

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**THEOLOGY/HISTORY**

**A PRESENTATION  
OF PERFECTION**

*by Mark S. F. Eckart*

**Books For The Ages**

**AGES Software • Albany, OR USA**

**Electronic Version 1.0 © 1997**

# A PRESENTATION OF PERFECTION

AN HISTORICAL LOOK AT SANCTIFICATION IN THE  
AMERICAN HOLINESS MOVEMENT AND  
SPECIFICALLY IN THE *GOD'S REVIVALIST*

## DEDICATION

Dedicated To  
Two Significant Ladies In My Life:  
My Loving Wife (Debbie)  
And  
My Godly Mother (Ella)

**Text Copyright 1993, Mark Eckart**  
Reprinted by Permission  
All Rights Reserved

# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Statement of Research Problems

Assumptions

Limitations

Definition

Research Procedure

Outcomes

## CHAPTER 2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Martin Wells Knapp, 1900-1901, God's Bible School

Knapp, Queen, and Story, 1901-1911

Meredith G. Standley, 1911-1950

Lloyd R. Day, 1950-1961

Elmer G. Marsh, 1961-1965

Samuel E. Deets, 1965-1975

Bence C. Miller, 1975-Present

School Personnel

*The God's Revivalist*

## THE HOLINESS MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

Methodist Foundations

Holiness Revival

Holiness Movement

Conservative Holiness Movement

God's Bible School and the Holiness Movement

## CHAPTER 3 DOCTRINAL CONTEXT

Revival of Holiness

Holiness Scholars

Summary

## CHAPTER 4 METHODOLOGY

Criteria for Article Selection

Interpretive Theological Data

Description of Theological Categories

Adequacy of Theological Grid as Analytic Tool

God's Bible School's Creedal Statement

Analysis of Behavioral and Appearance Stance

Sequence of Analysis

## CHAPTER 5 DATA

An Analysis Of God's Bible School's  
Holiness Creedal Statement

1906-1910

1930-1934

1956-1960

1980-1984

## CHAPTER 6 INTERPRETATION

Pentecostal-Substantive/1906-1910

Christological-Substantive/1906-1910

Pentecostal-Substantive/1930-1934

Christological-Substantive/1930-1934

Pentecostal-Substantive/1956-1960

Christological-Substantive/1956-1960

Pentecostal-Substantive/1980-1984

Christological-Substantive/1980-1984

Significant Shifts and Emphasis

## CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

### APPENDIX

A. Holiness Theological Grid

B. Holiness Classification Scheme

C. Article Classification Scheme

# PREFACE

This book came about as a result of the dissertation I did for my doctoral studies. It was interesting and insightful to study historically about the doctrine of entire sanctification.

As the book title suggests, this study is comprehensive in that I researched the development of the doctrine of sanctification from the time that Methodism started in America. This manuscript is also specific in that I studied twenty years of articles in the *God's Revivalist* concerning sanctification. The years examined were 1906-1910, 1930-1934, 1956-1960, 1980-1984. Men like Martin Wells Knapp, A. M. Hills, Oswald Chambers, Samuel Brengle, E. E. Shelhammer, T. M. Anderson, Leslie Wilcox, and H. E. Schmul gave some interesting truths concerning this great doctrine of holiness.

I have endeavored to change some of the language, so this book is not as technical as the dissertation. My prayer is that this book will help people to better understand the holiness doctrine; but, more importantly, that they may come to know the Holy Spirit in His fullness. In other words, to be entirely sanctified!

***Mark S. F. Eckart***  
***Cincinnati, Ohio***  
***July 1993***

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The American holiness movement arose in a renewal of interest in the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification among North American Methodists which spread beyond denominational structure, to include numerous Christians concerned with social reform and personal piety.<sup>1</sup> Since the late 19th century, a number of denominations, fellowships, connections, schools and colleges, mission organizations, and publications have been created to proclaim and present the movement's distinctive message of entire sanctification. God's Bible School and the serial publication *God's Revivalist* are examples of these entities established to uphold and promote the doctrine of entire sanctification.<sup>2</sup>

God's Bible School was started in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1900 by Martin Wells Knapp, a Methodist minister. Affectionately referred to as GBS, the School was among the first Bible schools founded in the United States. The original curriculum was a short diploma course of Bible and ministerial practice. By 1936 the curriculum had developed into a regular four-year collegiate course. In 1986 God's Bible School became an accredited member of the American Association of Bible Colleges. In addition to its collegiate program the School since 1922 has operated a state-certified high school and for several years has also offered a non-college credit correspondence program.

The official statement of institutional goals and objectives incorporates these various instructional programs with a ministry of publishing. The statement reads:

The aim of God's Bible School, College and Missionary Training Home is to operate a Bible college, Christian high school, and non-collegiate correspondence course as parts of a holiness institution. It also aims to continue to publish high-quality holiness literature in the traditions of the *God's Revivalist* and *Bible Advocate*. The purpose of the School includes maintaining and enlarging a

constituency through the periodical *God's Revivalist and Bible Advocate*, which has been published since 1888.<sup>3</sup>

This statement clearly indicates the function and importance of the *God's Revivalist* to the School. While the periodical was begun before the School started, it has been the public voice of the School since 1900.

The School is interdenominational, but its creedal statement reflects its commitment to the Wesleyan-Arminian theological position with a firm allegiance to the doctrine of entire sanctification. The spiritual heritage and commitment of God's Bible School is evident in all aspects of its educational programs and regulates much of the School's social life. Since the School is interdenominational, the *God's Revivalist* is the means by which ties are maintained between the School and its constituency. The relationship of holiness doctrine, especially entire sanctification, to the image of the School and the role of the *God's Revivalist* in communicating that image make the presentation of entire sanctification in the *God's Revivalist* an important issue to study. Although the *God's Revivalist* has been published for more than one hundred years, its presentation of the doctrine of entire sanctification has not received a systematic examination. Therefore, a study of articles concerning entire sanctification in the *God's Revivalist* can provide a perspective to understand:

- (1) the development of the doctrine of entire sanctification within the holiness movement, and
- (2) the relationship between explication of the doctrine and the life of God's Bible School. This project was designed and conducted to explore these issues.

## STATEMENT OF RESEARCH PROBLEMS

The first research problem is: To what degree has the doctrine of entire sanctification as expressed in articles in the *God's Revivalist* changed theologically during the period 1900-1990. The null hypothesis for this problem is: No significant theological change has taken place in the doctrine of entire sanctification as appearing in the *God's Revivalist*.



The second research problem is: To what degree has the governance, fiscal, and educational condition of God's Bible School contributed to the exposition of the doctrine of entire sanctification in the *God's Revivalist*. It is hypothesized that the condition of the School has had no material influence on the exposition of the doctrine.

## ASSUMPTIONS

In this study there were also three assumptions that needed to be stated.

The first assumption was that the doctrine of entire sanctification is central to the mission and image of God's Bible School and *God's Revivalist*.

The second assumption was that the *God's Revivalist* is significant to developing and maintaining the continued existence of God's Bible School. The constituency base for the College consists largely of the subscribers to the *God's Revivalist*. In fact, without the funds raised through the *God's Revivalist* the School could not exist, as a large portion of the budget is raised annually through the God's Revivalist.

The third assumption was that all *God's Revivalist* articles concerning entire sanctification have the approval of the editor and represent the School's officially sanctioned views of entire sanctification.

## LIMITATIONS

To help set out the perimeters for this study, there are at least two limitations.

First, as the preface of this project suggests, only four segments from the *God's Revivalist* were studied. Specific years that were examined are 1906-1910, 1931-1934, 1956-1960, and 1980-1984. It is possible that significant changes occurred in years not examined in this study.

Secondly, the articles were evaluated in view of the doctrinal statement about holiness that God's Bible School adheres to today. However, the evolving of this doctrinal position from 1900 has been studied in comparison to the School's current position concerning holiness. Primary source materials are not available to document any changes which may

have occurred in the School's doctrinal statement since 1900. The main criteria used to evaluate these articles is the doctrinal statement presently held by the School.

## **DEFINITION**

It also was helpful to consider a definition at the outset of this study. Entire sanctification needs to be defined. It is that act of God, subsequent to regeneration, by which believers are made free from original sin, or depravity, and brought into a state of entire devotement to God, and the holy obedience of love made perfect. For the purpose of this study, entire sanctification is defined by the doctrinal statement of God's Bible School.

## **RESEARCH PROCEDURE**

This project relies for its research data upon articles published in the *God's Revivalist* during selected time periods as stated previously. The periods were selected based upon specific developments in the history of God's Bible School, primarily in the areas of financial condition and governance.

To facilitate the analysis of data, an evaluative grid was developed. The grid reflects the various theological understandings of entire sanctification held or developed within the holiness movement during the 20th century. The grid is the interpretative tool used to determine changes or shifts in the presentation of the doctrine of entire sanctification.

Since doctrinal changes do not occur in a historical vacuum, a chapter is devoted to the historical development of both God's Bible School and the holiness doctrine. This historical review provides a context for the analysis of data retrieved from selected *God's Revivalist* articles and a means of correlating any changes in the presentation of entire sanctification and the condition of the School.

A more complete statement of research procedures appears in the chapter on methodology.

## OUTCOMES

There were at least two outcomes for this project. First, to incorporate my findings into the Doctrine of Holiness class which I teach at God's Bible School. This included sharing with the class (30-40 students) the theological grid I developed, the theological camps that were identified, and what conclusions were drawn by studying the *God's Revivalist* articles in view of these analytical tools.

Secondly, this study can help the administration and the editor of the *God's Revivalist* to see what part of the School's doctrinal statement has been emphasized in the *God's Revivalist* and which has not. Evaluating this project can assist the editor in selecting articles about holiness for future publication.

# CHAPTER 2

## HISTORICAL CONTEXT

As indicated in the introduction, this project has considered both the history of God's Bible School and the broader development of the holiness movement. Also, attention has specifically been given to the College's history as it relates to the *God's Revivalist* and the articles that have been selected to study. This chapter provides a brief historical overview of the significant developments in the School and holiness denominations.

### **MARTIN WELLS KNAPP, 1900-1901, GOD'S BIBLE SCHOOL**

Knapp, a Methodist minister, started God's Bible School in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1900. He had published the *God's Revivalist* since 1888 and, for several months, had been advertising the School before it opened on Thursday, September 27, 1900. At that time the School only offered a one-year course, and there were seventy-two students that enrolled the first year. The School started as – and still is – an interdenominational school of the Wesleyan-Arminian theological persuasion.

In August of 1900 this is what Martin W. Knapp said that God's Bible School was designed to be:

A place where Christian soldiers will be drilled in the rules and tactics of successful soul-winning warfare. A coaling-station, where people will lay in a supply of spiritual coal, which will enable them to make successful soul-winning trips on the salvation railroad. A salvation light-house, from which warning and inviting light will gleam to the salvation of many, not only in the city beneath, but over the world. It is God's. He has prompted it. He is leading His people to plant it and water it.<sup>1</sup>

This kind of introduction to God's Bible School found in the *God's Revivalist* showed that from the School's inception the periodical has had a significant part to play in the life of the School. Yearly since 1900 the

*God's Revivalist* has kept the constituency informed about the events that have taken place at God's Bible School.

The *God's Revivalist*, from the School's beginning, has also regularly carried articles about the doctrine of holiness. In fact, Knapp chose to refer to God's Bible School as the "Mount of Blessings," in part, because of its holiness emphasis. In 1900, he wrote in the *God's Revivalist*,

Another reason why it may fittingly be named the "Mount of Blessings" is that its mission is to mightily magnify the blessings of the new birth and the gift and gifts of the Holy Spirit, the double work which both saves from sins and sin, and makes mightily efficient in the cause of winning the world for Christ.<sup>2</sup>

Knapp also gave some specific teaching on the second work of grace in the *God's Revivalist* a month after the School had started. A reader wrote in and asked him four questions about holiness. From the answers he gave, we can tell what was taught in both the *God's Revivalist* and at the School about entire sanctification. The questions and Knapp's answers are:

What is sanctification?

It is the act of Divine grace, whereby we are made holy, wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit after regeneration, and is the completion of the work begun in regeneration. By this the true believer is enabled to love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself.

Are these high attainments in the Divine life for all men?

It is the privilege of every believer to be wholly sanctified, and to love God with all his heart in this present life; but at every stage of Christian experience there is danger of falling from grace, which danger is to be guarded against by watchfulness, prayer, and a life of faith in the Son of God.

Is the process of cleansing, gradual or instantaneous?

The process of cleansing is, in some cases, gradual, the remains of the evil nature wearing away by degrees; in others, instantaneous,

the believer receiving the blessing of a “clean heart” a few days, or even hours, after his regeneration.

May those who enjoy it live free from condemnation?

It is the high privilege of every one who is born of God to live, from that moment, free from the sins which bring the soul into condemnation—that is, from “voluntary transgression of known law.” Involuntary errors and mistakes needing the atonement of Christ remain to the end.<sup>3</sup>

Knapp died unexpectedly in 1901 at the age of forty-eight. He only served as school president for a little more than a year. The administration of the School was then passed to three women who served as trustees for ten years. We will consider the remaining history of the School by noting the presidents and the years that they served the School.

### **KNAPP, QUEEN, AND STORY, 1901-1911**

President Knapp must have had a premonition that he was going to die. As has been pointed out,

Just a few months before he passed away, he had written on a piece of paper the names of three people who were to succeed him as trustees; this paper was then sealed, and he wrote on the outside that it was to be opened after his decease. However, on Wednesday before his death he announced his successors and told Mrs. Knapp where to find the paper. He appointed

- (1) his wife, Mrs. Minnie Perle Knapp,
- (2) his secretary and assistant, Miss Bessie Queen,
- (3) the school evangelist and one of his close associates, Miss Mary Storey, to be the three trustees.<sup>4</sup>

Rev. M. G. Standley, who was a Bible teacher at the School and a close associate of Martin Knapp, was also to assist these three women in carrying on the administrative duties of God’s Bible School.

These three trustees and Rev. Standley were faithful to carry on the work of the School until 1911. The girls’ dorm and other buildings were added

during their administration to enhance the campus. There was also a rescue house started for unfortunate girls. Rev. Seth C. Rees was appointed as superintendent of the rescue house called “Hope Cottage.”

At least two other significant things happened during this administration. First, Rev. Standley and one of the trustees, Miss Bessie Queen, got married in 1902. Later Rev. Standley would serve as the School’s president for many years. The second significant thing that transpired was that in 1907 a problem arose concerning the ownership of the School. It became quite a conflict, eventually involving the court. The problem was explained in a master’s thesis about the history of God’s Bible School. The writer said,

The years 1907 and 1908 were years of severe trial and stress for God’s Bible School and Missionary Training Home, yet they were tests that helped to get the School more firmly established on a legal basis. Rev. Martin Wells Knapp had not exercised his lawful rights in appointing his successors, and, in 1907, the trust property and trusteeship were questioned.<sup>5</sup>

The conflict was brought about by concern over ownership and finances of the School. Some members of the Knapp family challenged the trustees about who really owned God’s Bible School. Eventually, the court got involved and M. G. Standley described the final settlement in the *God’s Revivalist*:

The Trustees were to pay all the court costs and attorney fees and for three years to give the Knapp Estate seven hundred and fifty dollars annually, and they were to own the books and copyrights which belonged to Brother Knapp during his life time.<sup>6</sup>

The Court further stated the School was a charitable trust and, as such, was not the property of any individual or group of individuals. It should be noted that even with the conflict the God’s Revivalist subscriptions continued to grow until there were approximately 12,000 subscribers by 1910.<sup>7</sup>

## **MEREDITH G. STANDLEY, 1911-1950**

As previously indicated, Rev. Standley married one of the three trustees (Miss Bessie Queen) that Martin Wells Knapp had assigned to serve as leadership of the School after his death. In 1906 another one of Knapp's appointed trustees, Miss Mary Storey, died. Before her death she had requested that Rev. Standley be appointed as a trustee to fill her position. The request was granted, and then both Standley and his wife served as trustees for five years. By 1911 Rev. Standley had gained the respect of the other trustees (Mrs. Bessie Queen Standley and Mrs. Minnie Perle Knapp) and was asked to serve as president of God's Bible School.

Rev. Standley was an ordained minister in the Pilgrim Holiness Church. The School experienced significant growth under Standley's administration. During his presidency several buildings and properties were added to the campus development. The Ten-Weeks Building, God's Revivalist Memorial Building, and the Knapp Memorial Building were added, to name just a few.

Lloyd R. Day, M. G. Standley's successor, in his thesis on the history of God's Bible School, summarizes the activities that took place during Standley's administration:

God's Bible School has shown a marked growth materially from a school valued at \$20,000 in 1900 to one approximately \$2,000,000 in 1948....By the school year of 1920, the School had purchased three large buildings on Young Street which were known as "Annexes 1, 2, and 3."

An enlarged Class Room, Printing Department, and Dormitory Building was begun in 1921. A \$200,000 campaign was launched to clear the debt on the building, and on June 10, 1923 "God's Revivalist Memorial Building" was dedicated.

Plans were drawn in 1930 to replace the old, frame tabernacle with a new Auditorium and Class Room Building. The sod was broken February 17, 1930, and the building was sufficiently completed so that the camp meeting could be held in the auditorium that spring.



The United States Government turned over to God's Bible School a war surplus "Dining Room Building and Kitchen", fully equipped, valued at \$70,000; it was appropriately received and dedicated Sunday, May 16, 1948.

In 1948, the campus of God's Bible School and College consisted of fourteen buildings including the Rescue Home at Glendale, and about twelve acres of land; it was estimated that the valuation was approximately two million dollars.<sup>8</sup>

During Standley's administration the *God's Revivalist* family also grew considerably. In fact, in the 1930's there were approximately 50,000 subscribers to the magazine. This is the largest number of subscriptions in the history of the *God's Revivalist*. It should also be stated that it was during Standley's administration, in 1922, that a state-accredited high school was started at God's Bible School.

However, everything did not turn out well for Standley. Over the years excessive financial debt accumulated. Eventually, the court once again got involved and appointed a new president.

### **LLOYD R. DAY, 1950-1961**

As indicated earlier, President Day inherited a lot of problems when he assumed the presidency of God's Bible School. The School had a court-appointed Board of Trustees that were to serve until the School could once again operate on its own. So the main challenge for Day, an ordained minister in the Wesleyan Tabernacle Association, and his administration was just to "survive" and to keep the doors of the School open from year to year.

The main problem that Day had to contend with when he became president was the million-dollar debt the School had accumulated over the years. Even though under his administration the debt was not eliminated, some progress was made in that direction.

### **ELMER G. MARSH, 1961-1965**

Marsh, like Day, inherited a court-appointed board and a huge financial debt when he became president. Rev. Marsh had been a faculty member

since 1912 at the School and was an ordained minister in the Pilgrim Holiness Church. Two significant things took place under his administration. In 1963, the School became a not-for-profit corporation, and in 1964 a constitution was drawn up placing the control of the School in a corporation whose members are former students, staff, and faculty of the School.<sup>9</sup> These actions taken by the School did not entirely free the School of the court's involvement, but they certainly were steps in the right direction. It was not until Deets' presidency that the School was completely free from the jurisdiction of the court.

### **SAMUEL E. DEETS, 1965-1975**

Much was done under Dr. Deets' administration. He was a former student, an ordained minister in the Wesleyan Methodist Church (later a member of the Pillar of Fire Church, and currently an insurance salesman). At the young age of thirty, he assumed the presidency of the School. Under his leadership the operating debt was liquidated. Consequently, as the School became more stable financially, the court allowed an alumni-elected Board of Trustees to resume complete responsibility for the School. Also, under Deets' administration the School acquired more property and started construction of a multi-purpose building.

### **BENCE C. MILLER, 1975-PRESENT**

President Miller came to the School after pastoring in the Wesleyan Church for several years and serving as a chief estimator for a large construction company in Indiana. His building expertise has been a real asset to the School. Mr. Miller has seen the completion of the multi-purpose building that Deets started; it was dedicated debt free in 1979. Also, a new library was just finished in 1990 and several buildings have been renovated under this administration.

The School has experienced growth in several areas since President Miller assumed the presidency. In 1982 the School had its largest enrollment ever, with four hundred students. (Throughout the history of the School, enrollment has averaged approximately 250 students per year.) The market value of the School has more than doubled under Miller's administration. In 1975 it was estimated that the School was valued at \$3,000,000. Today,

the campus consists of fourteen acres and twenty-eight buildings; the market value is estimated to be \$8,500,000.

## **SCHOOL PERSONNEL**

The School has existed for ninety-two years. Each president of the School has had his contributions to make for the ongoing of the School. The School has experienced some difficult days, but it is still flourishing as a center for holiness education today. Over 25,000 students have attended God's Bible School and College.

There have been hundreds of people employed by the School that have had a lasting impact upon the students both intellectually and spiritually. Some of the best teachers and preachers in the holiness movement have labored at the School.

For example, teachers like Walter Henschen, E. R. Borton, John Paul, J. R. Mitchell, and Leslie Wilcox have all taught the Doctrine of Holiness class on campus. Many well-known evangelists have preached at God's Bible School during the school year and at camp meetings. Men like Seth Rees, Oswald Chambers, Joseph Smith, E. E. Shelhammer, J. A. Huffman, Bona Fleming, Tony Anderson, Paul Rees, Lawrence Hicks, H. E. Schmul, L. W. Sturk, J. Wesley Adcock, and R. G. Flexon have appeared on campus.

Since the School is interdenominational, there have been faculty members from various holiness denominations. However, the most frequent denominations represented by the faculty in the early years of the School were Methodist, Free Methodist, Nazarene, Pilgrim Holiness, and Wesleyan Methodist. In the last few years there have been additional denominations represented as they have developed, such as the Bible Methodist, Allegheny Wesleyan Methodist, Bible Missionary, and other smaller holiness denominations.

For the most part, even with all of these religious groups represented on campus, there has been a common goal among the administrators and faculty: to train workers for Christ within the context of the holiness theological tradition. For the last nine decades the School has benefited from some great spiritual leaders that have not only lived a life

exemplifying holiness but have also challenged the student body intellectually.

## **THE GOD’S REVIVALIST**

As one looks at the history of the School, it is obvious that the *God’s Revivalist* has been a very significant part of the whole enterprise. Since the School started, ten editors have been responsible for keeping the *God’s Revivalist* family informed about what developments were taking place at God’s Bible School. The *God’s Revivalist* has been important to the School in several ways. As this research was being conducted, it became evident that the *God’s Revivalist* has been used to raise funds for the School; to recruit students; to promote special events, such as Homecoming and the annual camp meeting; and, in general, to keep the subscribers to the *God’s Revivalist* updated about the happenings at God’s Bible School.

There has often been a close connection between the President’s Office and the editorship. Three presidents and a wife of another have served as editor. Some of the other editors have served in other capacities along with the editorship, as noted below.

The ten people that have served as editors of the *God’s Revivalist* are:

- (1) Rev. Martin Wells Knapp (President), 1888-1901;
- (2) Mrs. M. W. Knapp (Trustee), 1902-1928;
- (3) Mrs. M. G. Standley (president’s wife), 1929-1949;
- (4) Miss Florence Carlson, 1950-1965;
- (5) Rev. Samuel E. Deets (President), 1966-1975;
- (6) Rev. Bence C. Miller (President), 1976-1977;
- (7) Rev. Glenn D. Black, 1978-1985;
- (8) Rev. Hubert Hotchkiss, 1986-1988;
- (9) Rev. Gary L. Spriggs (Vice President of Business Affairs), 1989-1990;

(10) Rev. Ronald E. Shew, 1991-present. Each of these editors has played a significant role in keeping the *God's Revivalist* constituency knowledgeable about the ongoing of God's Bible School and the holiness movement.

## THE HOLINESS MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

### METHODIST FOUNDATIONS

The Evangelical Revival led by John and Charles Wesley promoted renewed interest in Christian holiness. Initially centered in the British Isles, this revival rapidly spread throughout the 18th century, English-speaking world. The holiness message spread in America by itinerant preachers, and several Methodist churches were established to propagate the doctrine of Christian holiness.

The first holiness congregation in America was a Methodist church built in New York City in 1768. Thomas Webb was a captain in the British Army and had been a Methodist in England. He retired from the Army, came to America, and was mainly responsible for this first church being built.<sup>10</sup>

Mr. Wesley heard reports of Methodism starting in America and was elated that the holiness message was being spread beyond the boundaries of Great Britain. One author writes, "John Wesley, despite the autonomy of the new church and the watery miles that separated him from it, was a dominant influence in American Methodism until his death."<sup>11</sup>

Wesley corresponded with those in charge of Methodism in America. His input was highly regarded and his letters were welcomed. This can be verified by one of the first resolutions that was passed in the conference held by those in America. The resolution stated, "During the life of the Rev. Mr. Wesley, we acknowledge ourselves his sons in the gospel."<sup>12</sup>

The following letter is an example of the kind of letters that Wesley wrote to those who were in charge of the early Methodist Church in America. He wrote this the first year the church existed in America. He admonished,

Let none of them rest in being half Christians. Whatever they do, let them do it with their might; and it will be best, as soon as any of

them find peace with God, to exhort them to go on to perfection. The more strongly and vigilantly you press all believers to aspire after full sanctification as attainable now by simple faith the more the whole work of God will prosper.<sup>13</sup>

A few years later, Wesley sent Thomas Coke who would serve as joint superintendent with Francis Asbury of the newly established Methodist Church in America. The early Methodist Church was firmly committed to the Wesleyan understanding of Christian experience and holiness. The nineteenth century saw Methodism grow and expand; but, as in other denominations, some problems arose. In fact, there were four main divisions and several smaller offshoots that took place in the Methodist denomination in the nineteenth century. The four divisions and their reasons for beginning are as follows:

**(1)** The Methodist Protestant Methodist Church was formed in 1828 to protest against the episcopal type of government the Methodist Church was using.

**(2)** The Wesleyan Methodist Church of America was formed in 1843 because of the slavery issue. The Methodist Church took more of an accepting view of slavery than did the people that started this new denomination.

