupled with the Emperor’s denial of his own divinity at the close of the war would induce Japanese to more readily accept Christianity.⁸¹

Regarding the church’s leaders, in 1950 Eckel persuaded Kitagawa to move from his Kyoto church, which he had pastored since 1922, to open a work in Yokohama, near Tokyo. Isayama also transferred to a different church in the same city, to Oyamadai, where Eckel planned for the denomination to construct its headquarters in Japan. Both Isayama and Kitagawa began kindergartens in their churches. Many Protestant churches in Japan were doing the same.⁸²

Eckel began to set up an educational work which would attempt to reach Japanese effectively in the post-war era. He believed that education was the most important means of evangelism. He passionately desired that the church buy and take over operations of a school run by Rev. Nakada, a friend of the church, in Chiba, near Tokyo. Eight hundred were enrolled in the high school, which rested on two-hundred-fifty acres. Some Nazarene students already attended. Eckel initially received authorization from the General Board in 1947 for \$10,000 for this. By 1948, however, the General Superintendents had changed their mind. The General Church over-extended itself financially in the heady post-war years, and Eckel now estimated that the final cost to the church would be about \$25,000. Eckel would not accept the General Superintendents’ decision and proceeded to stir up his lay supporters in Southern California—to the ire of general church leadership. Instead of the purchase of the Chiba property, the church approved that of two acres near the Oyamadai church for a Bible College.⁸³

The educational work began in earnest. The Bible College opened in 1951. Eckel served as president, with both Kitagawa and Isayama among the teachers. They devised a four-year curriculum. After a visit of General Superintendent Hugh C. Benner in 1959, the General Church decided after all to take over the Chiba school, which now occupied only seventeen acres and included both a high school and a junior college. The deci-

sion to take over the school was the culmination, at least partly, of the long-held vision of Eckel and others to establish a liberal arts institution, the type which had so effectively served the Church of the Nazarene in the United States, on a mission field. The junior college was made up of English and Religion departments. The government appointed graduates of the English program to teach in public schools at the junior high level. Graduates of the Religion program were able to enter the Theological School. Leaders altered the curriculum of the Theological School, reducing it to three years but making the junior college Religion program prerequisite for entrance.⁸⁴

Harrison Davis, who taught at the Bible college before taking leadership at the junior college, ably articulated the ideals of both schools in 1960: "We feel that the preparation of Christian teachers as well as ministers is basic in the evangelization of cultured and education-conscious Japan."⁸⁵ Many who entered the college were not Christian. A Japanese teacher, Terry Yoda, desired to see graduates of the junior college "walk out of their own commencement with a diploma in one hand and a genuine Christian experience."⁸⁶

The Japanese church slowly reached toward its pre-war position of self-support and self-governance. Benner ordained twelve in 1959. Leaders also set a five-year program of self-support that year. By 1962 there were fifty-two organized churches, thirty-five of which were self-supporting. There were 3,469 members. However, not until 1964 did a Japanese again, for the first time since 1941, become district superintendent. The Assembly elected Aishin Kida, educated in the United States and a leader in the church since the 1930's, to this position. Perhaps there were a few who could remember the days before the war when the Japanese had established themselves through many years of trial as ingenious leaders and faithful laypersons taking responsibility not only for their own churches in Japan but for other areas of Asia as well.⁸⁷

The Christian churches in Japan recognized and respected the older Nazarene leaders in later years. Isayama continued to serve the Oyamadai church in Tokyo, the site of the denomination's headquarters in Japan, until retiring in 1957. He died in 1969. Kitagawa served as chairman of the Evangelical Fellowship of Japan, an organization of mostly holiness denominations initiated by the Nazarenes in 1951. This served as the focal point of Nazarene ecumenical relations after the denomination broke with the National Christian Council in 1954. Kitagawa's position in this led to his attendance at the World Evangelical Fellowship Conference

in Switzerland in 1953. On his return trip to Japan he toured Nazarene churches in the United States. Kitagawa replaced Eckel as chairman of the Board of Regents of the junior college and Theological School when the latter retired. He served as chairman of the New Century Crusade in Japan and also as both the representative from Japan and vice-chairman of the Fellowship of Asian Evangelicals, organized in 1965.⁸⁸

An era ended when Eckel retired in 1964. He had stayed on at the request of the foreign missions department for several years past retirement age. He had become what he had aspired to be as a young missionary, at one with the Japanese.⁸⁹

From the beginning Japan's leaders were unique in the annals of Nazarene history, and early leaders afforded Japan greater freedom than other fields to develop in its own way. The independency of Minnie Staples as well as the missionary-like standing of both Kitagawa and Isayama at several junctures led the General Church to frustration. Eckel himself was not always in the good graces of General Church leaders, but generally he bonded himself closely to the Japanese while at the same time promoting cooperation with the General Church.

In the case of Japan it is meaningless to talk of the development of national leadership since by design as well as gifts Japanese leaders were from the beginning in the forefront. The policies, and conflicts, as well as the economic situation allowed for Japanese to have great measures of self-government. Though difficult to manage from Kansas City, the early years of close cooperation between national leaders and missionaries was optimal for the establishment of a self-directing church. The foundations were solidly laid by personal relationships. The war, however, destroyed the continuity of progress. Probably the Japanese remembered more than the administrators in Kansas City the progress and promises of the 1930s. Out of necessity as well as planning the Nazarene work in Japan reverted to the status of a mission field in the late 1940's, but the longing for independence remained within the Japanese.

END NOTES

¹Roy Swim, *A History of Nazarene Missions* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1936), 113. For other studies to which the present one might be compared see William L. Sachs, "'Self-Support': The Episcopal Mission and Nationalism in Japan," *Church History* 58 (December 1989): 489-501; Floyd Cunningham, "Mission Policy and National Leadership in

the Church of the Nazarene in India, 1898-1960,” *Indian Church History Review* 25 (June 1991), 17-48, and “The Early History of the Church of the Nazarene in the Philippines,” *Philippine Studies* 40 (First Quarter 1993), 51-76.

²J. A. Chenault to H. F. Reynolds, August 3, 1911 and September 6, 1911; Chenault, “Annual Report” [1912]; Cora Snider, “Annual Report” [1912], G.B.F.M., Nazarene Archives; W. A. Eckel, *When the Pendulum Swings* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1957), 74-75 (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Eckel, *Pendulum*); J. Fred Parker, *Mission to the World: A History of Missions in the Church of the Nazarene through 1985* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1988), 290. (Hereinafter, G.B.F.M. represents *Minutes of the Department of Foreign Missions, General Board, Church of the Nazarene.*)

³Bresee to Snider, January 1, 1913, Bresee papers, Nazarene Archives.

⁴Snider, “Annual Report,” August 19, 1913, G.B.F.M. See Bresee, letter of commission, March 13, 1912; Bresee to Chenault, March 23, 1912; Bresee to Cora Snider, December 4, 1912; Snider to Bresee, April 20, 1913, Bresee papers; James P. Knott, *History of Pasadena College* (Pasadena, CA: Pasadena College, 1960), 18, 20.

⁵Bresee to Snider, January 1 and January 21, 1913; Snider to Bresee, August 28, 1913 and September 16, 1913; M[aria] E. Bresee to Snider, December 14, 1913. Previous to going to America, Nagamatsu had graduated from the government university at Kumamoto. See Reynolds, *World-Wide*, 58. On the long-range effects of the children’s work, see Eckel, *Pendulum*, 76; and Ross Kida, *The Many Faces of Japan* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1964), 49. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Kida, *Faces.*)

⁶Snider to Bresee May 23, 1913, August 13, 1913, February 3, 1914; Bresee to Snider, December 30, 1913, Bresee papers.

⁷Reynolds, *World-Wide*, 63.

⁸Reynolds, China, to members of the General Missionary Board, February 17, 1914, G.B.F.M.

⁹*Ibid.*; Reynolds, “Supplement,” February 25, 1914, G.B.F.M., Reynolds, *World-Wide*, 20-64.

¹⁰“The Policy of the General Missionary Board of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, to govern the work in Japan,” (Fukuchiyaama, Japan, January 17, 1914), (Files 305-14 and 241-47), G.B.F.M.

¹¹Reynolds, "The Annual Report of 1914 to the General Missionary Board of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene," G.B.F.M. On the social ministries of Christians see, e.g., Richard H. Drummond, *A History of Christianity in Japan* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1971), 220-241.

¹²W. C. Wilson, President, District Missionary Board, to General Missionary Board, September 8, 1913; "Missionary's Application: Minnie L. Staples," and "Missionary's Application: Isaac B. Staples," both received November 20, 1914, G.B.F.M. Four daughters from the previous marriage were college-age or beyond, so remained in America. See also Amy N. Hinshaw, *Messengers of the Cross in Palestine, Japan and Other Islands* (Kansas City: Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, Church of the Nazarene, n.d.), 45-48, 53-58; and Basil W. Miller, *Twenty-Two Missionary Stories from Japan* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1949), 99-104, which is a positive reflection on her ministry in Japan. Miller says she never attended school. His account is based on an interview with her second husband, C. P. Frazier. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Miller, *Twenty-Two*.)

¹³"Missionary Application: Hiroshi Kitagawa," August 8, 1914; Hiroshi Kitagawa to General Missionary Board, August 30, 1916, G.B.F.M.; Hiroshi Kitagawa, *The Guiding Hand*, trans. Jun Ooka, paper presented to History of Nazarene Missions class, Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary, Manila, Philippines, March 1987, 11-17; Catherine P. Eckel, *Kitagawa of Japan* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1966), 11-28 (hereinafter, this work will be cited as Eckel, *Kitagawa*); Amy N. Hinshaw, *Messengers [in] . . . Japan*, 53-58; Amy N. Hinshaw, *Native Torch Bearers*, 62-67. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Hinshaw, *Torch*.) The "white-collar" prominence here in the Kumamoto church, as in Fukuchiyama, was characteristic of the Japanese response to Christianity in this era. See Tetsunao Yamamori, *Church Growth in Japan: A Study in the Development of Eight Denominations, 1859-1939* (South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1974), 101-104. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Yamamori, *Church Growth*.)

¹⁴Staples to Gay, April 25, 1916, G.B.F.M.

¹⁵Kitigawa, "From Southern Japan," *Other Sheep* 3 (September, 1915), 5; Kitagawa, "Farewell Meeting for Mrs. Staples" [1916] (File 402-3); Reynolds to E. J. Fleming, April 1, 1925, G.B.F.M.

¹⁶Juliatte Tyner and Catherine Eckel, *God's Samurai: The Life and Work of Dr. William A. Eckel* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1979), 18-20. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Tyner and Eckel, *Samurai*.)

¹⁷Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness: The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962), 275-281. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Smith, *Called*.) Later Rees helped to form the Pilgrim Holiness denomination. See also Paul Rees, *The Warrior-Saint* (Indianapolis: Pilgrim Book Room, 1934), 86-92. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Rees, *Warrior*.)

¹⁸Staples to Anderson, January 29, 1917; April 2, 1917, April 17, 1917, May 6, 1917; Anderson to Staples, April 23, 1917; Reynolds to Staples, April 16, 1917. Staples asked Gay, rather than Reynolds, for permission to return to America for her operation. Staples to Gay, October 16, 1916, Staples papers. Later Staples transferred her membership to the Los Angeles First Church, where the Eckels also were members. See "Annual Field Report: Kumamoto," 1922. For Gay's continuing financial support for Staples, Kitagawa and their work see Kitagawa to "Father and Mother and Sister Clemie Gay," January 9, 1925, G.B.F.M.

¹⁹Eckel, *Pendulum*, 79-80; Nobumi Isayama, *Consider Nippon: Incidents From My Life* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1957), 17-23. (Hereinafter, the latter work will be cited as Isayama, *Consider*.)

²⁰Eckel, *Pendulum*, 82; Tyner and Eckel, *Samurai*, 33.

²¹Isayama in the early years was paid by the Missionary Board of the Southern California District, and later was paid by the General Missionary Board at a salary about equal to those of Nagamatsu and Kitagawa. He was not included on the district council at this time because he was not yet ordained. Kitagawa received \$25 monthly. The Staples, by comparison, each received \$35 monthly. But Kitagawa also received a supplement to his salary from Leslie Gay, and the wives of Nagamatsu, Kitagawa, and Isayama were each paid additional amounts through the support of both local Nazarene churches in the United States and the General Missionary Board. In addition, the Japanese workers received compensation from the local churches they pastored. Note that both Nagamatsu and Kitagawa had their memberships in the University Church at Pasadena until it was disbanded. Like Staples, Kitagawa then transferred to Kansas City First

Church. See Eckel to Reynolds, June 13, 1917; Cora Santee (Kyoto) to Reynolds, May 3, 1918, and various station reports, G.B.F.M.

²²Reynolds to Kitagawa, January 17, 1918; Reynolds to Staples, January 24, 1918; Anderson to Eckel, May 14, 1918, G.B.F.M.

²³“Proceedings of the Second Annual District Assembly,” July, 1918; Nagamatsu to [Anderson], August 28, 1918; Reynolds to Eckel, March 20, 1917; Eckel to Reynolds, August 30, 1918; Reynolds to Staples, October 12, 1918. See Eckel to Anderson, September 28, 1918, G.B.F.M., for long criticisms of both Lulu Williams and Minnie Staples. Yet Eckel gives a positive evaluation of Williams in *Pendulum*, 80-81.

²⁴Eckel to Anderson, January 31, 1919; Eckel to Wagner, January 31, 1919; General Board, untitled, unsigned typescript [1919] (File 262-47); *Herald of Holiness* (June 25, 1919); Reynolds, “To whom it may concern,” April 7, 1919, concerning Santee, and May 6, 1919, concerning the Wagners.

²⁵Nagamatsu to Anderson, February 3, 1919; “Annual Meetings of the Japan District,” (n.d.); “Annual Meeting of the missionaries and invited workers of the Missionary District of Japan,” (n.d.), G.B.F.M.

²⁶Nagamatsu to Anderson, July 5, 1919; G.B.F.M.; Tyner and Eckel, *Samurai*, 42; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 47. Note that V. G. Santin, a Mexican, was named District Superintendent in his country in 1919—the first national so delegated. This was due to the political situation in Mexico, which prevented missionaries. See Smith, *Called*, 344; Parker, *Mission*, 403.

²⁷Nagamatsu to Anderson, July 17, 1923, G.B.F.M.

²⁸*Ibid.*; Anderson to Nagamatsu, August 15, 1923, G.B.F.M.

²⁹J. B. Staples to Anderson, February 13, 1923, April 4, 1923, and July, 1923; Minnie Staples to Anderson and Reynolds, August 14, 1923, G.B.F.M.

³⁰Nagamatsu to Anderson, August 13, 1923, G.B.F.M. The work in Fukuchiyama eventually closed. After the Second World War the people in the city invited Nagamatsu to return there in order to reorganize the church. But it was not to be. See Kida, *Faces*, 49.

