3-1-1972

The Development of Pentecostalism Out of Revivalism in America: a Reaction against the Established Churches

Paul F. Hutchinson

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PENTECOSTALISM OUT OF REVIVALISM IN AMERICA: A REACTION AGAINST THE ESTABLISHED CHURCHES

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Paul Franklin Hutchinson

May 1972

Approved by: John W. Constable
Advisor

Everett R. Kalin
Reader

Short Title

DEVELOPMENT OF PENTECOSTALISM; Hutchinson; S.T.M., 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Because the writer has been personally involved with neo-Pentecostals in the charismatic movement, this thesis was undertaken in an attempt to understand that movement in terms of its history.[1] Such history cannot yet be written. At the same time, traditional Pentecostalism has had a strong influence on the charismatic movement. Apart from the fact that the charismatic movement is much less institutionalized than the older Pentecostalism, there is no essential nor normative difference between the two. A thorough understanding of the latter contributes materially to an understanding of the former.

A study of the charismatic movement would begin with Pentecostalism. That beginning point raises a question. How and why did Pentecostalism begin? Because Pentecostalism in the United States is a product of revivalism, the thesis began with the Great Awakening

---

[1] By the charismatic or neo-Pentecostal movement the writer means that manifestation of Pentecostal phenomena which began in the established churches in 1960 in St. Mark's Episcopal Church in Van Nuys, California, where the Rev. Dennis Bennett was the rector. He had received the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues. Rather than cause division in his congregation over this issue, he resigned. The movement spread during the 1960's across the nation and has infiltrated the major denominations. The Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International has been a non-denominational promoter of the movement. Charismatic teachings are essentially those of the older Pentecostalism. These are (a) An experience following infant baptism or conversion known as the baptism in the Holy Spirit; (b) The expectation of the gift of speaking in tongues as the sign of that baptism; (c) The presence of spiritual gifts in charismatic worship services, healings, prophecy, interpretations, and miracles.

of the eighteenth century. The history of revivals and related perfectionist movements leads to the origin of Pentecostalism. The thesis concludes toward 1910 after which year the Pentecostal Movement became increasingly institutionalized.

The purpose of the study was to trace organic theological connections and social influences. Thus to clarify origins and developments, the writer has been enabled better to understand the theology of the Pentecostal Movement. The realization of this goal has lent importance to the time invested.

Other motives led to the research for this paper. The dispensational scheme of history which one reads in Pentecostal literature; the claims of precedent, extracted from historical context, which are supposed to validate current phenomena; and the supposition that apparently isolated Pentecostal revivals spontaneously fell from heaven; these Pentecostal tendencies have moved the writer to attempt to disprove such assumptions.

Another motivation came from the popularity of the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship among neo-Pentecostals and charismatic church members. This popularity aroused the writer's curiosity. The study of the Plymouth Brethren has satisfied this curiosity.

Another motive lay in the fact that charismatic church members and neo-Pentecostals suffer classical Pentecostal influence when they broadly question or even reject infant baptism. The writer has answered this question in the historical study.

Finally, the Pentecostal definition of Spirit baptism casts aspersions on those deep spiritual experiences which this writer had prior to receiving the gift of tongues. In those former

experiences, far richer and more edifying gifts were received, such as power to preach the Gospel, the knowledge of the distinction between law and gospel, the desire to study Scripture, and aptness for teaching it. The Pentecostal definition exalts tongues over such gifts.

The scope of serious investigation was limited to the period 1720 to 1910. This beginning permits an understanding of American revivalism. It is certainly in this long historical context that revivals, and the Pentecostal revival in particular, should be investigated and understood. The assumption is that no revival simply "breaks out." The investigation concluded toward 1910 because the Pentecostal Movement had established its basic and pre-institutional character by that time.

The Great Awakening manifested not only the perennial features of a revival but set in motion the forces of change, both in theology and practice. The decay and loss of Jonathan Edwards' theology and the wide adoption of his methods constitute one of the key motifs of the century following the Great Awakening. The emphasis in the chapter on the Great Awakening is on the origin of those features which recur in later revivals.

The separation of church and state prepared the way for that uniquely American phenomenon, the denomination, and also for a new form of established religion. The frontier period, 1790-1830, made the revival a necessity and produced those conditions which brought on the Second Awakening. A theological parallel to Jacksonian democracy, this Awakening involved an attack on the denominational establishment.

Theologically and intellectually indisposed, the Finney revival resulted in the conditions it had originally attacked, lethargy, the anxious bench ritual, and moral laxity. Finney therefore adopted perfectionism. The chapter on American perfectionism is crucial in illustrating what happens to the second blessing doctrine when divorced from sacramental holiness.

After the Civil War, the complexities of the rising urban-industrial society, with evolution and natural science, forced theological changes. These changes, on the one hand, involved a further decay of the Puritan theological heritage to produce liberal theology and the social gospel. On the other hand, a reactionary movement resulted which combined with dispensationalism and pre-millennialism to produce fundamentalism. This line of nineteenth-century thought entered Pentecostalism. Moody's revivalism stood, often ambiguously, in the middle. Following Moody, the thought and revival efforts of Reuben A. Torrey produced important links to and influences on the coming Pentecostal Movement.

As a result of the Second Great Awakening, perfectionism received renewed emphasis. After the Civil War, this interest revived in the Holiness Movement. The absolutist zeal of this Movement produced a host of sects during the last twenty years of the nineteenth century and took the Movement out of the Methodist Church by 1900. These are the major theological influences, the others being the Torrey revivals and fundamentalism, which produced and helped to define the Pentecostal Movement. In no period were social conditions without influence on theology, but it is particularly important to

see how Pentecostalism was influenced by and still reflects the conditions which helped to give it birth.

Insofar as this writer knows, the origins and rise of Pentecostalism have not been traced historically in terms of the decisive contribution of the second blessing doctrine. Many popular studies have traced the tongues phenomenon for the past two thousand years. Such books are of little help in understanding Pentecostalism, which is not defined by the tongues phenomenon. Speaking in tongues is pre-Christian; it is found in non-Christian, usually alienated, groups. The phenomenon is open, Paul says, to the possibility of cursing Christ. Pentecostalism is defined by the separation of Spirit baptism from conversion and water baptism with the necessity or near-necessity of tongues as the significant proof of the second (or third, in some cases) blessing. The complete history of second blessing theology, or in other words, the history of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, remains and needs to be written.

Major and truly helpful sources have been Nils Bloch-Hoell, The Pentecostal Movement; Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American History; John Leland Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism; Arthur M. Schlesinger, A Critical Period in American Religion; Frank Bartleman, What Really Happened at Azusa Street; Timothy L. Smith, Called Unto Holiness; William Warren Sweet, Revivalism in America; W. A. Visser't Hooft, Background of the Social Gospel in America; Charles G. Finney, Lectures on Revivals; Ernest R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism; and Reuben A. Torrey, Baptism with the Holy Spirit.

Here is the summary of the writer's conclusions:

a. Revival or renewal theology, where there is any, is poor equipment for grappling theologically with the mighty social challenges and changes of the day;

b. As a platform for church renewal, Pentecostal ecclesiology is dangerous because it is based not on objective grace but on subjective gifts;

c. Renewal movements are self-contradictory. Although they tend to oppose institutions, they usually become what they oppose;

d. The dispensational interpretation of history is false;

e. To say that the Pentecostal Movement began in and was rejected by the churches is not entirely true. Such a statement should be balanced by the observation that Pentecostalism began among the sects which also rejected it;

f. There is no normative Pentecostal terminology;

g. To define Spirit baptism as an experience subsequent to conversion (of adults) and water baptism (of infants) endangers justification;

h. The writer of this thesis defines Spirit baptism as taking place at the moment of adult conversion or at the moment of infant baptism. Subsequent spiritual experiences should be referred to as infillings of the Holy Spirit. In the past three hundred years, there have been at least five different definitions of the baptism of the Holy Spirit;

i. Among the five, choice is determined by one's doctrinal commitment;

j. With the equation of conversion or water baptism with Spirit baptism, repeated infillings of the Holy Spirit may be expected and accepted;

k. Speaking in tongues is pre-Christian and occurs among non-Christians; it may become anti-Christian;

l. Its use as the sole or even primary criterion in the definition of Pentecostalism is misleading;

m. To write the history of the tongues phenomenon as if one were approaching Pentecostalism may lead to a misunderstanding of the movement;

n. The real issue with which Pentecostalism challenges the churches is not speaking in tongues but the Spirit-filled life, openness to the gifts of the Spirit, and power for Christian growth, instructed by God's Word, disciplined by a realistic sacramental theology, and embraced in a theology of the cross.

CHAPTER II

THE PURITAN ESTABLISHMENT COMPROMISES

While it was present in all of the American colonies, Puritan influence may properly be restricted to two groups in New England.[1] These two groups were the Plymouth Colony Pilgrims, who were separatists, and the Bay Colony Congregationalists, who claimed to be loyal members of the Church of England.[2] Whether in or out of the Established Church, Puritans have always been reformers. Their congregational polity partially describes them. In addition they sought to reform the Established Church. They sought a reform in the direction of pure worship purged of Romanist trappings, pure church government untrammeled by state interference, and pure personal life free from ecclesiastical or creedal constraint.[3]

Such a reformation involves two principles: (a) Voluntary church membership; and (b) Separation from both the world and the unreformed church. This revolution in ecclesiology implies that true religion is within the individual believer who is prior to the church and that the true church is an assembly of those who are already saints.[4] Basic to these beliefs was moral earnestness, strict life, disciplined

---

[1] Winthrop S. Hudson, "Puritanism," Encyclopaedia Britannica, XVIII (1962), 777.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ralph F. G. Calder, "Congregationalism," Encyclopaedia Britannica, VI (1962), 247.

[4] Ibid., VI, 248.

habits, and a dissatisfaction with mediocre religion. The source of this strenuous faith was a deep personal experience of God's grace which the Puritan zealously wanted to share with others.[5]

As the established church of the Bay Colony, congregational Puritanism rigorously excluded the unregenerate and at first admitted only those of the covenant.[6] Continuous dissent and the desire to broaden the franchise led to the "Halfway Covenant"[7] in 1662, and the replacement of the Charter in 1691 ended the hopes of establishing a colonial Zion. The Halfway Covenant permitted the unregenerate to become church members and to have their children baptized. These parents were halfway members who were not communicants. The Halfway Covenant was a compromise with the Puritan ecclesiology. Not only did it grant church membership to the unregenerate but it also permitted children to grow up within the church, some of whom underwent no experience of conversion.[8]

The Halfway Covenant of 1662 was therefore a compromise with the strenuous Puritan ecclesiology. Its introduction of evidently unregenerate members into the Puritan congregations of Massachusetts provided cause for strict interpreters of Puritan ecclesiology to oppose the tendency. This compromise and opposition to it was a necessary pre-condition to the Great Awakening.

---

[5] Hudson, XVIII, 777.

[6] Ibid., XVIII, 779.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ozora Stearns Davis and Matthew Spinka, "Congregationalism," Encyclopaedia Britannica, VI (1962), 251.

CHAPTER III

THE GREAT AWAKENING 1720--1760

Solomon Stoddard was evidently the first American revival preacher. He reaped "harvests" at Northampton, Massachusetts, in the years between 1679 and 1712.[1] Revivalism began effectively in 1734 when the New England clergy personalized and emotionalized religion. In the Treatise Concerning Religious Affections, Jonathan Edwards made religious emotions theologically and intellectually respectable.[2] This he did in the presence of a weakening establishment, frontier individualism, and a growing need for new methods to build the Church.

Outside of New England, the first American revival sprang out of continental pietism. This individualistic religion of the heart came mainly from South Germany in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.[3] It was manifested among Moravians and Dunkers, was present among the Lutheran and Reformed congregations, and took an extreme form among anti-institutional Baptists, Quakers, and Methodists.

In 1725, thirteen years before Aldersgate, the pietist preacher Theodore J. Frelinghuysen began a revival in central New Jersey, finding his strongest response among the poor and the young. There is room

---

[1] C. C. Cole, Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826--1860 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), p. 72.

[2] William Warren Sweet, Revivalism in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), pp. 30 and 85.

[3] Ibid., p. 25.

here to find rejection of the institution controlled by an older and well-to-do age group.

The Great Awakening began in 1734 and swept through New England for ten years, adding twenty-five thousand converts and one hundred and fifty new congregational churches. The last phases of the Great Awakening were in Virginia in 1750 under the Presbyterian, Samuel Davis. The Presbyterian revival in Virginia from 1740 to 1760 was also a social upheaval which first opened a breach in the ranks of privilege, increasing Presbyterian popularity and decreasing the popularity of the Established Church. Here began the trend which within a century made sects out of churches and churches out of sects, equalizing both into denominations. The Colonial Revival continued as a Baptist movement after 1760 and also as the beginning of Methodism under Devereux Jarratt, George Shadford, and Francis Asbury, its several phases being tied together by George Whitefield's seven tours of America from 1738 to 1770.

The Great Awakening was preceded by an attempt to introduce into New England a European establishment, a grace-dispensing institution. Such an attempt was taking place gradually when the Halfway Covenant was introduced in 1662. This reliance on predisposing means compromised that strenuous doctrine of the Puritan fathers, conversion by the monergism of divine grace. Institutional means predisposing to Christianity as a religion--worship, upright life, exposure to church in general, a cooled-off, unemotional religion--set or helped to set the stage for the Great Awakening. The Covenant removed social and political disabilities and satisfied the half-way members, but it naturally caused a decline in the already low communicant percentage.

Of the 101 souls on the Mayflower, 12 were church members; in all the colonies, church membership was low, exclusive, and hard to obtain. The foreign-born tend to abandon their old country ties.[4] The most highly-churched area was New England, but in 1760 only one in eight was a church member even after the Awakening.

Some people saw no contradiction between conversion and half-way membership in the same grace-dispensing institution. To an ardent Calvinist and Puritan, it may well have appeared as a pernicious evil. At any rate, Jonathan Edwards in 1731 had warned the Boston clergy of the presence of Arminianism in their midst.

Other factors contributing to the Great Awakening were frontier individualism, the universal priesthood of believers, and the need for new methods. The toleration of non-uniformity and the decay of church membership standards made clear the need for new methods. The loss of the old method of church growth had to be made good somehow.

There were political factors also. The status of the colonies was in doubt even from 1660; religious affairs took a back seat to politics; Indians kept the colonies in fear with the intermittent wars after 1689, the burden of which, in its colonial phases, fell on New England.

Jonathan Edwards (1703--1758) came in 1727 to Northampton, Massachusetts, on the right bank of the Connecticut River, twenty-four miles upstream from Enfield, Connecticut. The ensuing revival took seven years to kindle. In December, 1734, he preached a series of sermons against Arminianism. In the course of the ensuing revival,

---

[4] Ibid., p. 13. In 1760, one-third of the colonial population was foreign-born.

three hundred souls were converted amid denunciation, the apocalyptic message of the world's soon-end, personal invitation, the anxious bench, stamping, leaping, and frenzy.[5]

The revival became general in New England and especially in the Connecticut valley up to 1740. Whitefield united it with the New Jersey revival in his tour of 1738--1741 when the New England revival came to its climax.

As Edwards had warned the liberal clergy of Boston against free and universal grace, so he warned the lax Enfieldians on 8 July 1741 in a sermon entitled, Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God.[6] Edwards defended the emotional and bodily responses. On Long Island, such responses were carried to extremes by an unrestrained preacher named James Davenport.

Certain rather clear results of the Great Awakening appear, theological, ecclesiological, intellectual, practical, political, and educational.

The Great Awakening began the tendency from objective doctrine to individualistic and experiential revivalism; from the inclusive institution to the exclusive sect of the regenerate; and from a Christianized social order to the dualistic and world-fleeing sect.

Though Edwards was a restrained intellectual,[7] he unleashed anti-intellectual revival forces which emphasized practical ideas, a

---

[5]Gilbert Seldes, The Stammering Century (New York: John Day Company, 1928), p. 26.

[6]Ibid., p. 16.

[7]Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American Life (New York: Knopf, 1964), pp. 67-68.

disdain for doctrine, and a preference for the leader with the charisma over the thinker with an idea.[8] Anti-intellectualism first appears in American history among these Protestants of the Great Awakening.[9] Among them were the first thinkers; also among them appeared the first emphases on workable and successful ideas. While Edwards himself recognized the valid place of emotion in the Christian life and preserved the balance between faith and reason, other awakeners and revivalists did not. In the next century, Edwards' theology was disastrously defeated, but his methods gained a great victory.[10] The issue thus raised when emotion is opposed to reason or doctrine forces the theologians to state a propositional faith, a creed to which intellectual assent is given, while the revivalist in search of success becomes an advocate of anti-intellectual emotionalism. This unfortunate issue haunts American churches from the seventeenth century to the present.[11]

In American democracy's passion for equality, this anti-intellectualism has become political and, in the nineteenth-century quest for religious or business success, even more powerful as it questioned the apparently impractical and unproductive intellectual, be he theologian, historian, or scientist.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 55.

[9] Ibid., pp. 47-49.

[10] Seldes, p. 16.

[11] Edwin Scott Gaustad, Religious Issues in American History (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 105.

With its sources in pietism[12] and compounded by frontier primitivism,[13] anti-intellectualism prevented the development of an independent theology capable of critically apprehending secular thought. Later evangelicals therefore freely adopted popular secular attitudes in social and economic questions or else rejected them out of hand in a world-denying alienation from society.

To settle on the religion of the heart or of intuition not only rendered systematic and rational theology apparently and popularly impractical, but it also spelled the rejection of the learned and professional clergy.[14] The leader in this rejection was the evangelical movement and its descendants. Their well-meaning efforts were abetted by the frontier. Constantly outrun by the frontier, the institutional church had the balance tipped against it from the start.

The Great Awakening was only ambiguously anti-intellectual. Still, it set the precedent for later attacks on a learned clergy, the institutional church sacramentalism,[15] and liturgy. The regular clergy at first welcomed the revival. Only later did they realize that the travelling awakeners considered them to be inferior competitors. Moreover, the first major membership accessions on a scale larger than the

---

[12]James F. Findlay, Jr., Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 87.

[13]Hofstadter, p. 49.

[14]Ibid., p. 55.

[15]Seldes, p. 33. Jonathan Edwards' grandfather regarded the Lord's Supper as having independent and objective properties apart from the communicant, but Edwards rejected this theory.

confines of a single colony were of course made and gained by the travelling revival preachers, to the further detriment of the institutional clergy.

For the purposes of this writer, the important theological results were the division of New England theology into the opponents of revival, that is, the Old Lights; the advocates of revival, that is, the New Lights, and the separatists who became Baptists. Revival advocates finally overwhelmed their opposition and set the pattern of denominationalism for the nineteenth century.

The Old Lights were incipient rationalists and later Unitarians who withdrew from the Congregational association.[16] There was a split within the New Light ranks as well, over the survival of the Halfway Covenant. For example, in Edwards' own Northampton congregation, his insistence on the evidences of personal conversion led to his dismissal in 1750. In other congregations, the split on this issue led to separation; most of such separatists became Baptists who made the greatest gains from the Great Awakening.[17]

In the beginning of the Awakening the Puritan Calvinist Confessions were not in question. The real concern was with personal religious experience as a revolt against mere formalism, but within a hundred years Edwards' theology, the New England theology, met its demise.

---

[16] Winthrop S. Hudson, Religion in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 72.

[17] Ibid., p. 73.

In summary the important theological result of this First Awakening was a new theological system, sectarian, democratic, puritan in morality, and pietistic.[18] It was a beginning theological revolution and an incomplete reorientation from Puritan Calvinism to evangelicalism. This process was completed only after further theological battles in the Second Awakening one hundred years later.[19] Edwards' theology won out over old Calvinism and entered the Presbyterian churches of the north central states,[20] a fact of major significance in the nineteenth century in both the Presbyterian church and the Second Awakening. In the last third of the eighteenth century, the Great Awakening spread to the central and southern colonies where there developed a distinctly American phenomenon, the revival Baptists. With a simplified doctrine and a minimum of essential organization they carried the gospel to a mobile and rootless frontier. Their leveling influence in Virginia contributed to the separation of church and state. (Baptist preachers refused to apply for a license to preach.) Thus, before the political revolution, the ecclesiastical revolution had taken place. The hold of established churches was loosened and one common emotional interest for the first time united the colonies and rallied

---

[18] William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), p. 9.

[19] The writer of the thesis distinguishes Geneva Calvinism from Westminster Calvinism and both from the Calvinist theology which resulted from its admixture with pietism apparent in the early frontier Baptist preachers.

[20] Sweet, p. 199.

them about names such as Edwards and Whitefield long before Franklin and Washington.[21]

Revivalism did not always preserve its theological heritage. It exerted much social and political influence where there was an established church. It contributed to the separation of church and state. As time passed, revivalism found no other enemy than ecclesiastical lethargy, thus exercising less influence. Revivalism was a precipitant toward both eighteenth-century revolution[22] and nineteenth-century reformism[23] with a dynamic drive into change and improvement. It was equally reactionary in unleashing anti-intellectualism.

An important result of the Great Awakening was the primary emphasis placed on the Kingdom of God after the Great Awakening. The Kingdom of God was not redefined, but its revivalist preaching took first place over the cleansing of the human heart. This was a gradual process working side by side with the conservative message of forgiveness and cleansing. The end of the process was two separate gospels, one a socially irresponsible cleansing, the other an uncleansed social effort directed at building the Kingdom of God on earth.

---

[21]Hudson, pp. 76-77.

[22]William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1939), p. 251.

[23]Herbert J. Bass, The State of American History (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970), p. iii.

The germs of millennialism were present at the end of the Great Awakening probably in the left wing Protestant sects.[24] The Great Awakening and subsequent revivals made millennialism the common possession of American Christianity. The summary point is that the later revival preachers brought the coming of the Kingdom of God into the present, powerfully urging their hearers to face its coming and to decide.

Educational results of the Great Awakening include some distinguished schools. Education was subject to religious factionalism, sectarian control, and pietistic concerns at the expense of learning.[25]

---

[24]H. Richard Niebuhr, The Kingdom of God in America (Chicago and New York: Willett and Clark, 1937), p. 135.

[25]Hofstadter, p. 72.

CHAPTER IV

THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD 1770--1790

The alliance between pietistic revivalist and rationalist to separate church and state in this period was followed by the rapprochement between pietistic revivalist and the traditional and orthodox defenders of the formerly established churches. That's the key to American Christianity in the nineteenth century.[1] This strange rapprochement makes the nineteenth century hard to study, analyze, and generalize, because no matter what one says, it is at once suspect in light of some outcast or overlooked fact.

For one thing, pietism victoriously permeated almost all of the denominations; further, its opposition to rationalism conditioned also the traditional churches, both together winning the engagement but in the process scuttling much of the intellectual capital of Protestant theology.

American denominations today defend the separation of church and state. However the unique Christian revolution--religious freedom--first defended by rationalists[2] was among the Christians carried off by the left-wing sects, Baptists for example.[3] Religious freedom is one

---

[1] Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 52-53.

[2] Ibid., p. 56.

[3] William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1939), p. 222.

of the kingpins of democracy and with democracy a child of American Christianity.

Presently less than two hundred years old, this unique American invention overthrew a fourteen-hundred-year-old Christian axiom, all within the period 1620 to 1790. Although implicit and reluctant toleration had obtained by the middle of the eighteenth century in all the colonies,[4] the battle for separation was engaged in Virginia where the Anglican Church fought most bitterly.[5] The determining factor was the presence of the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists as dissenters.

The quickening of a democratic spirit resulted from the frontier revivalists such as Samuel Harris (born 1724; converted under Baptist preaching in 1758) whose efforts were devoted mainly to the heretofore neglected and unchurched poor. While he was not born in this country, he was a product of the frontier, and he functioned effectively where the established church neither wanted nor was able to reach. These frontier revival preachers gave to the poor the right to hear their own kind of preacher; they opened the way for the poor convert himself to become a preacher; and perhaps unintentionally, perhaps necessarily, they powerfully quickened American anti-intellectualism, the decay of the authority of the established church, and its ordered clergy and sacraments. This result was probably not intended, but vis-à-vis an ineffective or incapable establishment such a result appears inevitable.

---

[4]Mead, p. 18.

[5]Sweet, p. 274.