**(3)** Only two years later the Methodist Church split again as a result of the Civil War. The churches were called the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

**(4)** A fourth group started another church in 1860 called the Free Methodist Church. The people in this new church stressed separation from worldliness and also took a strong stand against the evils of secret societies.<sup>14</sup>

The doctrine of holiness was not the primary reason that these new church groups were started. For the most part, they still adhered to the doctrine that was espoused by the early Methodist Church. Peters wrote, “The doctrine of Christian perfection was heartily endorsed by the mother church and by her schismatic daughter alike. It was not an issue.”<sup>15</sup>

## **HOLINESS REVIVAL**

When talking about the holiness churches in America, some consideration should also be given to the great holiness revivals that took place in the mid- and late 19th century. The resurgence of revivalism that came upon America between 1840 and 1857 was significant in several Protestant denominations, but especially in the holiness movement.<sup>16</sup>

The doctrine of holiness was revived and multitudes of people found the experience of sanctification. This revival of holiness centered in Methodism but also reached out to other denominations. “A sufficient number of Baptist ministers also experienced the second work of grace during the revival of 1858 to begin a noteworthy ‘higher life’ movement in their denomination.”<sup>17</sup>

Certainly the doctrine of holiness was predominant during this time of church history. The message was being preached, and the experience was being discovered all through the Protestant movement. It has been said,

...we may conclude that the popularity of Christian perfection in both its Oberlin and Wesleyan forms, increased steadily in American Protestantism between 1840 and 1870. Although one branch of the Oberlin gospel tree bore holiness from the first bloom of grace and the other insisted on blossoming twice, the fruit of both was the sanctification of heart and conduct.<sup>18</sup>

## **HOLINESS DENOMINATIONALISM**

More could be said about this time in the history of Methodism and holiness doctrine in America, but, since this project concentrates on the twentieth century, a look at the development of holiness churches in that century is appropriate. There were some denominations that started in the second half of the nineteenth century that will be considered as well.

These denominations started in various parts of the country, but they all basically had one common goal, to promote the doctrine of holiness. The Methodist Churches, North and South, were experiencing a decline concerning the teaching of the doctrine of holiness when these other churches were started. There was a lot of unrest and dissatisfaction with the decline of holiness proclamation in the Methodist churches. These

other denominations were started, in part, to see the doctrine of holiness revived and practiced in Christian living. The general revival fervor previously mentioned had ebbed away. One writer describes the picture of that day:

It was felt by many that the Church itself was in a slough of spiritual despondency. Discipline, it was asserted, was sorely neglected, the class meetings were going or gone, there was too much conformity to secular practices and goals, and revivals were in disfavor.<sup>19</sup>

Following are a list of the denominational names and the year in which they started:

- (1) Brethren in Christ – 1863
- (2) The Church of God (Anderson) – 1881
- (3) The Church of God (Holiness) – 1882
- (4) The Pilgrim Holiness Church – 1897
- (5) The Pillar of Fire Church – 1901
- (6) Church of the Nazarene – 1907/1908
- (7) Churches of Christ in Christian Union – 1909
- (8) God's Missionary Church – 1936
- (9) The Wesleyan Church – 1968

These groups, though all considered to be holiness, vary in the form of church government, use of sacraments, flexibility or rigidity concerning the doctrine of holiness, and standards for Christian behavior. Consideration will be given to the distinctives of these churches, and how each started as a denomination.

The **BRETHREN IN CHRIST** church was formerly called the River Brethren Church. The Brethren in Christ church is a come-out group from the United Brethren in Christ. A historian gives this insight about the church:



The Brethren in Christ church originated about 1780 along the Susquehanna River near the present town of Bainbridge in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. At first known simply as “Brethren” the founders were rural people from the surrounding Pennsylvania-German community....The Brethren did not always concur with the theology of the Reformers. They rejected the doctrine of predestination and believed that Christ died for all mankind, leaving each individual free to accept or reject His salvation.<sup>20</sup>

It was not until 1863 that this church adopted the name Brethren in Christ. This church was influenced by Anabaptism and Pietism. It has practiced the Christian ordinances and non-resistance during war times. They have always emphasized entire sanctification as heart cleansing and empowerment by the Holy Spirit. Considerable authority is given to the local church government, but there are six regional conferences and a general conference which has the final authority. The church has two colleges and approximately 170 churches in America, besides missionary endeavors world-wide.

The **CHURCH OF GOD (ANDERSON)** started as a movement rejecting denominationalism. The founders were persuaded that the church of their day was overwhelmed with organizational expectations and ecclesiasticism. The leaders of this group wanted the church to be patterned after the New Testament concept of local church autonomy.

D. S. Warner was instrumental in starting this group. He was the editor of a religious periodical titled the *Gospel Trumpet*. This magazine was the tool Warner used to propagate and advertise his understanding of the church. In fact, without this paper the Church of God (Anderson) as it is known today would probably not exist. One writer said:

In tracing the beginning of the work and the way in which new workers were enlisted, it is very important to remember what it would be tedious to repeat: that nearly always the work started in a new place through the instrumentality of the *Gospel Trumpet* literature which was scattered far and wide by the brethren in every possible way.<sup>21</sup>

This church, then, is a congregational movement that is really concerned about the unity in the body of Christ. Although they believe in the doctrine of holiness, they would be flexible in their view of what the requirements are for a holiness lifestyle.

The **CHURCH OF GOD (HOLINESS)** started as a holiness association in the Midwest. This association has approximately one hundred churches in its group, and it does support a small Bible college in Overland Park, Kansas. They promote local church autonomy, but they do adhere to a strict view of the doctrine and lifestyle of holiness.

The **CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE** is the result of three independent holiness groups merging during 1907-1908. The three groups were the Association of Pentecostal Churches in America, Church of the Nazarene, and the Holiness Church of Christ. These three groups merged to form a new denomination called the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. Pentecostal in the name was eventually dropped because the Nazarene denomination did not want to be confused with those who promoted speaking in tongues.

Dr. P. F. Bresee was influential in seeing these groups join together as one denomination. Here is, in part, what took place:

And so at last the October day (1908) came when weary travelers from four corners of the nation climbed off the trains at Pilot Point and headed for the big tent beside Brother Robert's rescue home. The links of their fellowship had been forged on many anvils, yet tense moments of debate must temper them again before they could be joined. At one point in the proceedings, discussion of such matters as wedding rings and tobacco became so heated that H. D. Brown rose to suggest that if union could be had only at the price of multiplying rules the Nazarenes should let the southerners go. His speech repeated several times, was finally reduced to the words, "Mr. Chairman, let them go." Dr. Bresee, his hand upraised, responded each time, "We cannot let them go, Brother Brown; they are our own folks." Like so many other leaders in both North and South, Bresee had caught the vision of a national holiness denomination, which should set ablaze a line of churches and

missions in every city of the nation...and so the Nazarenes became one people, North and South, East and West<sup>22</sup>

The Nazarene Church endeavors to find a balance concerning church government. They would not be considered strong promoters of either congregationalism or episcopacy. They have held strongly to the doctrine of entire sanctification but have increasingly allowed flexibility concerning matters of lifestyle issues.

Mrs. Alma White was the founder of the Pillar of Fire Church. She preached often and the church was started out of her evangelistic efforts.

The **PILLAR OF FIRE** church condemned the modernism in theology that some in the Methodist Church promoted. Mrs. White, among other things, emphasized the inerrancy of Scripture, second blessing holiness, and the future judgment. The church, for the most part, kept the Methodist Church polity. The Pillar of Fire people have about thirty churches and three radio stations devoted to spreading the holiness message.

The **CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN CHRISTIAN UNION** was started by those leaving an established denomination, the Christian Union Church. Kenneth Brown in the denomination's history has noted:

Marshall, Ohio, a farming community nestled away in the hills of the southern part of the State, is located in Highland County, about ten miles from the county seat of Hillsboro. Driving through this little village, one would never suspect that here, during the year of 1909, a new holiness denomination came into being.<sup>23</sup>

This denomination has been aggressive evangelistically. It is headquartered in Circleville, Ohio, where it operates a Bible college to train ministers. The organization has about 250 churches and tends to be episcopalian in its form of church government.

**GOD'S MISSIONARY CHURCH** is a small denomination centralized in Pennsylvania. It was formed by a group of lay people holding cottage prayer meetings and revival services. It adheres strictly to a doctrine of holiness. The organization is rigid in both the doctrine and practice of holiness. It has about forty churches with one leader in charge of the

group. Penn View Bible Institute in Penns Creek, Pennsylvania, is the school that the God's Missionary Church sponsors.

The **WESLEYAN CHURCH** has been the last large holiness church to organize in this century. An official history gives the following explanation of how the Wesleyan Church came about:

Merger was not the problem to Pilgrims that it was to Wesleyan Methodists. The union of smaller church bodies with the mainstream had taken place often across the seventy-one years of the denominations's existence. So merger between two fairly equal bodies did not conjure up bad memories of the past. Merger with the Wesleyan Methodists was discussed informally early in the 1920's. The first formal discussions appear to have taken place with Dr. F. R. Eddy, then Wesleyan Methodist General Conference President and Publishing Agent, who met with Pilgrim General Board members and district superintendents in Indianapolis, May 11, 1944....Negotiations became much more serious in the late 1950's, and in 1958 the Pilgrim Holiness General Conference approved merger with the Wesleyan Methodist by more than the necessary two-thirds majority. But in 1959 the Wesleyan Methodist General Conference failed by the vote of one person to muster the two-thirds majority necessary on that level<sup>24</sup>

There was progress made over the next decade between these two groups. Church officials met, and committees worked to see the merger come about. Finally, on June 25, 1968, the Wesleyan Church came into existence.

The Free Methodist, Nazarene, and Wesleyan denominations are the largest of the holiness groups. They have been the most predominant in spreading the doctrine and teachings of the holiness movement around the world. The Church of the Nazarene alone has approximately ten thousand churches worldwide.

The majority of the denominations discussed in this section cooperate through the Christian Holiness Association to strengthen fellowship, evangelism, and religious education among holiness churches. These denominations, because of their size, are the most prominent and well-

known of the holiness churches. The membership predominantly reflects many characteristics of contemporary social and economic values.<sup>25</sup> Some within the holiness movement have reacted to the movement toward contemporary social and economic values (worldliness) as a betrayal of the holiness life-style and the doctrine of entire sanctification. Consequently, this shift toward “worldliness” has caused many individuals and/or congregations to create several newer denominations.

## **CONSERVATIVE HOLINESS MOVEMENT**

Within the past few decades there has been a conservative holiness movement emerge from these larger holiness denominations. This movement consists of individuals and congregations that have separated from established denominations over issues of modesty of dress, entertainment, divorce and remarriage, jewelry, sabbatarianism, and other issues perceived as compromising with the “world’s” values (i.e., sin). Also, this conservative holiness movement has from its inception had a strong desire to see revival come to local churches as well as individuals. The movement often emphasizes spiritual renewal and a commitment to seek after God. Some of the denominations in this movement are: Pilgrim Holiness, Allegheny Wesleyan Methodist Connection, Bible Methodist, and Bible Missionary. In addition, there are several very small denominations or fellowships and several independent congregations which identify with the conservative holiness movement. The conservatives have a counterpart to the Christian Holiness Association in the Interchurch Holiness Convention. The Convention, founded and led by Rev. H. E. Schmul, publishes a monthly magazine and sponsors an annual three-day conference which draws as many as 12,000 people.

The **PILGRIM HOLINESS CHURCH OF NEW YORK** was at one time part of the larger Pilgrim Holiness denomination. However, problems arose when part of the New York District believed that the general denomination was not allowing enough autonomy for their district. The New York Pilgrims said,

As time passed there was an increasing desire on the part of the general denomination for greater centralization of authority. This trend was in direct conflict with the unique autonomous authority

of the New York District. Therefore, in February 1963 the Conference again became a fully independent organization, changing its corporate name to the Pilgrim Holiness Church of New York, Inc.<sup>26</sup>

There have been about forty churches in this new denomination. There was also a similar denomination that formed in 1967 in the Midwest called the Pilgrim Holiness Church of the Midwest, Inc. This group would also have about forty churches. The two conferences have adopted similar disciplines, but each is completely independent in matters of government.

The **ALLEGHENY WESLEYAN METHODIST CONNECTION** used to be the Allegheny Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. This conference opposed the merger that brought about the Wesleyan Church. For years the Conference disagreed with the idea of merging, primarily because it viewed the proposed merger as giving more authority and power to the general denomination at the expense of conference leadership. There was a perception that the denomination was not fully committed to personal holiness. It all came to a climax in 1966. The Conference's view of its separation is:

The General Conference of 1966, called one year early to facilitate the proposed merger, refused to seat the Allegheny delegation, and the merger was passed by a large vote. Allegheny refused to join the merged group. Final settlement between the Conference and the General Church came in 1968 when the Conference accepted the name of The Allegheny Wesleyan Methodist Connection.<sup>27</sup>

This group has about 120 churches along with a Bible college in Salem, Ohio. They have attempted to adhere to the original doctrines, standards, and polity of early Wesleyan Methodism.

The **BIBLE METHODIST CHURCH** started in 1966. The members of this group were concerned about the lack of personal holiness they found in other holiness denominations:

Recognizing from past histories of holiness bodies that a decline in emphasis upon personal holiness seems to coincide with the increase of emphasis upon organization, centralization of authority and the machinery of church life, the Bible Connection of Churches

wishes to state that the whole and sole cause and purpose of this connection of churches is to spread scriptural (second blessing) holiness over the lands, building up a holy and separated people for the first resurrection.<sup>28</sup>

The **BIBLE MISSIONARY CHURCH**, for the most part, came out of the Nazarene Church. In November of 1955 the Church first organized with 126 members. The first meeting of the Bible Missionary Church is described as:

This crowd came in response to invitations from a group of God's burdened people who, after much prayer had decided to start this meeting, which really started in the hearts of many who felt that something must be done to preserve the rich heritage of "old-fashioned scriptural holiness" as they knew it in the beginning of the modern holiness movements.<sup>29</sup>

In 1987 the Bible Missionary Church lost some of its churches due to a church split over standards of conduct for holy living. However, only about thirty churches left, and the Bible Missionary Church still has well over 200 churches in their denomination. They also have a Bible school in Rock Island, Illinois. This church has also been known for its international evangelistic endeavors.

The last conservative holiness group to be discussed is the **WESLEYAN TABERNACLE ASSOCIATION**. This association, organized in 1935, was not intended to become a denomination. Rather, it was meant to unify various groups of holiness people that were not a part of a denomination.

The leaders said:

The purpose of this Association should be to promote Christian love and fellowship among godly leaders of various denominational holiness bodies, which will enable us to serve in the field of full gospel evangelism in a more efficient way....We further propose to offer credentials to worthy persons desiring them. We further propose to offer membership to various undenominational holiness bodies as affiliated congregations. Our purpose is not to exercise any jurisdiction over local congregations.<sup>30</sup>

This association has about 100 ordained ministers and nearly thirty churches. The Association does not own any property, so consequently they hold their annual meetings in various churches from year to year. Several missionaries and song evangelists are also commissioned by this organization.

## **GOD’S BIBLE SCHOOL AND THE HOLINESS MOVEMENT**

God’s Bible School is both a product of the holiness movement and a flagship institution of the conservative holiness movement. The College’s constituency and *God’s Revivalist* subscribers primarily support and share the views espoused by the Interchurch Holiness Convention. However, there are some supporters found in the conservative segments of the larger holiness denominations such as the Nazarenes, Wesleyans, and Free Methodists.

In the first years of the 20th century, God’s Bible School and the *God’s Revivalist* were in the mainstream of the holiness movement. Admittedly, turn-of-the-century holiness people were judged by most other Christian groups (including its theological cousins – the Methodist Churches, North and South) to be radical because of their preaching a sinless perfection (entire sanctification). During the century the larger holiness denominations began to gain the acceptance of other Christian traditions and move toward accepting contemporary social values. God’s Bible School, in standing with the conservatives against the socialization of the holiness movement, has come to be identified with those attempting to maintain some resemblance of the late 19th century doctrinal and behavioral holiness standards. Thus, *God’s Revivalist* subscribers primarily expect presentations of entire sanctification appearing in the publication to conform to “original” presentations. As a consequence of the tension and division within the holiness movement, God’s Bible School and the *God’s Revivalist* have moved from representing a radical movement to becoming standard bearers of the conservative movement.

Behavioral and personal appearance issues have traditionally been a real concern of the holiness movement.<sup>31</sup> As noted above, this concern has been one of the main factors leading to the creation of the conservative holiness movement. The reason for the importance of this concern is found in the



holiness movement's understanding of what constitutes a life set apart, or free, from sin. Therefore, these issues have been taken very seriously as expressions of holiness doctrine. Given the widely perceived relationship between personal behavior and appearance issues and the doctrine of entire sanctification, it is appropriate to evaluate the treatment of these issues as a means of assessing change in *God's Revivalist* articles pertaining to entire sanctification.

# CHAPTER 3

## DOCTRINAL CONTEXT

This chapter will provide a general overview of the doctrine of entire sanctification within the Wesleyan theological tradition. Emphasis has been given to writings of those theologians who have given systematic treatment to entire sanctification or have been frequently cited by holiness movement preachers and teachers.

### REVIVAL OF HOLINESS

By the early nineteenth century there had been a decline in the emphasis being placed on the doctrine of entire sanctification in American Methodism. Writing of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, John L. Peters states:

Little was said about the doctrine, for instance, in the principal denominational journals between 1832 and 1840. In 1834-35 a spate of articles did appear in the New York *Christian Advocate* pointing out the differences between the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection and certain antinomian teachings then receiving wide publicity. But, by and large, the “old Methodist doctrine” was becoming a denominational curiosity.<sup>1</sup>

However, the promotion of the doctrine of holiness did not stay in decline. Some holiness revivals and camp meetings came about to once again promote the second work of grace in the heart of the believer.

Other names will be mentioned later, but Phoebe Palmer, an effective preacher and writer, was greatly responsible for the revival of holiness that spread across America in the nineteenth century. The “Tuesday Meeting” that she started was very effective in spreading revival and the doctrine of holiness. These meetings were similar to the early Methodist class meetings that were promoted by John Wesley. People met on Tuesdays to

pray, worship, give accountability for their lives, and to especially seek and focus on the experience of sanctification.

A couple authors have given insight about these special meetings. Charles White has stated:

Phoebe Palmer's career as a revivalist began when she went downstairs to a women's prayer meeting her sister Sarah was holding in the home their families shared. Soon the meeting was open to men, and Phoebe eventually took over leadership of the gathering. She called it, "The Tuesday meeting for the Promotion of Holiness." In the almost forty years between 1837 and 1874, thousands of people drawn from the leading Evangelical denominations visited her parlors. There between walls hung with the mottoes, "The Lord Our Righteousness" and "Holiness to the Lord," while the pictures of Wesley and Fletcher looked on, many professed entire sanctification. Some left to establish similar "Tuesday Meetings," so that by 1887 they were being held in 238 places, some as far away as England, India, and New Zealand.<sup>2</sup>

Harold Raser has this to say about the "Tuesday Meetings" led by Phoebe Palmer. It was, "...a weekly religious meeting attended by clergymen and laypeople from many denominations – sometimes swelling to over 300 in number – as the most significant agency for promoting the "holiness revival."<sup>3</sup> The Tuesday prayer meeting promoted holiness and was a significant vehicle for many prominent persons to experience entire sanctification, but Palmer's ministry also included creating a distinctive holiness theology.

Palmer was a dynamic evangelist and was very effective in making the message of entire sanctification prominent. Her primary interest was to lead people into the experience of entire sanctification. After noting Palmer's theology was a "very practical theology which eschews strictly theoretical considerations,"<sup>4</sup> Raser states:

It was a "theology of holiness" which sought to develop the implications of two basic convictions:

**(1)** 'it is absolutely necessary that you should be holy if you would see God;'

(2) ‘holiness is a blessing which it is *now* your privilege and also your duty to enjoy.’<sup>5</sup>

It was with these two foundational considerations in mind that Palmer constructed her theology. The result of this distinctive theology was the well-known “altar theology.”<sup>6</sup> An important aspect of Palmer’s theology was the connection which she made between entire sanctification and the event of Pentecost.<sup>7</sup> This connection was so definite that “baptism of the Holy Spirit” and other expressions of Pentecostal language became the theological equivalent of entire sanctification. A further Palmer innovation was the association of power with purity. In her theology entire sanctification experienced as purity resulted, or issued forth, in spiritual power.<sup>8</sup> It was this particular understanding of holiness which became the norm for nineteenth and early twentieth century holiness preachers and teachers. Its influence was so pervasive that the older Wesleyan model was infrequently encountered in holiness teaching or preaching.

Camp meetings were also a tool used to revive the doctrine of holiness. For several decades camp meetings were a phenomenon that swept the country. Many communities had a tabernacle where holiness meetings would be held for several days or, sometimes, weeks.

There was concern about the decline of the doctrine of entire sanctification that caused some preachers to meet in 1866 to discuss ways to revitalize the doctrine. Peters talked about this when he wrote the following:

...a group of Methodist preachers met weekly in New York City to consider ways and means of responding to this crisis. Among the proposals offered was one by John A. Wood. He suggested that the ideal medicine for the restoration of vital spiritual life would be a camp meeting organized, advertised, and administered specifically for the promotion of holiness.<sup>9</sup>

This is just one example among many where camp meetings were organized to emphasize the message of holiness.

## HOLINESS SCHOLARS

While Palmer exercised a significant role in the formation of holiness movement theology, she was not the only source relied upon by the movement for its doctrinal understanding of entire sanctification. There were several other influential theologians that assisted in the formation of the doctrine of entire sanctification. Some of these were eighteenth century figures, while others were products of the movement.

### JOHN FLETCHER

Fletcher, a contemporary of John Wesley, basically agreed with Wesley's doctrine of Christian Perfection with some slight variations. A salvation-history approach to the Bible was taken by Fletcher, whereby he talked often about the doctrine of dispensations. The dispensation of the Father was in the Old Testament era, the dispensation of Christ was the time of the apostles before Pentecost, and the Holy Spirit dispensation was initiated at Pentecost and continues today.

The main difference between Wesley and Fletcher was concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit in the work of Sanctification.

While Wesley taught entire sanctification through the Holy Spirit given to us, and at times spoke of a coming or infilling of the Spirit as accomplishing the purification of the heart, he was restrained in his treatment of the Acts passages that refer to the dispensational coming of the Spirit and only rarely mentioned the baptism with the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, Fletcher made much of this dispensational baptism and distinguished sharply between those who had received it and those who, like the disciples before Pentecost, were still in the dispensation of the Son. Both men, however, implied degrees of Spirit baptism so that the remaining difference was more one of emphasis than of substance.<sup>10</sup>

### ADAM CLARKE

Clarke was saved at an early age after hearing a Methodist circuit-rider preach. He was later entirely sanctified and became a great scholar who

propagated the doctrine of holiness. John L. Peters quotes M. L. Edwards on Clarke:

He was the greatest name in Methodism in the generation which succeeded Wesley....He was not only the greatest scholar in Methodism,...but if to all men he was known as a scholar, to his own people he was a father in God and a brother beloved.<sup>11</sup>

Clarke was a powerful evangelist and involved in church administration, but he has been best known for his commentary on both the Old and New Testaments of the Bible. These commentaries are still published and used often.

Like John Wesley, Clarke was a consistent promoter of the experience of holiness. However, there are at least three ways in which Clarke approached the doctrine of holiness differently from Wesley. First, Clarke thought there should have been more emphasis put on the fact that sanctification was wrought in the heart instantaneously. “In fact, the instantaneous is the only method he recognizes as scriptural. Unlike Wesley and Fletcher he rules out altogether the idea of gradual attainment,”<sup>12</sup> notes Peters. Secondly, Clarke dogmatically proclaimed the experience of holiness was obtainable in this life on earth. Wesley wanted to find out if others had received the blessing before he preached about it, whereas Clarke said he would preach about it and live it even if no one else ever claimed the experience of holiness. Thirdly, Clarke left a written emphatic testimony to his personal holiness experience, whereas Wesley did not. Other than these items, Clarke was faithful to expound the doctrine of holiness as proclaimed by Wesley and, ultimately, by Scripture.

## RICHARD WATSON

Watson, a few years younger than Clarke, is also remembered as an influential early Methodist theologian. This scholar is known as the first person to systematize the theology of Methodism. His best known work is *Theological Institutes*. At least two things are noteworthy about Watson and his teaching of sanctification. In the first place, he held a high view of the work that takes place in regeneration. Watson emphasized that one must really be saved before he can receive the second work of grace.

Secondly, he often spoke of a person “gradually” experiencing sanctification. Peters has said,

Moreover, while Clarke was tending to move to the left of the standard set by Wesley and Fletcher (by his emphasis on the instantaneous), Watson was moving to the right (by his emphasis on the gradual).<sup>13</sup>

## WILLIAM POPE

William Pope is best known for his three-volume work entitled *Compendium of Christian Theology* published in 1875. In this work Pope quotes extensively from Wesley’s *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. Later Pope wrote another book, *Higher Catechism of Theology*. In this volume he gave more of his own view about Christian Perfection and summarizes and simplifies the *Compendium of Christian Theology*. William Greathouse has pointed out:

What Pope wishes to make most clear about the Wesleyan view is given under the heading “cardinal teaching.” And this is that perfection is solely the Spirit’s work in the believer; but implies his most strenuous co-operation: as to the former, it is received merely by faith and hence may be given instantaneously, in a moment; as to the latter, this is a gradual work, both preceding and following that instant.<sup>14</sup>

It is evident that Pope believed in both the instantaneous and gradual aspects of Christian Perfection.

There was one point upon which Pope is controversial among holiness theologians. “A distinct assurance, connected with the moment of final deliverance from sin, and as it were apart from the silent seal of the indwelling Spirit, is sometimes looked for without any express warrant of Scripture,”<sup>15</sup> stated Peters. Pope believed you could know that you were sanctified by the witness of the Spirit but that some people expected too much out of the doctrine of assurance. In other words, Pope did not believe a person should necessarily display some kind of a physical demonstration (i.e., shouting) to validate receiving the work of entire sanctification.

## THOMAS RALSTON

Thomas Ralston upheld a Wesleyan position of Christian Perfection. He was of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and was very influential both as a scholar and a preacher. His work *Elements of Divinity* was a required textbook for many years for those wanting to be ordained in the Methodist Church, South.

There were a couple of variations from Wesley's view in Ralston's presentation of entire sanctification. Ralston believed that Christian Perfection was simply regeneration grown to maturity. Writing of Ralston's views, Greathouse stated:

While insisting that regeneration and entire sanctification are the same in nature and differ only in degree, Ralston emphasizes that Christian Perfection involves entire consecration to God and a complete cleansing of the soul from all unrighteousness.<sup>16</sup>

Also, Ralston did not hold entirely to the Wesleyan position of a person being able to know that his soul was separated from sin, enabling him to live his life in perfect love. Ralston stated the following:

It matters but little whether this eminent state of holiness is gained by a bold, energetic, and determined exercise of faith and prayer, or by a more gradual process – whether it is instantaneous or gradual, or both the one and the other. The great matter is, with each and all of us, that we lose no time, but arise at once, and “press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.”<sup>17</sup>

## RANDOLPH FOSTER

By the middle of the nineteenth century many views were in circulation about the meaning of Christian Perfection. Even in the Methodist Church some were beginning to question the correctness of the Wesleyan position on holiness. One such doctrine circulating was that sanctification was synonymous with regeneration.