³¹Eckel, *Pendulum*, 99; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 47.

³²Bates to Board of General Superintendents, July 28, 1925; Bates to Department of Foreign Missions, [1925] (File 453-4), G.B.F.M.

³³Reynolds to Fleming, April 1, 1925 (File 453-11); "Report of Staples Committee," Reynolds to Fleming, April 1, 1925; Staples, "Hon-machi Nazarene Church and Bible School, Kyoto, Japan," August 11, 1933, G.B.F.M. The first point had to do with a North Dakota land scheme with which Anderson was involved. Some accused Anderson of not taking careful enough watch over the funds previously sent to Nagamatsu. Anderson resigned as church treasurer in 1925 and as Foreign Missions Secretary in 1926. Reynolds took over again in the latter capacity in order to restore confidence to the missions program, serving until 1928. See "Outline of Investigation" (unsigned, n.d.); Anderson to Board of General Superintendents, February 19, 1925, (File 239-21), G.B.F.M.; *Herald of Holiness* (February 10, 1926); Smith, *Called*, 339.

³⁴Staples to Anderson, April 2, 1923; Gay to Staples, December 7, 1925.

³⁵Staples to General Board, July 28, 1925; Anderson to Eckel, December 18, 1925; Reynolds to E. J. Fleming, April 1, 1925, which includes a quotation from a letter from Kitagawa to Bates, mention of Anderson's favorable stand toward Staples, and the report that Gay would take care of her fare (File 646-9). See also Kitagawa to Anderson, April 23, 1925; Kitagawa to members of the Mission Board, September 1, 1925; Anderson to Kitagawa, October 6, 1925; Kitagawa to Gay, November 16, 1925; and Kitagawa to Staples, November 14, 1925, G.B.F.M., showing his partisanship against Eckel and Bates.

³⁶Eckel to Morrison, December 9, 1930, G.B.F.M.

³⁷Anderson to Eckel, October 7, 1925, November 17, 1925, and December 18, 1925; Eckel to Bates, November 14, 1925; Eckel to Anderson, December 22, 1925; District Advisory Board of the Japan Church of the Nazarene, "Resolution," January 2, 1926; Eckel to Reynolds, January 27, 1926, March 31, 1926, and November 2, 1926; Reynolds to Howard Eckel, February 27, 1926; Bates to General Superintendents, November 14, 1925; Morrison to Eckel, August 1, 1928; Morrison "Minutes, 1931," Department of Foreign Missions, 14-16, G.B.F.M.; E. J. Fleming and M. A. Wilson, eds., *Journal of the Seventh General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1928), 174; cf. Tyner and Eckel, *Samurai*, 49-50.

³⁸Kitagawa to Reynolds, May 25, 1925; Kitagawa to Anderson, June 29, 1925, G.B.F.M.

³⁹J. B. and Minnie Staples, "The Japan Letter," March 1926; Kitagawa to Reynolds, April, 1926, G.B.F.M.; *The Other Sheep* (May 1926); Minnie Staples, "Brother and Sister Staples Return from Japan," *ibid.* 25 (February 1938), 12.

⁴⁰Kitagawa to Anderson, September 30 and November 17, 1925; Emma Word to Eckel, April 13, 1928; Morrison, "Minutes, 1931, Department of Foreign Missions," 14 (File 451-35), G.B.F.M.; *Journal of the Seventh General Assembly*, 179-180; *Proceedings of the General Board of the Church of the Nazarene, Special Sessions* (Kansas City: General Board of the Church of the Nazarene, [1929]), 11.

⁴¹Kitagawa to Anderson [received January 5, 1926]; Reynolds to Kitagawa, January 11 and July 27, 1926; Kitagawa to Reynolds, July 6, 1926, G.B.F.M.; *Journal of the Seventh General Assembly*, 4, 37, 89.

⁴²Basil Miller, *Twenty-Two*, 102; Frank B. Smith, "The Dual System in Nazarene Missionary Activity on Japan District: Unparalleled, Unbelievable, True" (Pamphlet, n.p., n.d.), 8 (File 452-4); Frank B. Smith, notarized statement, November 12, 1934 (File 646-18) G.B.F.M.

⁴³Basil Miller, *Twenty-Two*, 59-64.

⁴⁴Kitagawa, *The Guiding Hand*, 35, 37.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 28, 37; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 35; Eckel to Morrison, December 9, 1930 and January 31, 1931; Rees, *Warrior*, 105; on Nakada and the phenomenal growth and then division of the Holiness Church see Yamamori, *Church Growth*, 116-120, 128-133. Some of the reasons Yamamori lists for the Holiness Church's growth from 1924 to 1932 would also characterize the Church of the Nazarene in Japan, especially the emphasis on both immediate conversion and revivals.

⁴⁶"Preliminary Draft of Policy for Proposed Japan Branch of Pasadena College, Osaka, Japan," October 6, 1930 (File 452-4); Eckel to Morrison, April 10, 1931; Morrison to Eckel, April 22, 1931, G.B.F.M.; "Vita of Takeshi Ban," [1941] (File 282-46). Ban, a Japanese lecturer in religion and oriental history at Pasadena College from 1933 and a member of the Pasadena Nazarene Church, was the prospective president of the school mentioned in the late 1930's.

⁴⁷Joseph Glenn Gould, *Missionary Pioneers and Our Debt to Them* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, [1935]), 71.

⁴⁸Eckel to Morrison, June 22, 1933; "Annual Report of the General Stewardship Committee to the General Board," January 1931, G.B.F.M.

The proposed expenditures amounted to \$5,512 for Japan as compared to \$33,067 for India and \$24,236 for China for 1931-32.

⁴⁹Staples to General Superintendents and General Board of Foreign Missions, July 5, 1934 and July 10, 1934; notarized statement of Frank B. Smith regarding Kitagawa and Mrs. Staples, July 12, 1934 (File 646-18); Kitagawa to General Board of Foreign Missions, December 6, 1934; Morrison to Department of Foreign Missions members, April 9, 1935 (and, generally, File 453-54); Frank B. Smith, "The Dual System," *passim*; Kitagawa, "Explanatory Statement" [1935], G.B.F.M.

⁵⁰Morrison to Isayama, January 15, 1935; Isayama to Morrison, June 27, 1935; Eckel to Morrison, August 2, 1935; Morrison to Eckel, August 28, 1935, G.B.F.M.

⁵¹Morrison to Isayama, August 2, 1935, G.B.F.M.

⁵²Shiro Kitagawa and Takichi Funagoshi, "Notification from Headquarters," October 15, 1935; Isayama to Morrison, November 12, 1935; Chapman to General Superintendents, the Department of Foreign Missions and the General Board, December 31, 1935 (File 453-6), G.B.F.M.

⁵³Morrison to Isayama, January 17, 1936; Morrison to Shiro Kitagawa, January 13, 1936; R. V. DeLong and Mendell Taylor, *Fifty Years of Nazarene Missions*, vol. 2, *History of the Fields* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1955), 60; Parker, *Mission*, 294; Isayama, *Consider*, 67; Eckel, *Pendulum*, 90.

⁵⁴Kitagawa to C. Warren Jones, October 15, 1935; "Brother and Sister Staples Return from Japan," *The Other Sheep* 25 (February 1938), 12.

⁵⁵Eckel to Word, August 6, 1935; Kitagawa to Word, May 3, 1940, G.B.F.M.; Miller, *Twenty-Two*, 100-101; Susan Fitkin and Emma B. Word, *Nazarene Missions in the Orient* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, n.d.), 30, 39-40, 46; Swim, *History*, 117.

⁵⁶Eckel to Jones, August 4, 1937; November 22, 1937; March 22, 1938; and, November 17, 1938, G.B.F.M.; Eckel, "The Other Sheep in Japan," *The Other Sheep* 24 (March 1937), 9; Eckel, "One of Our Nazarene Sunday Schools in Korea," *ibid.* 27 (September 1939), 15.

⁵⁷John Toland, *The Rising Sun: The Decline and Fall of the Japanese Empire* (New York: Bantam, 1971), 507-519.

⁵⁸Kitagawa to Jones, December 6, 1938 and June 6, 1939; Kitagawa, "Trip to China" (5 pp.), June 9, 1939, G.B.F.M.; Kitagawa, "Japanese

Ministers Visit China,” *The Other Sheep* 27 (August 1939), 13, and, continued (September 1939), 12; Geoffrey W. Royall, “Walking in the Shadows: Japanese Nazarenes,” *The Other Sheep* 29 (June 1942), 19.

⁵⁹Kitagawa to Jones, October 25, 1939, G.B.F.M.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*; see Susan Fitkin, *Holiness and Missions* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1940), 25-26; Kida, *Faces*, 72-73.

⁶¹Kitagawa to Jones, December 6, 1938 and August 15, 1939; Kitagawa to General Board of Foreign Missions, December 6, 1938; Eckel to Jones, September 10, 1939; Jones to Kitagawa, September 27, 1939, G.B.F.M.

⁶²Eckel to Jones, March 22, 1938, G.B.F.M.

⁶³Eckel to Jones, September 10, 1939, G.B.F.M.

⁶⁴Eckel to Jones, November 17, 1938, G.B.F.M.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*; Eckel to “Our Homeland Friends,” April 26, 1939, G.B.F.M.

⁶⁶Eckel to Jones, December 5, 1939; see Eckel to Jones, March 21, 1938; and the long letter of Eckel to Jones, March 11, 1939, G.B.F.M.

⁶⁷Eckel thought that this was a question the church’s Department of Foreign Missions should answer. Eckel to Jones, March 11, 1939, G.B.F.M. I have found no reply to Eckel’s questions. But note one Nazarene young man’s refusal to do so under pressure a few years before: Alice Spangenberg, *Oriental Pilgrim: Story of Shiro Kano* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1948), 41-43. (Hereinafter, this work will be cited as Spangenberg, *Oriental*.)

⁶⁸Persecution came to members of the Holiness church, for instance, over the claims of the state as versus Christ. See Charles W. Iglehart, *A Century of Protestant Christianity in Japan* (Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle, 1959), 255-256.

⁶⁹Pearl Wiley to Jones, February 10, 1940, G.B.F.M.

⁷⁰Jones to Kitagawa, January 11, and April 8, 1940; Kitagawa to Jones, February 5, February 15, April 2, and June 25, 1940; Jones, telegram to Kitagawa [March 1940], G.B.F.M.

⁷¹Jones to Kitagawa, July 3, 1940; Kitagawa to Jones, August 22, 1940; Kitagawa to Nazarene friends, September 5, 1940, G.B.F.M.

⁷²Isayama to Jones, October 10, 1940, December 3, 1940, and July 7, 1941; Kitagawa to Jones, October 21, 1940, and September 17, 1941; Jones to Isayama, October 25, 1940, G.B.F.M.; William D. Eckel, *Japan*

Now (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1949), 94-96; Pearl Wiley, "Two Historic Assemblies," *The Other Sheep* (December, 1941), 9-10; Tei Ki-Sho, "A Letter from Korea," trans. R. A. Kida, *The Other Sheep* 29 (January 1942), 13-14. For the broader context of developments see Drummond, *A History of Christianity in Japan*, 257-265.

⁷³Jones to Isayama, February 5, 1941 and July 7, 1941, G.B.F.M.

⁷⁴Isayama to Jones, August 24, 1941, G.B.F.M.

⁷⁵The loyalty to Japan among leaders at this time of crisis is seen in Shiro Kano's desire during the war to return from studies in America to Japan in order to effectively minister there. See Spangenburg, *Oriental*, 169-208.

⁷⁶Tei Ki-sho, "A Letter from Korea," trans. R. A. Kida, *The Other Sheep* 29 (January 1942), 13-14. See Floyd Cunningham, "Early Japanese Missions in Asia," *World Mission* 20 (February 1994), 14-16, and (March 1994), 4-5.

⁷⁷Isayama, *Consider*, 69-71; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 60; Kida, *Faces*, 73.

⁷⁸Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 61, 63; Isayama, *Consider*, 71-72, 80-81; Joseph S. Pitts, "The Road to Tokyo," in Lauriston J. Du Bois, ed., *The Chaplains See World Missions* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1946), 21-25; William D. Eckel, *Japan*, 128. Mrs. Nagase continued to pastor the church in Hiroshima and was among those whom Benner ordained in 1959. Davis, "Silver Anniversary at Hiroshima," *The Other Sheep* 47 (February 1960), 4.

⁷⁹Isayama, *Consider*, 82-84; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 69-71; Pitts, "Road," 19; Pitts to Jones, September 20, 1945; J. B. Chapman to H. V. Miller, October 17, 1945 (File 772-3).

⁸⁰Kida, *Faces*, 79; W. D. Eckel, *Japan*, 109-112, 116-117. The Free Methodists stayed within the Christian Church of Japan until 1952. See *Japan Christian Yearbook*, 1957, ed. Kiyoshi Hirai (Tokyo: Christian Literature Society, [1957]), 177, 181-182; Japan "Council Minutes," March 29, 1954, G.B.F.M.

⁸¹Orval J. Nease, "Foreign Visitation, 1948," n.d.; Nease, "Closing Service in Tokyo," n.d., Board of General Superintendents, Nazarene Archives; Eckel, *Pendulum*, 121, 124; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 73.

⁸²Isayama, *Consider*, 89; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 76-79; cf. James M. Phillips, *From the Rising of the Sun: Christians and Society in Contemporary Japan* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1981), 60.

⁸³Eckel to Jones, March 11, 1947; Eckel to Powers, July 15, 1948; Eckel to Nease, June 2, 1949; Nease, "Foreign Visitation, 1948"; G. B. Williamson to Ruby Apple, July 29, 1949; Nease to Remiss Rehfeldt, October 8, 1949, October 20, 1949, and October 24, 1949, G.B.F.M. The total cost of the property was \$80,000, but airplane hangers located on the property could be sold. Nease disapproved of Eckel's attempt to gain support for this venture in Southern California, where Nease resided. He also opposed the return of Pearl Wiley, now Mrs. Hanson, to the field. He feared she would stir up the Eckel-Staples feud and align herself with the Kitagawa faction "just when things were looking up." Hanson returned anyway, without a commission from the church. See Nease to Rehfeldt, February 27, 1950, G.B.F.M.

⁸⁴Harrison Davis, "Educational Policy Recommendations," n.d., and Mildred Bangs Wynkoop, "Missionary Report," August 31, 1962 (both in File 412-5); Kida, *Faces*, 95-99; Parker, *Mission*, 301-302.

⁸⁵Harrison Davis and Doris Davis to "Dear Ones at Home," July 20, 1960, Davis papers, Nazarene Archives.

⁸⁶Terry Yoda, Christmas letter, 1961, G.B.F.M.