One of the aspects of the period under consideration is the lack of a theological rationale for or against an established church. Equally devoid of theological thought is the opposition to or support of rationalism. Anti-establishment sects at one time sided with rationalists to accomplish the separation of church and state; at a later time they sided with Timothy Dwight to oppose the Deist or infidel in order to promote revivalism.[6]

There was present also an incipient fundamentalism, perhaps inevitably a concomitant of anti-intellectualism. Previously mentioned is the Old Light-New Light split within New England congregationalism. This Old Light movement had, by 1800, become strongly Unitarian. That issue should have centered theological concerns on the person and work of Jesus Christ, but revivalism actually waged the battle against infidelity in the area of revelation, the Bible, and the acceptance of a Book.[7] This became the quasi-rational and orthodox position: if one accepts the scriptural evidences and their propositional statement, then one has an authoritative theology, law, morals, and social order.[8]

Religious freedom equalized the promoted sects and the demoted establishments and put them on the same competitive basis. The denomination which could best adapt its organization and message to frontier conditions would grow. The Methodist Church changed from a

---

[6]Mead, pp. 52-53.

[7]Martin Marty, The Infidel (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), pp. 116-117.

[8]Ibid.

small sect in 1760 to a large and prosperous church one hundred years later. On the other hand, formerly large and influential established churches, Congregational and Anglican, were unable to adapt to the frontier and by 1860 had become relatively small denominations. The instrument lay ready at hand for the pietistic sect to guarantee its own growth: the individualized and emotionalistic revival. The need to survive led to an emphasis on pragmatic religion experientially based and numerically successful. The successful pastor converted the most souls, theology withdrew from rational discourse, religion thus purveyed no longer belonged to the whole life of the intellect, and theology abandoned the field of rational studies to science.

The members of the former established churches responded to the challenge of denominational competition by turning to the pious winning of souls also. Lyman Beecher reflects this shaping of the American denomination.[9] He found a proper foil in infidelity which he attacked without profound thought.

To justify its own existence, the left-wing sect was anti-traditional and even deliberately ahistorical. The sect relied on the Bible alone and ignored church history from 100 A.D. to 1800 A.D. If the former church, now a denomination, wanted to compete, it accepted the same terms and premises.

Moreover, it was easy to begin anew. Just move west, and the evils and errors of tradition and of the eastern establishment were easily avoided. The country itself was making a great new beginning.

---

[9] Ibid., p. 105.

To awaken to God and national self-consciousness at the same time was a new beginning indeed. So youthful America, not least under the influence of the denominations, moved into the nineteenth century with surging belief in the coming Kingdom, the perfection of society, and progress.

CHAPTER V

THE FRONTIER 1790--1830

The nation was on the move during the frontier period. New England alone lost eight hundred thousand of its residents by westward migration.[1] The churches' problems of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries continued into the nineteenth as a result of this vast immigration into the Ohio Valley.

As the colonies had been the frontier problem of the old country, so in 1800 the new states had a frontier problem west of the Alleghany range. Conflict was inevitable, not first but most obviously in the American Revolution, then in Shay's and the Whiskey Rebellion, and later in the east-west sectionalism. This sectionalism played a part in Jacksonian democracy and in the Finney revivals.

Sweet characterizes these years as the time of the lowest moral and spiritual conditions in American history.[2] Whatever the post-revolutionary moral decay may have been, it was compounded by the evidently natural step into barbarism which accompanies a movement to the frontier. The frontier was crude, turbulent, godless, without institutions, and subject to an anti-intellectual primitivism. The concern of such primitivism was not to preserve the civilization which

---

[1] William Warren Sweet, Revivalism in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), pp. 112-113.

[2] Ibid., pp. 117-118.

arrived from Europe but to recover native simplicities in the powers of nature and the romanticized past, that is, the first-century church.

This period was a time of transition and readjustment. The transition had begun in the Great Awakening with the full-time itinerant preachers, George Whitefield, Gilbert Tennent, and James Davenport operating in the midst of a settled institutional church. Disestablishment and the emergence of the voluntary denomination brought the itinerant preacher to independent ministerial status. Its prototype was Asahel Nettleton, a restrained, institutional itinerant. The continuing transition removed the restraint, depreciated church membership, and insured the rise of a clergy both popular, acceptable, and effective. Here was formed the climate of opinion in which the professional revivalist could flourish, of which Finney first fully fit the description at the end of this period. Moreover revival is related to social need.[3] Wartime tensions, a physical frontier as in the period under consideration, or an ecological frontier as in the last quarter of the nineteenth century when there arose the frontier of the urban slum and a parallel revival.

Although the itinerant evangelists outran the institutional church, they did not destroy it. There was no institution on the frontier. The evangelists restored ordinary restraints and institutions to a barbarous land. To them, more than to any other single

---

[3]Thorsten Sellin and Richard D. Lambert, editors, Religion in American Society in The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1960), CCCXXXII, (November 1960), 11-12.

force goes the credit for taming the frontier.[4] To be successful on the frontier they were necessarily anti-authoritarian, anti-establishment, anti-Eastern, and anti-intellectual.[5]

The veterans of the Revolution had no place for the Puritan Sabbath on the frontier.[6] The recently disestablished Anglican church was under treason's cloud. There was no national church organization. On the frontier, the struggle for survival, the plentiful supply of hard liquor, the superstition and quackery, and the leveling influence of poverty were key factors in the situation. Natural to the frontier was the religion of the poor and disinherited with all that implies as perennially proper to such religion: emotionalism, personal experience, rejection of creed and liturgy, lay leadership, and a simple message.

Frontier conditions of this particular period influenced different denominations according to the measure of their achieved institutionalism at the time. For example, the Congregational Church, once effective on its own frontier, had achieved institutional status before 1800, rigidly opposed the new frontier to the west, and influenced it rather little.[7]

Among effective frontier denominations the Methodists are paradigmatic. Indeed, without the frontier, the Methodist Church would

---

[4]Charles A. Johnson, The Frontier Camp Meeting (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1958), p. 8, quoting Ralph H. Gabriel.

[5]Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American Life (New York: Knopf, 1964), p. 79.

[6]Johnson, pp. 8-10.

[7]H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York: Henry Holy, 1929), p. 145.

have played a much less significant role in American history. Its strong organization, itinerancy, and youthful flexibility fitted it admirably to convert the frontier. It adjusted to frontier conditions by giving up the Prayer Book, vestments, and distinction of clergy from people except in zeal and purity. What were stumbling blocks to more institutionalized denominations became the strength of the Methodists--lay preachers, Arminian theology, and emotionalism, all three of which split or were disdained by the Presbyterians.

The Presbyterians both invented and were split by the frontier camp meeting, the most spectacular of which was under their leadership at Cane Ridge, Logan County, Kentucky, in August of 1801. The regular Presbyterians favored a more institutional approach to church membership--much instruction through a trained clergy. Since this method failed to deal with the uninstructed masses of people, the Baptists, Methodists, Disciples (former New Light Presbyterians), and Cumberland Presbyterians came on the revivalistic scene. Significantly both of these Presbyterian groups rejected Calvinism and adopted an Arminian theology with a personalized, emotional appeal. This is significant because it reveals the frontier trend away from a God-centered theology based on predestination to a man-centered theology, that is, to anthropology. This is incipient perfectionism; it is an important ingredient of the theology of the coming century; and it marked a further step in the demise of Calvinist theology.

In order to succeed on the frontier one must perforce deny a double predestination and offer a more democratic grace, free to all. When Wesley had preached to the coal miners, this doctrine brought tears

to their eyes and left white trails down their blackened faces. It was no less effective on the American frontier, although its influence went far beyond Methodist circles.

The Methodist preachers emphasized a definite personal conversion, and frontier religion is certainly personal, not institutional. The Methodists were untheological and pragmatic in character. Finally they emphasized the Christian life, the fruit of the Holy Spirit, and moral reform disciplined through the class meeting. The turn to anthropology underlined the central place of man in the universe and made room for a strong insistence on sanctification, with an optimism which allowed one to posit the possible freedom from sin in this life. From this possibility the idea developed that sin may be eradicated in society too. Here is one of the roots of the social gospel. It finally appears to this writer that in the above respects Methodism is both a child of the Enlightenment and also the great spokesman of the frontier belief that man is the master of his own destiny.

Four features are peculiar to the character formation of the new voluntary denominations.[8] These four are denominational repristination, voluntaryism, revivalism, and competition.

In some respects the Revolution was a decisive break which assumed the necessity of surmounting the corruptions of the European past. Likewise when an individual underwent his own personal revolution, was converted, and joined a denomination for the first time, both alike looked hopefully to the future and rejected tradition and history. It

---

[8]Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 111-129.

was a time of new beginnings hopefully and supposedly based on the true and ancient foundations. The new denominations saw the Christian past not as a valuable repository from which understanding and guidance could be gained but as a suitably ignored lacuna characterized by deterioration from and corruption of the pure primitive church, toward the recovery of which Scripture alone held the key.

Peculiar in church history is the voluntary denomination which recognizes that the church must persuade and not coerce, and this in competition with other equal denominational claimants to the truth. Because a clear and closely defined theological position is considered divisive, the denomination may easily dampen or mute the issues, neglect its theology, and so strengthen the anti-intellectualism of the prevalent pietism. The successful church leader may be more of a politician with personal charisma than a man of ideas such as a theologian.

In many ways the most important factor was revivalism. Evangelism is one thing implying doctrinal content, incarnation, atonement, and resurrection, but revivalism stands for a method and its results. Pietism in the sense of emotion over intellect and the individual over the institution is not yet revivalism until it is Americanized and promoted by techniques aimed at producing quick results; unplanned (as in the camp meeting) group psychology which, by the end of this period now considered, became planned and manipulated; moral suasion brought to bear on the unconverted by means of an "altar call" to come forward to the "mourner's bench"; protracted prayer meetings and preaching services to break down the hard cases; or any

modification of these steps, however refined or gentle, climaxing in overt acclamations when a soul "comes through."

Given the peculiar American conditions of rapid westward expansion, an inadequate institutional church, the vast unchurched majority, and the theological admixture, perhaps revivalism was inevitable. Prior to the frontier period revivals were merely practicable. In this period however they became both necessary and far more influential because of the extreme limitations of what later came to be called the "Christian nurture" approach to church membership. In 1790 as much as 90 percent of the general population was unchurched.[9] Moreover a well-ordered educated ministry and institutional church considered the revival as exceptional, positively not subject to human manipulation. Such certainly was the prevalent attitude in the colonial period.[10] When the past appeared to be evil or at least something to be improved upon and surmounted, then a key factor was present in the situation. Revival was acclaimed as the proper way to promote Christianity. Such an attitude developed in this post-revolutionary period, and Finney rose to make the claim, saying in his Lectures on Revival, "Almost all the religion in the world has been produced by revivals."[11] To such an extent had American Christianity changed since the colonial period when no Christian in the established churches would have uttered such a comment.

---

[9]Hofstadter, pp. 81-82.

[10]James F. Findlay, Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 136-137.

[11]Ibid., p. 136.

The frontier pressure toward simple theology and numerically successful method justified any measures and promoted its successful and expert practitioners with whom the local pastor could not compete. This enhances the already present anti-intellectualism, still further abetted by a contemporary reaction to the Enlightenment.

Pietism may generate great spiritual power, but it needs a form or a movement. This form could be rationalism in the battle for disestablishment. It could be orthodoxy after the Revolution, or revivalism to whom pietism was happily married. In any case revivalism scrapped tradition and doctrinal theology and became the prey of the nineteenth century life-style and social-political ideas. Without an independent theology on one hand but with an anti-intellectual bent, it thereby opened the way for later denominational rejection of modern science with which it couldn't cope and accepted and blessed also the industrial, materialistic, and acquisitive American society of the late nineteenth century.

To summarize, this period saw the first laying down of the road on which later fundamentalism would travel, one branch of which, in the Holiness and Pentecostal revival, reacted against the acceptance of an industrial, materialistic, and acquisitive society.

Here began also that choice given to American Christians between being intelligent according to standards prevailing in centers of American intellect or being pious according to denominational criteria.

The rise and spread of American revivalism thus represents a victory for enthusiasm, individualism, emotionalism, and anti-intellectualism. This victory was due above all to the absence of a

stable institutional church life where thinkers were even welcome;[12] to a frontier which outran all institutions; also to the need for success aided by a plethora of competing sects; also to the mind-set of the early immigrants, many of whom were poor. The religion of the poor characteristically opposes an established church liturgy, sacrament, an independent and rational theology, and a vested and educated clergy. In such circumstances, authority is not so much destroyed as fragmented and becomes charismatic and personal rather than institutional.

Another ingredient of revivalism is opposition to the establishment, whatever its form may be. In this period the establishment was beginning to take its denominational shape. Hence anti-denominationalism has its beginnings in this period in the person of Alexander Campbell. He is the first of a long line of anti-denominational (really anti-establishment) crusaders who would pole-vault across eighteen or nineteen hundred years of supposedly corrupt church history into the middle of the first century in an effort to restore the primitive church. His successors are D. S. Warner, the Holiness Movement, the Pentecostals, the Full Gospel Business Men, and the contemporary charismatic renewal. Campbell took over what had formerly been the domain of the infidel and brought it into the ranks of the Christians: anticlericalism and opposition to credal and established religion.[13]

---

[12]Hofstadter, p. 56.

[13]Martin Marty, The Infidel (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), p. 122.

It remains finally to point out what has been hinted at--revivalism is ahistorical. The assumed discontinuity between the church's memory of its own past and the moment of personal conversion allows for a tendency which rejects the past. This tendency interprets the Reformation for example as a revolutionary break with an evil Romanist past and loses the understanding of the Church in its organic and historical continuity.

The last factor influential in shaping American denominations was competition which reached its peak in 1844. Its practical effect received impetus from an expanding frontier. Its theoretical influence lay in motivating spokesmen to defend and propagate their own denominational truth. Mead sees it as tending to blur historical differences and theological distinctions.[14] Competition to succeed pushes all alike to adopt the same successful working theology and effective technique.

---

[14]Mead, pp. 129-130.

CHAPTER VI

THE SECOND GREAT AWAKENING 1795--1835

One of the great religious movements of this period even up to the time of the Civil War was revivalism. This non-credal movement was established by 1815 as the working method of some of the Protestant denominations. It was inspired by Edwards' theology, by the fervor of the Wesleyans, and by the enthusiasm of the camp meeting, each one separately successful in its own right.[1]

Those denominations who adopted the method of experiential religion grew rapidly. During the period in question, and by 1850, Protestants in general increased from 365,000 to 3,500,000.[2] To state it even more strikingly, from 1800 to 1835, church membership showed more than a five-fold increase while the general population merely tripled.[3]

The awakening of this period had three phases:[4] (a) The camp meetings in the Ohio Valley from 1795 to 1810 merged Arminian and Calvinist theology; (b) Calvinism, reinterpreted through Jonathan Edwards' grandson, Timothy Dwight, and through Lyman Beecher (1775-

---

[1]Gilbert Seldes, The Stammering Century (New York: John Day Co., 1928), p. 93.

[2]C. C. Cole, Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826--1860 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), p. 13.

[3]Charles G. Finney, Lectures on Revivals, edited by William G. McLoughlin (Revised edition; Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960), p. xiv.

[4]William G. McLoughlin, Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), p. 12.

1863) and Nathaniel Taylor in the new intellectual climate, fostered a new interest in revivalism which in this phase began at Yale in 1802; (c) The final phase expressed itself through the work of Charles G. Finney and his Arminianized Calvinism in the last ten years of this time-frame. This brand of revivalism, which may be denominated as evangelicalism, harnessed frontier spontaneity to institutional methods, in active protest against institutional lethargy, formalism, Eastern political conservatism, and salvation by orthodox doctrine. Ironically, the fruits of evangelicalism resulted in the very things it had originally opposed. These fruits were lethargy, following revival; formalized revival method; a new political conservatism; and among Finney's followers, one may find monomaniacal insistence on the right doctrine, only now secularized as abolition.

Finney was a great man whose influence continues to the present time. He made evangelicalism a national religion; he precipitated the Presbyterian-Congregational split of 1837, and completed the demise of the Calvinist theological system.[5] The split was already present in a quiet way at Yale among the more flexible Edwardean Congregationalists. This was New School Calvinism which continued in an Arminian direction from Timothy Dwight and Nathaniel Taylor, to Lyman Beecher and to the open precipitant of change, Charles G. Finney. Another branch of this Edwardean or New Haven theology was the strict Calvinism of Samuel Hopkins. This is mentioned here because it was the source of the

---

[5]Finney, pp. xiii-xiv.

"disinterested benevolence" theory,[6] illogically adopted by the revivalists (Finney in particular) who more logically stemmed from the New School.[7] This theory is at the basis of social reform crusades, so plentifully spawned by evangelicalism. Following Finney's 1832 revival in Boston, the New School--Old School split hardened; Lyman Beecher was tried for heresy; Finney left the Presbyterian Church; and revivalism slowed down for twenty years until 1857. Thus ended the Second Great Awakening, the last revival to have any profound effects outside of the churches, that is, in the social-cultural life of the American people.

This writer believes that the key to understanding Charles G. Finney is to be found in his experiences of conversion and subsequent "baptisms of the Holy Ghost" which took place on 10 and 11 October, 1821. He experienced what he calls, "a mighty baptism of the Holy Ghost. Without any expectation of it, without ever having the thought in my mind that I had ever heard the thing mentioned by any person in the world . . . ." He identified this experience not as justification by faith but as a second powerful experience which took place in his new law office. This second blessing clarified to him what had happened in a previous experience which he also describes as taking place out in the woods. The first experience he identifies with justification, or conversion, and the second he calls a "baptism of the Holy Ghost," in terms which suggest a witness of the Holy Spirit admitting

---

[6] Whitney R. Cross, The Burned-over District (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), pp. 27-28.

[7] Cole, p. 43.

of no doubt, confirming, and assuring to him that in the first experience he lost "all sense of condemnation."[8] After this second experience, he was "endued with such power from on high that a few words dropped here and there to individuals were the means of their immediate conversion."[9] The experience was not new. It is described in the Westminster Confession. Traces of the second blessing occur prior to that time. It was broadly present in western Europe in the eighteenth century and is well-known in Wesleyan history as the "second blessing." It forms the basis of the coming Holiness revival and, differently defined in connection with speaking in tongues, is the essence of Pentecostalism.

---

[8]Charles G. Finney, Memoirs, in H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, American Christianity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), II, 20-24.

[9]Charles G. Finney, Power from on High (London: Victory Press, 1957), p. 9. Sources for the second blessing in theology and practice have been found in the following. Nils Bloch-Hoell, The Pentecostal Movement (Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964), pp. 139-140; James A. MacDonald, Wesley's Revision of the Shorter Catechism (Edinburgh: George A. Morton, 1906), pp. 61-70; John Leland Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), passim; Philip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966), III, 592-595, The Canons of the Synod of Dort under the "Fifth Head of Doctrine," especially Articles 9-11 on the "Perseverance of the Saints" and the struggle thereof; also III, 638, The Westminster Confession, Chapter XVIII, 2-3, on the assurance of grace; John Wesley, Journal of John Wesley, edited by Nehemiah Curnock (London: The Epworth Press, 1938), II, 43-49; John Wesley, The Letters of John Wesley, edited by John Telford (London: The Epworth Press, 1931), I, 248; and an article by James D. G. Dunn, "Spirit Baptism and Pentecostalism," Scottish Journal of Theology, XXIII (1970), 399. The credal sources make clear that such a theology was at least theoretically present early in the seventeenth century; the Wesleyan sources show that a second blessing theology was present in western Europe and the British Isles before the Wesleyan Revival.

Cross reports that Finney underwent a "reconversion to a sanctified condition" in Boston in 1843.[10] Whether or not this is true, the fact remains that Finney believed in repeated and intense anointings after one's conversion.

Why is the experience essential to the understanding of Charles G. Finney? Although he did not preach the doctrine as the Holiness and Pentecostal preachers do, it nonetheless so informed his basic approach to evangelism that he and his descendants could not and cannot abide two things, an educated minister who preached without power, and a cold and lethargic laity. In short, Finney directed his main attack within the church, upon its clergy and laity, not to the unchurched. This is only to say that, from the first, he worked with those who were also without experiential conversion and sanctification.

In Finney's opinion, the greatest danger was calm and cool Christianity.[11] In fairness to him it should be stated that his strategy had a precedent in the Presbyterian and Congregational revivalists who, in the westward migration, went where their people were, and not to the recruiting of raw frontiersmen to whom the Methodists and Baptists went.

New the anointing experience was not; fire in a dry and thirsty land it certainly was. In that area of New York state west of the Catskills and Adirondacks, which came to be called the Burned-over

---

[10] Cross, p. 249.

[11] Seldes, p. 408.

District, critical changes ushered in the Finney revivals in the middle 1820's.

It was a time which marked off the pioneer from the second generation. Completed in 1825, the Erie Canal speeded rural economic maturity, the one factor which may be correlated with the various occurrences of religious enthusiasm.[12] Such enthusiasm was most rampantly spectacular in those counties which no longer produced home-made textiles, indicating a prevalent family ability to buy yard goods from the sale of their agricultural produce.[13]

The people of the Burned-over District, especially before 1825, had emigrated from New England; they were younger than those who stayed in New England; they came from the hill and mountain, that is, the western parts of New England--not from the cities--and were, in short, descendants of the Edwardean enthusiasts, of the New Lights, whose adherents had moved west and north into Vermont after splitting from the Halfway Covenanters.[14] Further to describe them, they were baptistic, separatistic, and uneducated. Not among the Methodists primarily, who certainly were not from New England, but among even more left-wing sectarians this peculiar Burned-over blend is found, a blend of economic maturity, Edwardean enthusiasm, and, from the same background, Finney's charismatic and mystical intensity.

---

[12] Cross, p. 75.

[13] Ibid., p. 84.

[14] Ibid., p. 7.

Here in the Burned-over District benevolent societies, active elsewhere, were intensely active from 1830 to 1850 in Bible distribution, Sunday School work, temperance efforts, and Sabbath observance.[15]

This western New York storm center in the first half of the nineteenth century seethed with religious forces which produced Mormonism, Millerism, spiritualism, and two kinds of Methodists; the Thirteenth and the Eighteenth Amendments to the Federal Constitution; the Oneida Community; and the social forces which led to prohibition, abolition, and even to the Civil War.[16]

The fire fell on this tinder in October of 1825 in the town of Western, New York. Following his 1821 conversion and subsequent experiences, Finney had begun to preach as a frontier evangelist northeast of Watertown in 1824-1825 along a line between Antwerp and Evans Mills. Then in October, 1825, his former pastor, George W. Gale, invited him to Western. This revival broadened between 1825 and 1832 into the most spectacular revival this country has ever seen.[17] The Rochester revival of 1830-1831 spread to New England and the Ohio River as Finney's new theology and new measures caught on. This latter revival made Finney's reputation east and west, especially among younger pastors and Yankee businessmen.

---

[15] Ibid., p. 126.

[16] Ibid., pp. vii and 356.

[17] Benjamin B. Warfield, Perfectionism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1931), I, 19.

One may discern three strands of Christian thought in 1830.[18] These are: (a) The unitarian; (b) The modified orthodoxy of Lyman Beecher; (c) The thought of the dissenting Methodists, Baptists, and Disciples.

Finney combined (b) and (c), that is, the second and third heretofore independent strands of thought.[19] Nathaniel Taylor's doctrinal innovations in the direction of a more optimistic and activistic anthropology modified the Edwardean theology. Lyman Beecher's quiet entrepreneurial skills further cleared the ground, but Charles Finney laid the foundations of modern revivalism. Perhaps not consciously but certainly effectually, Finney both emulated Arminian theology and finally approximated its position, even though he came out of the Calvinist tradition. Just as Taylor and Beecher before him, he made adjustments in the New England theology--he could be called an extreme Taylorite--to achieve success in bringing about conversions. His contribution was therefore both theological, in hastening the breakdown of the Calvinist system, and practical, in popularizing, or more accurately, systematizing new and effective revival measures. Not the measures but their being systematized and institutionalized--that was the newness of Finney's New Measures.

The founder of evangelicalism detested formal religion, but in its place he introduced his own formalized soul-saving method, which is only to say that in his anti-institutionalism, even had there been no formal

---

[18] Martin Marty, The Infidel (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), p. 86.

[19] W. A. Visser't Hooft, Background of the Social Gospel in America (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1963?), pp. 134-135.

institutional church, Finney would have invented an institution. This is the perennial fate of the religious enthusiast. He digs his own grave; he ends up embracing the very thing he set out to demolish.

Moreover, from the supernatural and miraculous revival of the previous century, evangelicalism, through Finney's machinations, became an unmiraculous, man-centered and humanly manipulated system of which the purpose was to generate intense mystical experiences.