Foster came on the religious scene as a staunch supporter of the Wesleyan view of Christian Perfection. He was concerned about the deviation from the Wesleyan doctrine and wrote a book in 1851 to present his views



about the matter. The book was called *The Nature and Blessedness of Christian Purity*. It was received well and printed in a second edition a few years later.

In his book Foster pointed out that the Wesleyan view of Holiness does not support the idea that being saved and entirely sanctified are the same experience. He made this clear when he said,

But it may be asked with earnestness, “Is not the work of God perfect in regeneration?” and we answer, it is a perfect regeneration. But a perfect regeneration is not a perfect sanctification, no more than perfect penitence is regeneration. The soul is perfectly born anew, but it is not perfectly made holy.<sup>18</sup>

Foster in his writings was also concerned about what he considered negative aspects of Palmer’s “altar theology.” She encouraged seekers to come to the altar to literally present their bodies a living sacrifice to God. Foster, among others, felt that sometimes this methodology caused people to experience sanctification by mental assent only. He believed there was more to becoming entirely sanctified than just believing and the work would be done. Foster says,

Those who teach this new doctrine tend to substitute ‘mere belief’ for ‘confiding trust.’ For Wesley, sanctifying faith, like justifying faith, is more than intellectual assent; it is the warm trust of the heart.<sup>19</sup>

### **MINER RAYMOND**

There was still an unrest in Methodism over holiness when Raymond wrote his work. Greathouse has written,

During the holiness controversy in American Methodism, Miner Raymond (1811-97), professor of systematic theology at Darrett Biblical Institute, produced his three-volume *Systematic Theology*. Published in 1877, it was placed in the Methodist Episcopal Course of Study in 1880, where it remained until 1908.<sup>20</sup>

Raymond, like Foster, was a staunch supporter of a Wesleyan view of Christian Perfection. He did point out a couple of things to which

Methodism should be aware. First, no person should build his faith on another person's experience. He said that God works individually with us in our experiencing sanctification. Secondly, he did admit that it was difficult to define Christian Perfection. However, he wholeheartedly believed in the experience. He said,

The propriety of affirming the doctrine of Christian Perfection cannot be denied. The Scriptures recognize a state of grace which they speak of as a state of maturity, and they call that grace perfect love. They further assure that this is a state of grace which may be sought, obtained, and enjoyed.<sup>21</sup> Christian perfection, therefore, despite the difficulty of definition, includes at least these two ideas: maturity and perfect love. Explore those concepts and the breadth of the doctrine is evident.<sup>22</sup>

### JOHN MILEY

John Miley was a professor of systematic theology at Drew Theological Seminary. His two-volume *Systematic Theology* was published in 1894 and was reprinted as recently as 1989. The conclusions he arrived at had a far-reaching effect in the religious world, especially in Methodism.

This scholar did not hold to the same views as Wesley did concerning Christian perfection. He really did not see the need for a definite second work of grace. Peters has written:

Miley inclines to question the doctrinal necessity of such a work as entire sanctification as it was customarily presented. He sees no reason to assume that what is postulated for this "complete" work cannot be and is not accomplished in regeneration. Moreover, he states that there is no explicit scriptural support for the idea of an "incompleteness of regeneration." As a consequence, he says, "there is perplexity in the notion of entire sanctification," and "it should not be thought strange that some question the truth of this doctrine, or even oppose it." Second, and more emphatically, he opposes the view that entire sanctification must always be considered a second blessing. He holds that such may be a possible mode, but he objects to the insistence that it is the only mode.<sup>23</sup>

Miley saw Christian Perfection as being a maturity process. He said that there should always be plenty of time allowed for this process to take place. He admitted that a certain level of perfection could be reached, but that this perfection would vary with the personalities and temperament of each individual.

### **OLIN ALFRED CURTIS**

Olin Curtis was regarded as a renowned scholar in the Methodist tradition:

Olin Curtis (1850-1918) was the last major Methodist champion of Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection....His first teaching assignment was a Boston, but in 1896 he moved to Drew Theological Seminary where he enjoyed his greatest productivity. *The Christian Faith*, published in 1905, was for him a deserved reputation as a leading Methodist theologian.<sup>24</sup>

For this scholar it was important to study Wesley's belief about Christian Perfection. He believed that Wesley had some insights which later generations should not forget.

Curtis was one of the first scholars to talk about the psychology of holiness. In fact, he was not very impressed with Wesley's primitive understanding of psychology. Greathouse commented, in referring to Curtis:

Although he [Curtis] considers Wesley's psychology mixed up and crude in its realism, he can say of the meaning of his teaching, "I am as sure of his doctrine of Christian perfection as sure of its essential import as I am that I walk the earth."<sup>25</sup>

In reference to psychology, he talked about personal holiness or having holiness in each individual personality.

### **ASA MAHAN/CHARLES D. FINNEY**

In the middle of the nineteenth century Asa Mahan served as president of Oberlin College in Ohio, and Finney was the professor of theology at the College. They were responsible for what became known as Oberlin Perfectionism. These men put a great deal of emphasis on power and

experiencing a baptism of the Holy Spirit. “This new doctrine was an attempted synthesis of New School Calvinism and the Methodist doctrine of entire sanctification.”<sup>26</sup> Wesley had seen the Holy Spirit working throughout the stages of faith (i.e., prevenient grace, new birth, and sanctification). Mahan and Finney believed that the Spirit is “with” believers from their new birth, but is not “in” them until they receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost.<sup>27</sup>

Oberlin Perfectionism became very popular as a result of these two men, especially since Finney was such a well-known evangelist. This doctrine was also widespread, in part, because it reached out to both the Wesleyans as well as the Calvinistic thinkers. Finney developed this doctrine in his 1838-39 lectures on Christian perfection published in *The Oberlin Evangelist*, and Mahan espoused this view in a book, *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, published in 1870.

Oberlin Perfectionism does not hold, as Wesleyans do, to the cleansing of sin in the heart of the sanctified believer. This teaching by Mahan and Finney is, for the most part, taught today by a group called the Keswickians (they have met since 1876 at the Keswick Convention in England).<sup>28</sup> This quote explains what they believe:

For this school, the baptism with the Holy Spirit does not cleanse the heart from sin; it is only empowerment for victorious living and effective witness. While their teachers deny the possibility of sin’s destruction prior to death, they do advocate the possibility of a life of victory over “the old nature” for those who put themselves under the direction and control of the indwelling Spirit. But as long as Christians inhabit this mortal body, they must contend with the sin nature.<sup>29</sup>

The Oberlin position contends for the work of the Holy Spirit, but more emphasis is put on power than purity.

### DANIEL STEELE

Daniel Steele (1824-1904) was a traditional Methodist theologian. However, he was one of the first Methodist theologians to embrace Pentecostal terminology. In doing so he was following Palmer rather than

Mahan and Finney. Steele wholeheartedly went along with the baptism of the Spirit but took more of a Methodist approach concerning the extinction of sin in the heart of the sanctified believer.

In his book *The Gospel of the Comforter* he explained the baptism of the Spirit or the role of the Spirit in the sanctified person. He said,

When Christ is spoken of as our sanctification, it is meant, not that He enters into the hearts of believers and cleanses them, but that He provides the purifying medium, His own shed blood, and the sanctifying agent, the Holy Spirit. The Son's work is external, the Spirit's internal, or in philosophic terms, the work of the one is objective, that of the other is subjective; the one sanctifies provisionally and the other effectually.<sup>30</sup>

Steele was definitely influenced by Palmer's view of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. For example, in the book *The Gospel of the Comforter* he has much to say about the Holy Spirit. Some chapter titles include: "The Spirit's Work in Regeneration," "Two Perceptions of the Holy Spirit," "The Witness of the Spirit," and "The Fulness of the Spirit." One has said, "In this definitive volume Steele endeavors to harmonize this view with both the New Testament and Wesleyan doctrine."<sup>31</sup> Steele has had a significant effect on the theological development of the holiness movement. It would not be an overstatement to say Steele's teaching established an orthodoxy for the holiness movement.

### A. M. HILLS

Hills, a great holiness writer and preacher, was influenced by Finney and Mahan. In fact he wrote a book called *Life of Charles G. Finney*. Hills also wrote a book called *Homiletics and Pastoral Theology* which he dedicated to Finney. The dedication reads:

To the sacred memory of Charles G. Finney, at whose feet we sat and whose voice we heard, Sabbath after Sabbath, during the four formative years of our college course and the equal of whom as an effective ambassador for Christ, after studying preachers for more than half a century, we are free to say we never saw either in America or Europe.<sup>32</sup>

Even though Hills highly respected Finney and believed strongly in pentecostal understanding of sanctification, he did not embrace all of what Oberlin Perfection proposed. Hills endorsed and strongly believed in the baptism of the Spirit but had difficulty with Oberlin's definition and treatment of sin. In Hills' book *Holiness and Power* several weaknesses with the Oberlin position were pointed out. Hills stated the Oberlin theory and then gave several critiques to the doctrine as Finney and others proclaimed it:

President Finney, than whom no man of the century has been more revered by the writer, and no other has experienced a greater influence upon his life, as we have seen, held a peculiar theory of sin and depravity, denying that man's nature was depraved. All sin was in the wrong use of the will; moral quality could be affirmed of nothing else.<sup>33</sup>

Hills continued his critique:

If, as President Finney contended, man had absolute freedom of will to choose the right and reject the wrong, and that choice, when made, secured his holiness and sanctification, then it follows logically that any man can regenerate and sanctify himself in a moment by a simple act of will. Nothing can be more opposed to the teaching of Scripture upon this subject of sanctification, or to all human experience.<sup>34</sup>

Hills wrote another book called *Scriptural Holiness and Keswick Teaching Compared*. In this writing he argued strongly for the Methodist view of sanctification and the idea that all sin is done away with when a person is sanctified. He stated:

Entire Sanctification is a second definite work of grace wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer subsequently to regeneration, received instantaneously by faith, but which the heart is cleansed from all inward corruption and filled with the love of God.<sup>35</sup>

## H. ORTON WILEY

Wiley (1877-1961) is recognized as an authentic voice of the modern holiness movement. Like Steele, his aim was to synthesize Wesleyan theology and the newer insights of the 19th century (i.e., Palmer and Steele). “He does indeed adopt the position that entire sanctification is by the Pentecostal baptism with the Holy Spirit, but he is very careful to preserve the Christocentric nature of the Spirit’s work as understood by Wesley,”<sup>36</sup> wrote Greathouse.

Wiley endeavored to integrate an understanding of both the work of the Holy Spirit and Christ in his presentation of holiness. He wrote,

Pentecost marks a new dispensation of grace – that of the Holy Spirit. This new economy, however, must not be understood as in any sense superseding the work of Christ, but as ministering to and completing it. The New Testament does not sanction the thought of an economy of the Spirit apart from that of the Father and the Son except in this sense – that it is the revelation of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit, and therefore the final revelation of the Holy Trinity.<sup>37</sup>

## MILDRED BANGS WYNKOOP

Mildred Wynkoop’s book, *A Theology of Love*, is a definitive presentation of her understanding of sanctification. She presented a couple innovative ideas concerning entire sanctification in this work.

For one thing she saw sin being defined differently from most in the holiness movement. She saw inbred sin as being relational rather than a substance. Wynkoop wrote:

In order to make the proper distinction between the two dimensions of sin, commonly termed original sin and actual sin (or some such designation), it would be well to avoid any Platonic abstraction which is totally foreign to the Bible. The distinction in the Bible is an active spirit of “yielding” or dedication, to any center outside of God.... We do not need to serve sin; original sin is not “deeper down and farther back” than our moral responsibility.

It is not a thing, but a commitment of the self to a controlling center, always itself personal.<sup>38</sup>

Wynkoop also emphasized the blood of Christ as the predominant source for our sanctification. She did not discredit the Holy Spirit, but she did not promote the baptism of the Spirit terminology as did others. She said,

The central purpose of Jesus' ministry and death was for the sanctification of the Church. All other elements in redemption are incidental to this in that they are supporting parts of this one thing....Paul said, in Ephesians 5:25-26 that Christ gave himself for the Church in order to "sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word."<sup>39</sup>

### H. RAY DUNNING

H. Ray Dunning has written several books, but two of them expound his views about holiness very well. The book *Grace, Faith and Holiness* is more technical and is a comprehensive theological work that has a lot to say about sanctification. His other book, *A Layman's Guide to Sanctification*, is easier to read, but its treatment of holiness is excellent.

Dunning holds to many of the same views that Wynkoop holds concerning sanctification. He quotes from her work quite frequently. For example, concerning original sin he said,

In the light of this discussion we can see that Mildred Bangs Wynkoop is correct in defining sin as 'love locked into a false center, the self,' and holiness as 'love locked into the True Center, Jesus Christ our Lord.'<sup>40</sup>

Also, like Wynkoop, he adheres to a Christological view of how the work of sanctification comes about in the heart of a believer. After quoting several authors and spending many pages discussing the redemptive work in sanctification, he said, "The conclusion to all this is that entire sanctification in the Wesleyan understanding is best spoken of in Christological terms."<sup>41</sup>



## J. KENNETH GRIDER

Grider, in his book *Entire Sanctification: The Distinctive Doctrine of Wesleyanism*, wrote about the debate concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit in entire sanctification. In the Preface he stated:

The Holiness movement has been different from John Wesley, particularly in identifying entire sanctification with a personal baptism of or with the Holy Spirit. I feel that in amending Mr. Wesley at this point, the holiness writers have been scriptural. I feel also that in doing this they have been following a Wesley tradition or style. Since he himself changed certain aspects of his entire sanctification teaching as he went along, adding numerous notations in later years which indicate how his understanding had changed, it might be more un-Wesleyan than Wesleyan to swallow him whole.<sup>42</sup>

The author in his book did not overemphasize the work of the Holy Spirit in the process of sanctification. He did, though, agree with holiness writers more so than Wesley on this issue. He comments,

Though John Wesley did not identify entire sanctification with a “baptism with the Holy Spirit,” he was clear on the matter that God cleanses us from original sin radically. He spoke of “love filling the heart, expelling pride, anger, desire, and self-will.”<sup>43</sup>

## LESLIE D. WILCOX

Wilcox was one of the leading scholars concerning sanctification in the conservative holiness movement. He stated his views in his book *Be Ye Holy*. In the preface he told primarily why he wrote the book. He stated:

The purpose is to set before the reader a systematic arrangement of the doctrine of holiness as it is found in the Word of God. Other books have very fully and adequately presented the doctrine theologically. There are also some books which present at least some of the Scripture foundation for the doctrine. But the writer knows of no book which systematically and fully presents the Scripture on which the doctrine of entire sanctification rests.<sup>44</sup>

It is evident from his book that he believed that sin is a substance to be removed and that the Holy Spirit is the Person of God to do the work in the heart of humanity. In Chapter Eight he wrote, “The necessity for cleansing arises from the fact that carnality still remains in the heart of a person who has been born again.”<sup>45</sup> Later on in the chapter he gives scriptures to show that original sin needs to be purified or purged.

In another place in the book Wilcox wholeheartedly supports the work of the Holy Spirit in one’s getting sanctified. He wrote, “But since the work of sanctification is the supreme work of the Spirit, He is often referred to by the title Holy Spirit used almost as a personal name.”<sup>46</sup>

### **DALE M. YOCUM**

Like Wilcox, Yocum was also a respected holiness scholar in the conservative movement. He was an articulate preacher as well as a scholarly writer. His books *The Holy Way* and *Fruit Unto Holiness* give a good representation of what Yocum taught about entire sanctification.

Yocum also believed that original sin needed to be purged. He wrote, “The baptism with the Holy Ghost brings purging...it is a cleansing from sin as well as an empowering for service.”<sup>47</sup>

### **SUMMARY**

As this review of doctrinal expressions of entire-sanctification has made clear, there have been several different methods for explaining the experience of Christian perfection. The doctrine as formulated by John Wesley stressed the work of Christ in perfecting Christian love through freedom from sin. Fletcher gave a greater role to the activity of the Holy Spirit in this perfecting. Traditional Methodist theologians had a tendency to follow Wesley, but within the holiness revival the activity of the Holy Spirit was emphasized. This focus on the Holy Spirit and accompanying pentecostal terminology was so readily accepted by those involved in the revival of holiness teaching that it became for many in the holiness movement an unofficial orthodoxy. Others, both inside and outside of the holiness movement, sought to maintain the older Wesleyan understanding or attempted to hold the Christological and pentecostal views in dynamic tension. Another area of distinction concerns the emphasis given to power

versus purity. Wesley had stressed purity, while many in the holiness movement saw power as a significant component in the experience of entire sanctification. It is interesting to note that the pentecostal view usually stresses spiritual power and the Christological approach is commonly associated with an accent on purity.

Recently, some theologians in holiness denominations have begun to use a relational understanding of sin. Such a change calls for a major re-conceptualization of the whole theological enterprise, including the doctrine of entire sanctification. Some in the holiness movement have viewed this philosophical change with alarm, holding that it undermines any satisfactory understanding of the experience of entire sanctification.

For this review it can be concluded that holiness theology has been and continues to be a dynamic enterprise. Therefore, there exists the potential for theological variation in the expressions of entire sanctification appearing in the *God's Revivalist*. A topology of expression can be developed containing a series of contrasting concept sets: Christological (purity) versus pentecostal (power), and sin as substantive versus sin as relational. These concept sets will be useful in the analysis of *God's Revivalist* articles referring to entire sanctification.

# CHAPTER 4

## METHODOLOGY

In this project selected articles appearing in the *God's Revivalist* within predetermined years have been examined to determine if their presentation of entire sanctification had changed theologically and to what degree the condition of the School has effected any of these changes in presentation.

### CRITERIA FOR ARTICLE SELECTION

The history of God's Bible School was examined to identify several time periods during which the college experienced both "good" and "difficult" years. It was determined that four time periods would be selected and that the time periods selected would be spaced to sufficiently cover the history of God's Bible School and the *God's Revivalist* to 1990. Each time period was arbitrarily established as a five-year segment. The time periods selected were 1906-1910, 1930-1934, 1956-1960, and 1980-1984. The years 1930-1934 and 1980-1984 were considered "good" ones at God's Bible School, and the periods 1906-1910 and 1956-1960 were "difficult."

From the articles appearing in the *God's Revivalist* during the selected time periods, only articles pertaining to entire sanctification were reviewed. Two hundred articles were found to meet this criteria. The treatment of entire sanctification in these articles form the primary data for this project.

The review of holiness literature reported in the chapter on theological context indicated the advisability of using four terms for understanding expressions of entire sanctification. Each article's conceptualization of entire sanctification was classified on its use of Christological versus pentecostal language and viewing sin as substantial or relational.

## INTERPRETIVE THEOLOGICAL GRID

To facilitate article classification, an analytic tool in the form of an interpretive theological grid was developed. A two-by-two grid (Table One) was created with the following four classes: Christological language/substantive sin; Christological language/relational sin; pentecostal language/substantive sin; pentecostal language/relational sin.

**TABLE ONE**

Interpretive Theological Grid

Christological Language/Substantive Sin	Christological Language/Relational Sin
Pentecostal Language/Substantive Sin	Pentecostal Language/Relational Sin

### DESCRIPTION OF THEOLOGICAL CATEGORIES

Not only was a grid developed, but a definitive description was written for each of the four categories identified in the holiness classification scheme. Scripture references and various authors were quoted to lend support to the different categories. The four categories are:

#### **1. CHRISTOLOGICAL LANGUAGE/SUBSTANTIVE SIN**

This view contends that sin is an existence, matter, material, being, or something that needs to be eradicated or removed. An analogy is often used, when talking about sin, as of a tree being taken out by the roots. Terms are also used, such as carnality, flesh, old man, evil heart, and the root of bitterness to describe the substance that needs to be removed redemptively from a person. In sanctification the heart is purified from this element of sin.

Likewise, this category concludes that when one is sanctified, this element of sin is removed by the power and blood of Christ. Various scriptures are

used to support this position. Ephesians 5:25-27 and Hebrews 10:14, 13:12 are used to support the atoning work of Christ as the provisional means of sanctification. I John 1:7 is used to teach that the blood of Christ is the efficacious means of sanctification or of cleansing from sin.

Proponents of this category would also say that the ultimate purpose of Jesus' ministry and death was for the sanctification of the church. The concept of "you in Christ and Christ in you" is greatly emphasized. Hebrews 13:12 is seen as the climactic verse of the whole book of Hebrews. "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (KJV). This is seen as the predominant reason for the suffering that Jesus did on the cross. The High Priestly prayer of Jesus is also considered significant in support of this view.

## **2. PENTECOSTAL LANGUAGE/SUBSTANTIVE SIN**

This view agrees with the Christological/Substantive understanding of original sin as an existence, matter.

The distinguishing feature of this view is its focus on the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of a sanctified believer. The characteristic of power is predominant in this view. The sanctified person has the power through the Holy Spirit to witness, live a victorious life, and be an effective member in the Kingdom of God.

Supporters of this view would say that the work of sanctification is supremely the work of the Holy Spirit. The Book of Acts is vitally important to the support of this category. Scholars holding to this position point to various passages throughout Acts to verify their claims. Emphasis is placed upon what took place at, during, and after Pentecost. These terms are used often: "receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," "filled with the Holy Ghost," "the Holy Ghost fell," "poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost," "baptized with the Holy Ghost," "giving them the Holy Ghost," and "the Holy Spirit is come upon you." These statements are used to state the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit.

### **3. CHRISTOLOGICAL LANGUAGE/RELATIONAL SIN**

This view agrees with the Christological/Substantive understanding of the predominant work of Christ in sanctification.

Relational is a term contrasted with substance in relationship to defining sin. The relational category views sin as not being something to remove but a relationship to God that needs correction. Wynkoop stated,

In order to make the proper distinction between the two dimensions of sin, commonly termed original sin and actual sin (or some such designation), it would be well to avoid any Platonic abstraction which is totally foreign to the Bible. The distinction in the Bible is an active spirit of “yielding,” or dedication to any center outside of God.<sup>1</sup>

Supporters of this category do not deny depravity, but they just define it differently. Depravity is seen as a moral state of the soul, not a substance within it. Miley stated, “The removal of all remnants of depravity would be entire sanctification, but the view is purely physical, and hence can afford no clearness of conception.”<sup>2</sup> Likewise, original sin is not a deeper-down or farther-back substance but a condition of the moral state of the soul.

### **4. PENTECOSTAL LANGUAGE/RELATIONAL SIN**

This view agrees with the Christological/Relational understanding of original sin as being a moral state of the soul, not a substance within to be renewed.

This view agrees with the Pentecostal/Substantive understanding of the predominant work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

## **ADEQUACY OF THEOLOGICAL GRID AS ANALYTIC TOOL**

To test the suitability of the grid, a number of holiness theological monographs were read and classified using the grid. Thirty-three works’ treatment of entire sanctification were read, and it was possible to assign

each to a classification. The majority were classified in the Pentecostal Language/Substantive Sin class (27). Three were assigned to the Christological Language/Relational Sin class, and two were placed in the Pentecostal/Relational Sin class. There was a single example of the Christological Language/Substantive Sin combination. More information on the text can be found in the appendices. The methodological importance of this text was that it demonstrated the usefulness of the grid for examining the theological content of presentations of entire sanctification.

## **GOD'S BIBLE SCHOOL'S CREEDAL STATEMENT**

The creedal statement held by God's Bible School is stated in its constitution and appears in the School's catalog. Paragraphs Four and Five of the creedal statement were of specific interest to this study. The School's commitment to holiness doctrine, including entire sanctification, is continued in Paragraph Four. Paragraph Five pertains to lifestyle issues which the School considers evidential of the experience of entire sanctification.

As far as can be determined, these paragraphs have remained constant throughout the history of God's Bible School. The administration and trustees of God's Bible School consider the creedal statement as the baseline for orthodoxy. Therefore, the creedal statement is, and has been, the defining definition of acceptable belief and practice for both the College and *God's Revivalist*. Thus, the creedal statement sets the parameters for the experience of the doctrine of entire sanctification in the *God's Revivalist*.

Paragraph Four of the creedal statement was examined, using the Interpretive Theological Grid. This analysis was to determine the degree to which the four possible expressions of entire sanctification would be considered permissible by the School's governing authorities. The reason for the analysis was to determine if one or more of the possible expressive categories is prohibited or otherwise viewed with sufficient disfavor as to insure it will not appear in *God's Revivalist*. The analysis considered the question: How do proponents of each of the four theological classifications interpret the creedal statement?



## ANALYSIS OF BEHAVIORAL AND APPEARANCE STANCE

A separate analysis of each selected article in *God's Revivalist* was conducted to determine its stance on behavior and appearance issues. For this analysis a single scale with two categories was used. The categories were rigoristic and contextual.

A rigoristic position was defined to represent the traditional holiness movement rejection of costly adornment, specific forms of entertainment (movies, gambling, television, sporting events, dancing, Sunday newspapers, etc.), the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage and tobacco, membership in oath-bound secret societies, divorce and remarriage, and secular labor on Sunday. A rigoristic view would support overt expressions of personal piety and expect a high degree of modesty in dress and behavior. A rigoristic position expects a literal interpretation and a strict enforcement of church rules.

A contextual view of these issues would support moderating the rigoristic view to permit greater personal freedom of expression and more individual use of Christian judgment about entertainment and personal adornment and place few expectations on Sunday observance. Divorced and/or remarried persons would be welcome into membership and, in some cases, leadership positions. The prohibitions on liquor and tobacco would be maintained, but with little enthusiasm. Church rules in a contextual view serve as guidelines rather than as legislation.

A separate analysis of Paragraph Five of the School's creedal statement was conducted to determine if it committed the institution and *God's Revivalist* to either a rigoristic or contextual stance.

## SEQUENCE OF ANALYSIS

The following steps formed the sequence of analysis for the project:

1. God's Bible School's creedal statement was examined to determine the range of permissible expression of entire sanctification (Paragraph Four) and to determine its stance, rigoristic or contextual, on behavioral and appearance issues.

2. The selected articles were classified according to the interpretive theological grid on their expression of entire sanctification and to determine their stance, rigoristic or contextual, on behavioral and appearance issues.
3. If variation, or change, of expression for the doctrine of entire sanctification or in behavioral and appearance issues was discovered in Step Two, the connection between the condition of the School and changes in expression or stance was explored.
4. Conclusions were developed concerning the expression of the doctrine of entire sanctification, both doctrinally and behaviorally, in *God's Revivalist*.

# CHAPTER 5

## DATA

This chapter reports on the data that was found in the two hundred articles that were selected for study. The chapter consists of four parts, each dealing with a five-year period. Every article was not referred to, but attention was given to the significant content found in the writings, as well as expressions and themes that consistently appeared in the articles.