⁸⁷Eckel, "To the Fall Mission Council 1962 Meeting in Tokyo"; "Report of Local Churches April-December 1962," G.B.F.M.; Parker, *Mission*, 303; Donald Owens, *Sing Ye Islands: Nazarene Missions in the Pacific Islands* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1979), 27-29. Kida served until 1967. From 1966 to 1976 Kida was president of the theological seminary. When the General Church set new standards and procedures for achieving regular district status in the 1970's, Japan was among the first around the world to attain this distinction. Hiroshi Kitagawa's son Shin Kitagawa was District Superintendent at the time.

⁸⁸Eckel, "To the Fall Mission Council 1962 Meeting in Tokyo," Eckel, "Notice of Withdrawal," August 30, 1962, G.B.F.M.; Tyner and Eckel, *Samurai*, 73, 86, 97. There seemed to be some apprehension among the new missionaries that Eckel would even retire in Japan.

⁸⁹*The Japan Christian Yearbook*, 1957, 177, 181-182; Remiss Rehfeldt to Kitagawa, August 27, 1953, World Mission Division, Church of the Nazarene, microfilm number 92; *Other Sheep* 56 (May 1969), 23; Catherine Eckel, *Kitagawa*, 82-84. Kitagawa died in 1975 and Eckel in 1976. *Nazarene Biography Index* (Nampa, ID: Northwest Nazarene College, 1984), 33, 65.

REVIVALISM: IN SEARCH OF A DEFINITION

by

Russell E. Richey

Such a common and prominent feature of modern, western religiosity as revivalism would seem to require no definition. Everyone, surely, knows a revival when he/she sees one; knows what it is; and knows how to describe it. Yet, despite, perhaps even because of that familiarity, definitions do not come easily. Like Puritanism, the Enlightenment, utopianism, evangelicalism, reform, or liberalism, the very familiarity of the term “revivalism” invites a measure of confusion. The word is so ready for use that precision does not seem to be required. Students of the phenomenon can discuss it at some length before they discover themselves to have fundamentally different conceptions.

Three Ways to Definition

Scholarship has found ways of coping. Perhaps the most common and certainly the safest course—that taken by so many excellent discussions—is to offer more of a narrative portrayal than a definition.¹ In so doing the referent is depicted, described, indicated. This approach does not, however, lend itself to discrimination between what is and what is not a revival, to judgment about what constitutes revivalism, to determination of the temporal and geographical boundaries of the phenomenon. Or perhaps it would be better to say, it undertakes those definitional tasks primarily by limiting or extending the depiction. The definition is left for the viewer to extract from the picture.

At the other extreme from that full depiction, some scholars reach for the essential characteristics of the phenomenon, the two or three deter-

minants that all revivals share.² Much of the social history of awakenings, conversion, and piety attempts to isolate the few factors—typically extrinsic factors—that explain revival.³ Such screening can be immensely helpful as well. In principle, it should serve comparative purposes. Problems in this approach arise when the definition norms itself on the revivalism of a particular epoch, confession, or movement. For instance, Jonathan Edwards, the actors in the Methodist camp meetings, or Charles Grandison Finney easily become the measure of revival, certainly setting a standard that each would have approved, even demanded, and yet perhaps not the most even-handed approach.⁴ The other extreme, possible when the mesh on the screen is quite wide, is to find revivals or revivalism in virtually every apparently authentic religious expression. Finney himself fell prey to that temptation, affirming, “Almost all the religion in the world has been produced by revivals.”⁵

The present discussion takes an intermediate path. Instead of a full portrayal or a screen, we propose a constellation of ingredients as defining revivalism. The ingredients or factors appear in various combinations in revivals and revivalism. It is their combination, the constellation, that constitutes the definition. And while many revivals will exhibit the full range of these factors, the absence of one or two in a movement need not lead us automatically to refuse the label “revival.”⁶ It is the aggregation of these factors that yields the most adequate definition. This approach takes its departure from within generally recognized revivalist phenomena in 18th century and later American society, but goes on to ask in what sense the marks of these revivals can be understood in a more extended sense. This approach allows us to recognize revivalism or revivalistic patterns in 19th century abolition and temperance crusades and permits a scholar like Jay Dolan to speak of *Catholic Revivalism*.⁷ It also constrains us to recognize some boundaries to revivalism and to question its use outside essentially “modern” contexts, i.e., for pre-modern revitalization, religious excitements and conversion, and/or for efforts at proselytism in the modern epoch, but where “modern” conditions do not pertain. This point should become clearer as we proceed.

Ten Marks of the Beast

(1) Revivalism rests on Pietism. Pietist or pietist-like assumptions, beliefs, mores, and communal structures—the patterns of life and thought espoused by Spener and Francke, by the Jansenists, by the Hasidic Jews—give revivalism its shape and form. The association of revivalism

with Pietism is so close that one can appropriately ask whether revivalism has existed or can exist apart from Pietism. Certainly, we can argue that a pietist-like ethos seems vital. Particularly important are Pietism's insistence on experimental religion; on both consciousness and expression of the heart's commitments; on an obedient life and corporate discipline as appropriate expressions thereof; on the accessibility of the Biblical word and rule to the awakened lay spirit; on the importance of a witness communally shared through prayer, Bible-reading, hymns and preaching; on everyday life as a sacrament to be shaped and enlivened by a vibrant faith; and on doctrine or doctrines as the light by which all this activism stays on course.

It is this Pietist world-view that gives revivalism its character and dynamic. Were a one-factor definition to be required, Pietism would come closest to sufficing. In places, Pietism succeeded in shaping society and culture such that revivalism became almost a way of life.⁸ The transmission of this culture then became a communal and preeminently a family project, permitting and requiring vital roles on revivalism's behalf for women as well as men.⁹ Particularly in the 19th century, women involved themselves on behalf of revival—within families, nurturing the piety of spouse, children, servants; in congregations, through prayer groups and Sunday schools; and outward into community, nation and world through mission, benevolent and reform societies. Pietism lowered the gateway into ministry and raised the expectations of laity, thereby drawing women as well as men, blacks as well as whites into public witness, lay preaching, and eventually formal ministry. Pietism made revival always a communal endeavor.

(2) Revivalism requires a theology conducive to, or at least permissive of, aggressive proselytism. Historically, it has not had to be Arminian, though the Methodists vehemently insisted that it did, but it has had to countenance a preached word and personal witnessing that can reach beyond the lines of existing (Christian) community. The vigorous New Light or Edwardian Calvinism of the First Great Awakening served quite well. Revivalistic theology typically stipulates that the response to preaching produces an authentic faith and genuine Christian community. Theology associated with revivals may well recast itself to make revival and conversion the norms of Christian community and existence. Then the nature and task of theology are conceived in evangelistic terms. Not surprisingly, in the 19th century, when this did occur, the term most apt for this theology was "evangelical."¹⁰ That rubric served to identify a distinct camp within American Protestantism, one of three broad camps, and

thereby distinguished revivalistic versions of Protestantism from the more rigidly orthodox (the Princeton theology) and liberal (Unitarian).

With respect to revivalism, the term “evangelical” may now confuse matters more than it helps since 20th-century Evangelicalism derives as much from 19th-century orthodoxy as from revivalism and functions with a more confessional sense of purpose than its 19th-century counterpart.¹¹ Perhaps today “missional” or “missionary” would be a more apt adjective. What needs to be underscored, at any rate, is that revivalism requires a theology of action. It eschews theologies of inaction—like the hyper-Calvinism of such 18th-century figures as John Gill and John Brine or any extreme quietist, individualistic or rational positions. Revivalism needs and generates a theology of transformation.

(3) Revivalism works with a soteriology of crisis. It maps the religious pilgrimage so as to route all the faithful on Paul’s trip to Damascus.¹² A conversion or conversion-like experience is normative. Revivals ritualize this conception of the religious life. They so stage the religious message as to exhibit conversions as “the” faithful communal response. In that sense, they seek to produce conversions. Since Finney, ministers have self-consciously assumed control, even manipulative control, over these rituals; as revivalists they have presumed that they could produce revivals. From that same period, the revival ritual has been adapted to various causes for which a conversion seemed requisite. “Evangelists” staged revivals for abolition, temperance, the social gospel, peace, civil rights, abortion. The methodology worked marvelously with any cause that required converts. Revivalism’s soteriology of crisis proves useful to some who disdain revivalism’s claims.

(4) Revivalism, it is commonly said, assumes a declension. It would be perhaps more accurate to say that revivalism assumes a worldview in which declension is premised—nature is pitted against grace, “worldly” souls must be wrenched from perdition to salvation, that passage opening the way into the church. The existence of worldliness and its hold on individuals is conceived as a fall from a purer form of the church, the present “declension” points ahead to a renewal by appealing for the purer past as a reachable standard, and that jeremiadic gospel of fall and hope is preached. Within such an understanding, conversions and revivals define the community, distinguish the community of the faithful from the world. Those lines do not hold and really, for the revivalist, cannot, must not hold. Were they to do so, were the community to remain faithful, there would be no more revival or at best revival only for those outside. But

declension marks the world's intrusion into that community, indicates that the boundaries have been violated, and requires the church to once again define its contours. So revival is again called for. Without conversions and revival the church is not fully the church. And without a declension, revival is both conceptually and programmatically impossible. Declension serves then as a form of social analysis, a way of reading history, a scheme for identifying the work of Satan, a means of diagnosing the signs of God's hand in human affairs.¹³ The preaching of declension and the preaching of revival are the alternating currents of revivalistic culture.

(5) Revival is also impossible without crowds. That may seem a trivial or incidental concomitant of the matter. It really is not. Without provision for gatherings, perhaps frequent or protracted meetings of some kind, revivalism cannot occur. Here we can draw the line between a revitalization of religion ("revival" in some generic sense of the term) and modern revivalism. The former might occur through various agencies of social change and over an extended period; in that sense, Charlemagne's reforms produced a "revival" or revitalization. Revivalism proper, on the other hand, does not refer to change that happens piecemeal over time and that might be discernable only after the fact. It is an event, a visible happening, a species of crowd behavior. Revivalism happens. It happens to crowds. And crowds require a certain social density, a population to draw together.

This fact allows us to put in perspective the notion, popularized by William Warren Sweet, that revivalism was a frontier phenomenon.¹⁴ In fact, revivals, even in their 19th century form, were a well-developed "eastern" and even urban phenomenon before they moved west, as Terry Bilhartz has shown.¹⁵ The frontier as a place of sparse settlement¹⁶ should have been an unlikely spot for revival. Hence the importance of the camp meeting. It transformed wilderness into the city of God. For a short period it turned a region of sparse settlement into a dense congregation in the wood. Thereby it made revival possible, it made crowds possible under frontier conditions where otherwise neither crowds nor revival would ordinarily occur. And as revival produced the camp meeting so as to shape space to its own ends and achieve the necessary crowds, so also revival affected discourse so as to hold the crowds that had gathered. Revivalistic preaching emerged as popular discourse, preaching pitched to be heard under crowd conditions, rhetoric that would move the people, proselytizing utterance that focused attention on Pietistic belief and the expectation of conversion. The revival would be known by its "crowd" preaching.¹⁷

(6) Voluntarism functions as an extrinsic factor for revivalism. Revivalism flourishes when it has legal and social permission to exist, where crowds can gather, when proselytism is not forbidden, where clerical activism is sanctioned. Voluntarism provides these conditions. It also, of course, underlies the complex structure of denominational, parachurch, media and informal networks that define the voluntary religious sector. The prevalent western way of structuring the social order, voluntarism has developed under religious toleration, constitutional democracy and respect for human rights. Whether revivalism can exist outside such a “modern” ethos is difficult to determine. At any rate, we can say that revivalism presumes voluntarism—the right of individuals to “will” or choose what to believe, the right of individuals who will to believe and follow a given faith to congregate for those purposes, and the right for those who so congregate to offer that gift to others. Revival is actually a particularly aggressive form of voluntarism.

(7) A revival has liturgical form. This point was most forcefully made in the 19th century by the Mercersburg theologians, John Nevin and Philip Schaff. Nevin’s portrayal of *The Anxious Bench* and the sect system rendered revivalism’s liturgical form in pejorative terms.¹⁸ In less judgmental terms, his depiction still serves well. He grasped the important point that revivalism has liturgical shape and that it readily displaces other ways of being the church. From his angle, catechesis and the anxious bench vied for the loyalty of the German Reformed people. He insisted that the revival be recognized as a liturgical form. That form, of course, is not unitary, differs by region and movement, and has evolved over time. Edwards and Whitefield would doubtless have been shocked by 19th century camp meetings; Cartwright and Finney would doubtless be as shocked by today’s television revivalism.

Liturgical forms evolve, differ. However, the variety and evolution of revival, the revivalists’ attempts at being non-liturgical, and their self-conscious repudiation of liturgy should not confuse us. Revivals are revivals and are recognizable as revivals because they have definite ritual form. A revival dramatizes the path to salvation (as the staggers understand it). Revivalism might be seen as a belief in, an insistence on, and the provision for that liturgical form. Revivalism requires effective rituals, program and space with which to give dramatic expression to itself. Today’s televangelists are probably wrongly criticized for being theatrical. Theater belongs to the phenomenon. The more critical questions concern the gospel being dramatized, its fidelity to Scripture and creed, the appropriateness of the action to that gospel, the character and quality of Christian

life which the revival opens, the stewardship of the movement in question, and so forth.

(8) Revivals require charisma. Specifically, they depend upon charismatic leadership. It is the leader, the revivalist, around whom the drama of a revival unfolds. So critical have been the revivalists to the phenomenon that we tend to conflate the two, revivalist and revival. Certainly, since Whitefield that conflation has been easy. The man seemed to be the event. Revivals gave expression to the personality and person of the revivalist. The ministries associated with Bakker and Swaggart wrestled with issues having, in part, to do with the identification, the virtual equation of person and ministry. Those issues are not new. James Davenport posed such problems for the First Great Awakening. Subsequent revivals have been haunted by the indiscretions of one or more actors. In that regard, the genius of the camp meeting might again be noted. The camp meeting made it possible to orchestrate revivals and draw on charisma without producing a “one-person” play. Camp meetings were revival with many actors.¹⁹

(9) Implicit in virtually all the above points is an assumption or belief essential to revivalism. Those caught up in a revival believe it to be the work of the Spirit of God.²⁰ No one has quite equalled Jonathan Edwards’ exacting analysis of the Spirit’s working.²¹ Most would settle for less elegant ways of advancing the claim:

Affections that are truly spiritual and gracious, do arise from those influences and operations on the heart, which are spiritual, supernatural and divine.²²

The historian may or may not wish to honor this belief in his/her analysis. Today sophisticated commentary brackets out pneumatological claims. It is essential, however, to recognize that the actors in revivals believed the Spirit to be at work.