The Finney revivalism, which in this context has been called evangelicalism, was a resurgence of pietism. Evangelicalism produced logical extremes, the perfectionist and adventist movements of the Burned-over District. When evangelicalism broke down following the Civil War, it produced a reactionary offspring called the Holiness Movement. The effort of this movement to preserve evangelicalism and to prolong Finney's methods produced the Nazarene Church and the Pentecostal revival of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Before Finney wrote and published two volumes of sermons and lectures in 1835, he put his New Measures into effect certainly as early as the revival at Western, New York, in October 1825, and probably prior to that date. In 1824 he rejected a strict interpretation of the Westminster Confession[20] and began preaching that year, probably working out the method which brought the fire down on Western a year later. Therefore the New Measures are considered first; then follows discussion of Finney's Lectures on Revival published in 1835 and their influence in weakening the Calvinist theology in America.

---

[20]Finney, Lectures, p. xvi.

The New Measures were never precisely listed and defined but may be taken as the listed definition of revivalism given in Chapter V. Finney did not invent them--he just pushed them to an extreme. They had been invented by the preachers of the Great Awakening of the previous century. (Finney himself was accused of being the notorious James Davenport redivivus.[21]) They continued of course in the frontier camp meetings, from which source Finney may have borrowed them. The main opposition to them was theological--that these Measures were used in churches of the Calvinist Presbyterian tradition[22] in combination with a false theology, that is, Pelagian or Arminian, and with a fanatic spirit of pietistic radicalism. To those theologians who were struggling to preserve a loyalty to the Reformation theology, this charge was no doubt true.

Partly responsible for the extremities to which Finney extended his New Measures was the arid and unemotional spiritual climate prevalent in Old School Calvinism in its dying decades.[23] Out of it rose an emotional starvation, perhaps, which fed on Finney's methods. Unfortunately, he absolutized a passing phenomenon, mistakenly interpreting his towering success as a sign of God's pleasure.

Because old bottles will not hold new wine, spiritual renewal usually tends to be anti-institutional, whatever the regnant form may be. Wine needs a bottle, and spiritual renewal creates its own

---

[21] Ibid., p. xxxiii.

[22] Of course, other traditions used the method, but it was more welcome among Arminian and Arminianized Calvinist Christians.

[23] Finney, Lectures, p. xxxviii.

institutional forms. Likewise emotionalism, emotion for the sake of proving one's conversion, tends to be anti-intellectual.

> A theological seminary that aims mainly at the culture of the intellect, and sends out learned men who lack that enduement of power from on high, is a snare and a stumbling-block to the Church.[24]

That's the way Finney phrased the choice. The form substituted in place of academic discipline was the study of Christian experience, struggle in prayer, and the enduement with power from on high.[25] To survive, all three must be cast into an institutional form.

Finney's legal training made him tough-minded and literate, but his view of learning was instrumental.[26] Even with a concern for education, evinced in establishing Oberlin, Finney cannot be called an intellectual--he was concerned with results and the means to achieve them, had a narrow view of culture as dangerous to salvation, and scorned the written sermon. It is pertinent to observe here that Finney's evangelicalism diluted the educational traditions of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists at a time when the less educated Methodists were seeking and gradually did attain an educated clergy. The constant factor in both cases is that new wine seeks new bottles.

Finney's anti-institutionalism was not only a usual concomitant of pietistic revival, but it was also compounded with the individualistic and egalitarian spirit of Jacksonian democracy. Indeed, the Finney

---

[24] Finney, Power, p. 24.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American Life (New York: Knopf, 1964), pp. 91-92.

revival was the theological counterpart to the Jacksonian revolution.[27] Representatives of both Old and New School Calvinism, Nettleton and Beecher, considered Finney to be a dangerous preacher of class rebellion. They were really defenders of a status quo, an establishment guided by an ordered clergy within the Calvinist organic theory of society, who naturally felt threatened by irresponsible but highly successful travelling evangelists. Rightly so, too. Of the evangelists raised up by Finney's revival, all but Finney and Daniel Nash became disqualified for the ministry.[28] By 1845, Finney recognized the error and offenses of revivalism, although he never, even to his death in 1875, repudiated his 1835 Lectures.[29]

The Lectures reflected the spirit of the Jacksonian era, not in a political sense, but theologically, by singling out the issue between Whigs and Jacksonian democrats. His was a struggle against aristocratic privilege, respectable tradition, learned theologians, and the Federalist theocrats of the Eastern establishment. He opposed the traditional Calvinism, divine transcendence, pessimistic anthropology, and the organic view of society, in favor of an optimistic anthropology, a post-millennial progressivism, disinterested benevolence, and individual and social perfectionism.

Finney's resurgent pietism relied on the leading of the Holy Spirit. That distinguishes his brand of evangelicalism from the conservative

---

[27] Finney, Lectures, pp. xl and 131.

[28] McLoughlin, p. 132.

[29] Finney, Lectures, pp. xlix-lii.

and ecclesiastical revivalism of Lyman Beecher. It is the main point which moved Beecher to view Finney as a revolutionary.[30] Beecher opposed Finney only with difficulty at the New Lebanon Conference in July, 1827, because he was preaching essentially the same doctrine as Finney.[31] He really feared that the New Measures, which constituted an attack on Calvinism, would hinder his own and Nathaniel W. Taylor's efforts at Yale to accomplish the same thing, that is, to modify Calvinism in the direction of greater free will to the individual in effecting his own salvation.[32] If Beecher capitulated to Finney, let it be observed also that the great evangelist was himself changing and moderating.[33] Finney conducted a Boston revival from August, 1831, to April, 1832; this made the evangelicalism central to the theological dispute and ended Beecher's quiet efforts to reform Calvinism from within.[34]

The Lectures on Revival mark the end of two hundred years of Calvinism; the popular acceptance of "heart religion," evangelicalism, as the predominating faith of the United States; and the classic expression of the authority and faith of later revivalists. More than just anti-Calvinist, the Lectures reveal Finney's positive statement of the new religion that dominated popular American thought into the twentieth century, certainly for the entire time-frame of this thesis.

---

[30] Ibid., p. xxxii.

[31] Ibid., p. xx.

[32] Ibid., pp. xvii-xviii.

[33] Cross, p. 164.

[34] McLoughlin, pp. 63-64.

It is no small thing, in fact it is "one of the two or three great intellectual revolutions in American history,"[35] to mark the end of a once great theological system which embraced all who subscribed to the Westminster Confession: Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Reformed churches, and most Baptist churches. The decay proceeded in four directions, rationalistic Unitarianism, intuitional Transcendentalism, an eclectic and comprehensive theological method and theory of language in Horace Bushnell, and a theological task abandoned for social reform and service societies.[36] In the wake of the shattered system, one can find concern for salvation, say in 1800, giving way to self-improvement, perfectionism in the cults and fads of the 1840's, and reforming others, whether they wanted it or not, as in temperance, abolition, and later prohibition.[37] Medical quackery, Christian Science, spiritualism, mesmerism, and phrenology may be mentioned also. The popular evangelicalism promoted this confusion by blurring confessional lines, rejecting fine distinctions, and so caused creative theology to recede in importance.[38]

Finney at the same time was moving toward an Arminian perfectionism, which was added to his thought in 1836 as professor of theology at

---

[35]Finney, Lectures, p. xi.

[36]Edwin Scott Gaustad, editor, Religious Issues in American History (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 131.

[37]Seldes, p. 8.

[38]Marty, p. 142.

Oberlin.[39] By 1846, when he published Lectures in Systematic Theology, he had treated entire sanctification at length.[40]

This was perhaps inevitable. Revivalism and Arminianism were happily married from the beginning of their coexistence in America as previously remarked. One finds a trend through the decades illustrated in the Old School-New School Presbyterian splits, in the Cumberland Presbyterians, organized in 1810, and in the lack of difference by the late 1850's between the Methodist, New School, and Oberlin theologies. How Calvinism gave way to Arminianism is illustrated in the career of Finney's Oberlin colleague, Asa Mahan. He was born in 1799 on the New York frontier and began his ministry near Rochester as an Old School Calvinist. Later he modified his views to recognize some limited moral ability, perhaps at Lane Seminary in Cincinnati. At Oberlin he developed a doctrine of Christian perfection and accepted the promise of entire sanctification. He was typical of his period.

The ebullient optimism of the period 1830-1860, frontier mobility, and religious freedom produced a climate of opinion with the new evangelicalism which encouraged enthusiasm, emotionalism, perfectionism, a democratic belief in free salvation for all, and millennialism; but the disillusionment following the Millerite fiasco may have aroused the more pessimistic pre-millennialism. At any rate, evangelicalism encouraged

---

[39] William Warren Sweet, Revivalism in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), pp. 135-136.

[40] Cole, p. 63.

perfectionism and an optimistic post-millennialism which combined to produce the communal sects of the frontier, Oneida being the most typical of the period.

The second Awakening was unique in this regard, that it issued forth to save the world through organized movements. The converts of the Finney revivals concerned themselves in the 1830's and 1840's with the great and not so great social questions of their day, slavery, sexual purity, temperance, politics, business principles, and dietary reform.

These revival-inspired movements existed, in some cases, prior to 1830 as part of, fruit of, the previously existing revivals and also in the general social-cultural milieu of the early nineteenth century. It is clear that the Finney revival gave them new inspiration and, in its own right, created new movements.

The 1820's were a time of new beginnings. In the year of Finney's first revival, 1826, the American Home Missionary Society was founded. The American Peace Society and the American Temperance Society also were founded. New Harmony, Indiana, began and ended; the American Tract Society observed its first anniversary in May of the same year; the Erie Canal was opened (1825), with implications for economic growth and prosperity; a year later the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad was chartered; and there were weak beginnings of the labor movement, 1825-1827.[41] Prior to this decade, the American Bible Society was formed in New York City in 1816. Significantly, the American Bible Society had at least seven

---

[41] Ibid., p. 9.

auxiliaries in the Burned-over District before 1816 which accounted for much of the Society's later support.[42]

With this brief discussion sufficing for the period prior to 1832, roughly, the following remarks are addressed to the three decades from 1830 to 1860.

A youthful and high-spirited democracy was manifested in the election of Andrew Jackson; a growing industrial revolution, immense optimism, opportunity, individualism, and emotionalism characterized this era of new hopes, new sects, new movements, and new reforms. Revivalists easily equated their religion with progress and saw their government not only as the best in the world but also as the direct result of Protestant Christianity, both alike moving into a divinely inspired future toward national perfection. In theological language, the nation was moving toward the millennium through reform, personal and social.

An interest in humanitarian reform was not new in America, but rationalistic reformers, Tom Paine and Robert Owen, never too popular, were not the leaders in this period. Leadership fell to the pious reformers who had their predecessors, such as Cotton Mather.[43] To reform manners and morals prior to 1825 was not a reflection of popular thought; certainly reform and revivalism were not mixed before then.[44]

---

[42] Cross, p. 25.

[43] Cole, p. 97.

[44] Ibid., pp. 97-98.

The basis of reform derived from the Puritan concern for the welfare of others.[45] Following a community revival, it took the pattern of the benevolent society for Bible and tract distribution; educational or Sunday School societies to reform the youth; societies to eliminate vice, prostitution, and juvenile delinquency; and as revival became national, societies for abolition and temperance. By 1834, such societies had annual receipts of nine million dollars.[46]

Now the Finney revival was both a symptom of and cause of the social changes and movements prior to and following 1826. His theology included four basic elements: the progressive revelation of God's will; disinterested benevolence; perfectionism; and the optimistic brand of millennialism known as post-millennialism, the theory that the Lord will return at the end of a period of progress and improvement and a millennium brought to pass thereby.[47] It is to be distinguished from the pessimistic variety which despairs of the evil world, resigns responsibility for its condition, and looks for the catastrophic inbreaking of the heretofore absent Lord who then sets up His Kingdom on earth and the millennium begins. Evangelicalism popularized social perfectionism and postmillennialism,[48] but the theological roots of social reform involve all four.[49]

---

[45] Ibid., pp. 99-101.

[46] Ibid., p. 103, footnote 27.

[47] McLoughlin, p. 101.

[48] Timothy Lawrence Smith, Revival and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 43.

[49] McLoughlin, pp. 101 and 106.

The popular roots of social reform grew out of the religious radicalism which Finney touched off in the Burned-over District.[50] Typical in this connection was Luther Myrick. After his expulsion from the Presbyterian Church because of extreme revivalism, he went perfectionist.

The motive behind these perfectionists was to bring the Kingdom of God on earth. This perfectionist and millennial thrust is always in the background of the pious reforms of this period, 1830-1860.

Two among many moral crusades of the time serve to illustrate this perfectionist and millennial advance--the temperance (becoming prohibition) movement and the anti-slavery (becoming abolition) movement.

Long friendly to evangelical Protestantism, temperance became an integral part of evangelicalism when Finney included it in his 1831 revival at Rochester. Prohibitionism spread through the Burned-over District in the early 1830's and took over the national temperance organization after 1835.[51] When the 1837 panic hit the fortunes of the rich supporters of prohibition, its advocates were forced to political and legislative action.

Abolition absorbed all other benevolent movements and became such a far-reaching issue that some ministers by 1850 were ready for war to settle the dispute. In this sense revivalism out of the Burned-over District brought on the Civil War.[52]

---

[50] Cross, pp. 270-283, and Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 22-25.

[51] Cross, p. 213.

[52] Cole, p. 217.

The first anti-slavery sentiment rose among Unitarians and Quakers.[53] The force of perfectionism, on the other hand, defined slavery as a sin, which is to say that the anti-slavery crusade received zealous support in the Burned-over District and in other revival areas. Northern revivalists were not unanimous on the issue however. Finney, Beecher, and Bushnell were sympathetic to the anti-slavery movement but carefully refused to amalgamate the crusade with revivalism. It was Finney's followers who joined the two.

The leading anti-slavery voice in the first third of the nineteenth century was in the South,[54] but Northern perfectionism contributed to its termination. William Lloyd Garrison, who founded his Liberator in 1831, was a perfectionist;[55] the American Anti-Slavery Society, founded in 1833, was quickly supported by revivalists, especially in the Midwest.[56] The aggressive Garrison took over this society and gave the evangelicals this choice, to be pro-slavery Christians or anti-Christian abolitionists. The revival phase of the anti-slavery movement died with the revival of the 1830's. To survive, it was forced into politics in the 1840's; this further disrupted the abolition movement, and it lost united religious support.

This widening gap in the 1840's between religiously motivated abolition and political action against slavery split the movement

---

[53] Smith, pp. 180-181.

[54] Smith, Handy, and Loetscher, II, 167.

[55] Seldes, p. 244.

[56] McLoughlin, p. 82.

into a fundamental-literalistic-millennial wing of religious extremists who embraced Adventism and a less literal, practical minded group, Oberlin Congregationalists mainly, who were moving in the direction of liberal theology and the later social gospel.[57]

It remains to consider two voices of protest against the weaknesses of evangelicalism, Horace Bushnell (1802-1876) and John Williamson Nevin (1803-1886).

Bushnell was not opposed to revivals, but he sought a more constant movement in the life of the church to remove the bad elements from revivals. His open criticism of revivalism began in 1838. He was a pioneer in religious education in his book, Views of Christian Nurture (1847). It was many years before his views were understood.

Bushnell, representing an aspect of transcendental thought,[58] hoped to reconcile Congregationalism and Unitarianism,[59] but he succeeded in planting liberal theology in the churches, thus laying the basis for a deeper schism in American Protestantism than the one precipitated by Finney. This liberal theology matured by 1914 and was one side of the liberal-fundamentalist split of the latter nineteenth century, in which Bushnell's descendants were Lyman Abbott (1835-1922) and Washington Gladden (1836-1918) of social gospel fame.

In a sense, the issue between evangelicalism and the established denominations was the doctrine of the church. The pietistic ideal of

---

[57] Cross, pp. 277 and 284.

[58] Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963) p. 172.

[59] McLoughlin, p. 150.

the charismatic or anointed reformer, and this is true both of the prototype, Charles G. Finney, and also of his lineal descendants, is the gathered unity of all true believers into the true church. This ideal may be a mask for anti-institutionalism. Were the ideal realized in a visibly united church, then the reformer would rail against oppressive and coercive uniformity. He would still seek to realize his ideal, a separate and gathered group of spiritual athletes. It is the perennial issue between Mother Church begetting her children through ordered means of grace on the one hand and, on the other the visible saints who form their own church. This is the issue which John Williamson Nevin joined; he was in vociferous reaction to the ahistorical, individualistic, unchurchly, anti-ecclesiastical, and anti-traditional evangelicalism of his day.

In a series of publications between 1840 and 1847,[60] he thoroughly reevaluated the Reformation heritage and indicated how far evangelicalism had drifted from the catholic and churchly stance of the Reformers. These writings make clear that he saw the possibility of an ecclesiology rising out of the historical and organic understanding of the church, realistic sacraments, and a responsible clergy that would be far more adequate than the attenuated understanding of the church among revivalists. His small Anxious Bench[61] needs to be read by

---

[60] The History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism, published in an essay series, 1840-1842; Philip Schaff's Principle of Protestantism, brought out in English translation by Nevin in 1845; also Nevin's The Anxious Bench and Mystical Presence.

[61] John Williamson Nevin, The Anxious Bench (2nd edition; Chambersburg, Pa.: Publication Office of the German Reformed Church, 1844).

anyone who would understand the revivalism of the past one hundred and fifty years.

Nevin's indictment of the new formalism,[62] tongues,[63] pelagianism,[64] revivalism's small view of sin,[65] and his own emphasis on the churchly and corporate character of salvation[66] offer needed correctives even to this day. Perhaps in reaction to the conversion tactics of the revivalists, he over-defends infant baptism,[67] failing to observe that some within the established and institutional churches were apparently not renewed in infant baptism and have little understanding of adult conversion. On the other hand, to attempt to purify the church by denying infant baptism is to separate the wheat from the tares before the Last Judgment and is always as unsuccessful as the Donatists.[68]

---

[62] Ibid., p. 53.

[63] Ibid., p. 56.

[64] Ibid., pp. 114 and 123.

[65] Ibid., 127-129.

[66] Ibid., pp. 129-130.

[67] Ibid., p. 131.

[68] Philip Schaff, America: A Sketch of Its Political, Social, and Religious Character, edited by Perry Miller (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 171.

CHAPTER VII

AMERICAN PERFECTIONISM 1830--1860

The perfectionist search became an epidemic in America after 1835.[1] It attracted such diverse individuals as Charles Finney, John Humphrey Noyes, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Horace Bushnell, Phoebe Palmer, William E. Boardman, and Asa Mahan. Whether one considers Finney's perfectionism, or transcendentalism, or Methodist sanctification, or the ascetic communities, one is touching the same thread uniting many movements.[2] Perfectionism usually rises in times of social change and its maladjustments; and religious, economic, geographic, and political factors partially condition such movements as well.[3]

The benevolent societies of the early decades of the nineteenth century, relaxation of belief in total depravity, political and social optimism, and the moral perfectionist drive of revival heightened the awareness of the Kingdom about to come following the spectacular Spirit-outpourings of the early 1830's--withal, perfectionism is a natural result. With a world to save and time so short, with the

---

[1]Timothy Lawrence Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 113.

[2]Gilbert Seldes, The Stammering Century (New York: The John Day Co., 1928), p. 297.

[3]Merrill E. Gaddis, Christian Perfectionism in America (Revised 1939; unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Chicago, Chicago, 1929), pp. i-ii.

conviction prevalent in the Burned-over District that the Holy Spirit was directly guiding, pressure toward perfectionism erupted soon after 1831.

Protestant perfectionism has also been known to follow periods of high theology, in pietist reaction to Lutheran orthodoxy, or in Arminian reaction to ultra-Calvinism.[4] The latter is possibly true with respect to this period.

Whatever its theological roots,[5] American perfectionism did rise out of areas where revival waves had recurred, and this fact is especially true of central and western New York.[6]

Perfectionist sects were present in central New York in 1832 and held a conference at Canaseraga in the upper Genesee Valley in 1836.[7] The movement became much broader in the moral reform crusades, but the discussion at hand must center on the theological rather than on what became moral perfectionists.

One branch of it was manifested in the Oneida Community, founded by John Humphrey Noyes in 1845 at Putney, Vermont. Another branch, more germane to this thesis, was Finney's perfectionism which he developed at Oberlin. Both became institutional for the same causes but

---

[4]John Leland Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 61.

[5]Benjamin B. Warfield, Perfectionism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1931), II, 8, blames the New Divinity; Smith, p. 108, emphatically denies that Perfectionism rose out of the New School natural ability theory.

[6]William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1939), p. 407.

[7]Whitney R. Cross, The Burned-over District (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), p. 240.

on different doctrinal bases. The causes are several. As a revival dissipates, so does its perfectionist zeal. (Revival-motivated crusades died out or to survive went secular.) Sexual abuses rose and presented two issues, both doctrinal. One doctrine offers assurance of perfection through continual struggle. Another offers assurance of perfection through an intense conversion and an end to original sin. Which one of the two doctrines best safeguards against moral lapse? Now both Noyes and Finney, as well as Mahan, were influenced by Wesley's Plain Account of Christian Perfection and by James Brainerd Taylor's Memoirs. Noyes read these works in 1834, just two years before both Finney and Mahan read them in the autumn of 1836.[8] Both Noyes and Finney regretted the constant dissipation of revival zeal; both saw the need to embrace a broader perfectionism;[9] and both faced the inevitable impasse of revivalism. This impasse is on one hand more of the same, only with superficial trips to the anxious bench which only confirm the revivalist's bug-bear, empty ritualism. On the other hand, it is a new approach to perfection. Both Finney and Noyes chose the latter.[10] Finney was like Wesley in that he detested antinomianism and spiritual mediocrity.[11]

To answer the question concerning moral lapse Noyes chose intense conversion and threw out original sin, institutionalized and

---

[8]Warfield, II, 56.

[9]Cross, p. 239.

[10]William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), p. 148.

[11]Peters, p. 62.

disciplined within a sexual communism. Finney's moralism perhaps kept him from this answer. He chose the answer that continual struggle, with a sense of one's ability to sin, would keep the Christian from sinning, empowered by the Holy Spirit, of course.[12]

So Finney went west, still a young man. That was in 1835, at the age of forty-three. His real career--forty years of it--was still ahead of him. He left the Presbyterian Church to become pastor of First Congregational Church (1835-1872) at Oberlin and later president of Oberlin CollegiateInstitute (1851-1866).

It is reported that he went to Oberlin to train revivalists.[13] He certainly began to preach holiness. "Holiness to the Lord" was the streamer atop his revival tent at Oberlin in 1836.[14]

This new brand of revivalism was a synthesis of Quaker, Pietist, Methodist, and Puritan traditions. It promoted national reform by sanctifying believers through the baptism of the Holy Spirit as indispensable to reform.[15] Not exactly equivalent to Wesleyan perfectionism,[16] varying in degrees of Pelagianism, this Oberlin brand was popularized in

---

[12]Cross, p. 241.

[13]McLoughlin, pp. 82-83.

[14]William Warren Sweet, Revivalism in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 136.

[15]Smith, p. 108.

[16]Warfield, II, 66; Peters, p. 115.

the next fifteen years.[17] It sparked a holiness revival at Oberlin in 1839 and inspired the precursors of the Holiness Movement, Thomas Upham, William Boardman, and Robert P. Smith.[18] The resulting wave of perfectionism which swept American Protestantism between 1835 and 1870[19] included, logically if not organically, its renewal in Methodism in the 1840's.[20]

Among the Methodists, perfectionism reached its peak in the early years of the Second Awakening toward 1805,[21] after which it stabilized and gradually declined after 1812.[22] Various shades of interpretation existed among the Methodists, both left and right of Wesley. Adam Clarke (1762-1832) insisted on the instantaneous nature of the second blessing, but his younger contemporary, Richard Watson (1781-1833), affirmed the gradual element in sanctification.[23] Clarke opened the way for radical followers who insisted on the possibility of instantaneous and total purification. Clarke's position, "Without holiness, no

---

[17]Barbara B. Zikmund, Asa Mahan and Oberlin Perfectionism (doctoral dissertation, Duke University, Durham, 1969), p. xxxi, in Dissertation Abstracts International, Humanities and Social Sciences (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1970), Section A, numbers 1-2, 460A.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Smith, p. 103.

[20]Peters, p. 115.

[21]Ibid., pp. 96-97.

[22]Ibid., p. 98.