## AN ANALYSIS OF GOD’S BIBLE SCHOOL’S

### HOLINESS CREEDAL STATEMENT

The holiness creedal statement held by God’s Bible School is stated in the 1991 school catalog. The four views found in the “holiness classification scheme” were applied in an interpretative way to the creedal statement. The statement in the catalog was written in a paragraph format. However, for convenience sake, I have divided the two paragraphs into five components. The parts will be listed in the same order as they are found in the following paragraphs.

- A.** We believe there is a second crisis in the provision of salvation whereby the person who has been justified may also be sanctified by faith.
- B.** We believe the experience of entire sanctification is wrought instantaneously by the baptism with the Holy Ghost.
- C.** We believe when sanctified, the heart of the believer is cleansed from all inner sin.
- D.** We believe that the evidence of this experience is not any supernatural gift, but an inner witness that the heart has been purified from sin.

**E.** We believe this experience of entire sanctification can only be maintained by a walk of obedience and faith.

The five components of the creedal statement were measured against each of the four positions developed in the Interpretive Theological Grid. The question considered is: How do the proponents of each of these four theological classifications interpret the five concepts of the creedal statement? The letters below will represent the creedal statements that are stated above.

## **1. CHRISTOLOGICAL LANGUAGE/SUBSTANTIVE SIN**

**A.** This view would agree that there is a need for a second work of grace. Of course, in sanctification, as in justification, this work of grace is primarily brought about by the power and blood of Christ.

**B.** Christ is seen as the primary agent in the experience of salvation. One is sanctified instantaneously, but by the blood of Christ. The Holy Spirit was sent to assist the Christian in everyday living, but not necessarily to bring about a definite work of grace such as sanctification.

**C.** This is a very important concept for this view. Since sin is viewed as an existence, matter, or substance to be removed, this point in the creedal statement is certainly significant. The heart is cleansed or purified from this substance called “sin” by the blood of Christ.

**D.** This statement is true. Sanctification is not necessarily evidenced by some supernatural gift, and there is an inner witness when the work has been done. However, the inner witness is brought about by the redemptive work of Christ. The concept of “us in Christ and Christ in us” should always be emphasized.

**E.** It is possible to lose one’s sanctified experience. A sanctified Christian should strive to follow Christ wholeheartedly. This means worshipping Him, reading His Word, and following His commands.

## 2. PENTECOSTAL LANGUAGE/SUBSTANTIVE SIN

- A.** This concept is true. Not only may every person be sanctified by faith, but every person who has been justified should be sanctified by faith through the Holy Ghost.
- B.** In this view a lot of emphasis is placed on the concept. In fact, this is probably the most important concept that is found in the creedal statement. The Book of Acts is a primary source for those supporters of this view. Attention is given to how the Holy Ghost was used at, during, and after Pentecost. The Holy Ghost is the Person of the Godhead who brings about the instantaneous work of sanctification.
- C.** Since sin is an entity that needs to be removed or eradicated, this concept is promoted earnestly. Every sanctified believer needs to know that the Holy Ghost has cleansed or purified his heart from all inner sin.
- D.** When someone gets sanctified, there may be some emotion exhibited; but there need not be some supernatural gift displayed to prove the work has been done. The inner witness from the Holy Ghost that the heart has been purified from sin is enough evidence for the believer. The Holy Ghost will witness to the work He does in sanctification to every believer.
- E.** There is a maintenance program for those who are sanctified. They must walk in faith and obedience to God and His Word and especially to the Holy Ghost. This is the Holy Ghost dispensation, and He will be faithful to prompt our hearts according to God's will for our lives.

## 3. CHRISTOLOGICAL LANGUAGE/RELATIONAL SIN

- A.** There is a need for a second work of grace and this work is primarily brought about by the power and blood of Christ.
- B.** The Holy Spirit was sent to assist the Christian in everyday living, but Christ is the primary agent to bring about the experience of sanctification.
- C.** This concept is not counted as important for those who believe that sin is relational as it would be for those who believe that sin is a

substance. Instead of sin being “cleansed” in sanctification, Christ in His redemptive power deals with the moral state of the soul. Our relationship to God which has been deprived by sin is corrected in the sanctifying work of Christ.

**D.** The demonstration of a supernatural gift is not necessary for one to prove that he is sanctified wholly. There is an inner witness or confirmation of the work that Christ does in sanctification. However, this inner witness is a response to a relationship being restored, not to a substance being removed.

**E.** In sanctification we experience a right relationship with God, but it takes some effort on our part to keep this relationship healthy and strong. We must submit and yield to Christ and His Word on a continued basis for us to keep this experience. If we do our part to follow Christ, His redemptive provision will always be sufficient to allow us to walk in a sanctified experience with Him.

#### **4. PENTECOSTAL LANGUAGE/RELATIONAL SIN**

**A.** Every justified believer can and should be sanctified by faith in the Holy Ghost.

**B.** The Holy Ghost is the Person of the Godhead Who brings about the instantaneous work of sanctification.

**C.** This concept is not counted as important for those who believe that sin is relational as it would be for those who assert that sin is a substance. Instead of sin being “cleansed” in sanctification, the Holy Ghost in His redemptive power deals with the moral state of the soul. Our relationship to God which has been deprived by sin is corrected in the sanctifying work of the Holy Ghost.

**D.** Sanctification is not necessarily evidenced by some supernatural gift, and there is an inner witness when the work has been done. The Holy Ghost is always faithful to witness to the believer when he is sanctified wholly. When a person experiences a right relationship with God he will certainly receive confirmation from the Holy Ghost. The witness is to our right moral state with God, not a cleansing from a “substance” called sin.

**E.** The Holy Ghost will be faithful in assisting the sanctified believer in his walk with God. Whenever some action or attitude hinders our spiritual journey and relationship with God, the Holy Ghost will be present to point out our fallacy and give us the grace and help to correct the problem. If we walk in faith and obedience to God’s Word and the Holy Ghost, then we can live a successful sanctified experience.

The rest of this chapter reports on the data found in the articles that were selected for this project.

## 1906-1910

### 1906

In January of 1906, George Watson wrote an article called “How Holiness Is Lost.” In the article Watson makes reference to what he called “primitive holiness.” The term “primitive holiness” was derived from the biblical story of Eve in the Garden of Eden before she fell into sin. Watson believed that we could learn from Eve how not to fall from grace. He said,

If we turn to Genesis 3:6, we find a condensed statement of the various consecutive steps in the downfall of our race. And if we have the description of the fall of one pure and holy person, it will furnish a Key to interpret the fall of other souls from purity.<sup>1</sup>

Watson believed there were six steps in Eve’s fall from “primitive holiness.” The steps were:

- (1) The woman saw the tree;
- (2) it was good for food;
- (3) it was pleasant to the eyes;
- (4) the perversion of reason;
- (5) the revolt of the will; and
- (6) the communicating of sin to others.

He made some interesting applications in Step Six. He taught that Eve watered down what God had said about the forbidden fruit and eventually convinced Adam to eat. Consequently, Watson wrote,

How many have fallen from holiness because they took the liberty to misquote the Lord and tone down the Word of God. Many a preacher has lost holiness, he hardly knew how, when the secret was that he took the liberty of changing and toning down the exact Bible truth on holiness in his sermons and testimony.<sup>2</sup>

At the end of the article he went on to warn the people not to follow in the same path that Eve took in losing her “primitive holiness” experience.

Another article written during 1906 was authored by A. M. Hills. It was called, “The Third Blessing.” Hills attempted to set the record straight on what it meant to be entirely sanctified. He said he got weary of people trying to juggle with Scripture to support their pet theories. G. Campbell Morgan was cited as an example. Hills stated,

Morgan, of England, wants to avoid the Second Blessing of Sanctification, so plainly taught by a hundred passages in the New Testament. He finds it convenient, therefore, to deny that any of the followers of Jesus were converted until Pentecost, and therefore there is no second blessing for him or anyone else.<sup>3</sup>

Another example Hills gave of people attempting to support their own ideas from Scripture was the concept of “The Third Blessing.” Proponents of this view taught that a Christian can experience the baptism with fire as a separate third work of grace.

So the author in this article endeavored to show that this doctrine was wrong. Hills commented,

The promise of the Holy Ghost and fire was given by John the Baptist to be fulfilled by Christ in the experience of His disciples. It was fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost. The filling of the Holy Spirit and the appearance of fire and the cleansing all came at the same time. There was not a third blessing about it. And those sanctified disciples whose hearts were cleansed by the Pentecostal baptisms, all had the fire.<sup>4</sup>



In July 1906, a testimonial was published about a lady getting sanctified and healed. Sarah Adams told in this writing about how for twenty-five years she fought holiness and tried to hinder others from getting the experience.

Ms. Adams acquired a sickness and was suffering with severe pain. It is interesting that she testified that God made her sick so she would get serious about seeking sanctification. She asked God to take away her pain so she could attend a two-week protracted holiness meeting in her community.

God did take most of the pain away and she eventually got sanctified at the meeting. After twenty-five years of not having the experience here is the climactic point of her testimony:

Glory to God! I am happy. I want to tell it to everybody, for God wants me to tell it. I had a chronic sore limb, but God has nearly healed it, and I believe He will heal it entirely. My lungs are as strong as ever. I can sing and shout and praise God aloud. I can sleep and rest as sweetly as a baby.<sup>5</sup>

It is interesting to note the connection between holiness and healing in the testimony. The themes of entire sanctification and healing were frequently joined together by holiness evangelists.<sup>6</sup>

## 1907

There were several articles this year in the *Revivalist* about holiness producing power in the life of the Christian. The message was given that if someone is sanctified there will certainly be a change in their life. There will be power to live a victorious life over sin and to see others brought to Christ.

In February of 1907, an article was written called “Holiness a Thing of Power.” R. V. L. tells about a lady starting a meeting for holiness in her home. Several people got sanctified as a result of these house meetings. The power of the Holy Spirit spread to the local church where forty to fifty people were converted to God.

R. V. L. gave a perspective of what Holy Ghost power will do:

If you are afraid of fire, you had better extinguish the meeting of holiness – at least throw a wet blanket upon it and smother it down. If not suppressed, all the spiritual incendiaries of the neighborhood will gather in there, and something will happen. Somebody will be sanctified and several somebodies will be convicted and converted. But of one thing be sure – Holiness is a thing of Power. It will melt and charm and break hearts. It will attract and drive, subdue and elevate, awaken and soothe. Power in the church! we need it. Of machinery there is no lack.<sup>7</sup>

E. A. Fergerson wrote another article concerning the source of the Holy Spirit. He based his article from Acts 1:7. This article focused on the aspect of a Holy Spirit-filled person not being worldly. Fergerson said,

The Holy Spirit coming upon you will give you power to live right, power to stem the tide of worldliness and go up stream, power to stand in the minority, and though the odds are against you, you will go through with God.<sup>8</sup>

This author got very specific in what he meant by worldliness. He says if people really get the Holy Ghost,

Church members would have to quit renting buildings for saloons and scarlet sin purposes. Sabbath desecration would be thundered against until people would begin to have some conscience along that line. People will welcome preaching against dancing, card playing, theatre going, and ball games of all kinds.<sup>9</sup>

Also, in 1907 John Butler wrote an article about the Holy Ghost simply called “In Power.” Butler certainly believes in the power of the Spirit in sanctification, but in this article he emphasized the work of the Spirit before the second work of grace. He contended that some people come to get sanctified and what they need is to be justified. A sanctified Christian has power; but Butler wrote,

When we let the POWER of God into our souls, He will uncover all our past life, and make us forsake all our sins. I want to say that when a man gets under conviction he quits the sin business. Sanctification does not separate you from the world.<sup>10</sup>

During this year Oswald Chambers wrote several articles about holiness in the *God's Revivalist*. In fact, he was the predominant author about this subject in the year 1908.

In February Chambers wrote an article called "The Greatest Work in the World." He gave some admonition concerning this great work of holiness. First, that the readers should be aware of the school of thought that teaches sin or holiness or love in the abstract. "All popular holiness talk about getting into the Blessing and out of the Blessing simply arises from one of two causes; either disgraceful ignorance of the Word of God, or undue emphasis being given to states of feeling,"<sup>11</sup> stated Chambers.

Secondly, Chambers reminded the reader that the way to holiness is a simple way. He thought that people try to make the way to God in His fullness too difficult. He wrote,

The way of God is so simple that a wayfaring man or a fool cannot err therein; and it is perfectly certain that until a man becomes a fool in his own eyes, he will never find God's way.<sup>12</sup>

A follow-up article was written by Chambers entitled, "The Greatest Thing in the World." The main focal point of this writing was that holiness is the ultimate reason of why God provided atonement for humanity. In essence he said that being justified is not enough. The blood of Christ does not only provide forgiveness of sins, but also a holy heart.

Chambers really does not give Christians an option. He really believed that without holiness no one shall see the Lord. He declared:

To confine justification and holiness by making them either the same thing with different names, or by entirely separating them and making one the act of the grace of God, and the other the process of man's obedience, is to fall into thoroughly unchristian errors. Justification is the means to holiness, and to stop at one without the other is to annul both. Our Lord's work produces the greatest fact on earth – a saint; i.e., a holy man or woman.<sup>13</sup>

In 1908 Chambers wrote two more lengthy articles about holiness for the *God's Revivalist*. One was called "Entire Sanctification" and the other was titled "Have You Been Unselfed?"

In "Entire Sanctification" Chambers made some fascinating statements. In the first place the author evidently thought that most Christians never reach the state of entire sanctification. He insinuated this when he said,

Three times I have said already, and I am going to say it again. If five people – not one more than that number, – get right straight through to entire sanctification, blessed be God, who could measure the possibilities?<sup>14</sup>

Along with this he felt that if someone really did get sanctified it was nearly impossible for them to backslide. It could happen, but not very frequently.

Secondly, Chambers did not have much patience with those who were always struggling with temptation. He contended that those who were sanctified did not have to battle with being tempted. He commented:

We make our own destinies. We make our own callings. Men and women have no right to be continually battling with temptations. They should go higher, go deeper into God. You are to blame for the thing that is tempting or tormenting you. Go higher, or deeper. Get where God wants you to be.<sup>15</sup>

The article "Have You Been Unselfed?" was written later in the year. Chambers discussed the life of Judas and how he betrayed Jesus. He thought that Judas primarily betrayed Christ because he was never totally committed to Christ. Consequently, there is a lot of discussion in the article about the need to have double-mindedness and self-centeredness eradicated. Wrote Chambers:

The first record ever made of the disciples and apostles in the New Testament brands Judas as the one who betrayed Jesus. White-wash him if you like, but you slap Jesus in the face. The real enemies of the Cross of Christ are not the poor fallen people in the streets, but those who preach holiness, who testify to entire sanctification, who admire Jesus, but never let Him eradicate the

old self-centered disposition inside. Oh, may you let God have his way and eradicate that thing.<sup>16</sup>

## 1909

There were four articles published in 1909 about holiness that were authored by very influential men. The *God's Revivalist* published work written by John Wesley, Samuel Brengle, Martin Knapp, and Oswald Chambers.

The article by Knapp, "The Pentecostal Church," and the one by Chambers, "Spirit-Baptized Humanity," both focused on how the Holy Spirit can change a person through the work of entire sanctification.

Knapp, in his article, said a person that is a part of the Pentecostal church, who has been filled with the Holy Spirit, will be unworldly, sanctified, faithful, and subject to Christ in all they do. Here are a couple of key points that Knapp makes in his writing:

If men must graduate at West Point to officer an army, how much more must they graduate at the Pentecostal chamber for the more arduous work of officering Christ's Church...when you place an unsaved man on your Board because he is shrewd or influential or wealthy, and set aside men and women full of the Spirit, you insult the Holy Ghost, and advertise to all worlds that you think yourself wiser than God.<sup>17</sup>

Oswald Chambers started his article by asking, "Have you ever been baptized with the Spirit?" He proceeded to tell why one needs to be filled with the Holy Spirit. This is a summary of the whole article:

The enthusiasm for Humanity is one thing; and it is not the New Testament enthusiasm. The working for the brotherhood of natural man is not the passion of the New Testament. But the enthusiasm of the New Testament is the enthusiasm for Spirit-Baptized Humanity which is designed to embrace all the sons of natural Humanity. This is what is needed – this Spirit baptism, baptized with the Holy Spirit and fire.<sup>18</sup>

As indicated earlier, the editor published a writing by John Wesley entitled “Fruits of Perfect Love.” He said too many Christians are found wanting in gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, and temperance. Wesley admonished those lacking in these areas not to become discouraged but to continue to seek God in His fullness. He concluded those lacking in these “fruits” needed to go on to perfection.

Another significant article published during 1909 was authored by Samuel Logan Brengle. It was called “Confessing to Holiness.” He tells how he struggled in obtaining holiness, but how joyous he felt when he received the blessing. Here is what happened:

On the following Tuesday morning, just after rising, with a heart full of eager desire for God, I read these words of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus: “I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth on Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and he that liveth and believeth on Me shall never die. Believeth thou this?” The Holy Ghost, the other Comforter, was in those words, and in an instant my soul melted before the Lord like wax before fire, and I knew Jesus.<sup>19</sup>

## 1910

George D. Watson dominated the writing about holiness during this year of the *God’s Revivalist*. He wrote six main articles called “Obstructions to Growth,” “As I Have Loved You,” “The Gift of Wisdom,” “Three Portraits,” “Forms of the Carnal Mind,” and “Growing in Love.”

In “As I Have Loved You,” Watson talked about natural and supernatural, human and divine love. He made an interesting point about the love of God being made sure in the life of the Christian. Watson wrote:

A pure heart, instead of being the highest, is really the lowest stage of Christian perfection. We are now just prepared for real Christian living and service. It is infancy; we are sanctified infants. The STALWART boldness and heroic virtue of Peter and the martyrs have not yet been developed.<sup>20</sup>

The “Three Portraits” is actually a sermon preached by Dr. G. D. Watson in June of 1910. The “Three Portraits” he identifies were:

- (1) the initial Christian who has the first principles of salvation;
- (2) the Perfect believer who has all the elements of Christian perfection; and
- (3) the Apostate who turns away from Christ and denies that Christ and salvation are realities.

Watson viewed the initial Christian on one extreme and the apostate person on the other extreme. He considered the perfect believer in Jesus to be in the middle of the continuum. He basically summed up Christian perfection as constituting at least five things:

First he is enlightened; Second, he tastes the Heavenly Gift; Third, he is a partaker of the Holy Ghost; Fourth, he tastes the good Work of God; and Fifth, he realizes the powers of the age to come.<sup>21</sup>

## 1930-1934

### 1930

There were five articles published in 1930 that provide a good representation of the holiness message that was presented in the *God's Revivalist* that year. For the most part, they all addressed different aspects of the doctrine, but they collectively proclaimed with precision the message of entire sanctification.

In June the editor published an article by J. A. Huffman called "Results of the Pentecostal Experience." Huffman made it clear that Pentecost had an effect upon the lives of people that were involved in this special visitation by God. He warned that we should not just focus on the doctrinal aspect of sanctification but that there was also a practical dimension to this experience. He wrote,

Since the people of Pentecost were real people, living in a real world, and were very much like ourselves, if we can discover what the Pentecostal experience did for them, we may be able to draw

some conclusions as to what the Pentecostal experience should do for men and women today.<sup>22</sup>

An article called “Radical Holiness” appeared in the July issue of the *God’s Revivalist*. In this writing J. B. Chapman wrote about having a proper view of what radical holiness really means. Chapman points out that being radical pertains to more than what a person wears, where they go or do not go, or what kind of literature they read. He does think that these items deserve some attention in a holiness person’s life, but that they are secondary issues to the Christians. He commented,

Of course, eating and drinking and wearing clothes and reading printed matter and other employments of talent and time are included in every person’s living, and are, therefore, affected by his heart condition. But the man is greater than his manner; and deeds are products, not creators.<sup>23</sup>

The author was concerned that too many times the world has viewed the church as being radical for what they do not do instead of what they have experienced in entire sanctification.

Chapman believed that if one were radical, he was also peculiar. In fact, he said that holy people are radically peculiar. Here are some of the radical peculiarities he suggested:

They are peculiar in that they have been delivered from the love of self and have been given grace to pour out their lives for the good of others. They are peculiar in that they have been purged from all inbred sin and filled with the Holy Ghost. They are peculiar in that the power of sin over them has been broken and the pollution of sin cleansed away, and they are enabled to live above sin every day and to serve God in Holiness and righteousness.<sup>24</sup>

This is what he meant by “radical holiness.”

E. E. Shelhammer wrote an article that year called “Steps in Seeking Holiness.” He taught that one needs to seek sanctification as he would if he were seeking to be saved. “In seeking pardon or purity the steps are the same, the only difference being that when seeking pardon we deal with



actual sins, while when seeking purity we deal with the hidden principle of sin.”<sup>25</sup>

He said there were four steps that one was to go through when seeking either to be saved or sanctified. The steps were conviction, confession, crucifixion, and co-operating faith. Shelhammer gave testimony that this method works. “The Holy Ghost took me through step by step until I came to the end of myself, when the death stroke was given and the clear witness received that the precious Blood did ‘now’ cleanse from all sin. Oh, praise His name!”<sup>26</sup>

J. A. Huffman wrote another article that year called “Were the Disciples Sanctified at Pentecost?” He said there were three main theories concerning that issue. First, the disciples were not converted until Pentecost. This theory does away with the need for a second work of grace (sanctification). A second theory says that the disciples were sanctified before Pentecost. This theory causes people to seek for some kind of a third experience which Pentecost would represent. The third theory is the one that Huffman believed to be scriptural and right. He wrote,

The third theory is that the disciples were saved before Pentecost, that they were sanctified and baptized with the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and that their experiences may be considered as normal and, as such, as examples of what may be expected of normal Christian experiences in the dispensation of the Holy Spirit in which we live.<sup>27</sup>

The last article for our consideration in 1930 was written by a previously mentioned author, J. B. Chapman. His writing was titled “Holiness and Conversation.” By conversation he meant more than conduct. He was making specific reference to the language and words that holiness people should use and not use. Chapman challenged holiness people to be selective in the words they use, and he reminded his readers that they will eventually be judged by the words they say. A contrast was given between unholy and holy talk:

Only pure words can consistently proceed from a pure heart so let us examine our own conversation in the light of such a standard. Certainly this will rule out profanity and bywords and coarse

slang. It will rule out slander and backbiting and the spreading of evil surmises. It will rule out levity and excessive talkativeness, and the tendency to be a busybody.

On the other hand, from a pure heart as the fountain, there must certainly spring up praise to God for His goodness and mercy, so that public and personal testimony will be a delight. Also, there must certainly spring up wholesome words of warning against sin and the judgment of God.<sup>28</sup>

## 1931

There were eleven articles written about holiness in 1931. Five of the eleven articles offered some unique perspectives concerning the doctrine of holiness. Also, the themes of perfection and spiritual growth were predominant in several of these articles.

One of the five articles was by Tony Anderson called “The Perfect Man.” The premise for this article was taken from Psalm 37:37 where it says to “Mark the perfect man.” The first thing that Anderson pointed out was that there are some “perfect” saints on earth. He wondered why the unchurched people always want to point to the hypocrites in the church instead of the perfect saintly people.

He said the perfect saint has at least five characteristics. The person was upright, meek, just, and righteous. How did Anderson define perfection besides these four characteristics? He wrote,

A perfect man has a holy heart, and shows it by a holy life. The kind of perfection that God gives is perfected Holiness. Holiness is sinlessness. When one is made free from sin he is up to the standard of Christian perfection. In this respect he is like Christ. Sin is imperfection. No man is perfect who is deformed in soul by sin.<sup>29</sup> Another article was written that year called “Progressive Christians.” Hebrews 10:38 is used as a starting point for this article: “The just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him” (KJV). The author gave a great illustration to reflect upon this verse,

One who stops progressing in his Christian experience and living is like one riding a bicycle – to stop is to fall off! There must be constant advancement to maintain faith.<sup>30</sup>

As in the last article, this author admonished his readers to go on to perfection. He believed that Christians should always be making spiritual progress, but especially into perfection.

The word “perfection” seems to be a rather abused word when it is applied to Christian experience, but it appears one hundred and one times in the Word of God and therefore must have some importance in the experience of a Christian. What was the perfection that was meant? It was not angelic perfection, Adamic perfection or glorified perfection as spoken of in Philippians 3:12 but it was perfection that Paul said, in Philippians 3:15, could be attained. It is an experience into which God’s children may enter by the Holy Spirit coming into the heart and cleansing it from all its defilement and filling it with perfect love.<sup>31</sup>

In July an anonymous author penned a piece called, “The Second Coming and Holiness.” The author reminded the readers that they should always be looking for the return of Christ to the earth. In fact, he said that Christians should be praying for Christ to return to gather home the saints of God.

Another point was made concerning who will be ready for the return of Christ. The author indicated that only those who were sanctified will be ready for the Lord’s return. “The entire sanctification of spirit, soul and body is “unto” the coming, that is, for the coming. This implies that we will not be ready for the glorious manifestation of our Lord unless we are thus sanctified,”<sup>32</sup> said the writer. The author went on to admonish everyone to make sure they were sanctified so they would be ready for Christ to return.

J. A. Huffman wrote an article called “The Holy Spirit’s Relation to Sanctification.” The author established the premise for this article by reminding the reader that they were living in the Holy Spirit’s dispensation. Huffman made the analogy of someone dying and leaving an estate. He said,

Jesus Christ is the deceased who left the estate...the Holy Spirit, then, is the agent of pardon, for pardon or forgiveness is a stipulated provision in the atonement, note from Ephesians 1:7 and Colossians 1:14. The Holy Spirit is also the agent of sanctification, for it, too, is a stipulated provision in the atonement (Hebrews 13:12; Ephesians 5:25-27).<sup>33</sup>

The theme of growth in the sanctified life was also found in this article. The writer strongly believed that sanctification happened instantaneously in the life of the believer, but that there was also a daily growth factor in the holiness life. He commented,

The growth side of sanctification, however, needs to be emphasized. Too many there are who, having attained to the experience of sanctification, mistakenly suppose that they are now in possession of the whole thing, and fold their arms in ease or inactivity, and wither away.<sup>34</sup>

A. M. Hills wrote an article that year called “Snowflake Religion.” He said that snow is not as clean as it looks. There is a lot of dirt and debris scattered throughout the composition of snow. Even snowflakes themselves are dirty, although it is not always visible to the naked eye.