(10) Revivalism requires a communication network, a means by which the Spirit’s working becomes known, a way by which a specific episode or series of episodes of conversions are claimed by the larger community. In the 18th century, that network consisted of traveler’s reports, letters between sections of the country and across the Atlantic, word of mouth, newspaper reports, concerts of prayer, and, most important, the itinerating figure of George Whitefield. Eventually papers and journals appeared which were dedicated to the spread of “religious intelligence.” Revival created channels of communication; revival established new channels as society and technology required; and, of course, revival now employs satellites to beam television signals.

Revivals and Awakenings

This last point provides a useful way of distinguishing revivals and awakenings. When the network stimulates revivals, when revival one place helps trigger revival elsewhere, when revival becomes contagious and is communicated to the general society, when revival sustains itself over a prolonged period of time, revival becomes Awakening. At least, that might be one way of distinguishing the two and defining an awakening. Definitions of awakenings are every bit as slippery as definitions of revivalism. Claims of a “Great Awakening” depend, we should add, upon this particular factor—namely a communication network, a revival seismograph, that registers quakes of “awakening” magnitude. An awakening is, then, a social construction. So also is a revival.²³ They differ, according to this reading, primarily in scale. At any rate, that social construction we call “revival” takes institutional expression in a communication network.

Definition?

These factors typify revivalism: an underlying pietism, a missional theology, a soteriology of crisis, a jeremiadic understanding of “these days,” crowds, voluntarism, dramatic ritual form, charismatic leadership, confidence in the Spirit’s presence, and a communication network. By this constellation, we can define revivals and revivalism. These elements help us to recognize the phenomenon and to distinguish it from other religious forms and other modalities of societal change. But, to reiterate the point made earlier, they do not constitute a screen. The presence or absence of an element cannot be determinative in the identification of a movement as revival. Rather, the constellation highlights factors that occur in complex interaction in revivalism.

This is, obviously, not a history of religious definition of revivalism, but one that effectively limits its applicability. One might imagine situations in which the definition might be useful for movements in Judaism or Islam, but in general it will work best in modern, western Protestantism.

NOTES

¹See, for instance, the excellent essay by my colleague Stuart C. Henry titled “Revivalism.” It appears in the the *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience*, eds., Charles H. Lippy and Peter W. Williams,

3 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1988), II: 799-812. Also Bernard A. Weisberger, *They Gathered at the River* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1958); Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1965); William G. McLoughlin, *The American Evangelicals, 1800-1900. An Anthology* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968) and William G. McLoughlin, *Modern Revivalism* (New York: Ronald Press, 1959).

²David W. Bebbington in an unpublished essay, "Revival and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England," and in his *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989) provides a sophisticated version of this approach. Bebbington proposes four defining characteristics: conversionism, crucicentrism, biblicism and activism. A superb illustration of this approach, albeit to a different religious impulse, can be found in Henry F. May's *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976). He proposes "that the Enlightenment consists of all those who believe two propositions: first, that the present age is more enlightened than the past; and second, that we understand nature and man best through the use of our natural faculties" (xiv).

³Stephen R. Grossbart provides an insightful tour through and testing of such hypotheses in "Seeking the Divine Favor: Conversion and Church Admissions in Eastern Connecticut, 1711-1832," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 46 (Oct. 1989), 696-740. He questions the demographic, familial and economic factors lately used to explain revivals.

⁴Both the value and the limitations of this approach are well exhibited in Finney's first lecture, "What a Revival of Religion Is," *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, ed. William G. McLoughlin (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960). Finney's Arminian definition severely limits the applicability of his insights, essentially to the movement of which he was a part. See the second paragraph, which is calculated to warm Calvinist hearts: "*Religion is the work of man. It is something for man to do*" (9).

⁵*Ibid.*, 9.

⁶A much respected example of this approach can be found in Sidney E. Mead's analysis of "Denominationalism" in *The Lively Experiment* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963)—six formative elements characteristic of the phenomenon. Randall Balmer's "Eschewing the 'Routine of Religion': Eighteenth-Century Pietism and the Revival Tradition in America," also utilizes this approach.

⁷Jay P. Dolan, *Catholic Revivalism. The American Experience, 1830-1900* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978).

⁸See on this point, Philip J. Greven, Jr., *The Protestant Temperament: Patterns of Child-Rearing, Religious Experience, and the Self In Early America* (New York: Knopf, 1977).

⁹Representative of a growing body of literature investigating familial and female roles in revivalism is Mary P. Ryan's *Cradle of the Middle Class. The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

¹⁰For discussion of evangelicalism and the literature thereon, see Leonard I. Sweet, ed., *The Evangelical Tradition in America* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984) and especially the editor's essay.

¹¹See my colleague George M. Marsden's *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

¹²This represents a constriction of more traditional Protestant (or Catholic) morphologies of religious experience. On this point, see Charles Lloyd Cohen, *God's Caress. The Psychology of Puritan Religious Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

¹³For discussion of declension and its analytical meanings, see Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978) and Robert G. Pope, *The Half-Way Covenant* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

¹⁴See his *Religion in the Development of American Culture, 1765-1840* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), *The Story of Religion in America*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Harper, 1950) and *Revivalism in America* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945).

¹⁵*Urban Religion and the Second Great Awakening: Church and Society in Early National Baltimore* (Rutherford, N. J.: FDU Press, 1986).

¹⁶This is one of the several meanings which Frederick Jackson Turner gave to the term.

¹⁷For the religious, political and societal import of this new form of rhetoric, see Harry S. Stout, *The New England Soul. Preaching and Religious Culture in Colonial New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) and Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

¹⁸*The Anxious Bench* (Chambersburg, 1843).

¹⁹It should be obvious that revivals demand a certain set of charismatic gifts and that other religious movements require other charismatic gifts. Charismatic leadership can take many forms and function in many contexts.

²⁰Finney insisted: “Ordinarily, there are three agents employed in the work of conversion, and one instrument. The agents are God,—some person who brings the truth to bear on the mind,—and the sinner himself. The instrument is the truth. . . .”

“The agency of God is two-fold; by His Providence and by His Spirit” (17).

²¹*Affections. The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed., John E Smith, vol. II (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959).

²²*Ibid.*, 197. This is Edwards’ statement of the first of twelve signs that affections are truly religious and spiritual.

²³For an effort to define these two in relation to one another using Anthony F. C. Wallace’s revitalization theory, see William G. McLoughlin, *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).

THE MINISTRY OF MARY LEE CAGLE: A STUDY IN WOMEN'S HISTORY AND RELIGION

by

Stan Ingersol

Women's history programs were established firmly in American universities in the 1980s, marking their evolution from an incipient movement of reformist scholarship to a part of the academic mainstream. Today there are scholarly journals devoted solely to publishing the findings of women's history research. General publishers have joined university presses in marketing primary and secondary women's history sources.

The climate for studying women's history is vastly changed from the situation prevailing in the late 1960s when historian Gerda Lerner's professors at Columbia University urged her not to jeopardize a promising career by specializing at the outset on women—a subject they considered *outré*.¹ As women's history moved into the mainstream of historical investigation, it found a niche in the expanding area of social history that includes the study of labor, ethnic Americans, and religious culture. History faculties now routinely include one or more specialists in women's history.

Intersecting the Holiness Tradition

The themes of women's history have found a natural rapport with many historians of the American holiness movement. These interests converge because the holiness movement was among the progressive forces on behalf of women in 19th-century religion, giving them public

leadership roles and skills, and extending to women in the emerging Wesleyan-holiness churches full laity and clergy rights earlier and more readily than was the case in the older denominations. This intersection of interest was present in the early work of Timothy Smith, whose *Revivalism and Social Reform* (1957) took special note of Phoebe Palmer's impact on mid-19th-century religion. Smith's *Called Unto Holiness* (1962) gave attention to Mary Lee Cagle (referred to primarily as Mary Lee Harris) and the expanding circle of female ministers associated with her in the New Testament Church of Christ, a holiness-restorationist body.

Subsequent histories of the holiness movement by Charles Edwin Jones (*Perfectionist Persuasion*, 1974) and Melvin Dieter (*The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 1980) portrayed Phoebe Palmer as the founder of the Wesleyan wing of the ante-bellum holiness movement and included numerous references to women's roles in the genesis and development of the holiness tradition. Both works set these influences within the context of a holiness movement that embodied strong democratizing tendencies. Donald Dayton's *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (1976) drew considerable data from the holiness movement, while being simultaneously shaped by contemporary feminism and other currents of social change. Dayton likewise dealt with Mrs. Palmer and assembled other data showing how Wesleyans, Free Methodists, and Nazarenes were ahead of the social curve in ordaining women and recognizing their pastoral authority.

The impact on holiness studies from this focus on women's history became clearer in the 1980s. Scholars of the holiness tradition found that the emerging popularity of women's studies now made aspects of their tradition marketable to a larger audience. Among the studies published in the decade was Nancy Hardesty's *Women Called to Witness: Evangelical Feminism in the 19th Century* (1984), a work detailing women's lives and contributions to the Oberlin and Wesleyan holiness traditions. Phoebe Palmer is highlighted in Hardesty's work and in two full-scale biographies written by Harold Raser and Charles White. Equally important, a new edition of Palmer's writings appeared, edited by Thomas Oden and published by a Roman Catholic press in a series on "Sources of American Spirituality." While systematic theologians in the Wesleyan-holiness churches are dismissive of Palmer because of the problem of grace as posed by her "altar theology," Oden and the Paulist Press recognized that her primary value *as theologian* lies in that realm

that Roman Catholics call *spiritual theology*. Here she can be critically but positively appraised as a theological resource for a broader audience than the holiness tradition alone.² Alongside these, there appeared a number of doctoral dissertations in the 1980s that treat significant female holiness leaders, including Jennie Fowler Willing, Anna Howard Shaw, Frances Willard, Alma White, and Mary Lee Cagle.

The new focus on women in the holiness movement can be explained only in part by the market value of such research. History always moves forward by tapping previously unused sources and by asking new questions of familiar data, probing for new meanings from the past. Women's history raises new sets of questions that historians can bring to their investigations. Moreover, younger scholars in the Wesleyan tradition often are well attuned to the contemporary women's movement and may be on personal quests as they reach the point of scholarly research. Such agendas can be valid reasons for choosing research topics so long as biases do not distort the investigation and its report. Also, and most importantly, the data of the holiness movement and churches have relevance for research on a wide variety of subjects of general interest. For decades, historians have drawn data freely from Oberlin, Wesleyan Methodist, and Free Methodist sources to understand abolitionism. The same could be done (but generally is not) by those researching the modern missionary movement, fundamentalism, post-war evangelicalism, and other areas where Wesleyan-holiness churches participate in the general ethos of American Christianity. The study of women in the holiness movement helps to overcome the isolation of Wesleyan-holiness history from the broader history of Protestantism and the general society.

The intersection of women's history and the American holiness movement is full of promise in both directions. Women in the holiness tradition experienced the general struggle of women to be free from patriarchy, and their stories illuminate facets of that struggle and cast new light on the ways in which the oppression of women is being overcome. At the same time, both the struggles and the liberating experiences of women in the holiness movement can help illuminate the very soul of the religious tradition, not simply out of academic interests, but equally well for those who regard the tradition as valid.

The study of Mary Cagle's life, for instance, shows this dual character. It yields significant data on the place, role, and frustrations of the Southern woman. The story of her rise above oppression simultaneously illuminates certain dimensions of the question of what

kind of church the founders of the Church of the Nazarene intended it to be.

Mary Lee Cagle became a part of what historian Carl Degler describes as “the Other South.”³ In a book by that title, Degler wrote primarily about 19th century dissenters from Southern racial orthodoxy. “The Other South” can be understood more broadly, though, as that area of 19th century Southern mind and soul that was freed from the culture’s sterile social orthodoxies, of which racial orthodoxy was the cornerstone. Although Mary Cagle deviated somewhat from her region’s racial orthodoxy, she grounded her dissent elsewhere in the rejection of the South’s rigid orthodoxy about women’s place in the social order. Born in rural Alabama in 1864, she transcended the conservatism of her native region and church to embrace what she believed was a clear call to preach the Christian gospel. Mary Cagle’s choice of sectarian dissent became the logical means of resolving an intense inner conflict between her sense of divine call and Southern Methodism’s uncompromising attitude against women’s laity and clergy rights—a dilemma that can be understood as her particular embodiment of the universal conflict between conscience and obedience.

Conscience and Obedience

Mary Cagle’s maiden name was Mary Lee Wasson. Her parents farmed near Moulton, Alabama. Though she later had continuing contact with urban society, the agrarian way of life was the primary context of her childhood and, indeed, of her entire life. Her early sense of place was shaped especially by that ethos. Two other general ideas also shaped the boundaries of her life. The first was the doctrine of separate spheres—a social doctrine that permeated 19th century American life.

The concept of separate spheres assigned women a certain area of influence and men another. The domestic sphere assigned to women was an ambivalent heritage. Historian Nancy F. Cott argues that the separate sphere, as it developed in early America, was an advance over earlier forms of patriarchy in which males dominated all aspects of life, including the home. By contrast, the place of women had evolved so that 19th century women largely were able to enjoy a protected domestic sphere in which their authority over the home was accepted. The negative consequence was that women were not allowed to intrude upon the male sphere. Indeed, if they wanted to protect their own sphere and its degree of independence, the majority of American women believed that their

interest was vested in insuring that they and their sisters did not infringe upon the other sphere. Consequently, when American women became active in reform movements, such as temperance and suffrage, they did so by defining their involvement as an extension of domestic concerns, arguing in effect, as Carl Degler puts it, that “the world is just a large home.”⁴

A second idea restricted the world of the Southern woman. Standing Jeffersonian doctrine on its head, the ante-bellum South had poured considerable intellectual effort into an impassioned and reasoned defense of the idea of *human inequality* as a necessary component of its argument on behalf of African slavery. Upon this idea a new nation was proposed in 1861 and a bloody civil war was being fought at the very moment of Mary Cagle’s birth. The doctrine of inequality shaped the dominant attitude toward women just as it did toward African-Americans. In his studies of Southern evangelicalism, Donald Mathews found that the submission of children to parents and women to men was regarded as essential for maintaining the subjection of slaves to masters. Southern churchmen played conspicuous roles in developing hierarchical rationales and defending them on Biblical bases. Through instruction on the nature of social and family organization, churchmen reinforced the idea of human inequality, arguing that social good and the Almighty’s will were best carried out when each element in the hierarchy of being yielded due obedience to its superior authority. The period after Reconstruction saw new efforts made at codifying hierarchical modes of thought and behavior, symbolized by the wave of Jim Crow laws that spread in the 1890s. The inequality of race and gender was intertwined in Mary Cagle’s Southern society.⁵

It is ironic, then, that a church that defended social stability at the price of human inequality was also capable of breeding liberating spirits. And yet the genesis of Mary Cagle’s ministry lay in the rhythm of North Alabama revivalism, in which religion was part of the warp and woof of everyday life. Cagle’s parents were affiliated with different revivalistic churches. Her father was a Cumberland Presbyterian, while her mother was a Methodist. Her brother Frank was a seeker alongside her in the same Methodist revival in which she was converted at age fifteen. From the time she was a child, she had believed herself called to the “Lord’s work,” a broad term embracing everything a woman could do for God and the church, and in specific cases might include missionary service or marriage to a minister.