[23]Ibid., p. 107.

man shall see the Lord," became in Phoebe Palmer "Without a second definite work of grace, a man cannot see the Lord."[24] At any rate, the instantaneous second blessing was under attack in 1825,[25] and little was said of Christian perfection in the denomination's journals from 1832 to 1840.[26]

Possibly the Oberlin perfectionism was instrumental in stimulating new holiness interest.[27] In 1835, before the Oberlin brand of perfectionism was developed, Mrs. Sarah A. Lankford of New York City combined two Methodist ladies' prayer meetings to form a "Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness." Her sister Phoebe, the wife of Dr. Walter C. Palmer, received the second blessing soon after the meetings began, and she became the acknowledged leader.[28] By 1840 she had the support of several New York clergymen in her determined effort to organize a revival of Wesleyan perfectionism. In 1844 several bishops were elected who were much concerned with a renewed emphasis on perfectionism.[29] Phoebe Palmer was certainly influential in what later became the Holiness Movement. Not prominent but present in her teaching was the belief that the unsanctified Christian nullifies his regeneration and is lost. The specific use of such terms as

---

[24] Ibid., pp. 59 and 120.

[25] Ibid., p. 102.

[26] Ibid., pp. 100-101.

[27] H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, American Christianity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), II, 42.

[28] Smith, p. 105.

[29] Smith, Handy, and Loetscher, II, 42.

"holiness" and "entire sanctification"; insistence on public testimony; holiness as a state of the soul (against which Wesley had warned); these points became the later distinct possession and platform of the Holiness Movement.[30] Thomas C. Upham became involved in the perfectionist movement through contact with Phoebe Palmer in 1839 and, through him, Horace Bushnell, though the latter rejected the Methodist version.[31]

What appears to have happened in these years is a growingly radicalized revivalism. Evangelicalism went Arminian and "on to perfectionism," whether of the Wesleyan or Oberlin variety. Romanticism played a part.[32] Possibly also the urban locale with its rootless and insecure migrants was a factor. The increased role of women in religious affairs seen in the prominence of Mrs. Palmer, Mrs. Upham, Mrs. Boardman, Mrs. Hannah Whitall Smith, Mrs. Inskip, the second Mrs. Finney, and others is noteworthy.[33] Unquestionably, the hunger for an empirically successful religion played its part, for many of the adherents of perfectionism were active in benevolent and missionary enterprises.

It is not within the purview of this thesis to determine what really happened, and there is not agreement on the interpretation of

---

[30] Peters, p. 112.

[31] Smith, pp. 105-106.

[32] Ibid., p. 141.

[33] Ibid., p. 143.

the period,[34] but it does appear that revivalism, the great propagator of perfectionism, did decline after 1840 and until the 1857 revival. Reaction to the Millerite fiasco certainly fits in here. Certainly schism, sectionalism, antinomian sects, and the abolition crusade were in varying degrees expressions or symptoms of perfectionism and lent a bad odor to or detracted from interest in perfectionism in the period in question.

In summary of the perfectionist trend of this period 1800-1860, one observes an openness of definition of the second blessing at the beginning of the period in terms of possibility and availability. By the end of the period there were those who <u>required</u> an instantaneous second blessing as a proof of genuine salvation. This stance went beyond and hardened what was never denied in Wesley's theology, namely, the possibility and advisability of receiving a second spiritual experience beyond conversion. Wesley's doctrine was set in a sacramental context and assumed and urged the need to grow in grace prior to and following the second blessing.[35] Moreover the sacramental context was unknown, if not rejected, by the frontier religionist. Institutional restraint and sacramental holiness were lost, allowing a legalism to creep in and further to corrupt American Christianity. One may observe that advocates of the second blessing however defined usually denigrate or are ignorant of realistic sacramental theology.

---

[34]Gaddis, p. 268, affirms that the period 1840-1858 saw a decline and weakening of perfectionism. Smith says nothing about such a decline in holiness activities, nothing that this writer could find.

[35]Peters, pp. 183-184.

The 1857 Revival put a period to the decline of popular religion following Miller's adventist bubble. The decade and one-half from 1843 to 1857 saw the churches little more than hold their own.[36] Other factors might be considered but are not determinative by themselves: sectional bitterness, political excitement, anti-slavery fever, material prosperity, war with Mexico, the gold rush, and a sudden financial panic which began on 14 October 1857. Three weeks before the panic, Jeremiah C. Lanphier began weekly noon prayer meetings on Wednesday, 23 September, at the North Dutch Church on Fulton Street in New York City.[37] These meetings became a daily occurrence a week before the panic and by the spring of 1858 there were over twenty such meetings in the New York City area.[38] The Revival spread to the British Isles; it was quite unplanned; it was free from the excesses of the Western and frontier revivals; and it was an urban and Northern phenomenon. Southern financial interests centered elsewhere. That may be a factor in its lack of popularity in the South.

This revival prefigures the enlightened and regulated post-bellum revivals in the northern cities and marks the rise of lay participation and control. One such layman converted in this revival was Dwight L. Moody. Other results furthered interdenominational cooperation, ethical concerns, benevolent activity, and Arminian views which

---

[36] Frank G. Beardsley, Religious Progress Through Religious Revivals (New York: American Tract Society, 1943), pp. 183-184.

[37] Ibid., p. 217.

[38] Ibid., pp. 222-223.

crowded out much of the Calvinism which remained.[39] It was the end of a religious era. Henceforth, revivals had to contend with an industrial-urban-scientific society.[40]

One of the signs of the times appeared in 1858, The Higher Christian Life by William Edwin Boardman.[41] The international popularity of this book suggests a widespread thirst for holiness, power to overcome sin, convert the world, and bring the Kingdom of God on earth.[42]

Boardman was an Arminian perfectionist who became well-known on both sides of the Atlantic. Here are some samples of his thought:

> follow Him in the clear and distinct teaching of salvation from death and hell for the unconverted! It was the clear teaching of John the Baptist, and of Jesus after him. . . . And it was the equally clear proclamation by our Savior of the deeper spiritual baptism of the Holy Ghost as the privilege of Christians, even as John had foretold, which led the disciples to look for it and to receive it.[43]

While imputed righteousness is necessary, Boardman claimed that personal holiness is equally a basis for salvation. Of the Christian he says,

---

[39] Smith, p. 80.

[40] C. C. Cole, Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), pp. 74-75.

[41] William Edwin Boardman, The Higher Christian Life (Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1871). This quiet book is one of the best introductions to the Holiness Movement of the post-bellum period.

[42] Smith, p. 135.

[43] Ibid., p. 106.

[44] Boardman, pp. 18-19.

> He must be just in the eye of the law, justified before God; and he must also be holy in heart and life, or he cannot be saved.[45]

Of the second blessing he affirms its necessity for original power and progress in the Christian life:

> The Higher Christian Life, as a distinct plane of experience, with its definite beginning . . . is the true starting-point of progress and power. . . . there are many, many thousands in the churches at this moment who are hungering and thirsting for something, they know not what,--for this very thing, if they did but know it,--who, if it were credibly and definitely set before them, would at once spring to its attainment.[46]

Unencumbered by Methodist or Oberlin terminology, Boardman's popularity assured his place as a key figure in the coming Holiness and Pentecostal Revivals.

---

[45] Ibid., p. 55.

[46] Ibid., pp. 197-198.

CHAPTER VIII

A CRITICAL PERIOD 1865--1900

Trends and Changes

The post-bellum period was a time of tension and transition. Both theory and practice were changing. The churches had to struggle both with changing beliefs brought on by evolution and also, compounding the tension, with changes in the churches' relation to society. The latter was occasioned by the rise of a dynamic urban-industrial, materialistic, and acquisitive society. These two challenges are discussed briefly in the next section.

Evolution and the rise of an urban-industrial society provoked three reactions. One reaction was the social gospel. Another reaction was the gospel of wealth which issued forth from the conservative evangelicals. The third reaction was the Pentecostal revival, the fruit of the Holiness Movement. The Pentecostals rejected and were alienated by the first two attempts at a solution, refused to accept the serious challenges of this period, and sought salvation through a fundamentalist, pre-millennial, anti-intellectual, and reactionary escapism.

The years 1865 to 1900 stand of course on the hither side of the nineteenth century's great divide. While the period on the yon side of the Civil War, 1830 to 1865, had been years of momentous innovation especially in religion, the churches' social thought had been essentially a new conservatism. After the Civil War the churches agreed in opposing the development of social criticism and supported the status quo

established by the victorious Union armies. The churches saw wealth and poverty as divinely ordained and supported reforms of those evils which involved personal habits. Before 1877 and hardly thereafter, Protestant individualism could envision no concern for basic social ills other than their easy solution through moral judgment. The sovereign God who worked by immutable law allowed no human effort in social amelioration, although the revivalist parted company with the orthodox Calvinist and made room for human effort in matters of salvation.[1]

"Evangelical Protestantism reached the summit of its influence in America during the last half of the nineteenth century."[2] In the line of presidents which had preceded him, Lincoln was the last reluctantly to identify himself openly with a Protestant denomination.[3] The Protestant clergy enjoyed its highest prestige in these years. One thinks of Thomas K. Beecher (1824-1900), twelfth of Lyman Beecher's thirteen children, and pastor of the First Congregational Church in Elmira, New York, from 1854 to 1900. Widely popular there, for years he kept the town clock in repair and, on his trips to New York City, it is reported that he chauffeured the locomotive.[4]

---

[1]Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 39, 83, and 263.

[2]Timothy Lawrence Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 15.

[3]Ibid., p. 39.

[4]Harris Elwood Starr, "Thomas Kinnicut Beecher," Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), II, 136.

The first shock to Protestant complacency came in 1877; a series of such crises continued to 1894. Henceforth, it became increasingly difficult to justify depression, poverty, and urban slums as if they were divinely ordained. By rejecting the traditional Protestant answer as now untenable, and in the face of evolution, collectivist thought in sociology and economics, theological change, and a growing urban-industrial society, conservatives, by their inoffensive proposals, prepared the way for a Protestant hearing of the later more radical social thought.[5]

An aspect of the changing attitude away from mere moralism appears in Frances E. Willard. As early as 1874, she endorsed such anti-laissez-faire issues as labor's demands for wages and an eight-hour day.[6] Certainly anti-laissez-faire, prohibitionism was in this regard related to sabbatarianism which itself showed concern not only for a day of rest, but also for labor's demands for an eight-hour day. By the decade of the 1880's, sabbatarians defended their demands not only on moral but also on humanitarian grounds.[7]

Possibly the change was forced by an increasingly secular society and the lack of respect for the Puritan holy day, evident in the coercive attempts to preserve it.[8] Creeping secularism appears also in

---

[5]May, pp. 263-264.

[6]Ibid., p. 127.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Arthur M. Schlesinger, A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 16.

the 1876 founding of Johns Hopkins University, free of obligation to any religious group.

At the same time, the established denominations were increasing in wealth, membership, and educational standards.[9] Once-poor denominations, now middle class, deserted the poor who had to seek their religion elsewhere.[10] Here is one factor in the growth of the Holiness and Pentecostal movements. It is significant that general church growth was greater between 1880 and 1900 than the general population increase but less than the rate of increase of the urban wage-earning class.[11] A further sign that the churches were increasing in wealth was the transformation of the camp meeting into Chautauqua assemblies or middle-class resorts,[12] where summer cottages replaced the revivalist's tent.

The period may easily be read and interpreted in terms of corruption, spiritual decay, and poor church attendance.[13] The understanding is relative, of course; by modern standards, church membership

---

[9]This is detailed in Schlesinger, p. 30; William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1939), pp. 495, 505, and 532; and in Abdel R. Wentz, The Lutheran Church in American History (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publishing House, 1923), p. 211.

[10]Sweet, p. 496.

[11]Schlesinger, p. 30.

[12]Sweet, p. 496.

[13]Klaude Kendrick, The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), p. 25, quoting Schlesinger. Sweet, pp. 476-477, reports the fact. Kendrick would have us see the fact as justifying the origin of Pentecostalism.

was a strenuous matter.[14] By antebellum standards, and in light of the denial of the traditional conversionist basis of church membership in Bushnell's Christian Nurture, there was cause for revivalist alarm, due also to the environmental reform interest which came, in part, from the same source.

Not only were the poor being neglected in the increasing affluence of the churches--rural churches developed resentments against the rising urban culture, resentment apparent in at least two aspects. Indeed, Protestant reaction to urban-industrial changes in this period provided the impulse to retreat to a simpler childhood.[15] Two aspects of the reaction were the romantic picture of the ignorant but effective circuit-rider developed among those Methodists who opposed an educated ministry,[16] and the anti-Catholic American Protective Association which flourished in mid-Western rural areas between 1887 and 1896.[17] Certainly the backward look hardly equipped predominantly rural denominations to grapple theologically with the nature of man and his needs in an urban-industrial society. While not strictly measurable, those predominantly rural denominations such as the Methodists, Baptists, and Disciples[18] tended to support

---

[14] Smith, p. 18.

[15] Ibid., p. 15.

[16] Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American Life (New York: Knopf, 1964), pp. 95-96 and 100-101.

[17] Sweet, pp. 533-534.

[18] By 1906 they were well over eighty percent rural in their constituency. H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York: Henry Holt, 1929), pp. 182-183.

prohibition and Sabbath reform, but urban denominations of the East had larger interests in industrial conditions. It is not readily apparent that conservative Protestants did anything to heal the widening gap between Christianity and an increasingly secular culture.[19] This dereliction is a factor in the origin of the social gospel.

The theological chickens came home to roost in the last quarter of the century. Lacking a theology independent of the social-cultural milieu and with the exotic leftovers of a squandered theological capital, Protestantism perforce found itself on the intellectual defensive in this quarter-century, armed as it was with an irrelevant orthodoxy or a theologically impoverished revivalism.

It was the era of the "notorious infidel," Robert Ingersoll (1833-1899),[20] who was in lifelong revolt against extreme Calvinism. The year 1871 saw the publication of James Freeman Clarke's Ten Great Religions, which went through over twenty editions in fifteen years.[21] In 1875, Madame Blavatsky founded the Theosophical Society in New York City. The next year, Felix Adler founded the Society for Ethical Culture. Five years later, in 1881, the American Institute of Christian Philosophy began to publish literature on the relations between science and the Bible. In 1891, Washington Gladden published a popular account of the new biblical scholarship entitled, Who Wrote the Bible? Popular literature of the period gave increasing space to the

---

[19] Hofstadter, pp. 95-96.

[20] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[21] Ibid., p. 14; Schlesinger, p. 6.

attack on intolerant creeds.[22] In 1893, with an attendance of over one hundred and fifty thousand, the World's Parliament of Religions convened during the Columbian Exposition. Traditional theology was under attack by William Graham Sumner at Yale and by Borden Parker Bowne at Boston University.[23] Biblical criticism, comparative religion, and the relaxation of fundamental religion promoted theological acceptance of evolution in the last decade of the century. Such thought enabled spokesmen for the liberal theology to define social Christianity in terms of divine immanence, an organic view of society, and progress toward the coming Kingdom of God on earth.[24]

Finally, one may observe the parallels to previous periods of revival--syncretism, theological compromise, an inadequate ecclesiastical establishment, a breakdown and restructuring of society, a growing institutionalism, in this case involving higher standards of education for the clergy, an effete revivalism functioning to win souls for the establishment, and affluence which neglected the poor.

Two Challenges: Evolution and Urban-Industrial Society

Whether Copernican, Newtonian, Darwinian, or Freudian, revolutionary scientific theories are not new. The rise of evolutionism from 1858 to

---

[22]Schlesinger, pp. 7-8.

[23]John Leland Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 165-166, 169.

[24]C. H. Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 123.

1859, delayed in its effects by the Civil War, posed such a challenge to Christian theology as had not been known since the challenge of Greek philosophy. By 1870 the challenge was felt on a wide front, and it provided the spark for much philosophical, religious, political, and social thought for the balance of the nineteenth century. Evolution was seen as a threat both to religion and morality, and the controversy which raged over it reached a peak in the late 1870's. Not a few of the attacks on it were of inferior intellectual quality.[25] After 1870 as scientists and laity began to accept it, the religious press in the 1880's made more and more concessions and accommodations to the theory of evolution.

In its influence on American social thought, its primary expression was through the work of Herbert Spencer (1820-1903). From first publication in the 1860's to 1903, Spencer's works sold 368,755 volumes in the United States.[26] In social thought Darwinism could be but was not uniformly seen as a strong supporter of the status quo, private property, and conservative opposition to state intervention. In the late nineteenth century the theological stream was guided by changing attitudes toward this issue of laissez-faire individualism.[27] Theology gave little creative guidance in the thirty years from 1870 to 1900, years of particular change, ferment, and intellectual insecurity. After all, even Darwinism could be and was taken in different ways. Lester

---

[25]Hofstadter, p. 25.

[26]Ibid., p. 34.

[27]Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 175.

Frank Ward (1841-1913) accepted its implications for change but rather than arriving at Spencer's inevitable and natural perfectionism, the acceptance of which debars from voluntary efforts at reform, he insisted that it be interpreted in a totally different light than that of the conservatives.

As conservative thought represented by William Graham Sumner (1840-1910) tried to preserve some security in an era of rapid change, so also progressive thought, social or theological, found its champion in Ward whose ideas prepared the way for the coming managed state.

With respect to the rising urban-industrial society of this period, Protestant failure to adjust to the challenges of labor strife, population shift to the city, and the urban poor was equally as harmful in the area of mission practice as infidelity and syncretism were in the area of Christian thought. If a church is no better than its theology, then the fault lies here rather than in the many currents, affluence, evolution, or any other movement of the period in question. For example, the fact that in 1890, one percent of the families owned one-half of the country's wealth[28] is theologically less significant than the fact that the churches were unable to exercise theological and moral leadership, armed as they were with a theology from a previous era. Revivalists accepted the status quo, and other conservatives identified laissez-faire economics with theological orthodoxy.[29]

---

[28] H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, American Christianity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), II, 359.

[29] Ibid.

In the labor conflicts of the period from 1877 to 1894, only a minority of clergy,[30] men such as Washington Gladden and Lyman Abbott, defended the rights of labor. These labor conflicts were a powerful influence on Protestant social thought; almost as powerful an influence was the rise of the city.[31] Bushnell's theology of environmental influence prepared the way for men such as Josiah Strong to give up the old theology. More fully than many Protestant thinkers, Strong appreciated the social changes which were weakening the old individualism, the importance of modern science, and the influence of urban environment on human behavior.[32] This influence had to be reckoned with because population in towns of over four thousand inhabitants increased from one-third of the total population in 1890 to nearly forty-six percent in 1910,[33] the terminal year of this thesis' time-frame.

Even in the early 1870's, it was recognized that the urban wage-earner was shunning Protestant churches.[34] Some Protestant leaders re-examined their social attitudes. Such reexamination resulted in the settlement house, welfare work, and the institutional church. The last offered a wide range of social, recreational, and educational services. In the long run these activities challenged the traditional theory of poverty, supposedly a result of one's own sin, and the theory of wealth, supposedly a reward for righteousness.

---

[30] May, p. 91.

[31] Ibid., p. 112.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Sweet, p. 522.

[34] May, p. 122.

The Theology of the Established Churches 1865--1900

Three major theological streams of this period were: (a) The traditional scholastic orthodoxy residing chiefly at Princeton. This theology was authoritarian, transcendent, and doctrinal; (b) Pietistic revivalism embodied in Dwight L. Moody, for example. These two were the chief conservative Protestant forces of the period. Both were socially irrelevant. They might in agreement oppose liberal theology but such agreement was uneasy;[35] (c) Romantic liberalism conserved some aspects of the old evangelicalism.[36] It was in that sense romantic but also liberal with respect to the old orthodoxy. This stream of thought began with Horace Bushnell[37] and continued in Lyman Abbott and Washington Gladden. It became an empirical science of theology, immanental, and kind toward evolution. Its concern for Christian nurture and for the effect of a bad social environment turned its adherents into critics who struggled toward some social relevance when late nineteenth century social conditions challenged Christian ethics.

---

[35] Smith, Handy, Loetscher, II, 312.

[36] Hopkins, p. 14.

[37] Mead, p. 171, and May, p. 80. Bushnell was a social and economic conservative.

The foregoing bones are hardly meant to form a complete skeletal frame for the theology of the period except as it appears relevant to this thesis.[38]

Revival theology and scholastic orthodoxy formed a Protestant compound which refused to wrestle with the intellectual problems of the time. As the liberal theology developed in the 1880's, its intellectual performance was no more effective than that of the other two streams of thought. Its spokesmen, Henry Ward Beecher and Lyman Abbott, did not care what people believed.[39] Such theological indifference made religion a private affair unrelated to current secular thought. Theology was safe--it made no effort to grapple with science--or else uncritically accepted it.[40] In that case the Christian's role in society had nothing to do with theology but only with pious feelings. The result was on the one hand a theology irrelevant to modern thought, and on the other a life style which had accepted and was thoroughly determined by modern life and thought.[41] For example this meant that Beecher and Abbott were thoroughly modern in sympathy, therefore "liberals," but their theology was, for the one, out-of-date (and in that sense "conservative") or, for the other, non-existent.

---

[38] It is recognized that other streams of theological thought were present, Unitarianism and, later, the scientific modernism of Shailer Matthews, but this writer has been unable to relate them to the reactionary Pentecostal revival, except as Unitarian thought may have been present in the liberal theology.

[39] Mead, p. 136.

[40] Ibid., p. 137.

[41] Ibid., p. 138.

The Rise of Liberal Theology

The liberal theology had its beginnings in the old evangelicalism of the period 1830-1860 in the works of Horace Bushnell, particularly Christian Nurture (1846). Not at first widely influential, this theology grew steadily in acceptance through its advocacy by Henry Ward Beecher and Phillips Brooks and became the chief inspiration of the liberal theology,[42] so-called after 1900.[43] Its search for new truth came to terms with the thought of its day and accepted organic evolution, the historical-critical method of Bible study, the psychology, sociology, and philosophical idealism of the time, and the moral values of social, as opposed to individualistic, democracy.[44] "Bushnell's Christian Nurture was the most effective single factor in breaking down the old individualism."[45] This romantic liberalism was evolutionary rather than revolutionary; without cross, crisis or divine-human reconciliation thereby, and it looked to increasing fulfillment on earth of the promise of the Kingdom--but with no prior divine judgment.[46]

Liberal theology's acceptance of the historical-critical method of Bible study was perhaps promoted at Andover Theological Seminary.

---

[42] Sweet, pp. 491-492.

[43] Smith, Handy, Loetscher, II, 255.

[44] Ibid., II, 255-256.

[45] Hopkins, p. 5.

[46] H. Richard Niebuhr, The Kingdom of God in America (Chicago and New York: Willett and Clark, 1937), pp. 190-194.

Its early prophet was Moses Stuart who there introduced critical German scholarship in the antebellum days.[47] There at Andover the school of progressive orthodoxy had a foothold on its way to becoming the liberal theology.[48] The higher critical debate and its theological influence began in the United States in the 1880's primarily. Washington Gladden's Who Wrote the Bible? (1891) indicates the popular spread in American thought of this aspect of the new theology.[49]

The Congregationalists had honestly broken with their past at a national council in Boston in 1865 with the aptly named Burial Hill confession at Plymouth. They were no longer Calvinist. Their confessions became strictly testimonies, not tests nor standards of truth. This clear liberal tendency appears in Henry Ward Beecher (1813-1887) and Washington Gladden (1836-1918). Beecher was the outstanding churchman after the war and so effectively shook the theological foundations of evangelicalism that by the time of his death in 1887, there wasn't much remaining foundation to shake.[50] Outside the churches, the enemies of Christian truth had no ground on which to stand. Their position was too well represented within the structure of Protestantism. The sons of liberal theology were operating with an ever-decreasing theological capital. Gladden began where Bushnell left off, and Bushnell

---

[47] James F. Findlay, Jr., Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 147.

[48] May, pp. 84-85.

[49] Schlesinger, p. 4.

[50] Martin Marty, The Infidel (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), p. 170.

retained much of the theology of evangelicalism, as he protested against its abuses. Gladden had less of divine sovereignty, salvation, and redemption than Bushnell. The process continued after Gladden. The evangelistic elements were lost, and the liberal theology became increasingly secular.[51]

Gladden's social gospel came directly from Bushnell[52] with influences from Beecher.[53] His personal experience with the old theology[54] helped to equip him for his generation's needs. In 1886 he had studied the labor question and concluded that industrial productivity had brought no corresponding wage increase. Therefore he openly defended labor's right to organize fifty years before it was legally recognized. His social realism was an important contribution to Protestant thought; he voiced the views of a growing group of Protestants, and Gladden is rightly called "the father of the social gospel."[55] His social gospel was directly influenced both by his historical-critical understanding of the Bible[56] and by Spencer's organic theory of evolution.[57] It would be a fine distinction to say which was more influential on his thought concerning social salvation, Bushnell or Spencer.