An analogy was made to those Christians who were regenerated but not yet sanctified. They may have looked and acted clean, but they still had the dirt of the carnal nature that needed to be purified. He finished the article with a ray of hope:

The soot can be gotten out of the snowflakes, and the corruption out of man. The snow can be melted in a retort, and the water boiled into steam, and the vapour congealed again into pure snow. It is done by fire. So Christ, the Refiner, with the Holy Spirit fire can melt our hearts and leave in us the gold of holy hearts.<sup>35</sup>

## 1932

There were four articles that were published during 1932 that deserve our attention. They were written by Joseph H. Smith, John A. Duryea, A. M. Hills, and Charles H. Stalker. Three of the four articles put a significant amount of emphasis upon the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

In January an article was printed by Smith called “Purity and Progress.” The author challenged his readers to start seeking for holiness immediately after conversion. He thought that there was never any virtue in procrastination concerning spiritual matters. He said,

Heart purity is not to be expected as an end of progress, but it is to be sought at once (if even an operation should be necessary) in order to ensure the soul’s progress. As we do not wait for the growth of the flowers to kill off the weeds, so the root of bitterness must be eradicated from our hearts to insure the budding and the bloom of the Rose of Sharon and the Lily of the Valley there.<sup>36</sup>

Later in the article Smith said that heart purity insured spiritual progress in at least three ways:

- (1) by perfecting our vision;
- (2) by stripping us of every weight that would hinder our ascent;
- (3) by inhabitation of the Spirit. He put a lot of focus on the Holy Spirit when he wrote,

The pure in heart are never without His presence. He supplies ever-expanding vistas, ever-enriching love, and ever-empowering energy for the pursuit, the pleasure, and the performance of the ever-enlarging life in Christ.<sup>37</sup>

“Peter’s Fiery Baptism” is an article written by John Duryea. In this writing Duryea contrasted the life of Peter before and after the experience of Pentecost as recorded in the Book of Acts. It was pointed out how Peter denied knowing and serving Christ, and how later Peter asked forgiveness from Christ and was eventually baptized by the fire of the Holy Ghost. Duryea believed that the Pentecostal experience stabilized Peter for life. Here was what the Holy Spirit fire did:

The fire of Pentecost changed Peter to such an extent that we find there was no more fluctuation in his experience and life and when the final test came and he was to be crucified, he did not flinch but requested that he be crucified head downward, feeling he was not worthy to be crucified as his Lord.<sup>38</sup>

An article appeared in June and it talked about “God’s Standard of Holiness.” A. M. Hills quickly told his audience what God’s standard was:

God has revealed Himself as our Father. He has us in training for the skies, and plans to live with us in His palace forever. He tells us that no sin can ever cast a shadow on that holy place, and “without holiness no man shall see the Lord.” Holiness in the soul of the believer is necessitated by His holiness. He could not be himself and demand less, and be a holy soul.<sup>39</sup>

Hills reminded his readers that as sanctified believers they were to live holy, be perfect, walk as Christ walked without sin, be not of the world, do greater works than Christ did, and to love as He loved. In his conclusion he made a final plea:

The demonstration is complete. The standard is God’s, not mine. O brothers and sisters in Christ, seek the sanctifying grace! Do not face the fate of those who reject the light and grope in darkness without Christ and without the Spirit, and end at last in eternal light!<sup>40</sup>

Like the first two 1932 articles discussed, the last article also stressed the work of the Holy Spirit. In fact, the piece is called, “A Man Filled with the Holy Ghost.” Stalker started the writing by reminding the people that if they did not have the Holy Spirit in His fullness it was their own fault. He said the Holy Spirit would not come in His fullness to anyone that would not pay the full price of self surrender.

Stalker also said there were three main characteristics about the person filled with the Holy Ghost:

- (1) they carry comfort;
- (2) they see things that other people do not see;
- (3) they say things that nobody else says. He said there were no other words that can comfort like the words of a sanctified Christian. Also, that a person filled with the Holy Ghost saw victory wherever they were and were bold in speaking the truth even if it cost them their head.

Here were a few sentences he used to summarize his thoughts about the work of the Holy Ghost:

A man filled with the Holy Ghost is not filled with a lot of inventions, not filled with a lot of ideas, not filled with a lot of contradiction, not filled with a lot of boasting in his education, not filled with a lot of stuff handed down. I wonder how many of you could be chosen as men full of the Holy Ghost, or as a woman full of the Holy Ghost.<sup>41</sup>

### 1933

This year Samuel Brengle, Andrew Johnson, and Joseph Smith wrote for the *Revivalist*. These men all wrote articles that talked about different aspects of the doctrine of holiness, yet they all attempted to share the goodness of sanctification.

In January an article was printed by Brengle called “Hallelujah.” In this writing Brengle talked about his personal experience of getting sanctified. Brengle told the readers that for several years he had sought the blessing. He said he would have peace for awhile and then would fall back into doubt and despair. Finally, on January 9, 1885, at 9 o’clock, sitting at his study table in Boston, he got the real blessing.

There were several things that happened that caused Brengle to seek holiness:

I was a student of theology in Boston University, and had been stirred again to seek the blessing through the testimony of a fellow student, one of the quietest and least noticed students there, but whose testimony was clear and definite. Then Mr. Moody came to the city and preached a sermon on the baptism with the Holy Spirit that opened up a whole unknown realm of experience to me which made me very hungry. Then one of the professors gave a classroom lecture on the doctrine and experience of Christian Perfection which sent me out of the classroom with a heart really groaning after the experience.<sup>42</sup>

The groaning after holiness continued for Brengle. There were at least two more things that caused Brengle to seek God in His fulness. First, he read a

book called *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*. Secondly, he and a friend met one hour a day to pray, seek, and to confess their faults one to another until they obtained the blessing. These activities, aided by the Holy Spirit, eventually brought Brengle into the light of the second work of grace.

It was interesting what Brengle had to confess in order to get the blessing. He told his readers:

I was a student pastor in the city, and some time before I had taken the outline of one of Finney's sermons, and while I had filled in the outline with my own thoughts and material, yet I felt I had not "ministered as of the ability which God gave" me, and it was as though I had been caught stealing. Would I confess it? This led to the final struggle and crucifixion of self.<sup>43</sup>

Andrew Johnson in the March issue had a piece called "Growth in Grace." He observed that holiness people have a tendency to disregard this idea of growth in grace after sanctification. He gave the reason why he thought this took place:

Years ago the holiness teachers and preachers had to refute what is known as the "Growth Theory" of entire sanctification. They did not oppose growth in grace as such, but stoutly contended that people could not grow into sanctification.<sup>44</sup>

Johnson answered the question, What is growth in grace? He wrote, "It is improvement, progress, advancement, development. It is necessary because we are still in a state of immaturity even after we are sanctified. In entire sanctification we gain purity, but not maturity."<sup>45</sup>

He said that there were four proofs that one was growing in grace. They were

- (1) increasing in spiritual discernment;
- (2) having more successful resistance to temptation;
- (3) having greater patience under affliction;
- (4) having a more exact performance of duty.



In April, Joseph Smith wrote a short but significant article called “Holiness Flourishes in Humility.” He went to Romans Chapter 12 to prove his point:

In that classic on consecration and a holy life (Romans 12) we find three injunctions to the lowly mind: Concerning our gifts and attainments, “to not think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think” (v. 3). Among our brethren, “In honor preferring one another” (v. 10). As to our social and literacy ambitions, to “mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate,” and “Be not wise in your own conceits” (v. 16).<sup>46</sup>

He concluded that the world was opposite of this philosophy. The sinner promotes self by seeking high places of power in a fashionable society, but the sanctified Christian puts God first, others second, and self last.

## 1934

Buddie Robinson, George Ridout, and E. E. Shelhammer were all authors that wrote in 1934 for the *God’s Revivalist*. “Two Works of Grace” was authored by Robinson, and it was the first article about holiness to appear in 1934. Throughout this writing he used several scripture references to prove the Bible teaches holiness. His first choice of scripture to focus on this subject was James 4:8: “Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; purify your hearts, ye double minded” (KJV).

Even though Robinson strongly believed in the second work of grace, he said there was something that all sanctified Christian should remember, that they would still be tempted. He wrote:

Brother, the blessing of Holiness does not kill the devil. It kills the old man, but the devil never gives you up. Since I was converted and sanctified (I have been in the experience of holiness for a little over forty years) there has not been a day when the devil has not fought me. Why, brethren, the Israelites never did kill kings until they got into Canaan. They fought ordinary men back in the wilderness. When they got into Canaan they fought men ten and one-half feet high.<sup>47</sup>

George Ridout wrote an article titled “God’s Skies Are Full of Pentecosts.” Ridout stated that Pentecost was Christ’s greatest gift to the Church. He was concerned, however, that the church of his day was not taking full advantage of the results of Pentecost. The advantage of Pentecost for Ridout was

...a promise fulfilled, a prayer answered, a vision realized, a power bestowed, a fire kindled, an energy set free, a current set in motion, a river set flowing, a Spirit sent forth, a new song, and joy to the church, and power victorious.<sup>48</sup>

Shelhammer wrote a short article called “Three Grades of Sin.” The three kinds of sin were unbelief, evil-speaking, and prejudice or prejudging.

The author mentioned the first two sins but spent a lot of time dealing with the third sin. He focused on two groups of people, those prejudiced against the holiness people and holiness people prejudiced against other religious groups. Shelhammer wrote:

Multitudes of good people are biased against the doctrine of holiness, and against holiness people, to their own hurt. Even that beautiful, uncrowned queen, Frances Willard, deplored on her deathbed that she had lived beneath her privilege because she had listened to a bishop and allowed herself to pull off in spirit from the early Free Methodists on account of their plainness and views of Entire Sanctification. Again, many fine holiness people are prejudiced against all except their own little crowd, and as a result remain undeveloped and unused to the fullest extent. Does any one branch of God’s people hold and control all essential truth? Some of us seem to think so; hence, in sincerity cast our lot with it. Very well; this may be proper, providing we do not become sectarian and erosive toward others.<sup>49</sup>

## 1956-1960

### 1956

There were three articles that deserved our attention for this year. They were authored by E. W. Lawrence, M. L. Peterson, and Fannie Erb.

In April Lawrence wrote an article entitled “Entire Sanctification by Faith.” He started the writing by reaffirming the fact that God provided redemptively on Calvary for people to receive sanctification. Lawrence stated:

But God’s redemptive plan provides for much more than the mere forgiveness of the penitent, as Paul declared, first of all to the elders of Ephesus, then to Herod Agrippa, and finally to us today, every believer can enter into his inheritance of entire sanctification.<sup>50</sup>

The main position of the article was testimonies from various Christians telling about how they had experienced the deeper spiritual life. Lawrence gave testimonies he had collected given by Daniel Steele, George Mueller, and Evan Roberts.

He said this about Steele:

Dr. Daniel Steele said he made the discovery that he was living in a pre-pentecostal state of spiritual experience. He paid special attention to the Gospel of John and the Pauline Epistles, and God spoke to him...He also said that it was partly as a result of the ministry of the American Baptist revivalist, A. B. Earle, that he “discovered that it was the fullness of the Holy Spirit enjoyed as an abiding blessing,” that explained the successful life and work of those early disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>51</sup>

The comments about Mueller were given this way:

George Mueller would never have expressed the experience in Wesleyan Terminology; but there is not an atom of doubt that he lived the fully sanctified life. When someone asked him for the “secret” of his life and ministry, and the remarkable growth of the

work in Bristol, he said it was that one day he died, utterly died to sin and to self.<sup>52</sup>

Evan Roberts was a key person that God used in the revival that took place in Wales. Lawrence wrote:

For years Roberts had attended meetings, when one day an evangelist petitioned the Lord to bend his congregation. Here are Roberts' own words: "The Spirit seemed to say to me, 'This is what you need, to be bent' ...I prayed that God would bend me...Suddenly the glory broke...After I was bent, a wave of peace came over me, and the audience begun [sic] to sing...Henceforth the burden of souls became the burden of my heart. From that time I was on fire with a desire to go through Wales and, if possible, I was willing to pay God for the privilege of going."<sup>53</sup>

In August of 1956 Peterson wrote an article called "True Holiness." He pointed out that the doctrine of holiness has always had both its friends and enemies. He commented,

It is unfortunate but true that many enemies have been negative to this sacred theme and glorious experience because of two factors in particular – misinterpretation and misrepresentation. If the devil cannot get a person to completely backslide, he will try to get him to believing in and practicing a "false" holiness, and thus keep him from enjoying an experience of true holiness.<sup>54</sup>

The author believed there were at least seven characteristics of true holiness. Someone that has experienced true holiness would have inward righteousness, outward uprightness, a temper that has been tempered, firmness of purpose, due regard for the Holy Spirit, tenderness of spirit, and a charitable attitude with their fellowmen.

This is how the writing was summed up:

As one studies the Bible he is made to realize that holiness means much more than to stop using tobacco, stop going to worldly places of amusements, stop following the fashion parade, stop swearing, stop desecrating God's holy day, etc. While it will cover all such things, yet the grace of holiness penetrates deeper, and

invades the realm of our affections, our ambitions, our motives, our dispositions, etc. These will often be reflected in our temperament and seen in our eyes, heard in our voice, and even felt in a handshake.<sup>55</sup>

The third article for our consideration was an interesting piece called “Holiness Is Not an Appendage.” Mrs. Erb was worried that too many times the holiness message is neglected in the ministry and in the churches. She observed that the devil hated holiness and he would do everything in his power to see the message squelched. Here was her advice to all of the holiness preachers:

It requires a high state of grace and spiritual life and power for a minister to preach holiness definitely and persistently; and any preacher who is concerned about his spiritual status needs only to take note of how much he preaches holiness as a definite, second work of grace. If he presents it only once or twice a year, he had better suspect backsliding and lukewarmness, and in real repentance get back to God; then consecrate, and get sanctified, filled with the Holy Ghost.<sup>56</sup>

She solidified her point by quoting from Francis Asbury, an early bishop in the American Methodist church. He stated, “I am divinely impressed with a charge to preach sanctification in every sermon!”<sup>57</sup> Later, on his deathbed he said, “I have endeavored to preach holiness faithfully: but if I had my life to live over again, I would preach it still more persistently.”<sup>58</sup>

## 1957

There were three sermons about holiness that were printed in the *God’s Revivalist* during this year. They were preached by J. P. Trueblood, Millard Downing, and H. E. Schmul. All three of these sermons were delivered at the God’s Bible School Chapel.

Trueblood’s sermon was printed first in 1957 and it was titled, “The Gifts of the Spirit.” His scripture text was 1 Corinthians 12:7-11.

In the beginning of the sermon, a distinction was made between the Holy Spirit in the life of the Christian and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. He preached:

But not every Christian has the gifts of the Spirit. The gifts have nothing to do with our personal salvation. The normal place for these gifts is with the Spirit-filled, the wholly sanctified. But now and then people who are only regenerated may have them....Let us keep in mind that the supernatural gifts belong to God, and He divides them to whom and upon whom He pleases.<sup>59</sup>

In this sermon, there was also an interesting explanation given to what 1 Corinthians 1:2 meant when it said, “To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints” (KJV). Trueblood told the difference between experiential and provisional sanctification when he spoke:

That is the way it is with a converted person. He is sanctified in Christ Jesus: he is not experientially sanctified; but he is provisionally sanctified until he gets light on holiness. Should he die without having had light on holiness, of course he would go to Heaven. He could not go to Hell; there is no place for a regenerated person in Hell. The blood of Christ atones for his carnality as it atones for the carnality in my little child. But when he gets light on holiness as a second experience, he will either walk in the light and be sanctified experientially, or he will backslide and lose his justification.<sup>60</sup>

Downing preached a sermon called “Sanctification – a Second Work of Grace” during the mid-year revival, and it was later printed in the *God’s Revivalist*. John, Chapter Seventeen, was the main text used for this message.

Even though Downing read several verses to begin his sermon, it was not an expositional sermon. In fact, he discussed several topics in the address. One thing he identified was those that should not be seeking to be sanctified until they first had gotten saved. He preached,

In some holiness churches, and I am afraid even in some Bible schools, after a message on sanctification, down the aisle may come a character, popping...[her] chewing gum, who looks as though she might have just come from the circus. She has a beauty parlor head and discolored lips and cheeks and nails. She has clearance lights in her ears, and pearl chokers around her neck. Her dress has low

neck, no back, and no sleeves. She wears no hose, and only two or three straps across her feet for shoes ....This woman we have mentioned gets down on one knee at the mourner's bench...a Christian worker kneels down before her and prays. After a while, she looks up at the worker who tries to help her, pops her chewing gum a couple of times, and says, "Oh, I am a Christian. I came to be sanctified."<sup>61</sup>

H. E. Schmul preached a third sermon called "The Beauty of Holiness" at the God's Bible School camp meeting that was printed in the *God's Revivalist*. For a text he used Psalm 96:9: "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness" (KJV).

He said that holiness is beautiful in many ways. It is beautiful in appearance, courage, youthfulness, under fire, in retirement, and in death.

In the sermon Schmul spent a considerable amount of time talking about the beauty of holiness being tested under fire. He commented:

You can have an experience that is beautiful, even though folk may throw mud at you. You may be on your knees, you may be on your face; but, brother, after Hell has done its worst you can still have an experience in holiness.<sup>62</sup>

## 1958

There were three noteworthy articles that were published in that year. One was a general article, one was a testimony, and the last one was a sermon.

In January an article was reprinted from the writings of A. M. Hills. It was entitled "A Twofold Disease and a Double Cure." He identified the twofold disease as being sin. Here is how he defined the disease:

The Greek New Testament Lexicon gives the clue to the mystery. It gives two sets of definitions of the most common word for sin in the Greek language: *larmartia*.

(a) "Error, offense, sin" – in other words, our voluntary sins.

(b) “The principle or cause of sin, proneness to sin, sinful propensity.” Here then, are the two forms which the disease of sin takes in human experience.<sup>63</sup>

Later in the writing, Hills talked about universal sinning as a result of the twofold disease. He explained how this universal sinning came about:

It informs us that our first parents by their first sin brought on themselves a radical derangement of their moral natures – “a proneness to sin.” Then they begot children, each of whom inherited this principle of sin, or proneness to sin and by the simple law of heredity it has been passed on as an inheritance to every member of the human race.<sup>64</sup>

Hills, however, did more than just describe and define the twofold disease; he also offered a remedy for the sickness.

We are all by nature sick with the disease of sin. But a great Physician has come – the Lord Jesus Christ, with an unfailing cure for our disease. He will not force His remedies upon us, any more than any human physician does; but He opens an office nearby and advertises His remedies in a Holy Book. If we will only “draw nigh” to Him and ask for His help, He will cure us without money and without price.<sup>65</sup>

“How the Fire Fell” was a testimony given about how Daniel Updegraff got sanctified. The author commented:

Daniel Updegraff was one of the outstanding witnesses to Pentecost in the early days of the great holiness movement in the United States. He was a preacher of unusual ability and was used by God to lead thousands of souls into definite blessing. His personal testimony makes challenging reading in these days of vagueness and compromise.<sup>66</sup>

The writer quoted directly from Updegraff himself about what took place in his sanctifying experience. Here is the main message from Updegraff’s testimony:

I went to my knees with the resolute purpose of presenting my body a living sacrifice to God, and of proving His word that the



altar sanctifies the gift. Every vile affection was resolutely nailed to the cross. Denominational standing, business, reputation, friends, time, talent, and earthly store, were quickly and irrevocably committed to the sovereign control and disposal of my almighty Saviour. It came to be easy to trust Him, and I had no sooner reckoned myself “dead indeed unto sin and alive unto God” than the Holy Ghost fell upon me, just as I suppose He did at the beginning.<sup>67</sup>

J. W. Short preached a sermon at God’s Bible School’s camp meeting that was later put in the *God’s Revivalist*. The sermon reminded the readers that Christ, before He left the earth, promised His followers they would be endowed with power from on high by the Holy Spirit.

Short told how he had gotten sanctified and how the Holy Spirit had kept him stable during adversity. He gave an interesting insight about some difficulty he had had working at God’s Bible School. He preached,

Now as I look back over the years, it seems as if I could have heard the Comforter say, “I’ll be with you out on the foreign land; I’ll be with you when you have to sleep on a board down in Asheboro (when Bro. Fred Deweerd and I were starting a holiness work there); I’ll be with you when you come up Liberty Street after you help take *God’s Revivalist* down to the post office in a two-wheeled cart.” That was before they had the one-horse wagon. In the winter some of the street boys would throw snowballs at us. But when we reached this old Hilltop it seemed as if the glory flooded our souls more than ever.<sup>68</sup>

## 1959

George Watson, William S. Deal, and an anonymous writer all wrote articles the *God’s Revivalist* printed that need to be discussed.

In June a piece was printed by Watson that was entitled “Evidences of the Self-Life.” In this article he identified several manifestations of the self-life. By self-life he meant carnality in the heart that must be slain by the power of God.

One of the main manifestations he talked about was a touchy disposition. He wrote:

It is amazing how many there are who profess to be dead to self, and yet manifest a terrific sensitiveness at being slighted. If they are not invited to preach, or lend the prayer, or sing, or do something in church work or religious gatherings—if their talents are not recognized it is often quite difficult for them to conceal their ugly thoughts and feelings, and they insist that their wretched touchiness is a part of the Christ-life.<sup>69</sup>

In the article he went on to identify other manifestations of carnality. Things like forever looking out for Number One, always unwittingly magnifying self, and always putting forth an extra effort to impress people with one's gifts. At the conclusion of the writing, Watson made it clear that this type of behavior must be dealt with by the sanctifying power of Christ.

An interesting article was published anonymously in August called "What Shall I Wear?" This writing first appeared in *The Herald of Holiness*. The author started the article by stating that the matter of dress should not be overlooked as insignificant in the Christian life. The writer said that, since dress is often a controversial topic, many preachers have entirely avoided the issue. According to the writer, this was how holiness people should dress:

The Bible does not teach that our peculiarity should be in offensive appearance. We should dress neatly and becomingly, following the custom of our age with a modest reserve that attracts no attention to self. Be a credit, not a contradiction, to holiness. Holiness means cleanliness. Dress is an expression of inner refinement or lack of it.<sup>70</sup>

One last comment was given near the end of the writing:

The love for display and extravagant adorning of the flesh testified to a self-centered life. A humble walk with God and expensive, elaborate attire are incompatible. A heart dead to self and centered in God's will takes no pleasure in being on exhibition as a walking fashion plate.<sup>71</sup>

“The Deeper Life and the Human Element” was published in September and written by William S. Deal. This article attempted to balance the doctrine of holiness and human traits. “Some are befogged by purely human traits asserting themselves, which they mistake for carnality, and cast away their confidence, while others often pass up carnal traits as merely ‘human nature.’”<sup>72</sup>

The writer said that sanctified Christians can still have doubts, discouragements, feelings, righteous indignation, fear, and worry. This is a summary paragraph of what the article taught:

Sanctification removes carnality only, leaving us with our natural desires, affections, infirmities, and weaknesses, entirely human in every respect. The sooner holiness people learn this, the better for them, as much is otherwise inexplicable. High-pressure, air-tight, hair-splitting preachers should reason for a moment, “Is this theory a practical fact with me, or only a high-pressure notion?” This human element in salvation must be reckoned with if we are to have a clear, practical knowledge of working salvation.<sup>73</sup>

## 1960

I. J. Snider wrote three articles for that year that dealt with holiness. All three of the writings endeavored to proclaim the message of holiness so that the average lay person could better understand the doctrine of holiness.

In February the first article was published called “Purity and Maturity.” He pointed out the need there was to really understand these terms.

The identification of and the confounding of these terms lies at the base of nearly every objection to an instantaneous work of sanctification. A misunderstanding of the terminology has carried many strange notions, ideas, and much confusion; hence the subject needs to be dealt with so that people can understand the distinction.<sup>74</sup>

Snider made a couple of main points about these terms in the article. First, he said,

No Christian is instantaneously cleansed into maturity, nor do any grow into purity. The Bible nowhere promises maturity as a work of God by faith, but purity is promised. “A babe in Christ” may be cleansed from all inbred sin and become a pure Christian.<sup>75</sup>

A second significant point was made by Snider: “Maturity is nowhere made a condition of entrance into Heaven; however, purity is a requirement. Many Christians die in immaturity and are saved, they have been made pure. Purity is the moral qualification for Heaven.”<sup>76</sup>

In July an article was written entitled “Inbred Sin.” Snider wrote,

The term “inbred sin” is not a Scriptural term, yet it contains a concise explanation of the Scriptural terms, “carnal nature,” “our old man,” “the flesh,” and “fleshly lusts.” It expresses the same things as the theological terms “total depravity” and “original sin.”<sup>77</sup>

There were two main ideas portrayed in the writing. First, inbred sin is not actual sin; and, secondly, inbred sin is not removed at conversion. Concerning the first point, “People commit actual sins only in act, word, or thought. All actual sins are the result of inbred sin, in which we were born, which we inherited from Adam.”<sup>78</sup> Snider spoke to the second concept when he said,

Inbred sin still remains, but in a subdued state, it is the root of the strife we often see among Christians. It is this inbred corruption that makes the Christian Life so hard to many; it makes heavy crosses out of simple duties that reason would say ought to be considered as privileges.<sup>79</sup>

The last work published by Snider that year was called “Standing Grace.” Snider based this article on Romans 5:2 where Paul said, “By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God” (KJV). By standing grace Snider was referring to the stabilizing grace that is found in sanctification.

He gave several illustrations of people that had lost out with God entirely because they failed to go on into the experience of sanctification. This is how Snider summed it up:

This second grace is a step higher than the justifying grace, and we rejoice because we are in a state of grace with God that makes religion easy – no more warfare on the inside, no carnal nature to keep suppressed....The reason many people do not stand long after they are justified is that, seeing the need of this standing grace, they do not do anything about entering into it; they get careless and under trials, tests, or temptations they go down in defeat.<sup>80</sup>

## 1980-1984

### 1980

That year found three articles that were significant in promoting different aspects of the holiness message. They were authored by Leonard Sankey, Roy S. Nicholson, and James Robertson.

“Modesty an Attire, Adornment and Attribute” was an article that Sankey wrote for the *God’s Revivalist*. In it he gave a description of how the designers of clothes operate in society:

Unfortunately, the designers and stylists are not governed by the niceties of decency, morality or Bible teachings. Their god is Satan, their high priestess is fashion, and money is their prime minister. They know that humans snatch at change, no matter how outrageous, and will follow wherever the styles lead...<sup>81</sup>

This writing dealt mostly with modesty in attire and adornment. He said every Christian should be concerned about at least three things when they purchase clothing. The three items were the cut (low neck, etc.), color, and cost. Here was the main challenge that Sankey gave his readers:

In view of the constantly changing norms of the pagan society where we live, I would like to issue a call to Bible-believing Christians everywhere to determine to resist the trend toward immodesty and indecency and refuse to yield to the glandishments of satanic-inspired fashions which disgrace men and women alike.<sup>82</sup>

In August an article by Nicholson was published called “Full Salvation Involves Two Works of Grace.” He pointed out two important things in the writing.