The conversion of Mary Wasson (Cagle) instilled a strong evangelistic impulse in her. She sought to awaken her classmates religiously and saw the entire class brought into the Christian faith over the course of the following year. Through this process, she became convinced that God was calling her to missionary work. Once this was announced, however, her mother reacted firmly against it. Mrs. Wasson used strong language, stating that she would rather see her daughter dead than have her be a foreign missionary. The girl's determination wavered in the face of this bitter opposition. Mary resumed a conventional line of religious development that in hindsight she would criticize as "backslidden" since, as she later wrote, "my outward life was consistent and I kept up the form of religion but without power."⁶

A pivotal event occurred in Mary Lee Wasson's spiritual development about five years later. She heard for the first time the doctrines of the holiness revival cast in the idiom of the holiness evangelist. The preacher was revivalist Robert Lee Harris, a member of the Texas Conference of the Free Methodist Church. Harris was a Mississippi native whose early years were spent in Alabama in the county adjacent to Mary Wasson's. His message was deeply tinged by the Free Methodist emphasis on externals, strongly denouncing jewelry and fashion. Mary Wasson found the message compelling nonetheless. She was "reclaimed" in this revival and made a lifelong commitment to the holiness movement and its understanding of the gospel. She also came to a new and radical conviction about the nature of her call to Lord's work. She now claimed that God had called her to preach, not as a foreign missionary but in her own country and to her own people.⁷

Mary Cagle subsequently published two personal call narratives, including this one:

With the restoration came the old-time call to preach; but God by His Holy Spirit revealed to me that my work was not across the waters, but here in my homeland. What a struggle I had. I pled with God to release me from the call. It seemed it would have been so easy for me to say "Good-bye" to loved ones and native land and pour out my life among the heathen. The thought of remaining at home to preach the Gospel brought trouble to my heart. I knew there was not so much reproach attached to going as a missionary.

On my face before God, with tears, I would plead to be released. I knew to go out in this country as a woman preacher would mean to face bitter opposition, prejudice, slanderous

tongues, my name cast out as evil, my motives misconstrued and to be looked upon with suspicion.

Besides this, I was so conscious of my inability. My educational advantages had been very limited. I was reared a timid, country girl and had never been out in the world—in fact until twenty-seven years of age, had never been outside my native county in the State of Alabama. It seemed very strange God would call me when all these things were considered.

So often as I would plead my inability, the following verses of Scripture would be presented to my mind: “Then said I, Ah Lord God! behold I cannot speak: for I am a child. But the Lord said unto me, Say not I am a child: for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces: for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord. Then the Lord put forth His hand, and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put My words in thy mouth.”—Jer. 1:6-9. Many times, as I would take my Bible to read it, it seemed it would open where this passage is. I wished in my heart it was torn out of my Bible.”⁸

Mary Wasson’s new understanding of her call became an immediate source of family strife. A brother-in-law declared firmly that, if she preached, his children would never again be allowed to call her their “Aunt.” In the face of such pressure, she equivocated as she had done five years earlier in the face of similar hostility. She yielded to conventional expectations as she entered adulthood, becoming a teacher in area schools. An autobiography published in 1928 leaves little doubt that during these years she suffered anguish from the conviction that she was leaving her highest calling in life unfulfilled.⁹

Literary critic Lewis Simpson argues: “The most significant heritage of the Southerner is not, as popular myth would have it, an assigned social character—a stable role defined by family and social status. On the contrary, the real inheritance of the Southerner, the Alabamian, is the subtle imperative to define his or her identity.”¹⁰ It is not Simpson’s point to deny that there once was an assigned social character in Southern life, but rather to affirm that within such a social arena the need to differentiate oneself is the significant and redemptive aspect of the Southern heritage. Through childhood and early adulthood Mary Lee Wasson struggled with the “subtle imperative to define . . . her identity,” but struggled under the weight of social prejudice against women preachers. Were she alive today,

she might read with genuine familiarity the words of Carol Christ: “When the stories a woman reads or hears do not validate what she feels or thinks, she is confused. She may wonder if her feelings are wrong. She may even deny to herself that she feels what she feels.”¹¹ Southern Methodism had nourished Mary Lee Wasson’s religious experience, but would not affirm the call to preach that to her seemed to spring from the very heart of faith. To act on her sense of call would cut her off from family, church, and the universe of woman’s experience as affirmed by her culture. Mary Wasson was caught between the rock of conscience and the hard place of obedience.

Sisterhood and Redemption

Mary Lee Wasson married revivalist Robert Lee Harris in 1891. Harris had held periodic revivals in North Alabama for several years. She married for love, if not outright adoration, but she also expected that through supporting Harris’s ministry she would fulfill her destiny and find peace. She had never before left Lawrence County, Alabama, but she now travelled widely with her husband through the South. Her new role was a socially accepted form of the Lord’s work. Even so, in time Mary Harris discovered painfully that her inner struggle over the call to preach persisted. Her path to liberation was to be nevertheless through the instrumentality of Robert Lee Harris.¹²

Harris’s Free Methodist background was the key. Admitted into the Texas Conference of that church in 1885, he headed an independent missionary venture in Liberia from 1886-1888. Though outside the formal mission structure of Free Methodism, Harris received the reluctant approval of Free Methodist founder B. T. Roberts, who ordained him deacon and elder at the General Conference of 1886. Harris’s independent work was highly controversial, and during these years he was allied with a broader group of Free Methodist radicals that included: C. W. Sherman of the Vanguard Mission in St. Louis, a major sponsor of the Liberian mission; S. B. Shaw of Michigan, an advocate of interdenominational work who in 1901 was instrumental in calling the General Holiness Assembly in Chicago; and the Pentecost Bands led by Vivian Dake, a friend and protege of Roberts.

The faultline between the radicals and the Free Methodist mainstream lay in the independent character of various ministries supported by the radicals. Shaw’s interdenominational holiness work in Michigan put him at odds with his district superintendent, who wanted

energies focused on denominational goals. Harris and Sherman promoted independent foreign missions in competition with a new denominational missionary board. Dake promoted independent home missions, and later added foreign work as well. The radicals were strong advocates of Free Methodist legalism, but were equally strong advocates of the ministry of women. Dake's Pentecost Bands, modeled somewhat after the Salvation Army, eventually included at least seventeen bands composed exclusively of women, each containing two or three women preachers. The links within the alliance were tight. At Harris's urging, Sherman established a missionary training home in St. Louis that was training Dake's workers for foreign service by the time Harris's Liberian mission collapsed in 1888. The Pentecost Bands reopened the field, and Dake died shortly after visiting it in 1892. After his Liberian effort failed, Harris was conference evangelist in Texas for a year before withdrawing from the denomination. He united with a Southern Methodist congregation in Memphis and conducted revivals on the authority of a local preacher's license. His years in Free Methodism continued to mark the man and his message, however.¹³

Mary Wasson's marriage to Robert Lee Harris united her with a companion who combined a legalistic interpretation of Christian holiness with a progressive attitude toward the ministry of women. As they itinerated, she absorbed the idiom and methodology of holiness revivalism. By their third year of marriage, Harris was deeply involved in "the evangelist controversy" in Southern Methodism, and in May, 1894 he severed his links to all forms of institutional Methodism. In July, he launched a new movement in Milan, Tennessee, called variously "The New Testament Church" and the "Church of Christ." In essence, it was a form of Free Methodism indigenized and fitted to the Southern context. Its restorationist ecclesiology was similar to that of the numerous Campbellites and Landmark Baptists of the area, striking at the roots of any hierarchy that might impede the free work of an evangelist. Nevertheless, the movement's heart was the proclamation of the Wesleyan-holiness message. The new church order explicitly recognized the right of women to join men in preaching the gospel.¹⁴

Women preachers played an essential role in the origin of the new religious movement. Harris was in the grip of advanced tuberculosis as the movement began, and he relied on Susie Sherman and Emma Woodcock, preachers from the Vanguard Mission in St. Louis, to help preach and assist his work. Miss Sherman had begun preaching to the

poor on the streets of St. Louis while still a girl, and both women had preached for the Pentecost Bands. In Milan, Tennessee, they preached at nearly half the services during a crucial three-month long revival that launched the New Testament Church of Christ. Both women were charter members of the new church.¹⁵

A distinctive sisterhood originated in that revival. Mary Lee Harris had direct and daily contact with the Vanguard preachers, who modeled the type of ministry to which she felt called. Her struggle with the call intensified, especially after Susie Sherman and Emma Woodcock moved to other labors in August. As her husband moved slowly but inexorably toward death, Mary reached a point of crisis in which she finally decided to bargain with God over her call. She locked herself in an upstairs room of the Mitchum house and told God she would preach if her husband only lived. As she struggled in prayer, however, the absurdity of trying to coerce the divine will sank in upon her, and she gave an unconditional assent to the call. When she told her husband she had been divinely called to preach, he received the news without surprise. Robert Lee Harris died in November, leaving a widow, a congregation, a statement of beliefs, and a group of committed lay people willing to carry forward the movement he had begun.¹⁶

The New Testament Church of Christ developed its early connectional system under the leadership of three women and a man. In addition to Mary Lee Harris, the trio of women included Donie Adams Mitchum of Milan and a young woman from Memphis named Elliot J. Sheeks. The fourth member of the leadership circle was Donie Mitchum's husband, Milan businessman Robert Balie Mitchum. E. J. Sheeks' husband, Edwin, was a reluctant member of the new movement and did not become active in its work until several years later. Robert Lee Harris had formed holiness bands in several nearby towns. Wherever possible, the women began organizing the bands into churches. At Cottage Grove, Tennessee, Mary Harris and Donie Mitchum met with the holiness band, preached and taught the doctrines of the new church's faith and order, and organized the sect's second congregation with about twenty charter members.¹⁷

Mary Harris travelled widely during the first year of her ministry. In Memphis, she conducted cottage meetings with E. J. Sheeks, visited the city jail, and held services in a home for unwed mothers. On the Kentucky-Tennessee border, she preached in a camp meeting revival at which she overcame the timidity that had hindered her earlier preaching

and developed a more dynamic and confident style. In the early summer of 1895, she conducted an evangelistic tour in Arkansas with Fannie McDowell Hunter of Fulton, Kentucky. Hunter had become acquainted with the Harrises earlier, possibly through a revival that Robert Lee Harris had conducted in Fulton at the behest of Mrs. Hunter's father, John McDowell.

Born in about 1860 in Missouri, Fannie Hunter was the granddaughter of a circuit-riding Methodist missionary to the Indians. She was converted at twelve in Fulton, her childhood home, and at nineteen married Professor W. W. Hunter of Lebanon College. Three years later she was widowed and plunged into a deep religious crisis. Her spiritual renewal, dearly purchased, brought a greater seriousness about religion. Her involvement in holiness revivalism began as a music evangelist and broadened to include lay preaching.

In the summer of 1895, Fannie Hunter took Mary Lee Harris in hand and mentored her in the perils and challenges of an unmarried woman in gospel ministry. The two women traveled for several weeks in Arkansas, assisting a revival in Little Rock and preaching to inmates in the penitentiary. At the holiness camp meeting at Beebe, Mrs. Harris preached for several nights after W. A. Dodge of Georgia, the featured revivalist, cancelled his appearance. From there, the two women went to Searcy, where they conducted a revival in the Southern Methodist church.

Upon her return to Milan, Mary Lee Harris assisted in revivals there and at Humboldt, Tennessee. That autumn she and Donie Mitchum conducted a revival in Gadsden, Tennessee. Public interest was so great that they moved to the larger sanctuary of the Methodist Church for several days before opposition to their ministry forced them back to the public hall. When the revival closed, Donie Mitchum wrote in her journal that it was because "we didn't have room for the people."¹⁸ In November, William B. Godbey visited Milan and presented a series of lectures on millennial themes. Three years earlier Godbey had published *Victory*, a booklet linking Christ's return to the preaching ministry of women. Seizing upon Psalm 68:11 (which he took from the Revised Version, "God giveth the word, and the women who published it are a great host"), Godbey affirmed: "Glory to God for this prophetic vision of hosts and armies of women going forth preaching the gospel to all nations. The fulfillment of this vision is to bring the Millenium." Along the same line, Godbey published the pamphlet *Woman Preacher* in 1891, setting forth arguments for allowing women to preach. The specific substance of

Godbey's Milan lectures is unknown, but his affirmation of ministry by women no doubt encouraged the female ministers of the New Testament Church of Christ.¹⁹

A few weeks later, Mary Lee Harris went to Texas for Christmas and was invited to conduct a revival in Swedonia, a Scandinavian settlement near Abilene. In January 1896, she organized at Swedonia the first congregation of the New Testament Church of Christ in Texas. Before returning to Tennessee, Mrs. Harris conducted three more revivals and organized two other congregations in Texas.²⁰

The level of activity in her first year of ministry was sustained for nearly forty more years, except for periods of recuperation from exhaustion. She developed a rhythm of ministry that gravitated between summertime revivals and wintertime pastorates. After 1896 her attention focused primarily on the churches in Texas. In 1899 she settled permanently in Buffalo Gap, twenty miles southeast of Abilene. She conducted revivals where she could, at camp meetings, in brush arbors, in canyons, and in church houses. Wherever possible she organized new congregations.

The New Testament Church of Christ continued in Tennessee under the leadership of the Mitchums. Until she moved to Nashville in 1905, Donie Mitchum was an active lay preacher, serving several churches as pastor and holding revivals in West Tennessee and North Alabama. In Arkansas, the sect expanded initially from the efforts of E. J. Sheeks. A continual supply of new ministers, male and female, entered the church. Mary Lee Harris, E. J. Sheeks, and George Hammond were ordained in 1899 after the "mother church" at Milan, Tennessee, elected them to elder's orders.