---

[51]Niebuhr, Kingdom of God, pp. 194-197.

[52]Hopkins, p. 5.

[53]May, p. 171.

[54]Ibid., He could achieve no conversion experience.

[55]Ibid., pp. 171-174.

[56]Robert T. Handy, The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 84.

[57]Hofstadter, p. 106.

The erosion of theology reached its extreme in Lyman Abbott (1835-1922). Ingersoll could not attack Abbott, because both agreed in their criticism of the Scriptures.[58] Abbott's secular theology was broadly influential,[59] reconciled science and religion, denied original sin, and equated immorality with animality. This theology had no stance from which to condemn evil except from an evolutionary point of view and thereby also had given up the possibility and the need for salvation.

This dynamic movement, liberal theology, revolted against the social fatalism of the orthodox, against a moralistic biblicism, against a self-preserving ecclesiastical establishment concerned with gaining members for the institution, by means of revivalism, that is, and against an otherworldly heaven-hell dichotomy which could ignore the needs of the here and now.[60]

While theologically this revolt was not profound, it was nonetheless also a worthy social contribution. The social gospel dissipated the old theology and provoked the bitter modernist-fundamentalist split. The nub of the issue between the two centered on respective attitudes toward modern science.

---

[58]Marty, pp. 173-176.

[59]Hofstadter, p. 29.

[60]Niebuhr, Kingdom of God, p. 184.

CHAPTER IX

ORIGINS OF THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

In a narrow sense, the social gospel, stimulated by socialism, began as a reaction to the ethics and practices of capitalism as manifested in the labor situation, urban life, and the profit motive in regard to business practices and competition in the 1880's.[1] As contrasted to former periods, it was a reaction to the broad cleavage which an otherworldly pietistic revivalism and scholastic orthodoxy had allowed to grow between Christianity and social life in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

In this sense the original social gospel was a reactionary throwback. At the same time it was therefore also a reaction to that otherworldly religion. The concerns of the social gospel were primarily ethical. It was a daring innovation in the 1880's to challenge laissez-faire economic and social thought, to talk of social rather than individual sin, and to propose church responsibility for the amelioration of man's material welfare and social evils. In its beginnings, the social gospel was a movement in search of a theology and an institution. Walter Rauschenbusch provided the former, beginning in 1907; the adoption of social creeds by some of the churches provided the latter in 1908. The theological liberals who espoused this cause

---

[1] C. H. Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 319.

were often sociologically well-informed and educated. Its intellectual content was partially the cause of opposition.[2]

In a broader sense, the social gospel is the interpenetration of religious and social thought, in varying degrees, as Christian principles are applied to society and social principles are applied to Christianity. In this sense, the social gospel is still present. The issue the social gospel creates is between those who seek to regenerate society and those who seek individual conversion. Opponents of the social gospel include the latter and many more who acknowledge a Christian social mission but not based on a theology and social ethics whose sources are other than those of revealed religion.

The roots of the social gospel may go back to the seventeenth century New England churches and their close relation to the civic and social life of the town. Such churches existed not for themselves but for community well-being, not to promote denominational prestige nor survival but to cure injustice and promote social welfare.[3] More direct theological roots may be found in post-Edwardean theology, the New Haven theology of Nathaniel Taylor.[4]

The contribution of the Enlightenment appears in a concern for moral virtue, and the social gospel was moralistic; in benevolent concern for human welfare; and in a belief in the perfectibility of man and society. While there were strong ethical impulses within

---

[2]Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 178.

[3]Gaius Glenn Atkins and Frederick L. Fagley, History of American Congregationalism (Boston and Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1942), p. 248.

[4]W. A. Visser't Hooft, Background of the Social Gospel in America (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1963?), pp. 81-82.

evangelical Christianity, the Enlightenment influence is more accurately traced through Unitarianism. In this line of influence, the Enlightenment finally overcame its last opponent, the orthodox Protestant theology of the nineteenth century.[5]

The post-millennial reformers who came forth from the Finney revival to oppose slavery provide another root of the social gospel. Washington Gladden is reported to have said,

> now that slavery is out of the way, the questions that concern our free laborers are coming forward . . . moral questions . . . it is plain that the pulpit must have something to say about them.[6]

This post-millennial connection may only be logical rather than lineal-theological. The theological sources appear to this writer to be traced through the other wing of evangelicalism to Bushnell and his followers. The abolition movement had split over the issue of political involvement.[7] The rightists went biblicist, literal, and pre-millennial to embrace Adventism. The less literal and more practical leftists, Oberlin Congregationalists mainly, were post-millennial. It is perhaps this wing of mid-century reformist revivalism which logically led to Gladden's comment, although his theology came from the New Haven school through Bushnell.

In this connection, it should be observed that the older post-millennial doctrine of evangelicalism broke down under the shocks of

---

[5]Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 231-232.

[6]Quoted in Atkins and Fagley, p. 250.

[7]Whitney R. Cross, The Burned-over District (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), pp. 277, 284.

the social crisis between 1877 and 1894. Its own advocates reacted to the breakdown, gave up the old individualism, and produced a communal version, the social gospel.[8]

The earliest statement of the social gospel in the modern sense was by a Philadelphia iron merchant in 1851, a certain Stephen Colwell, who blamed ineffective Christianity on credal religion to the neglect of practical charity.[9] Social Christianity rose in western Europe a generation before the American version; and British Christian socialists were influential in America.[10] Decisive in the rise of the American social gospel were these elements: Enlightenment moralism, evolution, urban-industrial society, and theological breakdown which made some Christian leaders easy prey for the conqueror, modern science. One finds a coincidence between the fruition of modern science and the rise of the social gospel often in the same men who advocated a socially relevant Christianity and who at the same time wanted to adapt theology to science. This coincidence perhaps is the origin of the fundamentalist-modernist split.

Theological education was in transition in response to the challenge. After 1880 both the Harvard Divinity School and Hartford Seminary required a course in sociology. Andover Seminary did likewise after 1887. Chicago Theological Seminary established a chair in

---

[8]H. Richard Niebuhr, The Kingdom of God in America (Chicago and New York: Willett and Clark, 1937), pp. 161-162.

[9]Hopkins, p. 6.

[10]May, pp. 148-149.

Christian sociology in 1892.[11] Socially responsible churches were a vocal minority in the 1880's: St. George Episcopal Church in New York City; People's Temple in Denver; Russell H. Conwell's Baptist Temple in Philadelphia; and socially active organizations were organized on behalf of labor and with a Christian socialist concern.

There is no direct connection nor relation between liberal theology and progressive social thought. Both Bushnell and Henry Ward Beecher were economic and social conservatives, but the thought of both was necessary for a change to take place in Protestant social thought. In this connection two influences bear on the rise of the social gospel. Beecher's acceptance of Spencerian thought in 1882 prepared the way for his followers later to use his views and methods in a different environment to criticize rather than support the status quo. Richard T. Ely was a second powerful influence on American social thought. His rejection of older Protestant thought resulted from his historical studies in Germany.[12] His shock at the labor problems of the 1880's led him to critical study of the social structure. He did not patronize the labor movement but sincerely tried to understand it. His thought was based on the new theology.[13] As the social gospel approached early maturity in 1895,[14] its

---

[11] Atkins and Fagley, p. 254.

[12] May, p. 140.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., pp. 182-183.

influence in the churches varied according to locale; the urban and eastern churches were the leaders.[15]

As one of the triplet of reactions to the challenges of the latter nineteenth century, with the gospel of wealth and Pentecostalism, the social gospel bears some resemblances to the last. Both sought the New Testament ideal; both have tendencies to see Jesus as the Law-giver; both yearned for the visible results of the Gospel; both refused to identify the Kingdom of God with the church; both worked in a thought-frame of critical urgency; both therefore rejected compromise; both were denunciators, although there were differences in the objects of their denunciations. Differences are these: the Pentecostals were not evolutionary but revolutionary, apocalyptic, dualistic, world-fleeing, pre-millennial, and pessimistic. The key to the differences is the rejection of modern scientific thought in the form of evolution or historical-critical study of the Bible, both of which the social gospel movement accepted, and this acceptance was itself among the causes of the Pentecostal revival.

---

[15] Ibid.

CHAPTER X

THE GOSPEL OF WEALTH

If the social crisis of the late nineteenth century required the controlling and planning of society and the economy to promote social justice, then the social gospel was the response of those denominations who accepted the problem and also rejected pietistic revivalism and the gospel of wealth rooted in the traditional orthodoxy.[1]

The unrestrained free enterprise immediately following the Civil War was the age of the "robber barons," who to survive followed a new and expedient ethic ungoverned by a simpler agricultural ethic.[2] Andrew Carnegie did not invent but did state the justification of wealth on the basis of Adam Smith's capitalistic ethics. He rationalized the sufferings of one class as the inescapable price of progress; he justified his own kind of status quo in terms of a natural law which would allow the rich man to make money. Diligence in business and the use of the resultant wealth became a test of one's Christianity.

As revivalism came to depend on the financial support of business men, it could not easily criticize his methods. So arose a fatal

---

[1]Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 177.

[2]Gail Kennedy, editor, Democracy and the Gospel of Wealth (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 57.

dichotomy between personal piety, on the one hand equated with prayer and church work, and on the other the life of the man in business.[3]

Moody's gospel of wealth was equivalent to Carnegie's preachments, according to which social ethic one may help the worthy and needy individual. Labor, a commodity, was not a fit subject for charity. This social ethic separates business from religious influence. The social gospel was therefore seen as a dangerous mixing of the two.[4]

The Right Reverend William Lawrence, Episcopal bishop of Massachusetts, equated wealth with goodness of character and material prosperity as a sanctification of the national character.[5]

In the last decade of the century, the old Carnegie paternalistic benevolence was tempered to a stewardship of wealth common to all but entrusted to one. This challenged the former extreme individualism.[6]

---

[3]James F. Findlay, Jr., Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 85-86.

[4]William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), p. 278.

[5]Kennedy, p. 68.

[6]C. H. Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 161; Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 130-131.

CHAPTER XI

POST-BELLUM REVIVALISM 1870--1910

Dwight L. Moody 1837--1899

Charles G. Finney had laid the foundations of professional revivalism, and Dwight L. Moody erected the superstructure. Finney caused a split in evangelicalism and attacked weakening dogmatic lines, but Moody worked across the same previously antagonistic lines. Finney labored most successfully in towns under ten thousand in population, but Moody's successes were in large cities. Finney was a post-millenial optimist who wanted social change, but Moody was a pre-millennialist who resisted social change. Both revivalists opposed formalism and intellectual Christianity. Finney was an individual and social perfectionist, but Moody was ambiguous on the former and his pre-millennialism forbade the latter, although even on this point he was ambiguous because with Finney he believed that revivals would improve society.

Finney was closer to the Calvinist heritage than Moody was. His belief in the holiness of God led him to make strong moralistic demands. Moody was more irenic and less demanding than Finney. Moody preached the love of God. Both men agreed on man's agency in his own conversion. Both believed in and received a second definite work of grace, an infilling if not the baptism of the Holy Spirit.[1] There is

---

[1]James F. Findlay, Jr., Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 132 quotes

no suggestion that Moody believed in the Methodist Holiness version of the second blessing, that is, an entire sanctification from sin. Perfectionism was perhaps necessarily present in his revival theology of the 1870's and effective in his changing theology of the latter two decades of his life.[2]

If the failure of the institutional church to meet the challenge of the new urban frontier is a factor in the cause of revivals, then it was certainly present in the cause of the Moody revivals. Moody's professional methods offered a quick, traditional, and safe means to meet the need. However his most effective revivals which he engineered between 1873 and 1883 largely preceded the massive changes in American society between 1880 and 1910.[3] He was increasingly out of step with the times which he did not understand. It does not appear that he appreciably reached the urban masses nor did he increase church growth.[4] The changes of the period 1870-1910 were most upsetting but especially to the formerly rural constituency of the insecure, unintellectual, and

---

quotes from the diary of Moody's close friend, D. W. Whittle, to the effect that Moody underwent a deep spiritual experience in New York City in the winter of 1871. Whittle describes it as "the conscious incoming to his Soul [sic] of a presence and power of His Spirit such as he had never known before." This occurred just prior to one of his trips to England in this period and equipped him for the work he was about to undertake. See also Findlay, p. 238.

[2] Ibid., p. 245.

[3] William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), p. 168.

[4] Ibid., p. 265.

revivalistic urban Protestant denominations. Moody's simple gospel of salvation and hard work rewarded by success was most appealing to this conservative element.[5]

Moody's anti-intellectualism appeared in his preachments against intellectual sermons.[6] This was at a time when clergy educational standards were rising[7] which perhaps accounts for his verbal attacks. His anticlericalism was motivated by a pre-millennial desire to reform rather than destroy the church system.[8] He revealed his anti-intellectualism also in an uncritical dismissal of the new Bible scholarship. His instrumental view of Scripture rendered him incapable of grappling with an intellectual question.[9] Here again he was ambiguous. He had friends on both sides of the higher critical and the social gospel controversies. Perhaps such ambiguity was a sign of those times, the insecurity, the extreme positions which many took, the vacillation of America growing up and--as Moody's career spanned the Civil War, embracing Northfield, his beloved rural home, and also big-city and international fame--a looking in both directions, back to the simple verities and forward with apprehensions.

Although pietistic revivalism and pre-millennialism are not equivalent, they often appear together. Their first conjunction

---

[5] Ibid., p. 168.

[6] Ibid., p. 209 and Martin Marty, The Infidel (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), pp. 163-164.

[7] William Warren Sweet, Revivalism in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), p. 163.

[8] McLoughlin, p. 209.

[9] Findlay, p. 410.

appeared late in 1839 when Joshua Himes of Boston met William Miller. Himes at once recognized the instrumental value of Miller's doctrine for revival purposes.[10] Both revivalism and pre-millennialism reject the modern world by retiring into personal piety or by escaping into future bliss. Probably influenced by the Plymouth Brethren, Moody publicly preached a pre-millennial doctrine in the 1870's perhaps for the same instrumental reasons as had obtained in 1839. Increasingly it shaped his message.[11]

Pre-millennialism separated pessimistic, fundamentalist, pious, unintellectual, and insecure Protestants from those who were optimistic, evolutionistic, activistic, and modernist. Moody began the trend which led to this split.[12] He was ambiguous toward dispensationalism. Although he never accepted it, his sympathy for dispensationalism confirmed his pre-millennialism in the 1880's and 1890's.[13]

Decline of Revivalism 1880--1910

Following Moody's campaigns which had brought the revival technique to perfection, revivalism proceeded in the direction of the degenerated rantings of Billy Sunday (1863-1935) and in the work of the literate, highly influential, and successful Reuben A. Torrey (1856-1928). In another revivalist activity, the secularization of

---

[10] Whitney R. Cross, The Burned-over District (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), pp. 292-293.

[11] Findlay, pp. 249-253.

[12] McLoughlin, p. 10.

[13] Findlay, p. 250.

the summer camp-meeting has been noted.[14] The rise of social Christianity and concern for impersonal issues; the growth of interest in Christian education; the impersonal institutional church--these and other reasons account for a slowing down of Moody's brand of revivalism.[15] Furthermore, toward 1890 it was apparent that revivals had no real solution to urban-industrial problems. Some of Moody's followers turned to the then beginning social gospel and to local reform.[16]

Rural revivalism lived on in what became the Assemblies of God, Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), Dunkers, Pentecostals and Holiness groups. In their beginning the last were equally effective in urban or rural areas, and it should be observed that the Pentecostal revival of Topeka in 1901 did not catch fire until it arrived in Los Angeles in 1906 through Texas. Many, if not all, of these conservative revivalists were also pre-millennial, anti-institutional, and alienated from the temper and times of late nineteenth century America. All of whatever stripe opposed evolution, modernism, and progressivism, and were fundamentalist and moralistic.

Reuben A. Torrey 1856--1928

Reuben A. Torrey had an acknowledged influence on early Pentecostalism: "his sermons and writings did much to channel the thinking and form the doctrinal understanding of the early

---

[14] Supra, p. 72.

[15] Sweet, pp. 178-182.

[16] Findlay, p. 307.

Pentecostals . . ." on the subject of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.[17] Torrey himself was no Pentecostal. The Pentecostal Movement began on 1 January 1901. On that day there took place at Topeka, Kansas, the first identification of the baptism of the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues. It does not appear that Torrey knew about it, but he definitely knew of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Both Finney and Moody had influenced his thought.[18] Equally important is the fact that Torrey was an ardent fundamentalist (he was the editor of volumes XI and XII of The Fundamentals), who was in strong--if not bitter--reaction against the higher criticism. He graduated from Yale College in 1875, from the Divinity School three years later, and after a four-year pastorate at the Garrettsville, Ohio, Congregational Church, he studied at Leipzig and Erlangen in 1882. When he left Yale he was a higher critic.[19] In Germany he became a thorough sceptic but gradually found his way out of doubts into a definite conviction of truth.[20] Exactly when this conviction matured is not known but it was apparently during a pastorate in Minneapolis where he served from the time of his return from Germany until 1889. Here he experienced a spiritual crisis influenced by The Life of Trust, written by one of the Plymouth

---

[17]Gordon Francis Atter, The Third Force (Peterborough, Ontario: The College Press, 1962), p. 21.

[18]George T. B. Davis, Torrey and Alexander, The Story of a World-Wide Revival (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1905), p. 23.

[19]Ibid., p. 32.

[20]Helen C. Alexander and J. Kennedy MacLean, Charles M. Alexander, A Romance of Song and Soul-Winning (2nd edition; London, Edinburgh, and New York: Marshall Bros., Ltd., 1920), pp. 50-51.

Brethren, George Mueller of Bristol. Torrey said this experience was "perhaps the most decisive turning point in my life since I have been in the ministry."[21]

Moody invited the thirty-three year old pastor to become superintendent of the Moody Bible Institute. Torrey served in this capacity from the day the school opened, 1 October 1889, at least until 1901, it appears. In 1891 Torrey became also pastor of the Moody-founded Chicago Avenue Church. In 1898 a prayer group in this church began to pray for world-wide revival. These prayers were answered when Torrey was invited to Australia. He left Chicago on 23 December 1901, not quite one year after the birth of the Pentecostal movement.

His revival message emphasized both the Person and work of the Holy Spirit[22] and moralistic holiness.[23] His campaigns were undergirded by city-wide prayer circles and strong expectation of mighty actions from God.[24]

He visited England in September, 1903, and conducted a revival in south Wales the following year at which "The Spirit of God was present . . . in mighty power, and scores of ministers were set on fire with zeal . . . and carried the revival flame back to their churches."[25] At once after the Torrey revival, a religious

---

[21] Davis, p. 37.

[22] Ibid., 98, 130, and 227.

[23] Ibid., p. 227.

[24] Ibid., pp. 15-16 and 227.

[25] Ibid., p. 130.

awakening swept through south Wales in the autumn of 1904. The leader of the revival, Evan Roberts, personally testified of the power of this revival.[26] Word of it spread round the world and was influential in arousing keen expectations for revival in Los Angeles where the Pentecostal fire came down eighteen months later. Torrey was sure he was witnessing the first stages of the greatest revival in history.[27]

The Keswick Conventions 1875--1910

The Keswick Conventions are not to be identified with the American Holiness Movement, although Phoebe Palmer, Robert P. and Hannah W. Smith, and William E. Boardman were instrumental in the inception of the Keswick movement. Beginning in 1875 and annually thereafter, this series of holiness conventions is important to the present thesis because its conservative and Calvinist version of the second blessing caused a split in the American Holiness Movement.[28] The split resulted in a right wing exemplified by the Nazarenes who supposedly remained true to the Wesleyan entire sanctification teaching. The left wing Pentecostals adopted the Keswick version of the second blessing, an infilling of the Holy Spirit which they called "the baptism in the Holy Spirit." After 1 January 1901 they insisted on glossolalia as the sign and proof of that baptism.

---

[26] Ibid., p. 174.

[27] Ibid., p. 138.

[28] Timothy Lawrence Smith, Called Unto Holiness (Kansas City, Missouri: Nazarene Publishing House, 1963), pp. 25, 183-184, and 191-192.

These conventions were an effective world-wide center from which radiated the Keswick message. The conventions were broadly international from 1875. Pandita Ramabai of India attended the 1898 convention.[29] She had learned about the Holy Spirit through a Keswick missionary, perhaps in 1895. From her home in Mukti in 1907 began a pentecostal revival, preceded in September, 1906, by glossolalia phenomena.[30]

F. B. Meyer, an outstanding Baptist leader, probably did more than any other Keswick missioner to spread its beliefs around the world. He visited the United States in 1905-1906 and spoke in eighteen of the largest cities,[31] including Los Angeles, just before the outbreak of the Pentecostal revival in that metropolis.

Because of the Keswick concern to renew and bless the moribund ecclesiastical institutions and, further, because of their caution on the perfectionist issue, Moody took a warm interest in the doctrines and practice of these conventions. Their origin, by the way, coincided with his 1873 visit to Great Britain.

---

[29]Walter B. Sloan, These Sixty Years, The Story of the Keswick Convention (London, Glasgow, and Edinburgh: Pickering and Inglis, n.d.), p. 49.

[30]Donald Gee, The Pentecostal Movement (London: Elim Publishing House, 1949), pp. 27-28.

[31]Steven Barabas, So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention (Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, n.d.), pp. 40 and 186; also Sloan, p. 67.

CHAPTER XII

DISPENSATIONALISM, MILLENNIALISM, FUNDAMENTALISM

All dispensational theology is pre-millennial, but the reverse is not true. Dispensationalism and pre-millennialism must be treated separately.

Low-country pietism spawned dispensationalism in the thought of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669) who also had a marked interest in the historical understanding of the Scriptures.[1] For the present survey, dispensationalism originated with the Darbyites or Plymouth Brethren in connection with an interest in prophecy stimulated by Edward Irving,[2] sometime between 1828 and 1831.

John Nelson Darby (born 1800), the most prominent leader of the Plymouth Brethren, was the vanguard of fundamentalism. Regardless of the schematic divisions of history which a dispensationalist may invent, Darby's assumption is the main point, namely, that God's overarching plan is established and history must be fitted into it.[3] Perhaps a reaction against an irrelevant and complacent church, this ahistorical and exaggerated supernaturalism is a philosophy of despair which rejects any relation between Christianity and culture.

---

[1] D. H. Kromminga, The Millennium in the Church (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1945), p. 17.

[2] E. E. Whitfield, "Plymouth Brethren," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, edited by Samuel M. Jackson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), IX, 95.

[3] Clyde Norman Kraus, Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958), p. 43.

The lack of connection between church and world will be bridged at the second coming. There is no historical change but a forced compartmentalization of history in which change is a function of the divine in-breaking, as God supposedly ends one dispensation and brings in the next. This is a good way to deny both evolution and also effective Christian witness in society. It accepts a church irrelevant to modern society and justifies the fact.

According to this theory, the church and God's Kingdom are radically dissociated. The church is a mere parenthesis between Pentecost and the rapture, after which the Kingdom will be set up on earth. The church is a collection of saints unified across denominational lines by means of Bible institutes or spiritual life conferences. In the meantime before the rapture, a body of believers is being "called out" and a bride is being prepared to meet the Groom. The organized church is hopelessly lost and apostate, a dispensation which has failed like all previous dispensations. The church should not and cannot be reformed. The true believer who has the Holy Spirit should leave his false church and be joined "in the Spirit" with other true believers,[4] Spirit-filled saints, who were in Darby's time the Plymouth Brethren. In modified form, this anti-denominational theory was adapted into non-denominational or inter-denominational meetings and conferences. With modifications of time and place, the Plymouth Brethren were the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship of the nineteenth century.

---

[4]Clarence B. Bass, Backgrounds to Dispensationalism (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960), p. 103.

Further, the Body of Christ is peculiar to this age or dispensation, because it was not constituted until Pentecost by the baptism of the Holy Spirit.[5] Such a purely spiritual ecclesiology minimizes the corporate aspect of the churches and undermines institutional loyalty. The mission of the church is redefined too. It becomes purely spiritual and rails against social welfare efforts. It is significant that fundamentalism never formed a separate institution but united Christians across denominational lines.

Darby's spirit lives on in the exclusivism and separatism of fundamentalists, prophetic teachers, some Pentecostals and neo-Pentecostals and in the Scofield Reference Bible (1907), the terminal point for the development of dispensationalism.[6]

Turning now to "that blessed hope," it appears that the status of the church influences the cycles of pre-millennialism. When persecution stopped, so did ancient pre-millennialism. When the medieval church waxed fat like Jeshurun and kicked up its heels in hierarchical corruption, then medieval millennialism kicked up too. The ancient variety died a natural death, but the institution suppressed medieval millennialism.