First, that other denominations besides the holiness groups teach that sin still exists after the justified experience. He said, “All evangelical denominations teach, or acknowledge, that sin remains in the converted.”<sup>83</sup> He made reference specifically to the Protestant Episcopal, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches that all teach sin exists in a two-fold nature. Of course, all of these denominations would not agree about how the sin in the converted life is dealt with redemptively.

A second significant point Nicholson made was that scripture strongly supports entire sanctification as a definite work of grace, subsequent to the saved experience. For Biblical support he made reference to the disciples of Christ, Samaritans, Apostle Paul, house of Cornelius, Corinthians, and Thessalonians.

A piece called “Holy Living” by James Robertson, an instructor at God’s Bible School, was printed in October. The writer challenged the readers to remember that holiness is from the inside out, not the outside in. The Holy Spirit energizes people to live holy.

This was how he said it:

But men have always sought to offer God a substitute for inner moral rectitude. Some have tried to equate a meticulous regard for externals with the life of righteousness. Keep the law! Carry out to perfection a system of rules and regulations! But religion is more than external obedience to the Law. God requires truth in the inward parts. Morality that is not tied up with the vision of God’s holiness, God’s moral purity, soon becomes a sterile, conventional thing. Outside the context of the divine holiness, morals become mere manners.<sup>84</sup>

Robertson also reminded the audience that motives play an important part in holy living. Robertson wrote:

The real holiness of heart lies in the purification of our motives by the Holy Spirit. God looks not so much at what we do as at our

intentions...I wonder if, after all, the final demonstration of our love for God is not something that is never witnessed by the world – the quiet little obediences that only God knows about.<sup>85</sup>

## 1981

Two articles and one chapel message deserve our attention for 1981. Roy S. Nicholson and R. G. Flexon wrote the articles, and Leslie D. Wilcox preached a sermon at God's Bible School's chapel concerning holiness.

Nicholson's article was printed first that year, and it was called "Holiness Does Not Produce Fanaticism." In the writing the author does admit that some professing holiness people have turned into fanatics when it comes to religion. He commented,

There may have been, or may be now, those in the holiness movement whose extreme views may have brought this blessed experience into disrepute. But many of the opponents of entire sanctification have magnified those abuses out of all true proportions. Most of that which they offer as evidence did not come from representative holiness leaders, but from those on the fringes who might be inclined to fanaticism in regards to anything or any doctrine.<sup>86</sup>

However, even though Nicholson did admit that there were some holiness fanatics, he by no means promoted abandoning the doctrine. He affirmed his view by saying,

There is an experience of grace subsequent to regeneration, and despite any odium attached to it by evil association, it must never be deserted. Instead, the base alloys which may have encrusted to it and disfigured its beauty must be patiently renewed so that its beauty and value may be appreciated.<sup>87</sup>

Wilcox preached a sermon that was printed in the *God's Revivalist* during 1981. The title of the message was "The Need and Possibility of Two Works of Grace." For a text he used James 4:8b, "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double minded" (KJV).

The first observation he made about this verse was that it has two commands, and they are not addressed to the same group of people. He said,

Hands represent action, so there are actions that are wrong and need to be forgiven. The other command addresses the need that is not on the outside in the outer actions of life, but the inner condition of the heart – “the double minded.” Now that is something inside a person, not on the outside, so we find two different needs addressed.<sup>88</sup>

Throughout the whole sermon Wilcox reiterated the fact that the two commands were to be followed by all Christians. He felt that if the commands could not be followed, why did God give them in the first place? He stated:

We find that the text holds out two different possibilities, for I don’t believe that the Holy Spirit would inspire James to give commands of this kind if they were just simply hopeless commands. If he said, “Cleanse your hands,” he means there is a possibility of having hands that are clean. If he said, “Purify your heart,” there is a possibility of having hearts that are pure. Otherwise, the Bible is talking nonsense, and certainly don’t believe that we have that kind of break.”<sup>89</sup>

An article was printed in October entitled “Taking Inventory.” It was authored by R. G. Flexon. In this writing Flexon asked five questions:

- (1) Are you really born again?
- (2) Are you really sanctified wholly?
- (3) Are you indulging in any known sin?
- (4) Are you following a doubtful course of conduct?
- (5) Where are your interests centered?

He had a lot to say about all of these, but our main consideration is what he said about the second question. One interesting point he made was concerning the disciples of Christ:



The sanctification of some of the disciples of Christ seems to be more outstanding than their conversion. From the records, we may not be able to put a finger on a definite time and say that was the time of their conversion, but we can put our finger on the place and time when their hearts were purified by faith.<sup>90</sup>

In the last paragraph in the section about sanctification, Flexon asked several more questions:

Do you know when you were sanctified? Do you know where you were cleansed? Do you have the witness of the Spirit that such a work of grace has been wrought in your heart? Do you know it is now up-to-date? Do the carnal traits still stir under pressure? Are you sure the Old Man has been crucified and eradicated from your heart? If you do not, you are not ready for heaven and you are headed for disappointment at His coming or the judgment. Better take account of your stock.<sup>91</sup>

## 1982

There were not as many articles written about holiness that year in the *God's Revivalist*. Consequently, there were only two articles that were chosen for consideration.

In August an article was printed entitled "We Need God's Power." The author was Morris Chalfant.

The whole premise of this writing was that the church needs power that was introduced on the Day of Pentecost. This was the crux of the whole writing:

The greatest modern need of every church is a new Pentecost. Instead of spending so much time on socials, athletics, and other programs, why not spend some time seeking the Holy Spirit in Pentecostal power? There is a real, genuine Pentecost. We need it. We must have it. It is our only hope. Pentecost gives purity, power, perspective, passion, and persuasiveness. Pentecost will purge carnality, cleanse the soul, inspire the mind, reactivate the will, revitalize the spirit, and rejuvenate the emotions. Pentecost will revive the Church. The Church will awaken the world.<sup>92</sup>

Later that year John May wrote an article called “This Same Jesus.” As the title would indicate, this writing focused on the fact that Jesus is immutable and eternal.

May’s whole point in writing was to state that Jesus still requires His people everywhere to be holy. May commented,

Christ has not changed in person, power, position, or promise....He still demands that His people be different, and He provides the experience to make them different. “This Same Jesus” is equal to our needs for victorious holy living.<sup>93</sup>

The author also stated that the standards of holy living have not changed. Even though society changes, God’s requirements do not change. He wrote,

Obviously, people in Bible times had a different way of life. The same can be said of the early days of holiness history in the United States. But there had to be standards of holiness for them by which to live, and there has to be standards of holiness for us as well.<sup>94</sup>

## 1983

That year found various authors writing about holiness in the *God’s Revivalist*, but three articles specifically are noteworthy. One article was written by Editor Glenn Black, and the other two were penned by John May.

Black wrote a piece called “A Guide to Seeking Sanctification.” He started the article by reminding the readers that sanctification is a legitimate, Biblical doctrine that needs to be preached and practiced. He wrote,

The call to holy living is not some exotic or weird teaching. Nor is it the distinctive doctrine of a few peculiar believers. It is God’s command. It is His expectation of every Christian believer.<sup>95</sup>

Since the experience is commanded by God, Black gave a five-step process in seeking this experience:

**(1)** be sure of your conversion;

- (2) unreservedly and unconditionally consecrate your whole redeemed self to God;
- (3) ask God, believing from the heart, in Jesus' name to cleanse your heart from all inner sinfulness;
- (4) receive and experience the sanctifying fullness of the Holy Spirit by faith;
- (5) witness openly and often to the experience of inward cleansing from inner sinfulness.<sup>96</sup>

Later that year John May wrote an article entitled "Bible Prayers on Holiness." He looked at four prayers: the Lord's Prayer, the High Priestly Prayer, and two prayers of St. Paul.

He said this about the Lord's Prayer:

To analyze the requests in this prayer is to come to the conclusion that the answers result in holy living as demanded of and provided for God's people. From the hallowing of His Name to the doxology of praise, complete submission and dedication are required, and deliverance and victory are the result.<sup>97</sup>

May believed that the whole thrust of the High Priestly Prayer was holiness:

Every time a believer rises from an altar of prayer somewhere with victory written across his countenance, he is an answer to the Lord's High Priestly Prayer for His people.<sup>98</sup>

The author also went to Paul's prayers in Ephesians and 1 Thessalonians to focus on prayers about holiness. Here is how May summed up the prayers of St. Paul:

He prayed for their sanctification which involved the whole person. The spirit needed sanctification to glow and grow. Their soul needed sanctification in a deep relationship with the Holy Spirit. Their body-life needed sanctification for abundant Christian living and power.<sup>99</sup>

In September another writing was published by John May. It was entitled "True Holiness Is Putting on the New Man."

According to May, in putting on the new man there are at least four new things that are experienced in sanctification. Someone that has been sanctified will have a new purpose, new power, new position, and a new pledge. By having a new power he meant, “Our goals become Christ-centered rather than self-centered.”<sup>100</sup> The new power was described this way:

Through this power we can cope with crises and catastrophes. Here we find ability to witness, work, and win. Though we may suffer, there is power to bear up.<sup>101</sup>

What about the new position? May says,

It brings a new life-style. It is not a holier-than-thou experience which places us high above everyone and everything else. Holy separation is not anonymous with isolationism either by design or position.<sup>102</sup>

Concerning the new pledge, he wrote:

The truly sanctified have made a new pledge, one that arises out of complete surrender, total consecration, and continued dedication. Putting all on the altar is not only the act of the present moment but for the future as well.<sup>103</sup>

## 1984

As in 1982 the holiness articles were not so numerous, since there were only two writings for that year. They were authored by W. T. Purkiser and John May.

An article by Purkiser was reprinted from the *Herald of Holiness*. It was entitled “What It Means to Have a Pure Heart.” He made this observation at the beginning of his writing:

The scope of redemption does not stop with the impartation of life to a dead soul. Over and over, God calls His people to that grace the scripture calls “a pure heart” or “a clean heart.”<sup>104</sup>

What does it mean to have a pure heart? Purkiser made a good point when he said,

This question has an urgency for us it did not have for our fathers. We who live in the post-Freudian age have been told about the subconscious depths of personality in which are said to lurk motives and mal-adjustments we are never fully aware. We have been warned, in view of this, not to witness to a cleansing of which we cannot be sure. The warning has its point. But some things need to be said.<sup>105</sup>

He made three main points in dealing with this matter of a pure heart:

First, the Bible is not talking about a purity that would possibly satisfy the definitions of a depth psychologist. It is talking about a purity that satisfied the demands of a holy God....Second, the words of scripture do not depend for their validation on our powers of introspection. We cannot affirm that our hearts are pure in a scriptural sense because we do not detect defilement within....Third, both in the scripture and in experience it is clear that a pure heart does not mean that all emotional tangles are straightened out, all maladjustments of personality or quirks of temperament are corrected, or all need for discipline and growth ended.<sup>106</sup>

In May a piece was published by John May called “Glorious Freedom.” He stated that sanctified people should enjoy freedom, but within the perimeters that God has given for Christians to follow. This one paragraph sums up succinctly what May endeavored to write:

The truly sanctified do not constantly feel their spiritual pulse to check whether they are alive, but mind the checks of the Holy Spirit and live robust, happy, and satisfying lives. Their license to do good and their liberty to abstain from wrong guard against looseness in work, ethics, and standards. This results in well-rounded Christian living and glorious freedom.<sup>107</sup>

# CHAPTER 6

## INTERPRETATION

As was stated earlier, there were four theological categories designated for this study. This chapter interpreted the data found in the articles in view of those categories.

The two hundred articles selected for this study predominately represented the Pentecostal-Substantive category. The other category that was represented in a lesser way was the Christological-Substantive. The other two categories were not represented in the data at all.

A fifth category was established for those articles that did not represent any of the four theological camps. It was simply referred to as undetermined. Also, at the end of the chapter, other significant shifts and emphases were noted that took place from period to period.

### **PENTECOSTAL-SUBSTANTIVE/1906-1910**

Of the fifty articles chosen for this period, thirty-five of them supported the theological views of the Pentecostal-Substantive category.

Consequently, the authors saw sin as an entity to be removed from the heart, and this work was done by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Four of the writers during these five years that presented the Pentecostal-Substantive view were A. M. Hills, Oswald Chambers, W. B. Godbey, and Martin Wells Knapp.

In March of 1906 an article was published that was written by Hills called “The Third Blessing.” This article wholeheartedly taught this view. He wrote,

Fire as used in connection with the Holy Ghost is a symbol of His influence upon the heart. Fire burns, purifies, empowers, shines, illuminates, energizes: so also does the Holy Spirit effect believers when He comes into the heart.<sup>1</sup>

This quote shows, among other things, that Hills believed when a person is sanctified the Holy Spirit “burns or purifies” the heart from the substance of sin.

An article was written by Oswald Chambers in which he talked about the predominant work in the life of those who were sanctified. He said it this way,

There is only one holiness, and that is God’s holiness, and the holiness of the just name is of exactly the same nature. When the Holy Ghost indwells, that man bears an exact family likeness to Jesus.<sup>2</sup>

Later in the article Chambers was talking about what happens to sin when he stated,

Holiness is that I have been remade from the inside, and that the Holy Spirit of God dwells in my mortal body as His temple.<sup>3</sup>

Chambers wrote another lengthy article entitled “Entire Sanctification.” Again in this work he talked a lot about what the Holy Spirit did when a believer got sanctified. Also, at the beginning of the writing, he commented about the work of the Spirit after a person received sanctification. He believed part of the Holy Spirit’s job was to keep sanctified people humble. He stated:

Oh, the marvelous thing which the Holy Ghost does....The Holy Ghost, my sanctified brother, will take you radically back through your unregenerated days that you may remember where He took you from, that you may remember what you are, and that He did it all.<sup>4</sup>

For this study the phrase “he did it all” is significant. What did Chambers mean by this statement? He meant that the Holy Spirit is the predominant Person of the Holy Trinity that did the sanctifying work in a believer.

Oswald Chambers wrote a third article in 1909 called “Spirit Baptized Humanity.” In this writing he stated very clearly that the sin nature is something that must be taken away from the justified person. Chambers commented:

What I mean is this; when God by the Holy Ghost, in the atonement of Jesus Christ, takes the old Adam from me, He does not make me inhuman, He does not take away my human nature; He makes my human nature what it was intended to be the temple of the Holy Ghost.<sup>5</sup>

In another place when making reference to sin he said, "...that we might have this disposition of Adam removed from us."<sup>6</sup>

W. B. Godbey was another writer that strongly propagated the Pentecostal-Substantive view. In 1908 he wrote an article called "The Work of the Holy Spirit." The subtitle for that piece was "The Holy Spirit Our Perfecter." It was evident that the Holy Spirit was the main agent in the sanctification process.

Like Chambers, Godbey also made reference to the "Old Adam" that needs to be dealt with by the power of the Holy Spirit. He succinctly put it this way:

Here we are the positive declaration that the "God of all grace" will make you perfect so soon as you suffer a little while, i.e., till Old Adam can die. The Holy Ghost is ready to nail Him to the cross the moment you are ready. Then it will not take him long to die. You can never be His perfect disciple till you go to the cross, let the Holy Ghost nail you fast, and the Old Adam in your spirit bleeds and dies.<sup>7</sup>

Later in the writing he reaffirmed his position about the Holy Spirit when he wrote,

When you depreciate the work of the Holy Spirit, you always grieve Him. He loves a heart superabounding with gratitude for all the good work He has done in conviction, regeneration and sanctification.<sup>8</sup>

In 1909 Godbey wrote another article supporting this view entitled "The Gospel in Antioch." The author talked a lot in this article about how the Holy Spirit used Barnabas. He learned that Barnabas was so effective because he was full of the Holy Ghost and faith. Godbey admonished his



readers to likewise receive the Holy Ghost in His fullness. This was how he described the process:

You must get emptied of sin before you can be filled with the Holy Ghost. The great negative side of sanctification is the elimination of the sin personality out of the heart. This is done when the old man is crucified, and the body of sin destroyed....The Blessed Holy Spirit applies the cleansing blood and eliminates the sin personality away, utterly and forever. Then He moves into His own new temple, filling it with the glory of God.<sup>9</sup>

Later in the article Godbey made another statement that showed he believed sin was a substance that needed to be removed. He wrote,

The heart thus must be radically expurgated of original sin, before the Holy Ghost will fill you and abide.<sup>10</sup>

The founder of God's Bible School, Martin Wells Knapp, also taught the Pentecostal-Substantive view. An article was published in 1909 that he had written called "The Pentecostal Church." His view of the Holy Ghost was found in this statement:

People who have come out from the world and worldly ties and associations, been regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost and accepted God as their Father, Jesus as their Saviour, and have received or are ready to welcome the Holy Ghost as their Sanctifier, are the only material out of which Christ's church can be built.<sup>11</sup>

### **CHRISTOLOGICAL-SUBSTANTIVE/1906-1910**

This view was not as prominent in the articles as was the Pentecostal-Substantive view. However, there were eleven writings that espoused this theological position. The proponents in this theological camp saw original sin as a substance to be removed or cleansed and Christ as the main Person of the Trinity to accomplish this work in the sanctifying experience. George Kulp, Arthur Greene, George Watson, and an anonymous writer were some of the people that took this position.

In 1907 Kulp wrote an article entitled “Holiness and Heaven.” He was talking about the importance of Christians reading the Bible, especially those who were not sure of their sanctification. He wrote,

The Word of God will locate folks! Sin in the heart of the believer may, and must, be destroyed here. The blood cleanseth from all sin. The Lamb of God taketh away the Sin of the world, here or not at all.<sup>12</sup>

Kulp emphasized the work of Christ in sanctification again when he said,

Oh for an altar call that will persuade the holiness ranks until, all bowing together and staying on their faces before God, they, hearing from Heaven, should arise to go forth and show the Spirit of Christ, compelling the world to take note that they have been with Jesus and learned of Him.<sup>13</sup>

Arthur Greene wrote a short article that talked about the preeminence of Jesus Christ in sanctification.

Holiness recognizes the fact that Christ, the great High Priest, is working out His own plan and purpose even though we may not be able to understand all He allows to come into our lives.<sup>14</sup>

Later he said,

Holiness does not exalt self, but lives in humility and exalts Christ. It leaves self on the cross while Christ is held up to the people as a complete Saviour from all sin.<sup>15</sup>

In 1910 George Watson wrote an article called “As I Have Loved You.” This article concerned Jesus and what He has done for the human family. In Watson’s view Jesus provides three different stages in the life of love: first, divine love that is imparted when someone gets saved; second, the love of God made pure when someone gets sanctified; and, finally, a boundless fullness of love known as growth in grace. Watson believed in original sin being a substance, as is evident from this statement: “...the love of God made sure is the next stage when all mixture is taken away and all contrary dispositions eradicated.”<sup>16</sup>

The overall message in the article was that Jesus did all of the works of grace in those that believe in Him. But at one point Watson got specific when he admonished Christians to forgive as Jesus forgave. He said, “We can have the like spirit of forgiveness by drinking from the heart of Jesus.”<sup>17</sup>

An anonymous author also wrote an article that supported the Christological-Substantive theological camp. This one quote summarizes what the writing taught:

The sole means of ending this subtle foe, and the sad state of affairs is the crucifixion of the carnal mind-death to self and sin forever – by embracing the atonement made by our Lord, the explanation and purpose of which are given by Paul.

“Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate” (Hebrews 13:12)<sup>18</sup>

### **PENTECOSTAL-SUBSTANTIVE/1930-1934**

Out of the fifty articles chosen from this five-year period there were thirty-eight articles that taught the Pentecostal-Substantive view of sanctification. Some of the authors that promoted this position were J.B. Chapman, John Knapp, John Duryea, Joseph Smith, M. G. Standley, C. W. Ruth, George Ridout, and Andrew Johnson.

Chapman in July of 1930 wrote an article entitled “Radical Holiness.” This piece mentioned the danger of exaggerating incidentals, often exalting them to the places of prime importance.

However, Chapman did believe that holiness people were peculiar in their own way. Here was what he meant by being peculiar:

They are peculiar in that they have been delivered from the love of self and have been given grace to pour out their lives for the good of others. They are peculiar in that they have been purged from all inbred sin and filled with the Holy Ghost. They are peculiar in that the power of sin over them has been broken and the pollution of sin cleansed away, and they are enabled to live above sin every day and to serve God in Holiness and righteousness.<sup>19</sup>

Also in 1930 a writing was published in *God's Revivalist* authored by John Knapp. Like Chapman, he also used strong language to support the Pentecostal-Substantive category. In talking about the sanctified experience he wrote,

The Holy Ghost is the High Explosive of the greatest conflict of the ages. He is the one successful opposition to spiritual decline, dearth, and deadness. He works, instantaneously producing in a moment of time what years of growth or effort have failed to accomplish.<sup>20</sup>

Later in the article he talked about original sin. He said,

To say that sin cannot be destroyed in the human heart is to demonstrate one's own lack of personal acquaintance with the High Explosive of the spiritual universe.<sup>21</sup>

In 1931 John Duryea continued the theme of the Holy Spirit cleansing the heart of sin when a person gets sanctified. In his article "Progressive Christians" he made it plain about sanctification when he stated,

It is an experience into which God's children may enter by the Holy Spirit coming into the heart and cleansing it from all its defilement and filling it with perfect love.<sup>22</sup>

Duryea wrote another article in 1932 called "Peter's Fiery Baptism." Once again the author espoused what the Holy Spirit does in the second work of grace. This was how the article was introduced:

The one who prayerfully reads and ponders Peter's life, as recorded in the Word of God, receives much blessing. Let us study him in these three aspects: standing by the fire of the enemy, suffering in the fire of remorse, and purged by the fire of the Holy Ghost.<sup>23</sup>

The author wrote later about the effort that the purging fire of the Holy Ghost had upon Peter:

The fire of Pentecost changed Peter to such an extent that we find there was no more fluctuation in his experience and life. And when his final test came and he was to be crucified, he did not flinch but

requested that he be crucified head downward, feeling he was not worthy to be crucified as his Lord.<sup>24</sup>

Joseph Smith was another author that wrote in 1932. Smith likewise believed that the Adamic nature was taken out when a person got sanctified. When talking about spiritual progress he said,

Heart purity is not to be expected as an end of progress, but it is to be sought at once (if even an operation should be necessary) in order to insure the soul's progress. As we do not wait for the growth of the flowers to kill off the weeds, so the root of bitterness must be eradicated from our hearts to insure the budding and the bloom of the Rose of Sharon and the Lily of the Valley there.<sup>25</sup>

Smith believed that the Holy Spirit did this work in the heart of the believer. He stated,

...for the Pure in heart are never without His Presence. He supplies ever-expanding vistas, ever-enriching love and ever-empowering energy for the pursuit, the pleasure, and the performance of the ever-enlarging life in Christ.<sup>26</sup>

M. G. Standley was an author that wrote about this view in 1933. He preached a message over the radio that was later printed in the *God's Revivalist* called "Babes in Christ – Carnal." His position was stated clearly about both sin and the Holy Spirit in the following statements:

God is pure, holy and upright. God demands Holiness of us, and He has made provision that we can become His children, and then go on into the Second Blessing, being baptized with the Holy Spirit. No one can receive the baptism with the Holy Spirit who is not a child of God. It is a second, definite work of grace wrought in the heart of the believer by faith and removes or takes out that "old man" that carnal mind, that something that keeps the child of God a babe, and fills the soul with perfect peace, love, joy, longsuffering, and takes away that which would hinder, and brings the Holy Spirit to abide.<sup>27</sup>

Another sermon was printed in the *God's Revivalist* in 1933. It was preached by C. W. Ruth in the God's Bible School auditorium. It was

simply entitled “Christian Perfection.” During the sermon Ruth asked a rhetorical question: “What is the second blessing?” He answered, “It is the circumcision of the heart, cleansing it from the least and last remains of sin so that you love God with all your heart and mind and strength.”<sup>28</sup>

Later in the sermon his own testimony validated his understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification: “Then, in the year 1883, again in September, about half-past seven, Eastern Standard time...I received the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire.”<sup>29</sup>

In 1934 George Ridout penned an article called “God’s Skies Are Full of Pentecosts.” He, like the previous authors in this section, believed that in sanctification the Holy Spirit destroys the original sin in a person’s heart. Ridout thought that one should never talk about Pentecost or the experience of sanctification unless the Holy Spirit was included in the conversation. “The paramount lesson of Pentecost is obtained as we study it in the light of the Holy Spirit and His work,”<sup>30</sup> commented the author.

In another place in the article he told what took place in the lives of the disciples when they experienced the work of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. He said, “Pentecost was Christ’s greatest gift to the church. Its fiery tongue lit up the promises of God, burned away barriers, and purged clean the hearts of the disciples.”<sup>31</sup>

Andrew Johnson is the last author to be considered for this section. In his writing “Twelve Benefits of a Pure Heart” he talked a significant amount about the need to have the “old man” removed:

There are two kinds of sin – actual sin and original sin....In conversion all the actual sins are forgiven, all acquired depravity is washed away; new life or the “new heart” is imported; the soul is adopted into the Divine family, and the witness of the Spirit is given in the form of blessed assurance. Yet the “old man” of inbred sin or innate depravity remains. This is what is known as the residue theory. The Bible very clearly describes a double-hearted condition of the believer who has not yet gone on to perfection. “With a double heart do they speak” (Psalm 13:2)<sup>32</sup>

## CHRISTOLOGICAL-SUBSTANTIVE/1930-1934

There were nine articles written to support the position during these five years. C. V. Fairbairn, E. E. Shelhammer, A. M. Hills, and Buddie Robinson were some of the authors that supported and taught this position.