That year an Eastern Council of churches began to take form, and by 1900 it included twelve congregations and twice that many preaching points in Tennessee and Arkansas.²¹ The work in Texas was nearly equal to that in the Eastern Council. Among the western preachers was Henry C. Cagle, a young cowboy that Mary Harris married in August 1900. Converted, sanctified, and called to preach under his new wife's ministry, Cagle's experience illustrated the positive impact that the preaching of liberated women could enjoy, even in the muscular world of the cowboy. In 1902, Mary Lee Cagle issued a call for a convening of representatives from the various churches in Texas, and in November they established the Texas Council of the denomination. That council was the basis for the later Abilene District of the Church of the Nazarene, which today embraces the West Texas, San Antonio, and New Mexico Districts.²²

A pattern of sisterhood that emerged in the New Testament Church of Christ had roots in a closeknit pietist circle that originally included Mary Cagle, E. J. Sheeks, and Donie Mitchum. Outside this circle were larger, concentric circles that embraced Fannie McDowell Hunter and others. In her early ministry, for instance, Mrs. Sheeks traveled with Mrs. A. E. Masterman of St. Louis as her companion. Mary Cagle was accompanied often in her early ministry by Annie May Johnson, a young preacher, and Trena Platt, a musician. Platt's entry into itinerant ministry is instructive. It illustrates that hearing a woman preach could be a powerful and awakening experience for other women. Raised to be a proper Presbyterian, Miss Platt agreed to play the organ at a revival conducted in 1897 at Hillville, Tennessee, by Donie Mitchum and E. J. Sheeks. Two years later, Platt wrote that at Hillville "it was not only my pleasure but my first privilege of hearing the Gospel preached by women only." As her comment attests, women-led revivals generated a sense of sisterhood and female worth within the context of religious experience.

Miss Platt joined the other women in itinerant ministry and from 1897 to 1901 accompanied Mary Lee Cagle, providing companionship, music, and assisting in general revival work. Annie May Johnson of Swedonia, Texas heard Mary Cagle preach in 1895 and was sanctified in that meeting and called to preach soon afterward. Miss Johnson participated with Mrs. Cagle in subsequent revivals in Texas and Tennessee. She became an ordained elder, married Rev. William E. Fisher, and played a prominent role with her husband in the West Texas holiness revival.

Mrs. E. J. Sheeks' ministry was also inspired, in part, by Mary Cagle's. Though a charter member of the Milan, Tennessee church, E. J. Sheeks did not profess a call to preach until nearly two years later. When she did so, it was while assisting Mrs. Cagle in a revival in Arkansas. As a young girl, Mrs. Sheeks had heard the preaching of Rev. Louisa Woosley, a famous evangelist in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Mrs. Woosley had impressed the girl favorably, but Sheeks' actual entry into the ministry was encouraged and sustained more directly by her immediate friends, Mary Lee Cagle and Donie Mitchum. The strong sense of sisterhood among women of the denomination heightened the sense of ecclesial community typical of the believers' church mentality and helped women identify more definitely with their sense of divine call.²³

Apologetic for Women Preachers

The apologetic literature produced by the women in Mary Cagle's circle symbolized their unique sisterhood. There was constant need for a reasoned defense of female ministry. In their revivals Mary Cagle and Donie Mitchum regularly preached a stock sermon defending the basis for a woman's public ministry. In 1903, Annie Johnson Fisher published *Woman's Right to Preach*, a pamphlet based on a sermon delivered at Chilton, Texas. But it fell to Fannie McDowell Hunter to frame the issue in a way unique in the apologetics of female ministry. Hunter moved to Texas in 1901, spending the summer in revivals with Mary Lee Cagle and Trena Platt in West Texas. In the fall, she joined the staff of Texas Holiness University, then under president A. M. Hills, serving as matron of women students. In 1903 she became pastor of the New Testament Church of Christ at Rising Star, Texas. There, in 1904, she was host pastor of a union council at which the New Testament Church of Christ united with the Independent Holiness Church under C. B. Jernigan and J. B. Chapman, creating a new entity, the Holiness Church of Christ.²⁴

Two books appeared the following year testifying to the nature of this new denomination. One was its official church *Manual* and the other was *Women Preachers*, a work edited and more than half written by Mrs. Hunter. *Women Preachers* differed from other works of its genre by its collective nature. Exactly half the book summarized standard arguments for the ministry of women, developed in the previous half century and published in apologies by Phoebe Palmer, B. T. Roberts, Catherine Booth, and others.²⁵ But *Women Preachers* was distinguished from others of its kind by the narrative structure that comprised the second half of the book. Nine call narratives were published. Seven were written by women of the former New Testament Church of Christ, including Fannie Hunter, Mary Cagle, Donie Mitchum, E. J. Sheeks, Annie Johnson Fisher, Fannie Suddarth, and Miss Lillian Poole.

Another contributor was Rev. Johnny Hill Jernigan, a fearless preacher and advocate of women from the Independent Holiness Church wing of the Holiness Church of Christ. The inclusion of Johnny Jernigan's call narrative underscored the similarity in democratic ethos that characterized both parent bodies of the Holiness Church of Christ. Mrs. Jernigan had been ordained at the same time as her husband, in a service conducted in 1902 by Seth C. Rees under the auspices of the Apostolic Holiness Union. The last contributor was Rev. Eliza J. Rutherford, a Methodist Protestant evangelist who united with the Church

of the Nazarene in the 1920s. “Who gave thee this authority?” was the provocative question printed on the book’s front cover.

The call narratives affirmed the conviction of the women that their authority to preach was divinely given and stood above all human prejudice to the contrary. Fannie McDowell Hunter dedicated the book “To my beloved sisters, who are anointed by the Holy Spirit and commissioned, like Mary of old, to tell the sorrowing of their risen Lord, and who, as they go on their blessed mission for the Master, often meet the opposition and scorn of their opponents.” Whether scorned or not, ordained women had an unmeasurable impact on the Holiness Church of Christ. Twenty-three of the denomination’s 156 ordained clergy in December of 1906 were women. Thirteen of these were married to a clergyman, so that nearly one in four elders was either a female minister or her spouse. By 1908, the year the Holiness Church of Christ merged with the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, women composed 17% of the Southern church’s ordained ministry and nearly 21% of its licensed ministers. Their influence had been exerted on virtually every aspect of denominational life, including pastoral ministry, evangelism, home missions, foreign missions, and rescue ministries.²⁶

Before and after the merger with the Nazarenes, Mary Lee Cagle’s contribution was impressive. In the Nazarene period, she continued to carve an enviable role as a founder of new congregations, taking a leading role in establishing churches in Abilene, Lubbock, and many smaller places. At least eighteen congregations were founded directly by her and dozens of others with her assistance. In Lubbock, she and Henry Cagle were founding copastors in 1909. With her oversight, this congregation erected a building seating over 500 people, praised as the finest Nazarene facility in the Southwest at the time.²⁷ Over the next forty years, the Cagles held revivals from Tennessee to Arizona and from El Paso north to Cheyenne, Wyoming. When H. C. Cagle was superintendent of the New Mexico District from 1918-1920, Mary Lee Cagle served as the elected district evangelist. While he was superintendent of the Arizona District from 1920-1922, she pastored the church at Peoria, the largest on the district. And when he was superintendent of the Hamlin District (later Abilene, now West Texas District) from 1926-1931, she served part of that time as the appointed assistant district superintendent and later as district evangelist. She reported to the Hamlin District assembly in 1927:

Our work has not been with the larger churches, but with the weak struggling ones. I have held 13 revival meetings,

preached 175 times, saw 216 converted and 118 sanctified, and . . . have travelled about 10,000 miles in a car and have made a few trips on the train. I have visited practically all of the churches in the district and some of them more than once.

The following year, she apologized to the district assembly for a physical breakdown that had slowed her work, adding that God “showed me that it would please Him for me to come apart and rest awhile, so I took three weeks off and only preached twice.” From 1908 to 1928 she was a delegate to every General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene and served each on the critical Manual Revision Committee. Her influence in district affairs can be gauged by the ballot of the Hamlin District that elected her to the 1923 General Assembly. Out of sixty ordained elders eligible for election, she received the highest number of votes, outpolling by nineteen votes Rev. Emma Irick, popular wife of the current district superintendent, and by forty votes her own husband Henry, who had just terminated his superintendency of the Arizona District.²⁸

Mary Cagle’s personal struggle to overcome prejudice against her ministry solely on the basis of gender gave her empathy with a broad range of marginalized and dispossessed people. She wrote with a deep sense of compassion about those to whom she ministered in jails and prisons, stating that her first experience in prison ministry “gave her a greater degree of sympathy for the suffering” that remained throughout life. In Alabama in the 1890s, as new Jim Crow laws were legalizing racial segregation throughout the South, she accepted invitations to preach in black churches, contrary to the express wishes of members of her family. She supported rescue ministries aimed at prostitutes and unwed mothers. In 1904, for instance, she conducted a revival in the Dallas slums on behalf of Rev. J. T. Upchurch, founder of the Berachah Rescue Society. The meeting helped initiate the work of the society in the Dallas-Fort Worth area and greatly assisted the ministry in relocating from Waco to Arlington. People converted or called to preach under Mary Cagle’s ministry filled staff positions in the Berachah Home and at Rest Cottage for unwed mothers.

Mrs. Cagle’s own ministry of revivalism was directed primarily toward those who struggled in life. When she settled in Texas, her call was particularly to minister to those in small and out-of-the-way places. She defied today’s conventional church growth orthodoxy by choosing to minister in transitional communities. Her identification with cowboys was an expression of this mindset, for the cowboy was typically, in the apt

words of a recent journalist, “young, single, dirt poor and Southern,” and, like Mary Cagle, “a fugitive from his father’s farm.” In her autobiography she repeatedly referred to holding meetings in “the little neglected places.” Even the legalistic emphasis of her preaching was shaped partly by her identification with the dispossessed. Though her sermons against the worldliness of rings and jewelry strike later generations as narrow, her practice was to sell jewelry and use the money to support food and orphanage ministries in India.²⁹

Mary Lee Cagle preached regularly until 1948, and occasionally thereafter. She preached her last sermon on her birthday in 1954. Blind and supported by strong friends on either side, she preached for a half-hour with what the *Abilene Reporter News* described as “her usual vim and vigor.”³⁰ She died the following year. Her life demonstrates the complexity of female ministry in a society that expected her to maintain the integrity of woman’s sphere. Her willingness to step outside that sphere and wear the badge of a religious dissenter demonstrated her choice of conscience over sheer obedience to established religious structures that would not affirm her call. The early struggle with her call was frustrated by the lack of a sympathetic sisterhood. Her ability later to accept the call was enabled by the presence of such a sisterhood, and she became a faithful sister to others in her turn.

When the Church of the Nazarene took shape through mergers in 1907 and 1908, thirteen percent of its ordained ministry was female, and over half were in Mary Cagle’s section of the country.³¹ As co-creators of nineteenth century holiness sects and a twentieth century holiness denomination, Mary Cagle and her female associates created a place to preach, expecting their work to secure permanently an inclusive ministry in the Church of the Nazarene, so that future generations of women could build new ministries on their shoulders and not have to refight the old battle for a place to serve. That dream seemed secure until the 1940s, when female ministry began to wane in the Church of the Nazarene. The bright hope of Mary Cagle and her sisters in ministry is greatly diminished among Nazarene women today.³² As the denomination she cofounded now struggles with its identity, there is no predictable answer to the question of whether it will renew its covenant with its founding principles. One thing is predictable, however. If Mary Lee Cagle were a Nazarene today, she would fight the good fight again.

NOTES

¹Gerda Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past: Placing Women in History* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), xxiii-xxiv.

²Harold Raser, *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought* (Lewiston, N.Y. and Queenston, Ont.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1987), and Charles Edward White, *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist, and Humanitarian* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Francis Asbury Press, 1986). Also see Thomas Oden, ed., *Phoebe Palmer: Selected Writings* (New York, N. Y. and Mahwah, N. J.: Paulist Press, 1988).

³Carl Degler, *The Other South: Southern Dissenters in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974).

⁴Nancy Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979): 197- 206. For a view of the doctrine of separate spheres in Southern life, see the chapter entitled "Women, Religion, and Social Change in the South, 1830-1930" in Anne Firor Scott's *Making the Invisible Woman Visible* (Urbana & Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), esp. pp. 190-193. Carl Degler's apt phrase is a chapter title in his *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

⁵On the doctrine of inequality contrasted with the heritage of Jefferson and Madison, see Charles Sydnor, *The Development of Southern Sectionalism, 1819-1848* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949), pp. 333-335. Donald Mathews discusses the religious application to women of the doctrine of inequality in *Religion in the Old South* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 169-170.

⁶Mary Lee Cagle, *The Life and Work of Mary Lee Cagle* (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1928), pp. 15-21; and Fannie McDowell Hunter, *Women Preachers* (Dallas: Berachah Press, 1905), p. 70.

⁷Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 17-20; and Hunter, *Women Preachers*, p. 71.

⁸Hunter, *Women Preachers*, pp. 71-72. In both call narratives (one embedded in her autobiography, the other cited above), a mature Mary Lee

Cagle assessed her childhood inclination toward missionary work as a misinterpretation of her call to preach, as the culturally determined conclusion of a girl located in a society whose religious systems did not sanction, utilize, or provide a place of service for women of her self-understanding. In her *Life and Work*, she wrote (p. 21) that “foreign missionary work was all [I] knew a woman could do.” The narrative in Hunter’s *Women Preachers* (p. 70) is more explicit: “On account of the teachings of that time regarding women’s ministry, I decided there would be no opening for me in my homeland. I came to the conclusion that my call was to the foreign field where I supposed a woman would have freedom in preaching Christ to the heathen.” Mary Cagle’s reinterpretation of her early call to missionary work can be compared to the passage by Carol Christ quoted in the text and cited below (footnote 11).

⁹Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 21-22; and Biographical Questionnaire signed by Mary Lee Cagle and dated January 14, 1952, in the Mary Lee Cagle Collection, Nazarene Archives, Kansas City, Missouri.

¹⁰Lewis Simpson, in the introduction to Rosemary Cranfield, ed., *Perspectives: The Alabama Heritage* (Troy, Al.: Troy State University Press, 1978), xi.

¹¹Carol Christ, *Diving Deep and Surfacing: Women Writers on Spiritual Quest* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1980), p. 5.

¹²Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 22-24.

¹³A fuller discussion of Robert Lee Harris’ Free Methodist career can be found in Robert Stanley Ingersol, “Burden of Dissent: Mary Lee Cagle and the Southern Holiness Movement” (Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1989), pp. 69-98.

¹⁴On Robert Lee Harris’ role in the evangelist controversy, see the *Memphis Christian Advocate* (Oct. 26 and Dec. 14, 1893); the *Nashville Christian Advocate* (Nov. 2, 1893); and the *Milan Exchange* (Nov. 4, 1893). Also see Robert Lee Harris, *Why We Left the M. E. Church, South* (Milan, Tenn.: n.p., n.d. [Milan Exchange Company, 1894]). On the continuing Free Methodist influence on the theology and ethics of Harris’ movement, see *The Trumpet* (Oct. 1893, Jan. 1894, and Feb. 1894), a paper edited by Harris that copiously reprinted materials from *The Free Methodist* and *The Earnest Christian*. Copies of all these materials are in the Robert Lee Harris Collection, Nazarene Archives.

¹⁵*The Milan Exchange* (May 19, 1894): 4, provides details of the women's activities. For the backgrounds of the women, see Thomas Nelson, *Life and Labors of Rev. Vivian A. Dake* (Chicago: T. B. Arnold, for the author, 1894), p. 272. *The Vanguard* (Oct. 15, 1908): 4, contains an article on Susie Sherman that describes her youthful preaching on the streets of St. Louis.