America was a natural refuge for pure-church seekers and millennial sects. With the discovery and settlement of the New World, millennial hopes mounted. Reinforced by Adventism and taken up by Moody, pre-millennialism enjoyed a resurgence at the same time that

---

[5]Charles Caldwell Ryrie, Dispensationalism Today (Chicago: Moody Press, 1965), pp. 136-137 lists the scriptural bases: Acts 1-2; 11:15-16, and especially 1 Cor. 12:13.

[6]Kraus, p. 19.

the post-millennial hope of the liberal Protestants began to be secularized.[7] The debate was exacerbated by the affinity among pre-millennialism, dispensationalism, and fundamentalism, all united by supernaturalism on one hand, and post-millennialism and modernism united by immanentism on the other. The connections are not necessary however.

John Nelson Darby voyaged to the United States seven times between 1862 and 1877 and was actually in this country forty percent of this time.[8] He visited major cities mostly in the East and was influential in the Bible and Prophetic Conference movement, one of the principle roots of fundamentalism.[9] Darby had ministered in the churches of those men who were leaders in this movement.[10]

The first Bible Conference met at Swampscott, Massachusetts, in 1876, and two years later the first Prophetic Conference met at Holy Trinity Episcopal Church in New York City to promote the pre-millennial doctrine. These conferences constituted a refusal to come to terms with the thought and life of the late nineteenth century and as such paralleled the response of pietistic revivalism. Protestant scholastic orthodoxy with this pre-millennial supernaturalism could occasionally join forces against liberal theology.[11] The Second

---

[7] H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, American Christianity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), II, 314.

[8] Ernest R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism (Philadelphia: The Fortress Press, 1968), p. 8.

[9] Kraus, pp. 79-80.

[10] Ibid., pp. 78-79.

[11] Smith, Handy, Loetscher, II, 314-315.

Prophetic Conference in Chicago, 1885, enjoyed broad representation across denominational lines. Its deliberate aim was to rally the conservative opposition to post-millennialism and rationalism.[12]

These conferences really established an interdenominational premillennial creed which in 1895 issued into these points of doctrine: inerrancy, the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the resurrection, and the second coming.[13] This is not theology--it is presuppositions to theology. If it is any indication, then they had given up the theological enterprise and had retreated within the walls of dogma.

The adherents of the Bible Conference Movement considered themselves to be the true church within the apostate church,[14] a doctrine which entered American fundamentalism through the conferences, but it was from Darby originally. Their attitude toward the Bible was thoroughly literal and unhistorical, as if the whole thing were written solely for the latter days.[15]

Darbyite influence was present in the United States in the 1840's; Moody quite likely may have picked it up in the 1850's;[16] it is entirely possible that Moody came under Darbyite influence in 1868 and

---

[12]S. G. Cole, History of Fundamentalism (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931), pp. 31-32.

[13]Ibid., p. 34.

[14]Shirley Jackson Case, The Millennial Hope (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918), p. 204; Ryrie, p. 82.

[15]Case, p. 204.

[16]William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), p. 257.

certainly no later than 1872. He made three trips to the British Isles in 1867, 1870, and 1872, and visited some of the conferences of the Plymouth Brethren in Dublin in the interests of their lay evangelistic work. He visited George Mueller in Bristol in 1867, because Moody's Chicago labors had aroused his interest in Mueller's work with orphans. The Brethren exercised a lasting influence over Moody in their anti-liturgical, anti-establishment, and anti-clerical efforts at recovering primitive Christianity. Moody however could not accept the staunch Calvinism of these zealots, because Moody was an Arminian, and he didn't like the divisiveness of the Plymouth Brethren.[17] He never did fully accept the Brethren doctrine.

Including representatives of both the Dispensationalists and Keswick holiness doctrine, a ten-day conference began at Moody's hometown, Northfield, Massachusetts, on 1 September 1880, with an emphasis on the recovery of the pentecostal power of the Holy Spirit.[18] A logical parallel to the earlier Holiness Movement, the Conference had no apparent theological connection with it but was more accurately a precursor of Pentecostalism. Moody accepted the non-perfectionist definition of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as Keswick doctrine held it and as Pentecostals came to accept it, namely, an enduement with power for witness and service as Moody had experienced it in 1871. Friendly to the Holiness Movement, as were also the speakers and delegates at this and later conferences, Moody was unknowingly

---

[17] James F. Findlay, Jr., Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 257.

[18] Ibid., pp. 341-342.

contributing to the fundamentalist ecclesiology, namely, a highly individualistic, dispensationalist doctrine based on the holiness of the individual believer.[19] Moody, friendly to both Keswick holiness and dispensationalism, fully accepted neither but was apparently expediently seeking the renewal of the institutional churches through a pre-millennial, Holy Spirit revivalism. This element with belief in a literal Bible and corruption in the churches united the conference delegates. By virtue of the Dispensationalist and Holiness attitudes toward the nature of the church, a close connection exists between holiness and fundamentalism.[20] This is true empirically--holiness sects were and are usually fundamentalist--but it is also important to establish the point historically in terms of theological connections. The reactionary nature of the Northfield Conferences, evident in their pre-millennialism and in their attitude toward the established churches, is logically cut from the same cloth as the American Holiness Movement out of which came the Pentecostal revival. It may also be stated that Dispensationalism and Keswick were influential in the rise of British Pentecostalism.[21] The same may at least be suggested

---

[19]Sandeen, p. 17.

[20]Ibid., p. 6, footnote 13. Moody at these conferences kept together what was flying apart, namely, liberals (Josiah Strong, Henry Drummond, and William Rainey Harper) and conservatives. It is not recorded that the Conferences had any influence on the liberal theology. Thereafter, each went his own way.

[21]Donald Gee, "Movement Without a Man," Christian Life, XXVIII (July 1966), 50; Nils Bloch-Hoell, The Pentecostal Movement (Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964, and Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964), p. 82; and John Thomas Nichol, Pentecostalism (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper, 1966), p. 40. The Northfield Conferences continued into the 1890's, Findlay, pp. 406-407; they included Torrey among the speakers, George T. B. Davis, Torrey and Alexander, The

for the rise of American Pentecostalism. This entire period and Moody's role in relation to the various movements remains to be more accurately historified.[22]

The roots of fundamentalism have been outlined so far in terms of dispensationalism, pre-millennialism, holiness, the Darbyites, the Bible and Prophetic Conferences, and the Northfield Conferences. There are other roots which go deeper into American history than the biblicist movements of the latter half of the nineteenth century.

The history of American fundamentalism may be, with allowances for inaccuracy, stated this way: the Presbyterian Adopting Act of 1729 and the five points of fundamentalism propounded in 1895 and 1910 were separated by a century and three-quarters of pervasive cultural and theological change. There still remains a similarity of method and purpose. The purpose was to compromise with rationalism[23] and define the hard core of Christian doctrine which became the practicing credal formulation of some non-credal churches.

Between 1729 and 1910 there was formulated the Presbygational Plan of Union (1801) which abbreviated the confessions and required

---

Story of a World-Wide Revival (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1905), p. 43. His teaching on the Holy Spirit baptism approximated the Keswick doctrine, present at this time also at J. Wilbur Chapman's Winona Bible School. This would put Moody Bible Institute, Northfield, and Winona within the Keswick orbit.

[22]Findlay, p. 21.

[23]Lefferts A. Loetscher, The Broadening Church: Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954), pp. 98-99

assent to the fundamentals;[24] Finney and the other revivalists certainly believed in travelling light theologically.[25] Railing against credal formulations has a long history in America. What Finney attacked--creeds and credal lines--Moody crossed, and thus he became the immediate harbinger of fundamentalism and doctrinal minimalism which allows like-minded Christians to work across denominational lines.

Coming now to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the definition of fundamentalism becomes specific, pointed, and narrow in terms of the issues. It is opposition to higher criticism, evolution, and scientific method in theology and Bible study. It is dispensational, prophetic, pre-millennial, evangelistic, revivalistic, and undenominational.[26] In its organized form, fundamentalism was a political movement within denominations to combat liberalism by capturing and controlling church administration.[27] Specifically, it was an unstable alliance of the Princeton theology and dispensationalism to oppose the higher criticism.[28]

---

[24]McLoughlin, p. 123.

[25]Ibid., pp. 76-77, 125, 161, and 524.

[26]Winfred E. Garrison, "Fundamentalism," Encyclopaedia Britannica (Chicago: William Benton, Publisher, 1961), IX, 920.

[27]Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 183.

[28]Sandeen, p. 3.

Taking now together all roots of fundamentalism, their first historical concurrence was in 1878 at the First International Prophetic Conference.[29] This first visible coalescence of the various elements continued through the Bible Conference movement. For fundamentalism, the most important of these conferences was in 1895 at Niagara. Here were formulated the five points of dogma which in turn became the Fundamentals of 1910.[30]

The basis of fundamentalism is its spiritual ecclesiology from the holiness and dispensational roots[31] which prevents the movement from precipitating into a separate and new denomination. This fact is not commonly recognized. Its leaders were concentrated in the cities of the North and East, scarcely at all in the South.[32] To say that the modernists were the theological innovators is in fairness to be balanced by the fundamentalist dispensational doctrinal innovations.

Fundamentalism became outspoken beginning in 1909 through the munificence of two California laymen, Lyman and Milton Stewart. In that year among their many enterprises there began to appear the twelve-volume The Fundamentals.

As liberal theology was a sign that the Enlightenment had overcome its last foe, Protestant orthodoxy, so The Fundamentals are equally a

---

[29] Ibid., p. 11.

[30] Louis Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement (Paris: Mouton and Co., 1963), p. 183.

[31] Sandeen, p. 6.

[32] Ibid., p. 17.

sign of the victory of rationalism. This reductionist and compromising trend, resulting in The Fundamentals, is the fruit of revivalism also.[33]

---

[33]Loetscher, p. 98.

CHAPTER XIII

THE HOLINESS MOVEMENT

When John Wesley revised the Shorter Catechism, he omitted the following entirely:

> Q. 82 Is man able perfectly to keep the commandments of God?
> A. No mere man since the fall is able . . . .[1]

Thereby hangs this chapter.

Interest in holiness or perfectionism accompanied revival at its crest as in the 1830's and in 1858 with the appearance of Boardman's The Higher Christian Life.[2] The Civil War interrupted the interest in perfectionism of the late 1850's.[3] The moral and spiritual chaos following that conflict may have had some bearing on the renewed perfectionist emphasis in the 1866 centenary observance of the Methodist

---

[1] James A. MacDonald, Wesley's Revision of the Shorter Catechism (Edinburgh: Geo. A. Morton, 1906), p. 22. The issue with which the Holiness Movement dealt was stated clearly by the General Holiness Assembly which met in Chicago at Park Avenue Methodist Church in May, 1885, John Leland Peters, Christian Perfection and American Methodism (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 137, 162. The Assembly adopted this statement: "Entire Sanctification is a second definite work of grace wrought by the Baptism with the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer subsequent to regeneration, received instantaneously by faith, by which the heart is cleansed from all corruption and filled with the perfect love of God."

[2] Supra, p. 67.

[3] Timothy Lawrence Smith, Called Unto Holiness (Kansas City, Missouri: Nazarene Publishing House, 1963), pp. 12-13. Smith says that post-bellum chaos and corruption dampened the perfectionist interest which was kindled in 1858. Harper says the Holiness Movement was stimulated by the chaos which followed the Civil War. Michael C. Harper, As at the Beginning (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966), p. 22.

Church.[4] The Palmers had one of their best years in 1866.[5] The beginning holiness revival was at first an urban phenomenon promoted by pastors such as Alfred Cookman (died 1871) and others in Philadelphia, New York City, Wilmington, and Newark.[6] Cookman, with John S. Inskip and William McDonald, gave wise leadership to the early Holiness Movement. Inskip was chairman of the Methodist pastors conference in New York City. In the summer of 1867, these men with others organized the first general holiness camp meeting at Vineland, New Jersey,[7] out of which was organized the National Campmeeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness. Inskip was the president until his death in 1884, after which the Association declined.[8]

Methodist in leadership but somewhat interdenominational in attendance,[9] this first and successful holiness camp meeting grew in popularity. The emphasis on the second blessing spread as the camp meetings assembled annually and increased in number, mostly in the East.[10]

---

[4]Smith, p. 15, and also his "The Holiness Crusade," in The History of American Methodism, edited by Emory Stevens Bucke (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964), II, 611.

[5]Smith, "Crusade," History, II, 611.

[6]Ibid., II, 612; also Smith, Called, p. 26.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Nils Bloch-Hoell, The Pentecostal Movement (Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964), p. 189, footnote 85.

[9]Elmer T. Clark, The Small Sects in America (Revised edition; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1937), p. 73.

[10]Smith, Called, p. 15.

The 1870 Episcopal Address of the Conference of the Methodist Church South urged a renewed interest in the doctrine of entire sanctification.[11] The revival of holiness interest continued into the 1880's; received support in the first world conference of Methodists in London in 1881; and on 9 February 1886 observed the fiftieth anniversary of Phoebe Palmer's Tuesday Meetings in New York City.[12] That was fittingly and apparently the crest of the tide. Other holiness interests, rural in origin, were on foot which would take the movement out of the Methodist Church.

Threats to the Holiness Movement were evolution and the nurture theory of Bushnell. Both of these struck at the basic principles of American revivalism, the conversion crisis and especially in this case, crisis perfectionism, that is, second blessing holiness. Other threats resulted from the growth of the cities, even though the Movement had its beginnings in urban areas. The lodgment of the Holiness Movement in more conservative rural areas was threatened by the loss of membership from rural churches.[13] After 1880 at least twenty-five holiness and pentecostal bodies came into existence in the South and Midwest where the largely rural constituency of the Methodist Church centered.[14] Here pietistic holiness identified the visible with the invisible

---

[11] Hunter D. Farish, The Circuit Rider Dismounts (Richmond: Dietz Press, 1938), p. 71.

[12] Smith, Called, p. 19.

[13] William Warren Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1939), pp. 506-507. The number of rural church closings increased significantly between 1880 and 1900.

[14] Ibid.

church in the anti-denominational "church of God" movement.[15] This legalistic[16] and anti-credal[17] movement was also anti-Pentecostal. To identify the second blessing with speaking in tongues is surely non-Wesleyan. The Church of God (Holiness) therefore took its name to distinguish itself from its cousins, other "churches of God" in the pentecostal offshoot from the Holiness Movement.[18] On pre-millennialism, the Church of God (Holiness) held to the doctrine, but the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) was non-millennial.[19] The Nazarene Church likewise at its beginning was not unfriendly toward this doctrine. As far as this writer knows, here is the first occurrence of pre-millennialism in the American Arminian tradition. This occurrence may indicate the depth and extent of the rural alienation from the urban changes of the modern era. So far as this writer has been able to determine, the holiness sects were not dispensational.[20] However, pre-millennialism combined with an Arminian holiness basis for ecclesiology produced much the same reaction as the Calvinist Plymouth Brethren to the established churches in the British Isles. Where dispensational terminology

---

[15]Clarence E. Cowen, A History of the Church of God (Holiness) (Overland Park, Kansas: Herald and Banner Press, 1949), p. 15; Charles E. Brown, When the Trumpet Sounded (Anderson, Indiana: Warner Press, 1951), pp. 83-87.

[16]Cowen, pp. 104-105.

[17]Ibid., p. 70.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Brown, pp. 83-93, says D. S. Warner was in strong reaction against Adventism.

[20]James F. Findlay, Jr., Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 407, says so also.

does appear among second blessing advocates in the history of this period, it bears out a connection with the Keswick version of the second blessing. This coincidence is found specifically within the theology of A. B. Simpson and among the Pentecostals, to whom Simpson was cautiously similar. It would appear that dispensationalism has some bearing on the Holiness-Pentecostal split.

The rural reaction to the rising educational level of modernist pastors and laymen,[21] who were at least cool to the old revivalism, "was a main factor in the springing up of the numerous sects, such as the Churches of God and the Nazarenes."[22] The old-time religionists arranged their own holiness camp meetings and periodicals outside of institutional church control[23] in puritan protest against the conventional and worldly churches.[24] As these holiness bands separated from the denominations they provided many recruits for the Church of God ministry.[25] The movement entered the South in 1890 when D. S. Warner of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) went to Meridian, Mississippi.[26]

The rural, radical, and rigid adherents of the Holiness Movement were the first seceders to form independent sects in the 1880's before the slower-to-leave, better educated, and less rigid urban holiness

---

[21] Sweet, pp. 505-506.

[22] William Warren Sweet, "Revivalism," Encyclopaedia Britannica (Chicago: William Benton, Publisher, 1961), XIX, 241.

[23] Bloch-Hoell, p. 15.

[24] Shelton H. Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, American Christianity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), II, 313.

[25] Brown, pp. 101-110, and 156.

[26] Ibid., p. 156.

adherents left the established denominations in the 1890's. Because of growing official opposition, fanaticism among the independent holiness bands, strong attacks on entire sanctification after 1888, and increasing holiness work in city slums,[27] the issue came to a head at the 1894 General Conference of the Methodist Church South.[28] That was the year of repudiation and schism.

In the next six years, ten separate religious bodies organized with second blessing holiness as their chief doctrine. All ten were dominantly Methodist in former connection, all came out because of the Holiness Movement, and over half of them later, with related groups, formed the Nazarene Church at Pilot Point in 1908.[29] Of four million Methodists, one hundred thousand or 2½ percent went into the proliferating sects.[30] By 1900, the proponents of entire sanctification had largely withdrawn from American Methodism.[31]

Because they are both present in the history of the Holiness Movement, two questions need to be considered because their roots in the Holiness Movement have a bearing on the Pentecostal revival.

One involves church structure--the other the nature of the second blessing. There developed during the nineteenth century or continued from a previous generation three answers to the question of church

---

[27]Smith, Called, pp. 27-28.

[28]Charles W. Ferguson, Organizing to Beat the Devil (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1971), p. 282.

[29]Peters, p. 148.

[30]Ferguson, p. 282.

[31]Peters, p. 150.

structure.[32] One was to keep the European tradition. A second was the "Christian Church" movement of Thomas and Alexander Campbell which sought to restore New Testament Christianity based on the Bible alone. A third was the unity of transdenominational activities ignoring confessional lines. The second and the third were present in the Holiness Movement.

The interdenominational benevolent societies of the early nineteenth century did not object to the denominational establishment[33] nor did the Holiness Association in its interdenominational beginnings and early progress. As the Holiness Movement radicalized it adopted the second approach, apparent in the anti-denominational or putatively undenominational "church of God" movement, an effort to unite the church on the basis of the Bible alone.[34] Both the early benevolent societies and the Holiness Association ignored the historic roots of the churches, and both failed to restructure American Christianity.

The second question on the nature of the second blessing involves the distinction between the Arminian answer and the Keswick or Calvinist answer. At its 1897 meeting in Chicago, the National Holiness Association rejected premillennialism and Keswick views of the second blessing.[35] It would be interesting to know what lay behind this stand. It is either anti-Darbyite and anti-Calvinist or anti-Pentecostal or

---

[32] Smith, Handy, and Loetscher, II, 66-67.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Cowen, p. 70.

[35] Smith, Called, p. 35.

both. The association could possibly have known by this time of the stirrings of Pentecostalism in Tennessee and North Carolina, but because the former is more obvious, that is the likely answer. At any rate the point remains that the split here manifested is full of consequences for the Holiness Movement, because the future belonged to those Holiness advocates, namely, the Pentecostals who adopted the Keswick doctrine.

Finally, this writer has been unable to unravel the answer to this question. Why did Arminian holiness adherents, pre-millennial, and fundamentalistic, leave their churches to form new sects? The Keswick holiness representatives, also premillennial and, at Northfield, influenced by dispensational ideas, and also fundamentalistic, did not, nor did fundamentalists of the Northfield movement, leave their churches. A single variant appears and that is the rural background of the Arminian holiness people who were the first to secede. The urban Arminian holiness adherents left ten years later in the 1890's. The fundamentalists of the urban Northeast, with a dispensational and Keswick holiness ecclesiology, did not leave their churches. Perhaps their dispensationalism made them so pessimistic that they could see no possibility of a pure church. So they resemble the Puritans who stayed within the establishment. The perhaps more optimistic Arminian holiness leaders wanted reformation without tarrying and proceeded to establish manifestly holy congregations.

In this sense the holiness and pentecostal sects are equivalent to the seventeenth century separatists.[36]

---

[36]William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham (New York: Ronald Press, 1959), p. 465.

CHAPTER XIV

THE PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT

Definition and Origins

The Pentecostal Movement began at the turn of the century with the distinctive development of the doctrine of Holy Spirit baptism as an experience subsequent to conversion which empowers for witness and is manifested by speaking in tongues. A Pentecostal defines the Movement: "It is not like the Apostolic Church; it is the Apostolic Church reborn in our times."[1] This claim to be the restoration of primitive Christianity is emphasized by the cultivation of other charismatic gifts such as divine healing, in addition to tongues, in Pentecostal worship services. The doctrine of sanctification is that of the early Methodists. Baptismal doctrine and practice are baptistic. There is no normative Pentecostal doctrine. A broad variety of doctrine characterizes the Movement which finds its unity chiefly in this central factor:

> The central factor of the Pentecostal Revival is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, accompanied by the initial evidence of "speaking with other tongues." THIS IS THE HEART OF THE PENTECOSTAL REVIVAL.[2] (emphasis in original)

On the one hand this constitutive factor should not be taken as a requirement which is enforced on adherents of the Movement but as public

---

[1]David A. Womack, The Wellsprings of the Pentecostal Movement (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1968), p. 87.

[2]Gordon Francis Atter, The Third Force (Peterborough, Ontario: The College Press, 1962), p. 3.

doctrine to which there may be individual exceptions. On the other hand the statement certainly implies that the first Pentecost should be repeated as part of the experience of every Christian believer.

By 1900, revivalism had become international, and there was widespread hope for a world revival. The prayer and preaching campaigns of Reuben A. Torrey were both symptom and further cause of this revival expectancy. In such an atmosphere the Movement rose as a schismatic reaction to what Pentecostals considered to be the infidelity of the denominations. Pentecostals opposed an educated clergy, wealth in the churches, Christian nurture, liberal theology, the social gospel, science, and evolution. Opposing cooled-off, institutionalized, and formerly revivalist denominations, the Pentecostals advocated the old-time religion, the revival method, and experiential crises of conversion, baptism with the Holy Spirit, and speaking in tongues. As a reactionary movement Pentecostalism intensified native American Protestantism. Faulting established churches for their doctrinal innovations, Pentecostals made their own doctrinal innovation. They required what the Holiness Movement had encouraged, the Holy Spirit second blessing, with an added and inseparable emphasis, speaking in tongues.

This highly individualistic doctrinal phenomenon came to expression in a restless and individualistic society. Those who first expressed it at Topeka, Kansas on 1 January 1901 were wandering religious zealots. In a static society among effective institutional churches, this doctrine would have found expression less easily. In a rootless, restless, and dissatisfied society where the churches were in serious trouble, the joining of speaking tongues to the experience of the second blessing

was perhaps a sign of the times. Neither the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit nor speaking in tongues was new; what was new was their conjunction.

The period from 1880 to 1900 was near to or had seen the peak of immigration into the United States.[3] Industrial production had risen 600 percent between 1860 and 1900. Factory laborers had increased in number from about one and three-tenths million to about five and three-tenths million in the same period.[4] The shift of population from country to city and from east to west had produced social changes to which older urban churches were slow to adapt. It was the age of the entrepreneur in both business and religion. Fluid class lines, mobility, and weakening community life tended to isolate especially the urban individual. The leader of a sect had an important social and religious role in this period when the sects were proliferating rapidly.

Not until Pentecostalism arrived in Los Angeles did it really grow rapidly. The poor, the ghetto dwellers, and the victims of social and economic change were attracted to it. The Movement was extremely individualistic and aggressive. While they were willing to teach others, the adherents of the Movement were less willing to receive teaching or oversight even from other Pentecostals. An example of this individualism is Frank Bartleman, a leader of the Los Angeles Pentecostal revival in 1906. Before the revival began he carried on a vigorous preparatory

---

[3]Nils Bloch-Hoell, The Pentecostal Movement (Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964, and Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964), p. 9. The figures given for immigration into the United States are: 1861-1900, fourteen million; 1901-1910, eight and eight-tenths million.