Fairbairn, in his article “What Holiness Really Is,” indicated that sin was removed in sanctification when he wrote the following:

This second work of grace perfects the heart in love. This epoch is followed by growth in Holiness more pronounced and progressive than that which follows regeneration, for the heart, the centre of impulse, now rid of all that was at enmity with the love of God....<sup>33</sup>

The author went on to say later that sanctification takes place when Christ is enthroned within the heart. He stated,

Jesus said, “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” To “rise to walk in Heaven’s own light, above the world and sin, with heart made pure, and garments white, and Christ enthroned within” is the approximation of the human to the Divine to the full extent of human possibility.<sup>34</sup>

In 1931 a sermon by Shelhammer was published in the *God’s Revivalist* entitled “The Scope of Redemption.” In this sermon Shelhammer succinctly supported both aspects of this position by the following statement:

In regeneration Jesus Christ cuts down the tree. In entire sanctification he takes the root out. God planned not only to suppress carnality, but He planned its elimination and eradication. It is a greater work on the part of God to take sin out of one soul, root and branch than to save a dozen souls.<sup>35</sup>

Hills wrote an article in 1932 called “God’s Standard of Holiness.” He talked a lot about Christ and quoted several times from the Sermon on the Mount. At one point, writing about walking in the light, Hills said it was mandatory for believers to be cleansed from sin,

If we disregard the light and refuse to be guided by it, we will have no fellowship with God, and we will not be cleansed from sin, but it will remain upon us and in us to doom our souls forever.<sup>36</sup>

In this article Hills was persuaded that Christ is the agent that brings about the change in the work of sanctification. He wrote,

Intimate association with Jesus transforms and transfigures, molds and fashions and lifts the affections and desires until sin is hated and nothing will rest and satisfy but Christlike purity.<sup>37</sup>

The last article considered for this five-year period was authored by Buddie Robinson. In 1934 a piece was written by him entitled “Two Works of Grace.” Robinson saw original sin as something that needed to be killed. In talking about the devil he said, “Brother, the blessing of Holiness does not kill the devil. It kills the old man, but the devil never gives you up.”<sup>38</sup>

The author also taught that the work of holiness was brought about by Jesus. Robinson stated:

Then Hebrews 13:12,13 says that we are sanctified by the blood. Justified by the blood and sanctified by the blood. Is that not wonderful? That is God’s way. That is what He provided through the atoning blood of Jesus.<sup>39</sup>

### **PENTECOSTAL-SUBSTANTIVE/1956-1960**

Just as in 1906-1910 there were thirty out of the fifty-five articles chosen in this five-year period that advocated this position. Some of the authors that supported this view were Floyd Skinner, Fannie Erb, H. E. Schmul, W. C. Bowman, J. W. Short, J. M. Hames, A. A. Renshausen, and A. M. Hills.

Skinner wrote an article in 1956 entitled “The Power of Pentecost.” He believed that original sin is a substance that needed to be removed. “A depraved heart is our worst enemy, full of wretched, treacherous, unfathomable strivings to gratify its pride, passions, and foolish pleasures.”<sup>40</sup>



The author later focused on the Holy Spirit doing the work of sanctification when he wrote,

...But God's plan for Gospel Progress was not human skill at argument. It was to be Divine persuasion, using man as the open channel for the full-flowing presence of the Holy Spirit. This could be accomplished only when self was emptied of all carnal tendencies and filled with Divinity. Beloved, have you the power? Are you conscious of the cleansing and filling Presence of the Holy Ghost?<sup>41</sup>

In September of 1956 another article was authored by Mrs. Erb called "Holiness Is Not an Appendage." She saw the "old man" as carnality that lived in the heart. She said,

So when we allow carnality to have quarter in our hearts, and undisturbed contentment in our services, we harbor and protect an enemy of God, of all righteousness, and of our own souls as well – an enemy that can never be changed, improved, or transformed.<sup>42</sup>

She was also convinced that the Holy Spirit was the primary Person of the Godhead to bring about this work in the hearts of humanity. "The only remedy, or escape, is to let God destroy this enemy by the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire. This is sanctification, or holiness, and it can be received only when the believer has laid his all upon the altar....,"<sup>43</sup> wrote Erb.

In 1957 Mrs. Erb was published again in the God's Revivalist. In her article "Man's Greatest Enemy," she reiterated her support for the Pentecostal-Substantive view of sanctification. She told about the dangers of having the "old man" on board when she stated,

To be born again, to be made a new creature in Christ Jesus is a miracle of miracles. But unless the soul goes on to perfection and is sanctified wholly, the "old man" will soon cool the soul's fervor, and sin will have dominion again.<sup>44</sup>

In this writing Erb gave a remedy for those who may have backslidden because of carnality in the heart. It can be expected that she emphasized the Holy Ghost. She stated:

Merely turning over a new leaf, or reforming, will not bring the old time power. It takes deep repentance, doing the first works over again, consecrating to be faithful unto death – then God will come in sin-killing power, and will give glorious liberty in the Holy Ghost.<sup>45</sup>

Later in 1957 a sermon that Schmul had preached at God's Bible School camp meeting that year was published in the *God's Revivalist*. It was entitled "The Beauty of Holiness." One of his main points in the sermon was that holiness is beautiful in appearance. Not necessarily beautiful in the outward but in the inner man. According to Schmul, this beauty was brought about by the sin nature being purged by the Holy Ghost. He commented, "You can let the Holy Ghost give you a treatment for your soul, renovate your personality, do something for the inner man."<sup>46</sup>

Later in the sermon he said more about this beauty found in the saints of God. He stated,

There is a peculiar beauty about the saints. There is a glow, a radiance about them. Their very personality has been permeated and purged and sanctified by the power of the Holy Ghost. That is the kind of beauty I am talking about.<sup>47</sup>

In 1958, Bowman was found writing in the *God's Revivalist*. He wrote a piece called "Entire Sanctification" that espoused the Pentecostal-Substantive position. He taught that the sin nature remained in the heart after a person was converted. Bowman stated:

When one is converted, God forgives him for what he has done, and cleansing goes as far as he has polluted his soul by his own transgressions. But the nature of sin, which is inherited from Adam, is still left in the heart, though suppressed by the new nature received in conversion. This God cannot forgive, for it is a principle of evil; but He has made provision in the atonement whereby man can get rid of it.<sup>48</sup>

According to Bowman this provision in the atonement that took care of that principle of evil was brought about by the Holy Ghost. He wrote,

So with the second work of grace; when we are sanctified we are made holy. Sanctification is an experience; holiness is a state. Sanctification is accomplished by the baptism with the Holy Ghost.<sup>49</sup>

Later in 1958 a sermon was published that had been preached at God's Bible School camp meeting by J. W. Short. The title of the sermon was "Our Lord's Last Day on Earth." His address was focused on the command of Jesus to His disciples for them to wait in Jerusalem for power on high after He had ascended to Heaven.

In the sermon Short reminded the people of what can take place when someone experiences a personal Pentecost. He gave his own testimony of how sin was destroyed and how the glory filled his soul when he received the blessing.

The following was a climactic part of his sermon:

On the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit was given, not only to a hundred and twenty in an upper room, but to the world. We are living in the glorious dispensation of the Holy Spirit. He is the executive of the Godhead, carrying on the great plan of redemption, and He is here today.<sup>50</sup>

J. M. Hames continued this theme of the Holy Ghost removing the sin nature by writing the article "The Fullness of Pentecost" in 1959. At the very beginning of the article he gave his support to this view. He said,

We must wait in the upper room until the Pentecostal flame sanctifies us wholly, destroying the seed-principle of sin in us, and filling us with positive holiness.<sup>51</sup>

Of course, this Pentecostal flame was brought about by the Holy Ghost. He confirmed this when he wrote,

The meaning of Pentecost is nothing less than the actual descent of Deity, the adorable Third Person of the Godhead, working His advent to our glove. The Holy Ghost is none other than God.<sup>52</sup>

In May of 1959, A. A. Ronshausen wrote an article entitled “The Meaning of Pentecost.” His view of original sin was that the heart had to be emptied before the Holy Ghost could fill it. The author stated:

The Spirit can abide only in clean vessels. Purity and power can never be separated. Fire is the symbol of God’s presence, and is the greatest purifying agency known.... Seeking the Spirit’s baptism is no bargain counter religion. Emptying precedes filling – emptied of self, utterly yielded, every idol slain, the whole will bent to do the will of God.<sup>53</sup>

Wells represented this view of Substance-Pentecostal in the last year for this period when he wrote “The Call to Holiness.” In this article he very plainly stated that every Christian has a call to be holy:

So the command, “Be ye holy,” involves a real and vital separation from the world, and a definite act of cleansing by the Holy Ghost. Personal responsibility is ours, to avail ourselves of that purity of heart wrought by the Holy Spirit through faith.<sup>54</sup>

### **CHRISTOLOGICAL-SUBSTANTIVE/1956-1960**

There were ten out of the fifty articles chosen during this five-year period that represented this theological view. C. W. Ruth, T. M. Anderson, A. M. Hills, and E. W. Lawrence were some of the writers that taught this viewpoint.

In 1956 a work was published by C. W. Ruth. The writing was entitled “How to Obtain the Experience of Sanctification.” The author put a significant amount of emphasis on the necessity of consecration in the experience of sanctification. Ruth also made it clear that Jesus is the Person of the Trinity that does the work in the second work of grace. He commented,

Frequently, the last test of our consecration is in giving up our way of obtaining the experience and allowing Him to manifest Himself as He may choose. I can, and I will, and I do believe – not because I feel, but because He is faithful who has promised – that Jesus now sanctifies my soul.<sup>55</sup>

To support his view Ruth used Hebrews 3:12 as a primary text in the article, “Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.”

T. M. Anderson preached a sermon at God’s Bible School that was published in the *God’s Revivalist* in 1957. The title was “Oneness Through Sanctification.” In the sermon Anderson used this illustration to show the oneness that is found between Christ and those who are sanctified:

Now bringing the fact into closer view, draw an imaginary circle and place Jesus Christ, the Sanctifier, and the sanctified people within that circle. They are all one – there are no sanctified ones outside the circle, and no unsanctified ones in it.<sup>56</sup>

Concerning original sin Anderson taught that it must be taken out.

Sanctification must do something. It must take the discord out of us, it must clean us up on the inside so that we can be one with God, and He would not have to apologize for bringing us inside of Heaven.<sup>57</sup>

In 1958 a work by A. M. Hills called “A Twofold Disease and a Double Cure” was published. Hills talked about Christ and how He was able to cleanse the sin nature from the heart when one gets sanctified. The following quote summed up his position:

But there is a remedy: “Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleans it” (Ephesians 5:25,26). The pardoned souls who are now in God’s family and form His “church” are not now to be sanctified by being cleansed from that sin-principle or propensity to sin which regeneration – the first work of grace – did not cure or reach.<sup>58</sup>

E. W. Lawrence was published in 1960 when he wrote an article called “Pardon and Purity.” He saw the sin nature as a dirty heart that needed to be purified and Christ as the person to do it. Lawrence wrote:

God can and will forgive you when you repent and come to Him seeking His mercy. But He cannot forgive your dirty heart. That has to be purified. There is a precious verse that tells you all this.

‘If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness’ (1 John 1:9).<sup>59</sup>

### **PENTECOSTAL-SUBSTANTIVE 1980-1984**

During this five-year period, there were thirty-two out of the fifty articles selected that taught this theological position concerning sanctification. Some of the writers were Roy Nicholson, R. G. Flexon, Carl Ryan, Glen Black, and W. T. Purkiser. “Full Salvation Involves Two Works of Grace” was the article written by Nicholson in 1980. One of the main points he made was that the sin nature must be cleansed. In his view humans can only stand for God to do only one work at a time.

The sinner who seeks deliverance from his guilt does not at that time realize his need of inward cleansing from the sin nature.

Psychologically, one cannot take care of more than one major issue at a time. This is mentally impossible.<sup>60</sup>

Later in the writing he made reference to what took place at Pentecost. He said the Holy Spirit came and the people’s hearts were purified by faith. Likewise the Holy Spirit will do the work in the hearts of believers today.

R. G. Flexon wrote two articles in 1981 to support the idea of the Holy Ghost taking out the sin nature from the heart of man. The first writing was published in January and it was entitled “More Points to Ponder.” These points to ponder were gems of truth that Flexon would write periodically for publication. In this article he talked about sanctification. He asked a series of questions to get his point across. He wrote,

Do you know when you were sanctified? Do you know when you were cleansed? Do you have the witness of the Spirit that such a work of grace has been wrought in your heart? Do you know it is now up-to-date? Do the carnal traits still stir under pressure? Are you sure the Old Man has been crucified and eradicated from your heart?<sup>61</sup>

In October of 1981 Flexon wrote another article called “Taking Inventory.” In this writing he likened sanctification as the Holy Ghost taking out a nest of unclean birds and then filling the heart with His purity and power. Flexon stated:

The idea of being sanctified and not knowing it took place or where it happened is absurd. To have taken from the heart such a nest of unclean birds as covetousness, evil thoughts, deceit, hatred, lasciviousness, pride, anger, wrath, murder, theft, jealousy, and envy, and then have that heart filled with the Holy Ghost and not know something happened is preposterous.<sup>62</sup>

“The Victorious Life,” written by Carl Ryan in 1982, continued the theme of the Holy Spirit cleansing the heart from sin. The author talked about how someone that was not sanctified lived a life of continual struggle because of the sin nature that needed to be cleansed. Ryan believed that a saved person had a lot to rejoice about, but they should not stop on their spiritual journey until they had experienced the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. This was how he said it:

Though justified from all our guilty past, we are obligated to open our hearts to the will of God. We must tarry until we are endued with power from on high. This is a second work, and it is a work that destroys the sinful nature within that is bent on sinning. Then, the Holy Spirit comes in to abide giving you complete victory within.<sup>63</sup>

The editor of the *God's Revivalist*, Glen Black, wrote two articles in 1983 that also promoted this theological view. The first article was written in February and was called “Holiness, A Discussion of Definitions.”

Black, near the beginning of the article, committed himself concerning his view of sin. He wrote,

By personal choice and theological conviction I am Wesleyan-Arminian in my doctrinal beliefs....I believe in the operation of cleansing grace to remove “inbred sin,” a second work of grace called entire sanctification.<sup>64</sup>

In this article Black also quoted several theological scholars to support the definitions he discussed. One notable writer he quoted was H. Orton Wiley. In talking about sanctification Wiley said,

It is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, and comprehends in one experience and cleansing of the heart from sin,

and the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit empowering the believer for life and service.<sup>65</sup>

In March, Black wrote another article called “A Guide to Seeking Sanctification.” Once again he told about man’s sinful condition:

...This inward pollution of sin must be dealt with in view of Biblical commands and ultimately in view of the eternal consequences if holiness of heart is not pursued and attained through God’s mercy and grace. Committed sins need His forgiveness; but the sinful condition of man’s heart needs holy cleansing.<sup>66</sup>

Later he admonished his readers to “...revere and experience the sanctifying fullness of the Holy Spirit by faith.”<sup>67</sup>

An article from the *Herald of Holiness* was reprinted in the *God’s Revivalist* in 1984. The writing was by W. T. Purkiser and it was called “What It Means to Have a Pure Heart.” Purkiser believed that original sin needed to be removed in sanctification. He was talking about all that took place when one got the experience when he wrote,

But there’s more to holiness than the absence of sin, just as there’s more to light than the absence of darkness.<sup>68</sup>

He also confirmed what he believed about the Holy Spirit in relationship to Pentecost. Purkiser wrote:

For Peter, the most memorable result of Pentecost in the lives of the disciples was that God gave the Holy Spirit, ‘purifying their hearts by faith’ (Acts 15:8,9). In light of this, he later wrote,

‘Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently’ (1 Peter 1:22).<sup>69</sup>

## **CHRISTOLOGICAL-SUBSTANTIVE/1980-1984**

There were twelve articles out of the fifty selected for this time period that were Christological-Substantive in content. Four of the twelve articles will



be discussed in this section. The writers were Wilfrid Moutoux, John May, W. L. Boone, and Lennie Mancino.

In August of 1981 an article was published by Moutoux. He definitely believed that the sin nature needed to be cleansed. He went to the Book of Isaiah to prove his point, “Isaiah enjoyed the ultimate in that God Himself said of Isaiah, ‘Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged’ (Isaiah 6:7).”<sup>70</sup>

He made it clear that holiness was possible in this life. He wrote, Jesus, the final authority, emphatically declares,

“Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God” (Matthew 5:8). Yes, God’s Word is clear: holiness is at once possible and essential....Let Christians everywhere claim that cleansing Christ provided with the shedding of His own blood.<sup>71</sup>

The second article for consideration was published in October of 1982. May penned a writing entitled, “This Same Jesus.” The primary text used in this article was “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever” (Hebrews 13:8).

In reference to the holiness experience the author commented,

Christ is still where He was, and He always will be. He has not changed in person, power, position, or promise. He is immutable and eternal. He still demands that His people be different, and He provides the experience to make them different.<sup>72</sup>

The third article was written by Boone in 1983. It was called “Pride: The Original Evil.” The author concluded that all of sin goes back to the original problem of pride that Adam and Eve experienced in the Garden of Eden. However, Boone believed that God had a remedy for the problem found in the heart of humanity. He wrote,

There is nothing left to pride when it is cleansed. Since it is totally immoral, it is totally removed from a holy heart. If the stirrings of pride are manifested in the heart, it has not been dealt the death blow.<sup>73</sup>

According to Boone, Christ was the remedy for this problem. His last paragraph gave his readers hope:

Best of all, there is abundant grace to cleanse and keep us from the polluting nature of all sin. Where there is provisional grace, there exists an equally required pursuance and residence of that grace. All glory be to our Christ and His abundant freedom from all sin.<sup>74</sup>

Lenny Mancino wrote the last article we considered in this section. It was published in 1983 and it was called “Balanced Biblical Holiness.”

In the writing Mancino made a distinction between sin and sinfulness. He concluded that Christ was the remedy for both problems. The author wrote:

Holiness is God’s remedy and response to sin. Do you deeply believe that? Calvary was for Holiness. (See Hebrews 13:12) Ultimately, justice and judgement will blend as God’s climactic response to sin and sinfulness. In the meantime, you and I are to bring the world into a constant encounter with the holiness of God and of Christ. This is the Christian vocation as a part of God’s redemptive activity.<sup>75</sup>

## **SIGNIFICANT SHIFTS AND EMPHASIS**

As indicated in the first part of this chapter, there were not articles found in the two hundred articles selected for this study that supported or taught the relational view of sin. There were, however, one hundred and forty articles that supported the Pentecostal-Substantive view and forty-two articles that taught the Christological-Substantive position concerning sanctification.

There were other significant differences between the twenty years represented in this study. In the period of 1906-1910 at least three things were noteworthy. First, there were references throughout the literature in which people talked about getting sanctified and healed in the same experience. Secondly, there was more of a confrontational attitude taken toward those who may have had a different view of holiness from the one who wrote the article. An example was when A. M. Hills named G. Campbell Morgan as “...someone who juggled the scripture to defend his

pet theory of not teaching a second work of grace.”<sup>76</sup> Thirdly, Oswald Chambers was the most frequent writer about holiness during this era. Out of the fifty articles chosen for this five-year period, Chambers wrote twelve of them.

In 1930-34 there was a lot of emphasis put on the didactic aspect of holiness. The writers were concerned that sanctification was taught clearly and Biblically. It was evident just from the titles of the articles: “What Holiness Really Is”; “Results of the Pentecostal Experience”; “Holiness Its Guiding Spirit”; “Steps in Seeking Holiness”; “Were the Disciples Sanctified at Pentecost?” “Paul a Pattern His Sanctification”; “Bible Sanctification” and other titles were also of an instructional perspective.

The subject of purity was mentioned often during the years of 1956-1960. Several articles dealt with the subject, but four specifically focused on the topic. They were “A Pure Heart,” “Heart Purity,” “Purity and Maturity,” and “Pardon and Purity.” Also, there were some emphases during this five-year period that dealt with holiness and humanity. There were two articles that addressed this topic, but the one by William S. Deal comprehensively covered the subject. His article was “The Deeper Life and the Human Element.”

Roy S. Nicholson was a frequent writer for the *God’s Revivalist* during the years of 1980-84. In fact, he wrote fifteen of the fifty articles chosen for this time period. His articles were mainly theological in nature.

There were also various secondary issues addressed concerning holiness by various authors during these five years. Some of the article titles were about modesty, anger, and kindness.

The selected articles consistently maintained a rigorist position in relationship to behavioral and appearance issues. As noted in the earlier chapter, presentations of entire sanctification were found to be linked with very specific standards of behavior and dress. There was no evidence disclosed that articles in *God’s Revivalist* condone the cultural accommodation seen in some holiness denominations or groups.

As the presentation of entire sanctification has remained constant throughout the period under study, it appears that the condition of God’s Bible School has not materially affected the treatment of holiness doctrine.

It was impossible to further test the relationships between the exposition of entire sanctification in *God's Revivalist* and the general condition of God's Bible School without significant variations in the teaching of entire sanctification.

# APPENDIX A

## HOLINESS THEOLOGICAL GRID

HOLINESS THEOLOGICAL CATEGORIES	A SUBSTANTIVE (Including Eradication) versus a RELATIONAL VIEWS OF SIN	B PENTECOSTAL (Power) versus b CHRISTOLOGICAL (Purity)	C RIGORISTIC versus c CONTEXTUAL Behavior Standard
1. Clarke, Adam <i>Clarke's Commentary</i> Volume 3	A Book of Acts	B Book of Acts	N/A
2. Curtis, Olin A. <i>The Christian Faith</i>	A Chapter 27 (p. 365)	b Chapter 27	N/A
3. Deal, William S. <i>All About Pentecost</i>	A Chapter 11 (p. 81)	B Chapter 6	N/A
4. Dunning, H. Ray <i>Grace, Faith, and Holiness A Wesleyan Systematic Theology</i>	a Chapter 9 (p. 286)	b Chapters 11,12,13	c Chapter 1
5. Dunning, H. Ray <i>A Layman's Guide to Sanctification</i>	a Chapters 3,8	b Chapter 5	c Chapter 9
6. Finney, Charles <i>Systematic Theology</i>	A Chapter 35	B Chapter 35	C N/A
7. Fletcher, John <i>The Works of John Fletcher, Vol. 2</i>	A Section 6	B Section 6	N/A
8. Flexon, R. G. <i>Holiness &amp; Its Relatives</i>	A Chapters 9,3	B Chapter 1	N/A
9. Godbey, William B. <i>The Christian Faith</i>	A Chapter 1	B Chapter 4	C Chapter 2

HOLINESS THEOLOGICAL CATEGORIES	A SUBSTANTIVE (Including Eradication) versus a RELATIONAL VIEWS OF SIN	B PENTECOSTAL (Power) versus b CHRISTOLOGICAL (Purity)	C RIGORISTIC versus c CONTEXTUAL Behavior Standard
10. Grider, J. K. <i>Entire Sanctification: The Distinctive Doctrine of Wesleyanism</i>	A Chapter 2	B Chapter 5	N/A
11. Hills, A. M. <i>Fundamental Christian Theology</i>	A Chapter 26	B Chapters 26,27	N/A
12. Hotle, Marlin R. <i>In Search of Sanctification</i>	A Sin as a State, an Act Chapter 11	B Chapter 12	N/A
13. Knapp, Martin Wells <i>Christ Crowned Within</i>	A Chapter 6	B Chapter 7	C Chapters 5, 9
14. Knapp, Martin Wells <i>The Double Cure</i>	A Chapter 8	B Chapters 8,12	N/A
15. Mahan, Asa <i>The Baptism of the Holy Ghost</i>	A Entire Book	B Entire Book	C N/A
16. Metz, Donald S. <i>Studies in Biblical Holiness</i>	A Sin as a State, an Act Chapter 5	B Chapters 10,11	c Chapter 13
17. Miley, John <i>Systematic Theology</i> Volume II, 1894	a Chapter 8 (p.358, ff.)	B Chapter 8	N/A
18. Miner, Raymond <i>Systematic Theology</i> V.II	A Chap.3 (pp. 385-97)	B Chap. 3 (pp. 385-97)	N/A
19. Morrison, H. C. <i>Baptism with the Holy Ghost</i>	A Chapter 4	B Entire Book	N/A
20. Palmer, Phoebe <i>The Promise of the Father</i>	A Chapter 17	B Chapter 17	N/A

HOLINESS THEOLOGICAL CATEGORIES	A SUBSTANTIVE (Including Eradication) versus a RELATIONAL VIEWS OF SIN	B PENTECOSTAL (Power) versus b CHRISTOLOGICAL (Purity)	C RIGORISTIC versus c CONTEXTUAL Behavior Standard
21. Pope, Wm. Burt <i>A Compendium of Christian Theology</i> V. III	A Pages 44,ff.	B Pages 28-44	C N/A
22. Purkiser, W. T. <i>Conflicting Concepts of Holiness</i>	A Chapter 1	B Chapter 4	N/A
23. Ralston, Thomas <i>Elements of Divinity</i>	A Pages 457-70	B Pages 460-70	N/A
24. Steele, Daniel <i>The Gospel of the Comforter</i>	A Chapter 15	B Chapter 15	N/A
25. Van Wormer, H. C. <i>God's Absolute Standard Entire Sanctification</i>	A Chapter 1	B Chapter 7	C Entire Book
26. Watson, Richard <i>Theological Insti- tutes, Volume 2</i>	A Chapter 29	B Chapter 29	N/A
27. Wesley, John <i>Plain Account of Christian Perfection</i>	A Pages 14-19	B Pages 78-108 (esp. p. 100)	C N/A
28. White, Stephen <i>Eradication Defined, of Holiness</i>	A Entire Book	B Chapter 7	N/A
29. Wilcox, Leslie <i>Be Ye Holy</i>	A Disposition or Nature of Sin from Adam Chapter 4	B Chapter 6	C Chapter 16
30. Wilcox, Leslie <i>Profiles in Wesleyan Theology, Volume 3</i>	A Nature of Sin Acts of Sin Chapter 8	B Chapter 12	C Chapter 13

HOLINESS THEOLOGICAL CATEGORIES	A SUBSTANTIVE (Including Eradication) versus a RELATIONAL VIEWS OF SIN	B PENTECOSTAL (Power) versus b CHRISTOLOGICAL (Purity)	C RIGORISTIC versus c CONTEXTUAL Behavior Standard
31. Wiley, H. Orton <i>Christian Theology</i> Volume 3	A Chapter 30	B Chapter 30 Page 29	c Chapter 10
32. Wynkoop, Mildred <i>A Theology of Love: The Dynamic of Wesleyanism</i>	a Sin Not a Thing Page 150	b Chapter 15	c Chapter 10
33. Yocum, Dale M. <i>The Holy Way: Studies in the Doctrine of Holiness</i>	A Formality of Our Own Human Nature Chapter 4	B Chapter 3	C N/A



# APPENDIX B

## HOLINESS CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

Christological Purity	Pentecostal Power		
Substantive	Deal Flexon Godbey* Hills Hotle	Knapp* Metz+ Morrison Palmer Pope	Van Wormer* Wesley White Wilcox*
Relational	Dunning+ Wiley+ Wynkoop+	Grider Miley Purkiser	

\*Strict Behavioral Standards

+Relaxed Behavioral Standards

# APPENDIX C

## ARTICLE CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

Christological-Substantive	Pentecostal-Substantive
32 - 1980's 35 - 1950's 38 - 1930's 35 - 1900's	12 - 1980's 10 - 1950's 9 - 1930's 11 - 1900's
Christological-Relational	Pentecostal-Relational
0 - 1980's 0 - 1950's 0 - 1930's 0 - 1900's	0 - 1980's 0 - 1950's 0 - 1930's 0 - 1900's

1980-1984	1956-1960	1930-1934	1906-1910
6 undetermined	5 undetermined	3 undetermined	4 undetermined

# ENDNOTES

## CHAPTER 1

- <sup>1</sup>The literature on the holiness movement is extensive. Introduction to this literature can be found in Charles Edwin Jones, *A Guide to the Study of the Holiness Movement* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974), and William Charles Miller, *Holiness Works: A Bibliography* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1986).
- <sup>2</sup>The official title of the publication is *God's Revivalist and Bible Advocate*. In this project the title has been shortened to *God's Revivalist*.
- <sup>3</sup>*God's Bible School and College, Catalog 1989-1991* (Cincinnati: God's Bible School, 1989), 5.