¹⁶Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 23-25.

¹⁷The Journal of Donie Adams Mitchum, unpublished ms., pp. 23-24, microfilm in the Donie Adams Mitchum and Robert Balie Mitchum Collection, Nazarene Archives; and *The Milan Exchange* (Feb. 2, 1895): 4.

¹⁸Hunter, *Women Preachers*, pp. 48-61; Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 28-39; Donie Mitchum's Journal, pp. 25-27; and *The Milan Exchange* (Nov. 16, 1895): 3.

¹⁹Donie Mitchum's Journal, p. 25; *The Milan Exchange* (Nov. 23, 1895): 4; and William B. Godbey, *Victory* (Ennis, Tex.: J. H. Padgett, 1888), p. 27. Also see William B. Godbey, *Woman Preacher* (Louisville: Kentucky Methodist Publishing Co., n.d. [copyright 1891]).

²⁰Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 40-53; *The Milan Exchange* (Jan. 25, 1896): 4; and *Holiness Evangel* (May 1, 1908): 2.

²¹On Mary Lee Cagle's general activities, see her *Life and Work*, pp. 54-83. Additional details are in Mrs. Mitchum's Journal. These sources, along with others from the local and religious press, are used in Ingersol, "Burden of Dissent," chapters 7 and 8. The ordination service is described in "The Journal of the [New Testament] Church of Christ," ms. ledger book, pp. 6-7, and, in more detail, in the "Record Book of the [Milan, Tennessee New Testament] Church of Christ," entry for December 14, 1899. Both mss. are in the New Testament Church of Christ Collection, Nazarene Archives.

²²On Henry C. Cagle, see Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 64-65, and the *Abilene Reporter-News* (April 2, 1944) of Abilene, Texas. An account of their wedding is preserved in a clipping from *The Evangelist*, official paper of the New Testament Church of Christ, on p. 158 of Donie Mitchum's Journal. For the creation of the Texas Council, see the *Council and Guide Book of the Churches of Christ* (Dallas: Penning Printing People, n.d.), pp. 31-33

²³On Mrs. Sheeks, see: "Facts for the Obituary of E. J. Sheeks," typescript, signed by her, Elliott J. Sheeks Collection, Nazarene Archives;

and Mrs. E. J. Sheeks, “Christian Experience and Call to Preach,” in Hunter, *Women Preachers*, pp. 84-89. On Annie Johnson Fisher, see: Mrs. William E. Fisher, “Christian Experience and Call to Preach,” *Women Preachers*, pp. 62-64; and Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 51-59. On Trena Platt, see Donie Mitchum’s Journal, pp. 47, 50, 56, and 57; also Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, p. 63. The quote from Trena Platt appeared in an article in *The Evangelist*, preserved as a clipping in Donie Mitchum’s Journal, p. 105.

²⁴“Women Preaching,” ms., inscribed: “Sr. Harris preached at Bluff Springs, Oct. 4th, 1896;” in the Donie Adams Mitchum Collection, Nazarene Archives. Mrs. Cagle’s mature sermon on the topic is printed in her *Life and Work*, pp. 160-176. Also see Annie May Fisher, *Woman’s Right to Preach: A Sermon Reported as Delivered at Chilton, Texas* (San Antonio: By the Author, n.d. [1904]). The *Pentecost Herald* (April 1, 1904): 6, advertises Mrs. Fisher’s booklet in lots of fifty. On Fannie McDowell Hunter, see *Second Catalogue of Texas Holiness University, 1901-1902*, *Third Catalogue of Texas Holiness University, 1902-1903*, and *Texas Annual Council, New Testament Church of Christ: Second Session, 1903*.

²⁵The primary texts in this apologetic tradition were Phoebe Palmer, *Promise of the Father; or, a Neglected Speciality of the Last Days: Addressed to the Clergy and Laity of all Christian Communities* (Boston: Henry V. Degen, 1859); Catherine Booth, *Female Ministry; or, Woman’s Right to Preach the Gospel* (London: Morgan & Chase [1859]); B. T. Roberts, *Ordaining Women* (Rochester, N. Y.: Earnest Christian Publishing House, 1891); and Walter A. Sellw, *Why Not? A Plea for the Ordination of Those Women Whom God Calls to Preach His Gospel* (Chicago: Free Methodist Publishing House, for the Author, 1914 [orig. ed. 1894]). Sellw, like Roberts, was a Free Methodist bishop.

²⁶An account of Johnny Jernigan’s ordination service appears in *God’s Revivalist and Bible Advocate* (Jan. 8, 1903): 5, where her name is mistakenly rendered as “Jennie.” Her name is occasionally spelled “Johnnie,” but I have used the spelling that appears in books written by her husband (see, for instance, the dedication page in C. B. Jernigan, *From the Prairie Schooner to a City Flat* (n.p., n.d. [c. 1926])). On Hunter, *Women Preachers*, see: cover, dedication, and pp. 51-100. For an analysis of Hunter’s book and its call narratives, see chapter 10 of Ingersol, “Burden of Dissent.” Statistics regarding female ministers in the Holiness

Church of Christ are calculated from the “List of Preachers and Missionaries of the Holiness Church of Christ,” *Holiness Evangel* (Dec. 15, 1906): 7-8, and the “List of Ministers” in the *Proceedings of the Second General Assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene* (Los Angeles: Nazarene Publishing Company, 1908).

²⁷Mary Cagle founded three congregations in Tennessee, three in Alabama, at least twelve in Texas, and one in Arizona. She assisted in starting many others, such as the Abilene (Tex.) Church of the Nazarene, and three in Wyoming. Nearly half of the churches she founded in Texas disappeared immediately before or during the Great Depression, which coincided with a period of extended drought leading to rural depopulation. On her ministry in Lubbock, see: Tanner Laine, *Lubbock First [Church of the Nazarene]* (Lubbock, Tex.: Duncan Press, [1984]), and Lawrence L. Graves, *A History of Lubbock* (Lubbock, Tex.: West Texas Museum Association at Texas Technical College, 1962), pp. 106, 198-199, 443-444. Graves mentions that Nazarenes, at any early date, actively joined with Methodist, Presbyterian, and Christian churches in union revivals. Description of the church building in Lubbock is found in the *Pentecostal Advocate* (May 19, 1910): 10.

²⁸Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 131-160. Also see: Ingersol, “Burden of Dissent,” pp. 284-293. On the Cagle district superintendencies, and on Mary Lee Cagle’s office of district evangelist, see the New Mexico District of the Church of the Nazarene, *Proceedings of the . . . Annual Assembly*, 1918-1920; the Arizona District, *Proceedings*, 1920-1922; the Hamlin District, *Proceedings*, 1926-1929; and the Abilene District, *Proceedings*, 1930-1932. Quotations from the Hamlin District *Proceedings*, 1927 and 1928. On Mrs. Cagle’s participation in General Assemblies, see *Proceedings of the . . . General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene* (prior to 1923, *Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene*): 1908-1928. Figures pertaining to her election to the 1923 General Assembly are found in the Hamlin District *Proceedings*, 1922, p. 16.

²⁹Mary Lee Cagle, *Life and Work*, pp. 30-31. On her ministry in black churches, see *ibid.*, p. 62. On revivals in the Dallas slums, see *ibid.*, pp. 108-109, and the *Pentecost Herald* (May 1, 1904): 6. On individuals who entered social ministries, see *Life and Work*, pp. 87-88. Ingersol, “Burden of Dissent,” pp. 222-233, contains a description of two homes for unwed mothers operated by Nazarenes in Texas, and an analysis of the

relationship this type of ministry bears to the ministry and ordination of women. The social alienation of the cowboy is described in *The Sunday Oklahoman* (Mar. 27, 1983).

³⁰*Abilene Reporter-News* (Feb. 4, 1954).

³¹“Roll and Directory of Ministers,” *Proceedings of the Second General Assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene*, pp. 3-17.

³²Figures showing the rise and decline of female ministry in the Church of the Nazarene appear in Rebecca Laird, “A History of the First Generation of Ordained Women in the Church of the Nazarene” (M.A. thesis, Pacific School of Religion, 1990), pp. 158-165. Laird selected four districts in different regions of the United States and calculated the percentage of ordained female elders on each through 1950. She found that the percentage peaked at 28.3% on the Southern California District in 1934, at 17.2% on the New England District in 1944, at 29.5% on the Abilene (now West Texas) District in 1941, and at 24% on the Tennessee District in 1936. Figures for women holding a district minister’s license were much higher, peaking at 37.7% on the Southern California District in 1947, at 36.3% on the New England District in 1926, at 45.4% on the Abilene District in 1925, and at 36% on the Tennessee District in 1930.

BOOK REVIEWS

Barry L. Callen, ed., *Listening to the Word of God: A Tribute to Dr. Boyce W. Blackwelder*. Anderson: Anderson University and Warner Press, 1990, 172 pages.

Reviewed by David Bundy, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Indiana.

This volume celebrates the fortieth anniversary (1990-1991) of the founding of the School of Theology of Anderson University and the influence of Boyce W. Blackwelder (1913-1976) who taught at Anderson School of Theology from 1963-1976. Each of the contributors are from the Church of God (Anderson) tradition and were students and/or colleagues of Blackwelder. The introductory essay by Barry Callen provides an account of the life and ministry of Blackwelder who, after earning a Th.D. at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1951, spent twelve years in pastoral work. During these years he published three books, which in part led to his being invited to teach at Anderson in 1963.

A detailed "Chronology" of Blackwelder's life is provided, as is a "Selected Bibliography of Writings" (14-17) listing three unpublished theses, six books, and a number of articles in the *Gospel Trumpet* and its successor, *Vital Christianity*. This is followed by a previously unpublished essay by Blackwelder, "Perspectives on Biblical Studies and Seminary Education." It reflects on the nature, methods, and goals of graduate theological education. Written in 1975, this essay remains a passionate statement.

The other eight essays are contributions to Biblical studies addressing a variety of issues and using a variety of scholarly approaches. The first four use the insights of literary theory. James Christoph, "Equal

Access to Grace in Ministry” (41-55) argues that the creation narratives provide the model for a commitment to the equal status of women in ministry within the church. He demonstrates that both versions of the creation in Genesis point toward “relationality” (53) as the essential structure of human social interaction. George Kufeldt, “The Prophets: Divine Words or Human Words?” (57-67), develops a Biblical model for understanding prophets and prophecy which is in sharp contrast to the popular media-defined role of that Biblical office.

The essay “Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels,” (69-88) by Frederick Burnett, is a contribution to narrative criticism of the Gospels. He correctly notes that plot and story in narrative studies of the Biblical text have been emphasized, but little attention has been given to characterization. The term is defined as used in literary studies and a survey of research on the phenomenon in classical literature is provided. Burnett then reflects on the figure of Peter in the Gospel of Matthew. John Stanley, “Holy Spirit as Empowerer for Ministry in Luke-Acts,” (91-100) rejects both the theological and historical approaches as primary methodologies for analysis of Luke and Acts and experiments with a literary approach, arguing that Luke’s theology cannot be understood apart from the literary structure of the two documents.

Spencer Spaulding, “The Significance of the Differing Audiences in Galatians and Romans” (103-119), is a contribution from the perspective of audience analysis theory. The author notes that the debate about the perspectives of Romans and Galatians has failed to take into account audience analysis as suggested by “Reader Response Theory.” The use of Leviticus 18:5 in Galatians 3:12 and Romans 10:5 is developed as a case study. It is convincingly shown that the adaptation of the material by Paul for the two distinct audience contexts can be demonstrated from the texts of Romans and Galatians.

The final three essays bring diverse scholarly tools to bear on the problems under investigation. Gene Miller, “*Teleios* as ‘Mature,’ ‘Complete,’ or ‘Brought to Completion’ in the Pauline Writings,” (121-130), seeks to demonstrate that the goal of Paul is not “perfection” but “spiritual maturity and completeness of experience” (128), insisting that the quest is continuous for the Christian community. Kenneth Jones, “Babylon and the New Jerusalem: Interpreting the Book of Revelation” (133-150), reviews various interpretations of “Babylon” in the Apocalypse. He rejects many of the approaches commonly found in the

Church of God (Anderson), American Evangelicalism, Fundamentalism, and Adventism, insisting that, instead of predictive, the message of the Apocalypse is that God is “truly in charge of the world and everything in it” (147). “Ministerial Authority in Biblical Perspective,” (153-162), by James Earl Massey, Dean of Anderson School of Theology, reflects on the nature of ministerial authority, arguing that it is not received from the office held, but from the “spirit of service and sacrificial surrender to the experience of the cross” (161) in the community of faith.

The articles are all in dialogue with the tradition of the Church of God (Anderson) and with contemporary European and North American Biblical scholarship. The authors are aware of and use critical methodologies, especially literary and narrative methods, in the analysis of the Biblical text. Each offers a contribution to the discipline of Biblical studies as well as to discussions within the Church on some vital issues. The volume is a remarkable achievement. This is one of the rare volumes that has been published within the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition that has significance for Biblical studies and approaches the cutting edge of the discipline. Other Wesleyan/Holiness writers have written for scholarly Biblical studies journals edited outside the tradition. However, this the first volume published by a Wesleyan/Holiness publishing house to integrate critical methodologies. The editor, authors, Warner Press, and Anderson University are to be congratulated.

Thomas Lessmann, *Rolle und Bedeutung des Heiligung Geistes in der Theologie John Wesleys*, edited by Studiengemeinschaft für Geschichte der Evangelisch-methodistischen Kirche. Stuttgart: Christliches Verlagshaus, 1987, 150 pages.

Reviewed by Randy L. Maddox, Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, SD.

Lessmann provides here a general study of the role and significance of the Holy Spirit to the full range of Wesley’s theology. His focus is clearly on the basic elements of the *ordo salutis*, but he also discusses the Spirit’s role in relation to such topics as the means of grace and the four major sources or authorities in Wesley’s theology (the “Wesleyan quadrilateral”). While by no means identical, this work covers much of the same territory as Lycurgus Starkey’s *The Work of the Holy Spirit*.

Some elements of Lessmann's approach are distinctive enough to deserve further comment. In the first place, he consistently draws upon the work of *both* John and Charles Wesley throughout the book. Indeed, he argues that Charles' work "mirrors" the theology of John (9). Generally this procedure helps demonstrate the commonalities between the brothers and provides helpful examples from the poetic works for many major themes. However, Lessmann is not sufficiently sensitive to the *differences* between the Wesleys, particularly concerning the issue of the nature and timing of Christian perfection. Thus, his discussion of this topic strains under the attempts to incorporate both John's insistence on instantaneous attainment and Charles' stress on the continual realization that we have not yet attained.