[4]Ibid., p. 10.

campaign, urging people to deeper spiritual life. The Holiness people rejected his efforts among them.[5] In the same way when an acknowledged and key figure in the Movement, Charles F. Parham, came to Los Angeles in the early autumn of 1906, Bartleman was suspicious of him.[6] This same Bartleman left or joined four separate groups in the course of 1906. He began as a Holiness enthusiast; then he joined Joseph Smale's New Testament Church; then he joined the Azusa group; then he started his own church at Eighth and Maple Streets in Los Angeles.

American Pentecostals trace their origins to the Holiness Movement,[7] but they went beyond the second blessing as defined by that Movement. At least through 1910 there was broadly present in the Pentecostal Movement an experience of a third blessing beyond the second blessing of entire sanctification.

The conservative Holiness Movement rejected this Pentecostal interpretation and remained more faithful to the Wesleyan doctrine. The Pentecostals adopted the Keswick doctrine of the Holy Spirit baptism which is not a cleansing from sin but an empowering for

---

[5]Frank Bartleman, What Really Happened at Azusa Street, edited by John Walker (5th printing; Northridge, California: Voice Christian Publications, 1968), p. 12.

[6]Carl Brumback, Suddenly . . . From Heaven (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), p. 59.

[7]Atter, p. 22; Bloch-Hoell, p. 62; Charles W. Conn, Like a Mighty Army Moves the Church of God, 1886-1955 (Cleveland, Tennessee: Church of God Publishing House, 1955), p. xix; Merrill E. Gaddis, Christian Perfectionism in America (Revised 1939; unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Chicago, 1929), p. 330; Donald Gee, The Pentecostal Movement (London: Elim Publishing House, 1949), pp. 6 and 28; Michael Harper, As at the Beginning (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966), p. 25; John Thomas Nichol, Pentecostalism (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper, 1966), pp. 6-7.

service. Reuben A. Torrey popularized this doctrine in the United States with the publication (1895) of his Baptism with the Holy Spirit.[8] Torrey however did not require speaking in tongues as proof of the Holy Spirit baptism.[9] Because Holiness sects were the first to experience what to them was a third crisis beyond entire sanctification, one finds a period of confusion from roughly 1886 to 1910. In this period Pentecostals were preaching three distinct experiences: conversion; the old Holiness teaching on entire sanctification; and beyond it the baptism in the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues.[10] Because of growing Baptist and Calvinist influence led mainly by Pastor Durham of Chicago, the Pentecostal Movement in 1910 returned to an emphasis on the finished work of Christ applied to the sinner in his conversion.[11] This emphasis is a Keswick influence. Beyond conversion

---

[8]Reuben A. Torrey, Baptism with the Holy Spirit (5th edition; London: James Nisbet, 1904), pp. 13-14; Gee, pp. 4, 28.

[9]Torrey, p. 16.

[10]Carl Brumback, Suddenly . . . From Heaven (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), pp. 98-100; Stanley H. Frodsham, With Signs Following (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1946), p. 41; M. E. Redford, The Rise of the Church of the Nazarene (Kansas City, Missouri: Nazarene Publishing House, 1948), p. 96; Homer A. Tomlinson, The Shout of a King (Queens Village, New York: The Church of God, U.S.A., Headquarters, 1968), p. 15; Irwin Winehouse, The Assemblies of God (New York: Vantage Press, 1959), p. 70. The Pentecostal Holiness Church and the Church of God adhere to the threefold doctrine. Joseph E. Campbell, The Pentecostal Holiness Church 1898-1948 (Franklin Springs, Georgia: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951), p. 179; and Atter, p. 134.

[11]Atter, pp. 133-134.

many Pentecostals accepted the native American brand of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with tongues following as their definition of the second blessing.[12]

John Alexander Dowie (1847-1907) established in 1896 the Christian Catholic Church in Zion, evidently in Chicago. Five years later he founded Zion City on Lake Michigan, 42 miles north of Chicago. He had come to Evanston in 1890 and to Chicago in 1893. He was an extreme fundamentalist who practiced divine healing. Because of healings which occurred among primitive Pentecostals at Culberson, Tennessee (?), and Turtletown, Tennessee, some Dowie representatives visited there after 1892. In return from Turtletown, many families moved to Zion City, Illinois.[13] Some of Dowie's followers were the first Pentecostal leaders.[14]

Charles F. Parham opened in 1898 the Bethel Healing Home at Topeka. This healing center was inspired by the work of John Alexander Dowie. In a tour of the East early in 1900, Parham visited, among many others, Dowie in Chicago and A. B. Simpson in Nyack, New York. He incorporated the results of his observations in his own Bible School later that year.[15]

A. B. Simpson's Christian and Missionary Alliance was an amalgamation in 1897 of two previously separate organizations. The first

---

[12] Ibid.

[13] Tomlinson, p. 8.

[14] Brumback, pp. 8-9, 72, and 82; Gee, p. 5.

[15] Klaude Kendrick, The Promise Fulfilled (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), pp. 45-47

was the Christian Alliance which began in 1887; the second was the Evangelical Mission Alliance which was incorporated in 1890.[16] Simpson left the Presbyterian ministry in 1881.[17] He may have attended the 1885 Keswick Convention.[18] His omni-denominational Missionary Training Institute at Nyack trained missionaries from many denominations for world evangelism.[19]

Simpson was in many respects like Reuben A. Torrey on the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Both were very cautious on the question of speaking in tongues. Whether or not Parham encountered the tongues phenomenon at Nyack or in Chicago or in both places is not recorded. It is reasonably certain that speaking in tongues was known among Dowie's followers before Parham visited there in 1900. It is also known that the tongues issue brought much strain into the Christian and Missionary Alliance in 1900. This influence came from the ties which existed between McClurkan's Pentecostal Alliance in Nashville and The Christian and Missionary Alliance. McClurkan broke this tie early in 1901.[20] He repudiated the Keswick version of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and he and his group finally joined the Nazarene Church.

---

[16]Robert B. Ekvall, After Fifty Years (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Christian Publications, Incorporated, 1939), p. 17.

[17]Gaddis, p. 361.

[18]Ekvall, p. 17.

[19]Gaddis, p. 362.

[20]Ekvall, p. 11.

General Features

The established denominations of the last quarter of the nineteenth century were weak in the sense that they were unable to cope effectively with the social crisis. The rise of scientific naturalism at mid-century had begun a cleavage which was clearly marked by the end of the century. The division was between fundamentalism and modernism, because fundamentalists refused to accept the alternatives which the modernists offered. These alternatives were a modern faith or scepticism. Accepting neither alternative nor divine immanence nor the naturalistic interpretation of events, pre-millennial sects multiplied after 1880. They reestablished the literal and unhistorical study of Scripture as the authoritative interpreter of history. This simple and powerful sectarian reaction to the wealthy institutional churches aroused a very warm response among the poor who were ethically and emotionally alienated from the established and ordered churches.[21] The reaction was perhaps inevitably anti-institutional,[22] anti-clerical,[23] anti-credal,[24] anti-intellectual,[25] anti-liturgical,[26]

---

[21]Helmut Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York: Henry Holt, 1929), p. 29.

[22]Bartleman, pp. 32-33; Brumback, pp. 41-42; Kendrick, pp. 70-71; Bloch-Hoell, p. 10.

[23]Bartleman, pp. 32-33; Brumback, p. 119.

[24]Bartleman, pp. 17 and 60.

[25]Ibid., p. 60; Campbell, p. 175; Conn, p. 33.

[26]Bartleman, pp. 32-33.

and anti-traditional in that sense which denies any value to church history since the year 100 A. D.[27]

The Pentecostals were fundamentalist,[28] pre-millennial,[29] and dispensational.[30] Dispensational overtones appear in the early rain-latter rain plan of history.[31] Between the early rain and the latter rain, the apostate church is found. The time period between the two rains is variously defined from the end of the first century or from the time of Constantine to the inception of the Pentecostal Movement.[32] This dispensational belief[33] was strengthened empirically by the apparent recovery of the first Pentecost. The church was dispensationally constituted nineteen hundred years ago by the Holy Spirit baptism and speaking in tongues.[34] That was the early rain. The latter rain brings the same phenomenon. The church is peculiar to this present

---

[27]Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 108; Harper, p. 18; Bloch-Hoell, p. 1.

[28]William W. Menzies, The Assemblies of God: 1941-1967, The Consolidation of a Revival Movement (Iowa City: University of Iowa doctoral dissertation, 1968), in Dissertation Abstracts, Humanities and Social Sciences (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1969), Section A, numbers 10-12, 4095A; Conn, pp. 26-27.

[29]Atter, p. 124. This is still true; cf. Womack, p. 88.

[30]Winehouse, pp. 14-15, in J. R. Flower's introduction. Conn, p. 74.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Bartleman, pp. 27, 47-49; Womack, p. 69.

[33]Charles Caldwell Ryrie, Dispensationalism Today (Chicago: Moody Press, 1965), pp. 136-137.

[34]Albert Benjamin Simpson, The Holy Spirit (New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1925), II, 32-36. See also Ryrie, pp. 136-137.

dispensation which is supposedly soon to be ended by the rapture,[35] but the church must first be restored to its primitive purity by the baptism with the Holy Spirit. For early Pentecostals, it was an easy distinction between the church and the Bride.[36] Only those who had the baptism in the Holy Spirit could form the Bride prepared to meet Christ.[37]

The result of this dispensational schematism is not only contempt for the historic Christian church[38] but also contempt for history itself. This ahistorical attitude made the apparently isolated and divinely spontaneous Pentecostal revivals appear to participants to be just that--absolutely Heaven-sent with no historical roots or connections with any other equally spontaneous revival.[39]

At the same time that nineteenth century Protestant apologetics had weakened or failed,[40] the Pentecostal Movement claimed to have solved the problem of truth. By a reactionary biblicism and religious pragmatism this zealous movement withstood liberal theology, vindicated the Christian faith by producing the palpable evidence of signs and wonders, and revived the church by winning souls. As individualism

---

[35]Bartleman, pp. 38 and 47-48. Pentecostals still believe this. Womack, p. 88.

[36]Brumback, p. 114.

[37]Bartleman, p. 38.

[38]Ibid., p. 58; Atter, p. 120.

[39]David J. duPlessis, "The World Pentecostal Movement," World Christian Handbook 1968, edited by H. Wakelin Coxill and Sir Kenneth Grubb (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967), p. 15; Bartleman, p. 42; Conn, p. 20; Gee, pp. 29-30; Atter, pp. 5 and 57; Nichol, p. 46, uncritically suggests that the India revival has no historical connections with any other influence.

[40]Bloch-Hoell, pp. 98-100, details this failure.

both in Europe and the United States is empiricist,[41] so the Pentecostal Movement is a theological parallel to pragmatic individualism. To establish the truth of the Christian revelation at a time of mass urban alienation from the churches, Pentecostalism proved itself eminently successful both in winning souls and also in demonstrating Christian truth by healings and miracles.[42] The zealous drive toward palpable proof appeared in Los Angeles; as 1905 came to an end, Bartleman wrote:

> We are assured of no less than a "Pentecost" for this whole country. But we can never have pentecostal results without pentecostal power. And that will mean pentecostal demonstration.[43]

The manifest gifts prove that a revival is taking place:

> wherever there has been a great revival of religious fervor in any denomination or group of people there has always been an accompanying manifestation of the gifts of the spirit--speaking in other tongues, divine healing, etc.[44]

The result is seen in a mighty proof of power for ministry:

> For sixty years signs and wonders have been following the preaching of the Word of God. This Revival has done more to put God's tools into the hands of the minister than a lifetime of study could do. . . . all of these spiritual gifts are causing the Church to rise in the strength of the Lord.[45]

---

[41] Ibid., p. 8.

[42] Ibid., p. 12.

[43] Bartleman, p. 19.

[44] Atter, p. 11.

[45] Ibid., p. 303.

Early Beginnings

The beginning of the Pentecostal Movement is located and dated in at least three different ways. Led by William F. Bryant, there was a first beginning in 1896 in Cherokee County at the extreme southwestern tip of North Carolina.[46] The first clear doctrinal and experiential expression occurred on 1 January 1901 at Charles F. Parham's Bethel Bible College at Topeka, Kansas.[47] This date and place are accepted by the author of this thesis. On the basis of the Parham doctrine which was preached in Los Angeles by W. J. Seymour, the Pentecostal Movement achieved international fame in 1906 at the Azusa Street assembly hall. This revival was the effective beginning of the Pentecostal Movement.[48]

The 1896 beginning in North Carolina "did not last long, and the main introduction of tongues to this body of churches ten years later was linked to Azusa."[49] In 1902, this body organized as The Holiness Church at Camp Creek, North Carolina, and in 1907, at its moderator's urging, took the name Church of God. The moderator, Ambrose J. Tomlinson, invited G. B. Cashwell to the 1908 General Assembly. Fresh from the Azusa revival, Cashwell preached the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with the gift of tongues. Under Cashwell's

---

[46] Conn, pp. 18-27.

[47] Kendrick, pp. 36-37. Kendrick, a Pentecostal, accepts this date and place.

[48] Gee, p. 11.

[49] James S. Tinney, "Black Origins of the Pentecostal Movement," Christianity Today, XVI (October 8, 1971), 4-5.

ministry, Tomlinson received both gifts on 12 January 1908.[50] From this date, Tomlinson was active in the Pentecostal Movement and did much to spread and strengthen the Church of God. This body later located its headquarters in Cleveland, Tennessee.

Charles F. Parham was born in Muscatine, Iowa, in 1873. He had an early interest in the ministry which he gave up while he was a student at Southwestern College in Kansas. A near-fatal attack of rheumatic fever renewed his dedication to the ministry and aroused an interest in healing.[51] He was at first a Congregational lay preacher;[52] then he became a Methodist but had some difficulty with their connection. He withdrew into Holiness circles and became a Pentecostal in 1901.

His theology involved the basic doctrines of the coming revival. He advocated the conversion crisis and instantaneous sanctification which destroyed original sin. This was a conscious rejection of the Christian nurture theory.[53] Essential to the coming revival was premillennialism which Parham accepted; he also was deeply concerned about divine healing.

Parham returned in the fall of 1900 from an eastern tour of many unusual new ministries such as those of Alexander Dowie and A. B. Simpson.[54] Convinced of their power and eager for more blessings to

---

[50] Conn, p. 81, and Brumback, p. 57.

[51] Kendrick, pp. 38-42.

[52] Nichol, p. 26.

[53] Kendrick, pp. 38-42.

[54] Supra, p. 127.

come, he opened in October, 1900, the Bethel Bible College at Topeka, Kansas.[55] About forty students, including twelve ministers, entered the school for its first and only year. The prevalent belief of the student body was conditioned by their Methodist, Holiness, and Friends background. Some of them believed that they had already received the Holy Spirit baptism as defined by the Holiness Movement. They knew of Finney and Torrey, whose The Baptism with the Holy Spirit had just appeared in 1895.[56] Undoubtedly they came to seek more blessings. With the Bible as the only textbook, the question which Parham assigned for their study was to discover the scriptural evidences of the Holy Spirit baptism.[57] The apologetic concern of this question was answered in terms of an ahistorical, biblicistic, and pre-millennial theology.[58]

Of a Methodist background, Agnes N. Ozman was born in Albany, Wisconsin, and grew up in Nebraska. After public school, she attended in 1892-1893 the Horton Bible School in St. Paul, Minnesota. This year of study associated her with the Holiness Movement. After further investigations at Dowie's and Simpson's schools, she was

---

[55] Kendrick, p. 47.

[56] Ibid., p. 48.

[57] Bloch-Hoell, p. 22; and Morton T. Kelsey, Tongue Speaking (New York: Doubleday, 1964), pp. 61-62.

[58] Elmer T. Clark, The Small Sects in America (Revised edition; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1937), p. 47; Bloch-Hoell, p. 21.

engaged in mission work in Kansas City when, yearning for deeper spiritual experiences, she heard of and enrolled in the Bethel Bible College.[59]

On 1 January 1901, the answer to Parham's assigned study question came to Agnes Ozman. Hardly the first to speak in tongues, she was certainly the first to speak in tongues as the result of a conscious doctrinal study of the Holy Spirit baptism and a seeking of an experiential answer. In the doctrinal--experiential sense, this event marks the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement.

After four years of revival travels in Kansas and Missouri with his new gospel Parham began a revival in Orchard, Texas, on Easter Sunday, 1905.[60] His message preceded him from Topeka to Houston through Sister Lucy Farrow. She prepared the way for Parham's Houston Bible School which opened in December, 1905.[61] The Orchard revival may mark the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement in Texas. From Orchard the Movement spread to Brunner, a town 45 miles west of Houston, and thence to Houston itself. Here W. F. Carothers of the Brunner Holiness Church worked with Parham in revivals and in the Bible School. Here also W. J. Seymour learned of the new gospel. Seymour, a black, was a Holiness preacher. How Neeley Terry, a visitor from Los Angeles, met him is unknown. Upon her return to

---

[59]Bloch-Hoell, p. 23; Frodsham, chap. 2; Kelsey, p. 81; Kendrick, pp. 48-53.

[60]Kendrick, p. 60.

[61]Tinney, p. 5; Lucy Farrow was a black minister; the Bible School was racially integrated.

Los Angeles she convinced the congregation of which she was a member, a black Nazarene Church on Santa Fe Avenue, to invite Seymour to preach. Here he began in April, 1906.[62]

The Los Angeles Revival of 1906--1909

It is no accident that the Pentecostal Movement achieved world fame in Los Angeles. The city was growing rapidly in 1906, and the churches were not keeping pace with the growth.[63] The black influence was a key factor from Topeka to Houston and thence to Los Angeles.[64] The Baptist influence appeared in Joseph Smale and in the Baptist residence at 214 Bonnie Brae Street. The Holiness influence was perhaps stronger still.[65] A final factor was the preparatory labor of Frank Bartleman, whose intense fasting, prayer, tract, and periodical program preceded the revival by the space of fifteen months.[66] Once the revival began in April of 1906, it lasted for three years. People from every continent of the world visited the Azusa Street revival. It

---

[62] Bloch-Hoell, p. 31; Kendrick, p. 64; Nichol, p. 32.

[63] Bloch-Hoell, p. 30, says the population of Los Angeles was one hundred thousand in 1900 and three hundred and twenty thousand in 1910; half of the population were newly arrived immigrants. As late as 1936, Los Angeles church membership was below the average of other cities in the United States.

[64] Ibid., p. 31; Bloch-Hoell claims that there was twice the percentage of blacks in the Los Angeles population as compared to the general population of the United States.

[65] Ibid., pp. 31-33; also Bartleman, pp. 32 and 52.

[66] Bartleman, pp. 1-2 and 8.

is therefore correctly held to be the center from which Pentecostal activities extended to all parts of the world.[67]

A year and one-half before the Azusa revival and as a result of the 1903-1904 campaign of Reuben A. Torrey in England and Wales, the spectacular Welsh revival began.[68] F. B. Meyer brought a report of it to Los Angeles on 8 April 1905.[69] Frank Bartleman heard the report as an answer to his deepest prayers and by correspondence he agreed in prayer with Evan Roberts, the leader of the Welsh revival. They prayed for a similar outbreak in Los Angeles.[70]

Frank Bartleman had been a Holiness evangelist for ten years before he arrived in Pasadena in December, 1904. Here he began preaching on 14 January 1905. Thirsting for a new Pentecost, he labored in various local Holiness revivals and among the Baptists in Pasadena and Los Angeles while he carried on his vigorous preparatory program. Holiness did not satisfy him.

> I found my soul crying out for God far beyond the seeming Holiness people. I wanted to go deeper . . . to something more substantial and lasting that would put a rock in my soul.[71]

The Welsh revival began to exert visible influence not only on 8 April 1905 through F. B. Meyer but also and particularly through Joseph Smale, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Los Angeles. On

---

[67] Kendrick, pp. 67-68.

[68] Supra, p. 99.

[69] Bartleman, pp. 1-2.

[70] Ibid., pp. 11-12, 14, and 16.

[71] Ibid., p. 12.

17 June 1905, Bartleman attended this church.[72] Smale had been in Wales and was organizing prayer meetings for a similar revival. Bartleman participated in this effort, and in June or July a fifteen-week revival began. Bartleman had high hopes that this was the beginning of the revival which he sought.[73] Forced out by his own congregation, Smale organized in February, 1906, The New Testament Church in Burbank Hall. Bartleman with six members of this group agreed to pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit with signs following, but tongues are not mentioned in the list of desired gifts. He at first took active part in this revival-oriented ministry, but its organization and lack of zeal forced him to say, "It began to look as though the Lord would have to find another body," a pure body free from sectarian organization and party spirit.[74]

Unknown to Bartleman, W. J. Seymour arrived at this time in Los Angeles and preached the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues in a black Nazarene Church on Santa Fe Avenue. For this doctrinal innovation, he was locked out. This is the original schism, at least on the West Coast, between the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements, and it began among black people. To asperse the Holiness doctrine of entire sanctification by suggesting, as Seymour did, that tongues are necessary to complete it was a doctrinal novelty few Holiness people could accept.

---

[72] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[73] Ibid., p. 9.

[74] Ibid., pp. 14-15.

Bartleman met Seymour on 16 March 1906 at a house meeting, not at 214 Bonnie Brae Street.[75] They met again on 26 March at this address to which Seymour had been invited. It was the residence of Richard and Ruth Asberry, relatives of Neeley Terry. They were Baptists, possibly members of Smale's congregation.[76] Here on the evening of 9 April, a pentecostal revival began with Spirit baptisms and speaking in tongues. Bartleman said, "For some reason I was not privileged to be present at that particular meeting. A number had spoken in tongues there."[77] After three days and nights the overflow was so large that they went to a former Methodist Church at 312 Azusa Street in the black neighborhood.[78] The first pentecostal revival had a successful beginning in Los Angeles for many reasons. One reason which was not true at Topeka was the presence of living witnesses who knew in advance that the spiritual experience and the gift of tongues were definitely attainable. The Los Angeles beginning of the Pentecostal revival was almost exclusively black. Whites were attracted to the revival, but within five months it was practically a black mission. The revival continued at various places, one being Bartleman's mission at Eighth and Maple Streets. He opened this mission on Sunday, 12 August 1906, because the Azusa

---

[75] Ibid., pp. 20-21; Bloch-Hoell, p. 197, footnote 116.

[76] Bloch-Hoell, p. 37.

[77] Bartleman, p. 22.

[78] Nichol, p. 33. Tinney, XVI, 5.

revival was adopting organization which, to Bartleman, made it just another rival of the churches. Besides, the Azusa work was not deep nor real enough for him.[79]

In 1908 Bartleman toured the United States, preaching at Holiness missions. Upon his return to Los Angeles on 5 December 1907, he found dissension among the pentecostal missions. This fighting continued and was especially marked in 1909 in the form of jealousy, doctrinal controversy, programs, and church orders. "Disaster was bound to follow such tactics . . . and it did so . . ."[80] Bartleman was always honest; "The cause suffered most from those within its own ranks, as always."[81]

---

[79]Bartleman, pp. 41, 51, and 54.

[80]Ibid., p. 70.

[81]Ibid., p. 62.

CHAPTER XV

CONCLUSIONS

The beginning of Christianity, the Reformation, the Counter-Reformation, Puritanism, and perhaps the Great Awakening changed the course of social and political history. In contrast American revivals since 1800 have had decreasingly significant social and political results. Adherents of the Pentecostal Movement hail it as the greatest revival in history:

> [It is] . . . possibly the greatest revival of all time . . . world-wide in it's [sic] scope . . . continues unabated . . . after more than fifty years.[1]

While the movement is undoubtedly world-wide, its social and political influence and its distinctive impression on the course of history have been somewhat difficult to discern.

The social cause of American revivals seems to be related to the breakdown of an old order accompanied and followed by the restructuring of society and/or the church. Perennially the American revival has manifested anti-intellectual, anti-theological, anti-institutional, anti-clerical, anti-sacramental, anti-liturgical, anti-traditional, and anti-historical tendencies. Every general revival has manifested some of these tendencies if not all.

---

[1]Gordon Francis Atter, The Third Force (Peterborough, Ontario: The College Press, 1962), p. ix.

The decade of the 1960's was a decisive turning point in social, moral, and theological attitudes. The current renewal movements inside and outside of the church bespeak the previous decade of crisis. The thesis has reviewed the failure of revivalism to grapple effectively with the social and economic challenges of the day. To deal with the challenges of current change, advocates of an effective theology might beware of two reactions. On the one hand, solely to restate traditional dogma is an anti-intellectual fundamentalism which may be at best theologically irrelevant. On the other hand, to bring revival movements into the church would also be a resignation from the task of theological renewal. Be they arch-conservative or neo-Pentecostal, the fringe groups are alienated by current social, ecclesiastical, and theological dissolution. They refuse to face the profound challenges of these days, deny or thwart theological reformulation, and appeal to those who are least able and least willing to contribute a constructive theology to a new religious order.

Insofar as the issue is the nature of the church as the Body of Christ and the Holy Spirit who calls that Body into being by the Gospel, then the Pentecostal platform is risky. Left-wing efforts have not changed since the Azusa revival in 1906 of which Frank Bartleman wrote,

> Pentecost has come to Los Angeles, the American Jerusalem. Every sect, creed, and doctrine under Heaven is found in Los Angeles as well as every nation represented.[2]

---

[2]Frank Bartleman, What Really Happened at Azusa Street, John Walker, editor (5th printing; Northridge, California: Voice Christian Publications, 1968), pp. 37-38.

To those Christians of the original Pentecost who continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrinal and sacramental fellowship, such a claim would have been incomprehensible. To unite the representatives of various doctrines and creeds by the shared experience of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues does not reconstitute Pentecost nor the apostolic church. Nonetheless Stanley Frodsham, a Pentecostal, sees speaking in tongues as the sign that God is restoring His true church:

> in addition to the tongues being evidence that those who receive the same [have the baptism in the Holy Spirit], it is also the fulfilling of Joel's prophecy . . . how few recognize that . . . God is bringing about the restoration of His true church, giving to her in these last days what she had at the beginning.[3]

This claim bases church renewal not on the objective grace of God in the Gospel but on the results of the Gospel, infused grace, subjective change in the heart of man, and spiritual gifts. The writer of this thesis agrees with Köberle who is of the opinion that Christian joy must be based on the death of Christ which justifies us. Renewal must have an objective basis.[4]

Neo-pentecostals have a real despair of the institutional church which leads them to a zealous and dedicated effort, perennially present in the United States since the time of the Campbells, to establish the New Testament church. The effort would bring heaven to earth by ignoring or abolishing doctrinal differences in a subjective

---

[3]Stanley H. Frodsham, With Signs Following (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1946), p. 265.

[4]Adolf Köberle, The Quest for Holiness, translated by John C. Mattes (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1938), p. 63.

unity of the Spirit. Since God has not yet abolished the denominations, the neo-Pentecostals abolish them to establish an undenominational unity which supposedly approximates the New Testament ideal.

A basic weakness of every renewal movement comes from the fact that it is difficult, if not impossible, to institutionalize the power of the Holy Spirit. At the same time it is impossible to enter the future except through an institution. As soon as a renewal dynamic seeks to perpetuate itself by organization and educational literature, it is an institution. By the end of its first generation, it will have become an institution like to that which it first tried to renew.

One of the key but often hidden issues which the Pentecostal Movement raised was--and still is--the nature and interpretation of history and God's action and purposes therein. The Movement inherited from dispensational theology an extremely reactionary supernaturalism which has allowed its adherents to interpret apparently isolated pentecostal revivals as totally divine and spontaneous phenomena. Against this assumption, the thesis has traced the direct Torrey influence on the Welsh revival in 1904 and thereby its indirect influence on the Azusa revival in 1906; the Keswick influence in the Indian revival at Mukti in 1906; Dowie's influence in the Holiness-pentecostal revivals of eastern Tennessee and the great discovery at Topeka in 1901, in which A. B. Simpson's influence was not totally absent; and the chain of events which led directly to the Azusa revival. The aim has been to vindicate that view of history which embraces divine action in and through the time process.

Michael Harper asserts that the Pentecostal Movement "began in the churches and was largely ignored or rejected."[5] The writer of this thesis attempted to document this claim, assuming that "churches" here means the established denominations. In the following discussion this writer distinguishes established denominational congregations from recently formed and independent congregations which are referred to here as sects.

The early Pentecostals came out of Holiness congregations. In days when the Holiness schism in eastern Tennessee was barely ten years old, Holiness congregations in that area could hardly be classified as established denominational outposts. Prior to 1908 when the Nazarene Church was formed on a national basis, and even more so prior to 1895 when it organized in Los Angeles, the Holiness Movement consisted of isolated associations which are not correctly referred to as "the churches." With regard to the situation in 1906 in Los Angeles, there is more point to the claim. Here the Nazarene Church had organized in 1895, and after preaching at the Nazarene church on Santa Fe Avenue in 1906, A. J. Seymour actually was locked out. To such a limited extent the Pentecostal Movement began "in the churches." A contemporary account fixes the beginning outside of the churches:

> [The revival in Wales] . . . is mostly in the churches, this [in Los Angeles] is outside. The churches will not have it . . . [are] critical and condemnatory . . . .[6]

---

[5]Michael C. Harper, As at the Beginning (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966), p. 13.

[6]Bartleman, p. 56, quoting a Toronto Canadian, Dr. W. C. Dumble, who was visiting in Los Angeles in 1906.

With equal justice it may be claimed that Pentecostalism began among the sects and was rejected by them, but no one ever says so. Holiness people, a Pillar of Fire group, and the Nazarene Church on Santa Fe Avenue--all alike rejected the new movement.[7] Since the sects opposed one of their own, why should the churches be faulted for opposing the new movement also? Finally, Bartleman states that real opposition from the churches came only after the Azusa revival organized under the name, "Apostolic Faith Mission."[8] The conclusion is that to fault the churches for rejecting the movement is unfair.

All conclusions regarding Pentecostal doctrine must allow for exceptions. The one exception even to this generalization may be in the doctrine of the sacraments; here the Calvinist Reformed and Arminian theories, while not always the same, are similar in the sense that both reject a realistic sacramental theology and particularly the Lutheran view of the sacraments. Although in practical matters such as church organization and liturgy, Pentecostals differ markedly from Roman Catholicism, Bloch-Hoell says both are similar in mysticism, casuistry, healings, and anthropology. He further claims that doctrinally and practically Lutherans, of all Christians, are least similar to Pentecostals.[9]

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 12 and 41; Harper, p. 27; John Thomas Nichol, Pentecostalism (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper, 1966), p. 32; Klaude Kendrick, The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Pentecostal Movement (Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), p. 63.

[8] Bartleman, pp. 41-42.

[9] Nils Bloch-Hoell, The Pentecostal Movement (Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964, and Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964), p. 175.

Pentecostals separate water baptism from the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is not accidental that Pentecostals reject infant baptism. Infant baptism is the purest gospel unconditioned by intellectual attainment or human cooperation. Its retention proves that the objective grace of justification has been understood; its denial indicates the opposite.

This writer has not found any Protestant sources between 1500 and 1900 which both distinguish the baptism of the Holy Spirit from water baptism and at the same time believe in sacramental regeneration.[10] From a purely historical point of view, to safeguard a high doctrine of the sacraments, the baptism in the Holy Spirit should be connected with water baptism or with adult conversion if it precedes. Subsequent spiritual experiences may be referred to as infillings of the Holy Spirit.

From this same historical point of view, what is at stake here is the nature of sanctification in the narrow sense. To the reformers, perfection was perfection in faith, faith in Jesus Christ, which is planted

---

[10]Charismatic Lutherans and Roman Catholics, both of whom presumably believe in the baptismal regeneration of infants, who accept the Pentecostal definition of the baptism in the Holy Spirit perforce separate it from their realistic doctrine of infant baptism. There may be historical precedent for this separation; if so, it remains to be pointed out. The present writer has not found evidence of it. The contrary can be documented, namely, that those who have defined the baptism in the Holy Spirit as an experience subsequent to infant baptism or adult conversion overwhelmingly depreciate or reject infant baptism. This statement is with primary reference to Protestants and therefore also with respect to the past four hundred and fifty years. On the assumption that the foregoing is correct, then for a Lutheran, if not a Roman Catholic, to accept the Pentecostal definition of the baptism in the Holy Spirit is indeed a doctrinal innovation.

in infant baptism or at the time of adult conversion and is nurtured and strengthened by the means of grace. It is rooted in objective justification. To John Wesley and the Arminian tradition which descends from him, in which tradition Pentecostalism stands, perfection is an inherent ethical perfection, an increase in infused grace, and an increase in love and obedience.[11] In the case of Pentecostalism, it is as well the increase in infused grace, the results of grace, that is, the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Any weakening of the connection between the sacraments and growth in grace to that same extent opens the door to legalism. An illustration appears in the Wesleyan second blessing theology. In the development from Wesley to Adam Clarke and Phoebe Palmer, the loss of sacramental holiness allowed the baptism in the Holy Spirit, that is, the second blessing to become necessary for salvation.[12] This same possibility is always present in Pentecostalism.

At least four definitions of the baptism in the Holy Spirit have been found in the course of study for this thesis. There is no reason why other definitions may not develop as well. To enumerate and localize, they are: (a) A second blessing after conversion giving the witness of the Spirit and assurance of salvation. Wesley found this version among the Moravians; (b) A second blessing which cleanses

---

[11]Harald Lindstrom, Wesley and Sanctification (London: The Epworth Press, 1946), p. 136. This rather basic distinction between two definitions of the Christian life is illustrated in the 3 September 1741 conversation between Wesley and Zinzendorf at Gray's Inn Gardens, reported in Lindstrom, pp. 137-138.

[12]Supra, pp. 63, 68.

from original sin, the Holiness definition; (c) An initiatory blessing of regeneration by water baptism or adult conversion. This is the conservative Protestant definition; (d) The speaking in tongues which follows and signifies the baptism in the Spirit. A fifth has occurred among Holiness Pentecostals. That is to combine (b) and (d). The doctrine which one may choose out of this congeries of definitions is governed by one's theological commitment. To safeguard justification one should choose (c). Other choices weaken justification or expose it to attack by opening the door to legalism.

The contemporary issue rises between (c) and (d), that is, between the conservative Protestant definition and the Pentecostal definition. Pentecostals admit that the Bible evidence for tongues as the initial sign of Spirit baptism is not clear nor conclusive.[13] The doctrine is really born of and validated by experience.[14] There is not uniformity of belief in world Pentecostalism that speaking in tongues is the necessary evidence of Spirit baptism,[15] nor is there uniformity among Pentecostals on the term, "baptism in the Holy Spirit," which incidentally is not a biblical term. Some sections of the Pentecostal Movement prefer the term, "infilling of the Spirit."[16]

The conclusion is that the lack of uniform belief among Pentecostals should serve as a caution against any firm and convinced

---

[13] So says a Pentecostal, Atter, pp. 126-128.

[14] Ibid., and also pp. 148-150.

[15] Bloch-Hoell, p. 131.

[16] Atter, pp. 30 and 121.

acceptance of the central factor of Pentecostalism.[17] Another conclusion is that to define Holy Spirit baptism as an experience subsequent to infant baptism or adult conversion endangers the doctrine of justification. To insist on the necessity of a spiritual experience validated by a palpable manifestation such as speaking in tongues opens the door to legalism.

The summary issue which Pentecostalism raises is the nature of sanctification in the broad sense. Whenever justification is not fully understood, then infant baptismal regeneration is questioned, and assurance of salvation is displaced to a subsequent experience, human work, or infused grace. This displacement endangers the Gospel.

---

[17] Supra, p. 122.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Bartleman, Frank. What Really Happened at Azusa Street. Edited by John Walker. 5th Printing. Northridge, California: Voice Christian Publications, 1968.

Boardman, William E. The Higher Christian Life. Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1871.

Finney, Charles Grandison. Lectures on Revivals in Religion. Edited by William G. McLoughlin, Jr. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960.

-----. Power from on High. London: Victory Press, 1957.

Mahan, Asa. The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. N. p., 1966.

Simpson, Albert Benjamin. The Fourfold Gospel. New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1925.

-----. The Holy Spirit. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Christian Publications, Inc., 1896.

Torrey, Reuben A. Baptism with the Holy Spirit. 5th edition. London: James Nisbet, 1904.

Wesley, John. The Journal of John Wesley. Edited by Nehemiah Curnock. London: Epworth Press, 1938.

-----. The Letters of John Wesley. Edited by John Telford. London: Epworth Press, 1931.

B. Secondary Sources

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. "The Moral and Theological Revolution of the 1960's and Its Implications for American Religious History," The State of American History. Edited by Herbert J. Bass. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970. P. 99.

-----. "Theology in America: A Historical Survey," The Shaping of American Religion. I in Religion in American Life. Edited by James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961. Pp. 232-321.

-----, editor. Theology in America: The Major Protestant Voices From Puritanism to Neo-Orthodoxy. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1967.

Alexander, Helen C., and J. Kennedy MacLean. Charles M. Alexander, A Romance of Song and Soul-Winning. 2nd edition. London, Edinburgh, and New York: Marshall Brothers, Ltd., 1920.

Arthur, William. The Tongue of Fire; or The True Power of Christianity. New York: Harper, 1868.

Atkins, Gaius Glenn, and Frederick L. Fagley. History of American Congregationalism. Boston and Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1942.

Atter, Gordon Francis. The Third Force. Peterborough, Ontario: The College Press, 1962.

Bach, Marcus. The Inner Ecstasy. New York and Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1969.

Barabas, Steven. So Great Salvation: The History and Message of the Keswick Convention. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, n. d.

Bass, Clarence B. Backgrounds to Dispensationalism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960.

Beardsley, Frank G. A History of American Revivals. New York: American Tract Society, 1904.

-----. Religious Progress Through Religious Revivals. New York: American Tract Society, 1943.

Benz, Ernst. The Eastern Orthodox Church. Translated from the German by Ricard and Clara Winston. 1st edition. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1963.

Bloch-Hoell, Nils. The Pentecostal Movement. Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1964. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964.

Brickley, Donald P. Man of the Morning. Kansas City, Missouri: Nazarene Publishing House, 1960.

Brown, Charles E. When the Trumpet Sounded. Anderson, Indiana: Warner Press, 1951.

Brumback, Carl. Suddenly . . . From Heaven. Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1961.

Bruner, Frederick Dale. A Theology of the Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

Bulgakov, Sergiei N. The Orthodox Church. New York: Orthodox Book Society, 1935.

Campbell, Joseph E. The Pentecostal Holiness Church 1898-1948. Franklin Springs, Georgia: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951.

Case, Shirley Jackson. The Millennial Hope. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918.

Chapman, J. B. A History of the Church of the Nazarene. Kansas City, Missouri: Nazarene Publishing House, 1926.

Clark, Elmer T. The Small Sects in America. Revised edition. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1937.

Cole, C. C. Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Cole, S. G. History of Fundamentalism. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931.

Conn, Charles W. Like a Mighty Army Moves the Church of God 1886-1955. Cleveland, Tennessee: Church of God Publishing House, 1955.

-----. Pillars of Pentecost. Cleveland, Tennessee: Pathway Press, 1956.

Cowen, Clarence E. A History of the Church of God (Holiness). Overland Park, Kansas: Herald and Banner Press, 1949.

Cross, Whitney R. The Burned-over District. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950.

Curran, F. X. Major Trends in American Church History. New York: The American Press, 1946.

Damboriena, Prudencio. Tongues as of Fire. Washington and Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1969.

Davis, George T. B. Torrey and Alexander, The Story of a World-Wide Revival. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1905.

Dunn, James D. G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Ind., 1970.

Ekvall, Robert B. After Fifty Years. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Christian Publications, Inc., 1939.

Farish, H. D. The Circuit-Rider Dismounts. Richmond, Virginia: Dietz Press, 1938.

Ferguson, Charles W. Organizing to Beat the Devil. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1971.

Findlay, James F., Jr. Dwight L. Moody, American Evangelist. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Flew, R. Newton. The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Foster, Frank H. A Genetic History of the New England Theology. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Frodsham, Stanley H. With Signs Following. Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1946.

Gaddis, Merrill E. "Christian Perfectionism in America." Revised 1939. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1929.

Gasper, Louis. The Fundamentalist Movement. Paris: Mouton and Company, 1963.

Gaustad, Edwin Scott, editor. Religious Issues in American History. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, 1968.

Gee, Donald. The Pentecostal Movement. London: Elim Publishing House, 1949.

Gill, Frederick C. The Romantic Movement and Methodism. London: Epworth Press, 1954.

Grant, Robert M. Augustus to Augustine. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, 1970.

Handlin, Oscar, editor. Immigration as a Factor in American History. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Handy, Robert T. The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Hansen, Marcus Lee. The Atlantic Migration. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1940.

Harper, Michael C. As at the Beginning. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966.

Hauschild, David E. "The Contemporary Charismatic Movement and the Reaction of the Lutheran Church." Unpublished Research paper, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1970.

Hills, A. M. Holiness and Power. Cincinnati: Revivalist office, 1897.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-intellectualism in American Life. New York: Knopf, 1964.

-----. Social Darwinism in American Thought. Revised edition. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955.

Hopkins, C. H. The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Horton, Wade H., editor. The Glossolalia Phenomenon. Cleveland, Tennessee: Pathway Press, 1966.

Hudson, Winthrop S. American Protestantism.

-----. Religion in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Jamison, A. Leland. "Religions on the Christian Perimeter," The Shaping of American Religion. Vol. I in Religion in American Life. Edited by James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961. Pp. 162-231.

Johnson, Charles A. The Frontier Camp Meeting. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1955.

Kelsey, Morton T. Tongue Speaking. New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Kendrick, Klaude. The Promise Fulfilled. Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1961.

Kennedy, Gail, editor. Democracy and the Gospel of Wealth. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1949.

Knox, Ronald. Enthusiasm. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.

Koeberle, Adolf. The Quest for Holiness. Translated from the 3rd German edition by John C. Mattes. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1958.

Kraus, Clyde Norman. Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958.

Kromminga, D. H. The Millennium in the Church. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1945.

Lemons, Frank W. Our Pentecostal Heritage. Cleveland, Tennessee: Pathway Press, 1963.

Lindström, Harald.. Wesley and Sanctification. London: Epworth Press, 1946.

Loetscher, Lefferts A. The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954.

Marty, Martin. The Infidel. Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961.

May, Henry F. Protestant Churches and Industrial America. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949.

Mayer, Frederick E. The Religious Bodies of America. 3rd edition. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954.

Mead, Sidney E. The Lively Experiment. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Mecklin, John M. The Story of American Dissent. Port Washington, New York: Kennikut Press, 1970.

MacDonald, James A. Wesley's Revision of the Shorter Catechism. Edinburgh: George A. Morton, 1906.

McLoughlin, William G., Jr. Modern Revivalism, Finney to Graham. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.

McLoughlin, William G., Jr., and Robert N. Bellah. Religion in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Menzies, William W. "The Assemblies of God: 1941-1967, The Consolidation of a Revival Movement." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1968. Dissertation Abstracts International. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1970. Numbers 10-12, Section A, Humanities and Social Sciences, 4095A.

Nevin, John W. The Anxious Bench. 2nd edition. Chambersburg, Pennsylvania: Publication Office of the German Reformed Church, 1844.

Nichol, John Thomas. Pentecostalism. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper, 1966.

Nichols, James H. The Mercersburg Theology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

-----. Romanticism in American Theology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Niebuhr, Helmut Richard. The Kingdom of God in America. Chicago and New York: Willett and Clark, 1937.

-----. "The Protestant Movement and Democracy in the United States," The Shaping of American Religion. Vol. I in Religion in American Life. Edited by James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961. Pp. 20-71.

-----. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. New York: Henry Holt, 1929.

Persons, Stow. "Religion and Modernity, 1865-1914," The Shaping of American Religion. Vol. I in Religion in American Life. Edited by James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jamison. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961. Pp. 369-401.

Peters, John Leland. Christian Perfection and American Methodism. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Redford, M. E. The Rise of the Church of the Nazarene. Kansas City, Missouri: Nazarene Publishing House, 1948.

Riggs, Ralph M. The Spirit Himself. Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1949.

Ross, Kenneth Needham. Seventh Day Adventism and Mormonism. London: SPCK, 1956.

Rudnick, Milton L. Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.

Ryrie, Charles Caldwell. Dispensationalism Today. Chicago: Moody Press, 1965.

Sandeen, Ernest R. The Origins of Fundamentalism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Schaff, Philip. America: A Sketch of Its Political, Social, and Religious Character. Edited by Perry Miller. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Seldes, Gilbert. The Stammering Century. New York: The John Day Company, 1928.

Sherrill, John L. They Speak with other Tongues. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Sloan, Walter B. These Sixty Years, The Story of the Keswick Convention. London, Glasgow, Edinburgh: Pickering and Inglis, n.d.

Smith, H. Shelton, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher. American Christianity. Vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.

Smith, Timothy L. Called Unto Holiness. Kansas City, Missouri: Nazarene Publishing House, 1963.

-----. "The Holiness Movement," The History of American Methodism. Vol. II. Edited by Emory Stevens Bucke. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964. Pp. 608-627.

-----. Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.

Sweet, William Warren. Methodism in American History. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1933.

-----. Revivalism in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944.

-----. The Story of Religion in America. New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1939.

Tomlinson, Homer A. The Shout of a King. Queens Village, New York: The Church of God, U. S. A., Headquarters, 1968.

Visser't Hooft, W. A. Background of the Social Gospel in America. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1963(?).

Warfield, Benjamin B. Perfectionism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Webster, Douglas. Pentecostalism and Speaking with Tongues. London: The Highway Press, 1964.

Wentz, Abdel R. The Lutheran Church in American History. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publishing House, 1923.

Whitley, Henry C. Blinded Eagle. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1955.

Wilkerson, David. The Cross and the Switchblade. New York: B. Geis Association, distributed by Random House, 1963.

Winehouse, Irwin. The Assemblies of God. New York: Vantage Press, 1959.

Womack, David A. The Wellsprings of the Pentecostal Movement. Springfield, Missouri: Gospel Publishing House, 1968.

Wright, Louis B. The Atlantic Frontier 1607-1763. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1947.

Zernov, Nicolas. Eastern Christendom. New York: Putnam, 1961.

Zikmund, Barbara B. "Asa Mahan and Oberlin Perfectionism," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Duke University, Durham, N. C., 1969. Dissertation Abstracts International. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1970. Numbers 1-2, Section A, Humanities and Social Sciences, 460A.

C. Reference Works

Abrams, Ray H., editor. "Organized Religion in the United States," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Vol. CCLVI. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1948.

Calder, Ralph F. G. "Congregationalism," Encyclopaedia Britannica. VI. Chicago: William Benton, 1962. Pp. 247-251.

Coats, Robert H. "Holiness," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. VI. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1959. Pp. 743-750.

Davis, Ozora Stearns, and Matthew Spinka. "Congregationalism," Encyclopaedia Britannica. VI. Chicago: William Benton, 1962, Pp. 251-253.

DuPlessis, David J. "The World Pentecostal Movement," World Christian Handbook 1968. Edited by H. Wakelin Coxill and Sir Kenneth Grubb. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967. Pp. 15-18.

Garrison, Winfred E. "Fundamentalism," Encyclopaedia Britannica. IX. Chicago: William E. Benton, 1961. Pp. 920-921.

Gaustad, Edwin Scott. Historical Atlas of Religion in America. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1962.

Hudson, Winthrop S. "Puritanism," Encyclopaedia Britannica. XVIII. Chicago: William Benton, 1962. Pp. 777-780.

Schaff, Philip. The Creeds of Christendom. III. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966. Pp. 581-673.

Sellin, Thorsten, and Richard D. Lambert, editors. "Religion in American Society," The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1960. Vol. CCCXXXII.

Starr, Harris Elwood. "Thomas Kinnicut Beecher," Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by Allen Johnson. II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. 136-137.

Sweet, William Warren. "Religious Revival," Encyclopaedia Britannica. XIX. Chicago: William Benton, 1961. Pp. 240-241.

D. Periodicals

Conn, Charles W. "A Spiritual Explosion," Christian Life, XXVIII (July 1966), 30-31, 54.

Courtney, Howard P. "Present-Day Evidence of Christ's Return," Christian Life, XXVIII (July 1966), 34-35.

Dunn, James D. G. "Spirit Baptism and Pentecostalism," Scottish Journal of Theology, XXIII (1970), 397-407.

Gee, Donald. "Movement Without a Man," Christian Life, XXVIII (July 1966), 27-29, 50, 52-53.

Kretzmann, P. E. "The Social Gospel," Concordia Theological Monthly, XV (July 1944), 459-471.

Moellering, Ralph L. "Rauschenbusch in Retrospect," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVII (August 1956), 613-633.

Tinney, James S. "Black Origins of the Pentecostal Movement," Christianity Today, XVI (October 8, 1971), 4-6.

Zimmerman, Thomas F. "Rags to Riches," Christian Life, XXVIII (July 1966), 32, 55-56.