A second characteristic of Lessmann's discussion is a repeated affirmation of the connection between the Holy Spirit and grace. While not explicitly developed by Lessmann, this connection provides help in distinguishing Wesley's view of grace from the "created grace" of Medieval Catholicism or the "imputed grace" of Protestantism, showing its affinity to the Eastern Orthodox view of grace as the very "powers" of the Godhead in human life.

Perhaps the most original and helpful section in Lessmann is that which discusses the fruit of the Spirit as the *driving motive* for sanctification (69ff). That is, he insists that love, joy, peace, etc., should be seen not just as the result of sanctification, but as the affections that stimulate our growth in holiness. Lessmann stresses that this means that Wesley sees the motivation for holiness as joy, not threat. It also makes clear that Wesley is working from a "virtue ethic," though Lessmann does not identify this clearly. Finally, it should be noted that Lessmann follows the mainstream of German Methodism in concluding that (John) Wesley's emphasis on the possibility of attaining perfection in this life is neither scriptural nor true to human experience (141). Thus, his call is for us to retain the emphasis on the necessity of growth in holiness in this life, without the expectation of full attainment.

Lessmann concludes from his survey of the role and significance of the Holy Spirit in Wesley's theology that Wesley's theology is centered in pneumatology (130), and that his theology of sanctification in particular is rooted in pneumatology (49). Unfortunately, he neither develops nor defends these claims in the context of the recent discussions of the perceived switch from Wesley's Christologically-grounded understanding of sanctification to a Pneumatologically-grounded understanding in the

American Holiness movement. While this prevents his work from speaking directly to this debate, his overall treatment still offers helpful insights to all interested in Wesley's understanding of the Holy Spirit and grace.

R. Laurence Moore, *Selling God: American Religion in the Marketplace of Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Reviewed by William Kostlevy, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky.

They are the neglected heroes of the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition. The purveyors of gospel art calendars, greeting cards, prophecy charts, wall mementos, records, audio tapes, and, perhaps more embarrassingly, a seemingly endless supply of popular religious devotional, self-help, and Christian living titles of dubious scholarly merit. Forgotten by a generation of scholars who sought, if not salvation, at least respect in the academy, these merchants of Christian kitsch reappear as the central actors in Laurence Moore's remarkable account of the marketing of Christianity in the United States.

The United States is not a secular society, Moore concludes, partly because of the cultural inventiveness of such "masterly actor/preachers" as Lorenzo Dow, Peter Cartwright, and especially Charles Finney. Although Moore notes that the roots of the "commodification" (i.e., the ways in which churches have grown by "participating in the market") of religion can be found in the colonial period in the preaching and self-promotion of individuals such as George Whitefield. It was Christianity's, especially evangelicalism's ability to adopt new techniques for maintaining public influence in the competitive market-driven world which allowed it to prosper in the new republic. Following his insightful discussion of the marketing of religion in antebellum America, Moore traces American Christianity's successful adaptation, and at times co-opting, of leisure, the workplace, religious advertising in the Progressive Era, and the remarkable marketing success of contemporary evangelicals and New Age groups.

Although thoroughly documented, Moore's work does not escape the problems inherent in any work that attempts to survey such a broad topic. Invariably some groups (for example, Methodists) receive less attention

than they warrant, while others, such as spiritualists, receive greater attention. More troubling is the author's tendency, amazingly alternating the Marxism of Paul Johnson and the neo-classical economics of Thomas Haskell, to reduce religion to its perceived social functions. In such a scheme, revivals, regardless of location, time, or actors, become a mass movement to achieve social control, presumably to make a proletariat more docile, or, for economic liberals, more socially useful. In fact, religion, especially evangelicalism, is certainly too multifaceted to serve one social function or the interests of any one social group.

Regardless of its limitations, Moore's work has particular relevance for students of the Wesleyan/Holiness movement. It is important for scholars to remember that the movement they serve was marketed in North America, and subsequently around the world, not by the ecumenical counsels of the first five centuries or by an eighteenth-century graduate of Oxford University, but by preacher/actors such as W. B. Godbey, H. C. Morrison, Beverly Carradine, and Bud Robinson. To forget that is to endanger not only the survival of the movement but, perhaps more significantly, one's own paycheck.

Manuel Ossa, *Epiritualidad popular y accion politica. El Pastor Victor Mora y la Mision Wesleyana Nacional. 40 anos de historia religiosa y social, 1928-1969*. Centro Ecumenico de Medellin; Santiago: Ediciones Rehue, 1990, 257 pages.

Reviewed by David Bundy, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Ossa was born in Santiago, Chile, in 1931. He was a pastor of the Iglesia Evangelica (unida) de Hessen y Nassau (Germany), and since 1989 has been a research scholar of the Centro Ecumenico Diego de Medellin in Santiago. Here he has provided an analysis of the life and ministry of Victor Manuel Mora (born 20 Aug. 1884, died 21 Dec. 1969), founder of the Mision Wesleyana Nacional in Chile, as well as of the denomination by the same name which developed from the mission. With a doctorate in theology from the Institut Catholique de Paris (1964) and a "magister" in sociology (1973), Ossa is uniquely qualified to examine this uniquely Chilean indigenous church which, he reports, split off from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1928 over matters of spirituality and social ethics.

The early years of Mora's life are accessible only through undocumented and sometimes self-contradictory oral traditions. His first documented contact with the Methodist Episcopal Church seems to have been about 1918 (age 34) at Puente Arenas, a community pastored by a certain Rev. Reeder. In 1919 Mora was listed as director of the Epworth league, an organization for youth. From 1921-1923 Mora attended the Seminary operated jointly by the Methodist and Presbyterian churches in Santiago. Two pastoral appointments followed. His revivalism and radical spirituality brought him into conflict with the Methodist Episcopal Church. As a result, forty-three individuals joined their pastor in founding the Mision Wesleyana Nacional. Mora was censured by the Methodist Episcopal Church and finally expelled at the Annual Conference of 1931. As Ossa indicated, the name of the new organization was chosen to reflect the values and aspirations of Mora. The church was to be radical in spirituality and mission in the Wesleyan tradition, as well as being an indigenous church.

After chronicling these beginnings, Ossa describes the growing trends toward a radical social ethic as well as radical spirituality. Chapter two discusses the period 1929-1940 and the third chapter is devoted to the years 1950-1969. Regrettably the decade 1940-1950 receives no significant attention. Ossa analyzes the entire development exclusively in terms of the social dimensions of the tradition and attempts to ground the developments in the context of the American Methodist Episcopal Church's "Social Gospel," which was introduced into Chile in May, 1919 when the "Social Creed" was published in Spanish in the Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian periodical, *El Heraldo Cristiano*. This interpretive perspective needs reexamination.

There are two grounds for questioning the identification of the "Social Creed" with the phenomenon of the Mision Wesleyana Nacional. The first is historical and the second ecclesiological. First, it is assumed that the radical social vision of Methodism first arrived in Chile with the "Social Creed." However, Methodism in Chile was founded by William Taylor, an abolitionist Methodist (freed his own inherited slaves) who had fought for worker's rights in San Francisco as early as 1848 and continued to work for the rights of indigenous peoples in South Africa, the Caribbean, and India before he arrived in Chile in 1877. All of the early Methodist Episcopal Church missionaries went to Chile under the aegis of the non-juridical "self-supporting" missions of William Taylor. On Taylor's life and mission theories, see the David Bundy essay "Bishop

William Taylor and Methodist Mission: A Study in Nineteenth Century Social History," *Methodist History* 27(1989), 197-210 and 28(1989), 3-21. The efforts of the Methodist Episcopal Mission Board to control the results of the mission work were instrumental in the development of the first Pentecostal churches in Chile. See Walter Hollenweger, "Methodism's Past is Pentecostalism's Present," *Methodist History* 20(1982), 169-182.

Mora would have experienced the conflict between the Methodists and the derivative Pentecostals. Surely the choices made by Mora over against the Methodist Episcopal Church with regard to (1) native leadership, (2) identification with Pentecostalism, and (3) the adoption of the Wesleyan Holiness/Pentecostal synthesis of radical spirituality and social vision, were significant. These, one could argue, only make sense when analyzed in terms of the Wesleyan/Holiness heritage of William Taylor and the conflict over mission theory and ecclesiology of that tradition with the Methodist Episcopal Mission Board, a conflict which focused from 1875-1907 on the experience of Methodism in Chile and Latin America. This is not to say that Mora did not accept tenets of the "Social Creed." All Methodists did, for it was congruent with various elements of their Wesleyan and Holiness past. Indeed, the argument can be made that the "Social Creed" was developed within mainline Methodism to detract from the Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal attacks against Methodism's increasingly bourgeois values.

Secondly, the response of the Methodist Episcopal Church to Mora's ministry was to "locate" him, a juridical term which meant that he was removed from the recognized active clergy of the denomination. This disciplinary procedure also had been used against Taylor, who founded the Methodist Episcopal Church in Chile while "located" in the South India Conference of that church. The ecclesiological response of Mora was to declare the new tradition a "mission" in the Wesleyan tradition. The same response had been made both by the earlier Chilean pentecostals and by their co-religionists in the Holiness and Pentecostal movements in the U.S.A. It was Taylor's "Pauline" mission theory and praxis which gave a theoretical basis for such an ecclesiological decision.

Ossa has done admirable work in bringing together significant data about the life of Victor Mora and the origins of the Mision Wesleyana Nacional. Much of the data presented in this volume was collected by oral history research; other data was found in obscure publications not normally preserved in either national libraries or ecclesiastical archives.

However, the reliance on standard Methodist historiography, which has repressed the narrative of Taylor's influence in Chile and of the radical social and religious agenda of the Holiness movements within Methodism, has led him to interpret Mora and the Mision according to a grid which does not provide wholistic explanations of the origins and development of that significant tradition. It is hoped that, from the basis of the splendid research on which this book is based, other scholars will revisit the problem. Despite these interpretive quarrels, Ossa merits the gratitude of all scholars of Methodism and Pentecostalism for his work in bringing the Mision Wesleyana Nacional and its founder to the historiographical table.

John Christopher Thomas, *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community*. JSNT Supplement Series, 61. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991, 214 pages.

Reviewed by Russell Morton, Perkins School of Theology, Dallas, Texas.

Originally presented as the author's doctoral dissertation at the University of Sheffield, this volume presents an in-depth examination of John 13:1-20. Thomas discusses the role of foot washing in the first century Jewish and Greco-Roman environment, and provides literary and exegetical analyses. Finally, he proposes a reconstruction of the practice of foot washing in the Johannine community based on later church praxis and interpretation up to the time of Augustine.

One of Thomas's most important contributions is his description of the role of foot washing within the ancient Greco-Roman environment (19-60). Citing both Jewish and classical sources, he points out that it fulfilled clearly defined functions within the first century social milieu. Among both Jews and Gentiles, foot washing served as: (1) part of an individual's efforts to maintain personal hygiene; (2) a ritual of hospitality; and (3) an act of servitude. It also functioned in cultic settings to establish ritual purity.

Three basic conclusions are drawn. Within Judaism, foot washing was considered a necessary preparation for various activities. Lack of proper preparation, particularly in cultic settings, could be referred to as acting "with unwashed feet" (29, 42; see Philo, *Quaest in Exod.* 1.2).

Foot washing is also mentioned within the context of providing hospitality, usually within the setting of a meal (35-40). Finally, foot washing was usually performed by a servant (40-41). These observations also hold true for the Greco-Roman world in general (42-52).

Most remarkable, however, is the way in which foot washing has been transformed in Jn. 13:1-20. Among Thomas's conclusions are: (1) the servant motif is prominent in John 13:1-20; (2) the motivation of the action is Jesus' love for His disciples; (3) foot washing is not merely a gesture of hospitality, but an act which cleanses the disciples; (4) the actions of Jesus may have reference to His impending death; and, in light of 1 Tim. 5:9-10, (5) it is possible that Jesus' command in Jn. 13:14 "to wash one another's feet" was taken literally by some in the church (59-60).

Thomas next engages in a literary and structural analysis of Jn. 13:1-20 (61-125). This passage is an introduction to the second part of the gospel, which R. Brown refers to as the "Book of glory." In these verses, themes from the earlier "Book of signs" (Jn. 1-12), particularly Jesus' role of servant and good shepherd (Jn. 10:1-18) and his impending sacrificial death (Jn. 3:1-21; 6:25-65), receive extended development. The passage also functions as an introduction to the farewell discourse of chaps. 13-17. John 13:1-20, therefore, is a transitional passage, looking back to what precedes and forward to what is coming.

According to Thomas, Jn. 13:1-20 is a single literary unit in which themes introduced in 13:1-11 are further developed in 12-20 (116-118). Verses 1-5 constitute the introduction in which the act of foot washing itself is described. Verses 6-11 relate a dialogue between Jesus and Peter and describe the importance of receiving foot washing from Jesus. Finally, in vv. 12-20 is a discourse in which the significance of the act is explained, and the command that the disciples emulate Jesus' action (vss. 14-17) is given (108-112). Thomas concludes that Jn. 13 :1-20 portrays Jesus acting in an unprecedented manner. Nowhere else in antiquity does a superior wash the feet of inferiors. Foot washing is also not an option, but a command reiterated three times. The disciples are to continue the practice in almost sacramental fashion (115-116).

The final chapter discusses how the early church understood the foot washing command of Jesus. Drawing on numerous witnesses from both eastern and western traditions, including Ignatius, Tertullian, John Chrysostom, the Apostolic constitutions, Augustine, Athanasius, and Ambrose of Milan, it is concluded that the passage often was interpreted

as a literal command. On the basis of these observations, Thomas judges that the Johannine community would have viewed foot washing as a sacramental rite which provided for the forgiveness of post-conversion sin (149-158).

Thomas has provided an interesting and important analysis of a much neglected pericope. His discussion of foot washing in both the Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts of the first century provides an especially important service. His insights into John 13:1-20 are cogent and helpful. The weakest part of the book may be his discussion of foot washing in the later church. Several of the passages seem allegorical and may not support the conclusion that it functioned as a sacrament.

In addition, one of the most interesting, and perhaps unanswerable questions regarding the text is not discussed. Does the foot washing narrative actually derive from the historical Jesus, or does it reflect later practice on the part of the Johannine community? While it may have been impossible within the limits of Thomas's study to examine this issue, it needs to be addressed in some context. Thomas himself understands the importance of this issue, and proposes it as one among other topics for further study (189). It is to be hoped he or others are able to take up the challenge and add further insights to this already important work.

Officers of the Wesleyan Theological Society 1992-1993

President:	Susie C. Stanley Western Evangelical Seminary Tigard, Oregon
First Vice President:	George Lyons Northwest Nazarene College Nampa, Idaho
Second Vice President:	Donald A. Thorsen Azusa Pacific University Azusa, California
Secretary-Treasurer:	William C. Kostlevy Asbury Theological Seminary Wilmore, Kentucky
Editorial Committee:	Paul M. Bassett, Editor (1987-93) Wesley Tracy Bill Faupel