## CHAPTER 2

- <sup>1</sup>Martin W. Knapp, "God's Bible School," *God's Revivalist*, 23 August 1900.
- <sup>2</sup>Martin W. Knapp, "Mount of Blessings," *God's Revivalist*, 23 August 1900.
- <sup>3</sup>Martin W. Knapp, "Questions Asked and Answered," *God's Revivalist*, 11 October 1900.
- <sup>4</sup>Lloyd R. Day, "A History of God's Bible School in Cincinnati 1900-1949," Master's Thesis. University of Cincinnati, 1949, 43.
- <sup>5</sup>Day, 73.
- <sup>6</sup>Meredith G. Standley, "God's Bible School," *God's Revivalist*, 9 July 1908.
- <sup>7</sup>Joe C. Brown, "A Preliminary Report of Self-Evaluation of God's Bible School." Dissertation, Nazarene Theological Seminary, 1985, Chapter Two.
- <sup>8</sup>Day, 66-67.

- <sup>9</sup>Brown, 43.
- <sup>10</sup>Frederick A. Norwood, *The Story of American Methodism*, 3 v. (New York: Abingdon, 1964), Vol. 1, 76-80.
- <sup>11</sup>John L. Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism* (New York, NY: Abingdon Press, 1956), 92.
- <sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 128.
- <sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 124.
- <sup>16</sup>See Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-19th Century America*, 45-62.
- <sup>17</sup>Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-19th Century America* (New York, NY: Abingdon Press, 1957), 138.
- <sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, 140-44.
- <sup>19</sup>Peters, 134.
- <sup>20</sup>Carlton O. Wittlinger, *Quest for Piety and Obedience, The Story of the Brethren in Christ* (Nappanee, IN: Evangel Press, 1978), 1-2.
- <sup>21</sup>Charles E. Brown, *When the Trumpet Sounded, A History of the Church of God Reformation Movement*-(Anderson, IN: The Warner Press, 1951), 152.
- <sup>22</sup>Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness, The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962), 219.
- <sup>23</sup>Kenneth Brown, *History of the Churches of Christ in Christian Union* (Circleville, OH: Circle Press, Inc., 1980), 73.
- <sup>24</sup>Lee Haines and Paul Thomas, *An Outline History of the Wesleyan Church* (Marion, IN: The Wesley Press, 1976), 161.
- <sup>25</sup>The Church of God (Holiness) and the Pillar of Fire are exceptions to this generalization. They are numbered among the denominations included within the conservative holiness movement.
- <sup>26</sup>Pilgrim Holiness Church of New York, *Discipline* (Albany, NY: 1971), 1.

- <sup>27</sup> Allegheny Wesleyan Methodist Connection, *Discipline* (Salem, OH: 1990), 3.
- <sup>28</sup> Bible Methodist Church, *Discipline* (St. Mary's, OH: Published by the General Conference, 1982), 3.
- <sup>29</sup> Bible Missionary Church, *Discipline* (Rock Island, IL: Published by the Bible Missionary Church, 1983), 4.
- <sup>30</sup> *Wesleyan Tabernacle Association Manual*, (1990), 4.
- <sup>31</sup> The importance of these issues within the holiness movement is illustrated by literature dealing with behavioral and appearance issues. A recent example is A. Wingrove Taylor, *A Biblical Theology of Jewelry in Its Wider Context of a Theology of Adornment* (Indianapolis: Wesley Press, 1992).

### CHAPTER 3

- <sup>1</sup> Peters, 100.
- <sup>2</sup> Charles Edward White, *The Beauty of Holiness Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist, and Humanitarian* (Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press, 1986), 161.
- <sup>3</sup> Harold E. Raser, *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1987), 8.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 150.
- <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p 151. Quotations from Phoebe Palmer, *Entire Devotion to God: A Present to a Christian Friend* (London: Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, 1853), 13-14. Emphasis added by Raser.
- <sup>6</sup> See Palmer's treatment of entire sanctification in Phoebe Palmer, *The Way of Holiness With Notes by the Way* (New York: Palmer & Hughes, 1867). Also, see Phoebe Palmer, *Faith and Its Effects: Fragments from My Portfolio* (New York: Foster & Palmer, 1848), 98-105, for a concise statement of "altar theology." Raser provides a useful review of "altar theology" in his *Phoebe Palmer*, 171-77. For Palmer her "altar theology" was a "shorter way" to the experience of entire sanctification. Some within the holiness movement have spoken of improving upon Wesley when discussing the "shorter way."

- <sup>7</sup>For a concise example of this, see the “Editor’s Preface” written by Phoebe Palmer, *Pioneer Experiences; Or, The Gift of Power Received by Faith* (New York: W. C. Palmer, 1868), v-xii. More complete statements of Pentecostal language and imagery being associated with entire sanctification are found in *Phoebe Palmer, The Promise of the Father; Or, A Neglected Specialty of the Last Days* (Boston: Henry V. Degen, 1859). Cf., Raser, *Phoebe Palmer*, 273-4, Note 125, 381-2.
- <sup>8</sup>Palmer, *Pioneer Experiences*, xi-xii.
- <sup>9</sup>John L. Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism* (New York, NY: Abingdon Press, 1956), 134.
- <sup>10</sup>Paul Bassett and William Greathouse, *Exploring Christian Holiness*, Vol. 2 (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1985), 236.
- <sup>11</sup>John L. Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism* (New York, NY: Abingdon Press, 1956), 103.
- <sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 106.
- <sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 107.
- <sup>14</sup>Bassett and Greathouse, 255.
- <sup>15</sup>Peters, 159.
- <sup>16</sup>Bassett and Greathouse, 272.
- <sup>17</sup>Thomas N. Ralston, *Elements of Divinity*, (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1924), p. 470, as quoted in Bassett and Greathouse, 272.
- <sup>18</sup>Randolph S. Foster, *The Nature and Blessedness of Christian Purity* (New York: Land & Scott, 1851), 76-80, quoted in Bassett and Greathouse, 276.
- <sup>19</sup>John Wesley, *Wesley’s Sermons*, “The Scripture Way of Salvation,” Works, 6:52-54, quoted in Bassett and Greathouse, 277.
- <sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 279.
- <sup>21</sup>Raymond Miner, *Systematic Theology* (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1880), 2:384.
- <sup>22</sup>Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism* (New York, NY: Abingdon Press, 1956), 103, quoted in Bassett and Greathouse, 157.
- <sup>23</sup>Peters, 159-60.

- <sup>24</sup>Bassett and Greathouse, 285
- <sup>25</sup>Ibid., 287
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., 302.
- <sup>27</sup>Ibid., 307.
- <sup>28</sup>W. Ralph Thompson, "An Appraisal of the Keswick and Wesleyan Contemporary Positions." *Wesleyan Theological Journal I* (Spring 1966) :21-26.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid., 312.
- <sup>30</sup>Daniel Steele, *The Gospel of the Comforter* (Salem, OH: Schmul Publisher, 1973), 105.
- <sup>31</sup>Bassett and Greathouse, 313.
- <sup>32</sup>A. M. Hills, *Homiletics and Pastoral Theology* (Salem, OH: Schmul Publishers, 1985), 1.
- <sup>33</sup>A. M. Hills, *Holiness and Power* (Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist Press, 1897), 46.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid., 48.
- <sup>35</sup>A. M. Hills, *Scriptural Holiness and Keswick Teaching Compared* (Salem, OH: Schmul Publishers, n.d.), 29.
- <sup>36</sup>Bassett and Greathouse, 316.
- <sup>37</sup>H. Orton Wiley, *Christian Theology*, Vol. II (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1952), 310-11.
- <sup>38</sup>Mildred Bangs Wynkoop, *A Theology of Love* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1972), 150.
- <sup>39</sup>Ibid., 316.
- <sup>40</sup>H. Ray Dunning, *Grace Faith and Holiness* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1988), 484.
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid., 470.
- <sup>42</sup>J. Kenneth Grider, *Entire Sanctification: The Distinctive Doctrine of Wesleyanism* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1980), 9.
- <sup>43</sup>Ibid., 21-22.
- <sup>44</sup>Leslie D. Wilcox, *Be Ye Holy* (Cincinnati, OH: Revivalist Press, 1977), 9.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 71.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 57.

<sup>47</sup>Dale M. Yocum, *The Holy Way* (Salem, OH: Schmul Publications, 1981), 63-64.

## CHAPTER 4

<sup>1</sup>Mildred B. Wynkoop, *A Theology of Love* (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1972), 150.

<sup>2</sup>John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. II-(New York, NY: Hunt & Eaton Press, 1894), 358.

## CHAPTER 5

<sup>1</sup>G. D. Watson, "How Holiness Is Lost," *God's Revivalist*, 11 January 1906, 15.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>A. M. Hills, "The Third Blessing," *God's Revivalist*, 8 March 1906, 1.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>"Sanctified and Healed," *God's Revivalist*, 12 July 1906, 10.

<sup>6</sup>Donald Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987), 115-137.

<sup>7</sup>R. V. L., "Holiness a Thing of Power," *God's Revivalist*, 14 February 1907, 15.

<sup>8</sup>E. A. Ferguson, "Ye Shall Receive Power," *God's Revivalist*, 11 April 1907, 4.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>E. A. Ferguson, "In Power," *God's Revivalist*, 2 May 1907, 2.

<sup>11</sup>Oswald Chambers, "The Greatest Work in the World," *God's Revivalist*, 27 February 1908, 1.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.



- <sup>13</sup>Oswald Chambers, "The Greatest Thing in the World," *God's Revivalist*, 5 March 1908, 1.
- <sup>14</sup>Oswald Chambers, "Entire Sanctification," *God's Revivalist*, 23 April 1908, 2.
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>16</sup>Oswald Chambers, "Have You Been Unselfed?" *God's Revivalist*, 5 November 1908, 2.
- <sup>17</sup>Martin Wells Knapp, "The Pentecostal Church," *God's Revivalist*, 15 April 1909, 2.
- <sup>18</sup>Oswald Chambers, "Spirit Baptized Humanity," *God's Revivalist*, 15 July 1909, 11.
- <sup>19</sup>Samuel Logan Brengle, "Confessing to Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 29 April 1909, 5, 12.
- <sup>20</sup>G. D. Watson, "As I Have Loved You," *God's Revivalist*, 25 August 1910, 4.
- <sup>21</sup>G. D. Watson, "The Three Portraits," *God's Revivalist*, 17 November 1910, 3.
- <sup>22</sup>J. A. Huffman, "Results of the Pentecostal Experience," *God's Revivalist*, 12 June 1930, 3.
- <sup>23</sup>J. B. Chapman, "Radical Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 11 September 1930, 1.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup>E. E. Shelhammer, "Steps in Seeking Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 25 September 1930, 2.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup>J. A. Huffman, "Were the Disciples Sanctified at Pentecost?" *God's Revivalist*, 2 October 1930, 10.
- <sup>28</sup>J. B. Chapman, "Holiness and Conversation," *God's Revivalist*, 19 February 1931, 3.
- <sup>29</sup>Tony Anderson, "The Perfect Man," *God's Revivalist*, 19 February 1931, 3.

- <sup>30</sup>John A. Buryea, "Progressive Christians," *God's Revivalist*, 16 April 1931, 9.
- <sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>32</sup>"The Second Coming and Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 9 July 1931, 9.
- <sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>34</sup>J. A. Huffman, "The Holy Spirit's Relation to Sanctification," *God's Revivalist*, 20 August 1931, 4.
- <sup>35</sup>A. M. Hills, "Snowflake Religion," *God's Revivalist*, 15 October 1931, 16.
- <sup>36</sup>Joseph H. Smith, "Purity and Progress," *God's Revivalist*, 21 January 1932, 3.
- <sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>38</sup>John A. Duryea, "Peter's Fiery Baptism," *God's Revivalist*, 14 April 1932, 12.
- <sup>39</sup>A. M. Hills, "God's Standard of Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 23 June 1932, 3.
- <sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>41</sup>Charles H. Stalker, "A Man Filled with the Holy Spirit," *God's Revivalist*, 8 December 1932, 4.
- <sup>42</sup>Samuel L. Brengle, "Hallelujah!," *God's Revivalist*, 26 January 1933, 10.
- <sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*, 10.
- <sup>44</sup>Andrew Johnson, "Growth in Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 2 March 1933, 3.
- <sup>45</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.
- <sup>46</sup>Joseph Smith, "Holiness Flourishes in Humility," *God's Revivalist*, 27 April 1933, 9.
- <sup>47</sup>Buddie Robinson, "Two Works of Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 11 January 1934, 16.
- <sup>48</sup>George Ridout, "God's Skies Are Full of Pentecost," *God's Revivalist*, 14 June 1934, 5.
- <sup>49</sup>E. E. Shelhammer, "Three Grades of Sin," *God's Revivalist*, 13 September 1934, 12.

- <sup>50</sup>E. W. Lawrence, "Entire Sanctification by Faith," *God's Revivalist*, 5 April 1936, 12.
- <sup>51</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>52</sup>Ibid., 3.
- <sup>53</sup>Ibid., 3, 4.
- <sup>54</sup>M. L. Peterson, "True Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 23 August 1956, 4.
- <sup>55</sup>Ibid., 5.
- <sup>56</sup>Fannie Erb, "Holiness Is Not an Appendage," *God's Revivalist*, 27 September 1956, 5.
- <sup>57</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>58</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>59</sup>J. P. Trueblood, "The Gifts of the Spirit," *God's Revivalist*, 28 February 1957, 3, 4.
- <sup>60</sup>Ibid., 3.
- <sup>61</sup>Millard Downing, "A Second Work of Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 14 March 1957, 4-5.
- <sup>62</sup>H. E. Schmul, "The Beauty of Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 17 October 1957, 3.
- <sup>63</sup>A. M. Hill, "A Twofold Disease and a Double Cure," *God's Revivalist*, 30 January 1958, 4.
- <sup>64</sup>Ibid., 5.
- <sup>65</sup>Ibid., 5.
- <sup>66</sup>"How the Fire Fell," *God's Revivalist*, 9 October 1958, 5.
- <sup>67</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>68</sup>J. W. Short, "Our Lord's Last Day on Earth," *God's Revivalist*, 30 October 1958, 4.
- <sup>69</sup>George D. Watson, "Evidences of the Self-Life," *God's Revivalist*, 25 June 1959, 14.
- <sup>70</sup>"What Shall I Wear?," *God's Revivalist*, 13 August 1959, 5.
- <sup>71</sup>Ibid., 13.

<sup>72</sup>William S. Deal, "The Deeper Life and the Human Element," *God's Revivalist*, 3 September 1959, 2.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup>I. J. Snider, "Purity and Maturity," *God's Revivalist*, 4 February 1960, 5.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>77</sup>I. J. Snider, "Inbred Sin," *God's Revivalist*, 14 July 1960, 9.

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup>I. J. Snider, "Standing Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 25 August 1960, 5.

<sup>81</sup>Leonard Sankey, "Modesty in Attire, Adornment, and Attitude," *God's Revivalist*, 14 August 1980, 6.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup>Roy S. Nicholson, "Full Salvation Involves Two Works of Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 28 August 1980, 6.

<sup>84</sup>James D. Robertson, "Holy Living," *God's Revivalist*, 23 October 1980, 9.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>86</sup>Roy S. Nicholson, "Holiness Does Not Produce Fanaticism," *God's Revivalist*, 26 March 1981, 9.

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>88</sup>Leslie D. Wilcox, "The Need and Possibility of Two Works of Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 27 August 1981, 8.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>90</sup>R. G. Flexon, "Taking Inventory," *God's Revivalist*, 22 October 1981, 8.

<sup>91</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>92</sup>Morris Chalfant, "We Need God's Power," *God's Revivalist*, 21 October 1982, 7.

<sup>93</sup>John W. May, "This Same Jesus," *God's Revivalist*, 21 October 1982, 6.

<sup>94</sup>*Ibid.*

- <sup>95</sup>Glenn Black, “A Guide to Seeking Sanctification,” *God’s Revivalist*, 3 March 1983, 15.
- <sup>96</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>97</sup>John W. May, “Bible Prayers on Holiness,” *God’s Revivalist*, 19 May 1983, 7-8.
- <sup>98</sup>*Ibid.*, 8.
- <sup>99</sup>*Ibid.*, 9.
- <sup>100</sup>John W. May, “True Holiness or Putting on the New Man,” *God’s Revivalist*, 15 September 1983, 6.
- <sup>101</sup>*Ibid.*, 7.
- <sup>102</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>103</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>104</sup>W. T. Purkiser, “What It Means to Have a Pure Heart,” *God’s Revivalist*, 5 April 1984, 10.
- <sup>105</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>106</sup>*Ibid.*, 11.
- <sup>107</sup>John W. May, “Glorious Freedom,” *God’s Revivalist*, 17 May 1984, 9.

## CHAPTER 6

- <sup>1</sup>A. M. Hills, “The Third Blessing,” *God’s Revivalist*, 8 March 1906, 1.
- <sup>2</sup>Oswald Chambers, “The Greatest Thing in the World,” *God’s Revivalist*, 5 March 1908, 1.
- <sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>4</sup>Oswald Chambers, “Entire Sanctification,” *God’s Revivalist*, 23 April 1908, 2.
- <sup>5</sup>Chambers, “Spirit-baptized Humanity,” *God’s Revivalist*, 15 July 1909, 3.
- <sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>7</sup>W. B. Godbey, “The Work of the Holy Spirit,” *God’s Revivalist*, 31 December 1908, 3.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>W. B. Godbey, "The Gospel in Antioch," *God's Revivalist*, 15 April 1909, 6.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>M. W. Knapp, "The Pentecostal Church," *God's Revivalist*, 15 April 1909, 11.

<sup>12</sup>George B. Kulp, "Holiness and Heaven," *God's Revivalist*, 5 December 1907, 1.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Arthur Greene, "Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 23 July 1908, 3.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>George D. Watson, "As I Have Loved You," *God's Revivalist*, 25 August 1910, 4.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>"Carnality-Abomination," *God's Revivalist*, 25 March 1909, 12.

<sup>19</sup>J. B. Chapman, "Radical Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 11 September 1980, 1.

<sup>20</sup>John F. Knapp, "High Explosives," *God's Revivalist*, 7 August 1930, 12.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 12.

<sup>22</sup>John A. Duryea, "Progressive Christians," *God's Revivalist*, 16 April 1931, 9.

<sup>23</sup>John A. Duryea, "Peter's Fiery Baptism," *God's Revivalist*, 14 April 1932, 12.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Joseph H. Smith, "Purity and Progress," *God's Revivalist*, 21 January 1932, 12.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 3.

<sup>27</sup>M. G. Standley, "Babes in Christ – Carnal," *God's Revivalist*, 16 March 1933, 2.

<sup>28</sup>C. W. Ruth, "Christian Perfection," *God's Revivalist*, 13 July 1933, 4.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

- <sup>30</sup>George W. Ridout, "God's Skies Are Full of Pentecosts," *God's Revivalist*, 14 June 1934, 4.
- <sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>32</sup>Andrew Johnson, "Twelve Benefits of a Pure Heart," *God's Revivalist*, 2 August 1934, 3.
- <sup>33</sup>C. V. Fairbairn, "What Holiness Really Is," *God's Revivalist*, 22 May 1930, 3.
- <sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.
- <sup>35</sup>E. E. Shelhammer, "The Scope of Redemption," *God's Revivalist*, 23 July 1931, 4.
- <sup>36</sup>A. M. Hills, "God's Standard of Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 23 June 1932, 3.
- <sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, 2.
- <sup>38</sup>Buddie Robinson, "Two Works of Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 11 January 1934, 16.
- <sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>40</sup>Floyd L. Skinner, "The Power of Pentecost," *God's Revivalist*, 23 February 1956, 5.
- <sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*, 6.
- <sup>42</sup>Fannie Erb, "Holiness Is Not an Appendage," *God's Revivalist*, 27 September 1956, 5.
- <sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>44</sup>Fannie Erb, "Man's Greatest Enemy," *God's Revivalist*, 29 August 1957, 16.
- <sup>45</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>46</sup>H. E. Schmul, "The Beauty of Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 17 October 1957, 2.
- <sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>48</sup>W. C. Bowman, "Entire Sanctification," *God's Revivalist*, 4 September 1958, 5.
- <sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*

- <sup>50</sup>J. W. Short, "Our Lord's Last Day on Earth," *God's Revivalist*, 30 October 1958, 2.
- <sup>51</sup>J. M. Hames, "The Fullness of Pentecost," *God's Revivalist*, 12 March 1959, 2.
- <sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>53</sup>A. A. Ronshausen, "The Meaning of Pentecost," *God's Revivalist*, 14 May 1959, 2.
- <sup>54</sup>D. M. Wells, "The Call to Holiness," *God's Revivalist*, 22 September 1960, 9.
- <sup>55</sup>C. W. Ruth, "How to Obtain the Experience of Sanctification," *God's Revivalist*, 19 July 1956, 5.
- <sup>56</sup>T. M. Anderson, "Oneness Through Sanctification," *God's Revivalist*, 13 June 1957, 2.
- <sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.
- <sup>58</sup>A. M. Hills, "A Twofold Disease and a Double Cure," *God's Revivalist*, 30 January 1958, 5.
- <sup>59</sup>E. W. Lawrence, "Pardon and Purity," *God's Revivalist*, 16 June 1960, 2.
- <sup>60</sup>Roy S. Nicholson, "Full Salvation Involves Two Works of Grace," *God's Revivalist*, 28 August 1980, 6.
- <sup>61</sup>R. G. Flexon, "More Points to Ponder," *God's Revivalist*, 29 January 1981, 2.
- <sup>62</sup>R. G. Flexon, "Taking Inventory," *God's Revivalist*, 22 October 1981, 9.
- <sup>63</sup>Carl Ryan, "The Victorious Life," *God's Revivalist*, 2 September 1982, 16.
- <sup>64</sup>Glenn Black, "Holiness a Discussion of Definitions," *God's Revivalist*, 3 February 1983, 14.
- <sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>66</sup>Black, "A Guide to Seeking Sanctification," *God's Revivalist*, 3 March 1983, 15.
- <sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>68</sup>W. T. Purkiser, "What It Means to Have a Pure Heart," *God's Revivalist*, 5 April 1984, 11.



<sup>69</sup>Ibid., 10.

<sup>70</sup>Wilfrid Moutoux, “Holiness Is Essential,” *God’s Revivalist*, 13 August 1981, 2.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid.

<sup>72</sup>John May, “This Same Jesus,” *God’s Revivalist*, 21 October 1982, 6.

<sup>73</sup>W. L. Boone, “Pride: The Original Evil,” *God’s Revivalist*, 6 January 1983, 5.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., 6.

<sup>75</sup>Lenny Mancino, “Balanced Biblical Holiness,” *God’s Revivalist*, 17 February 1983, 7.

<sup>76</sup>A. M. Hills, “The Third Blessing,” *God’s Revivalist*, 8 March 1906, 1.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin, H. A. *Holiness and the Human Element*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal Publishing, 1919; reprint, Salem, OH: Schmul Publishers, 1976.
- Bassett, Paul M. "The Fundamentalist Leaving of the Holiness Movement, 1914-1940: The Church of The Nazarene, A Case Study." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (Spring 1978): 65-91.
- Bassett, Paul M. and Greathouse, William M. *Exploring Christian Holiness*, Vol. 2. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1985.
- Brengle, S. L. *Helps to Holiness*. London: Salvation Army Publishing House, 1896; reprint, Atlanta, GA: Salvation Army Publishing, 1975.
- Brown, Charles E. *When the Trumpet Sounded, A History of the Church of God Reformation Movement*. Anderson, IN: The Warner Press, 1951.
- Brown, Joe C. "A Preliminary Report of Self-Evaluation of God's Bible School," Dissertation. Nazarene Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Brown, Kenneth. *History of the Churches of Christ in Christian Union*. Circleville, OH: Circle Press, Ind. 1980.
- Caldwell, Wayne. *The Fruit and Gifts of the Holy Spirit*. Marion, IN: The Wesley Press, 1979.
- Carter, Charles W., ed. *A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology*, Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press, 1983.
- Day, Lloyd R. "A History of God's Bible School in Cincinnati, 1900-1949." Master's Thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1949.
- Deal, William Sanford. *All About Pentecost*. Salem, OH: Schmul Publishing Co., 1983.
- Deasley, Alex R. G. "Entire Sanctification and the Baptism with the Holy Spirit: Perspectives on the Biblical View of the Relationship." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 14 (Spring 1979):27-44.
- Dunning, H. Ray. *Grace, Faith, and Holiness: A Wesleyan Systematic Theology*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1988.

- . *A Layman's Guide to Sanctification*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1991.
- Earle, Ralph. *Sanctification in the New Testament*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1988.
- Flexon, R. G. *Holiness and Its Relatives*. Indianapolis, IN: Pilgrim Publishing House, 1949.
- Godbey, William Baxter. *Sanctification*. Cincinnati, OH: Elm Street Printing Co., 1884.
- God's Bible School and College Catalog*, 1991-1993.
- God's Revivalist*. 1906-1910, 1930-1934, 1956-1960, and 1980-1984.
- Greathouse, William M. *The Fullness of the Spirit*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1958.
- Grider, J. Kenneth. *Entire Sanctification: The Distinctive Doctrine of Wesleyanism*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1980.
- Haines, Lee and Paul Thomas. *An Outline History of the Wesleyan Church*. Marion, IN: The Wesley Press, 1976.
- Hills, Aaron M. *Fundamental Christian Theology*, 2 v., Pasadena, CA: C. J. Kinne, 1934.
- . *Homiletics and Pastoral Theology*. Salem, OH: Schmul Publishers, 1985.
- . *Scriptural Holiness and Keswick Teaching Compared*. Manchester, England: Star Hall Publishing, 1910; reprint, Salem, OH: Schmul Publishers, n.d.
- Hotle, Marlin R. *In Search of Sanctification*. Salem, OH: Schmul Publishing Co., 1991.
- Hyde, A. B. *The Story of Methodism*. Springfield, MA: Willey & Co., 1889.
- Knapp, Martin Wells. *Christ Crowned Within*. Cincinnati, OH: Cranston and Stowe, 1889.
- . *The Double Cure*. Cincinnati, OH: M. W. Knapp, Revivalist Office, 1895.
- Lindstrom, Harold. *Wesley and Sanctification*. Stockholm: 1946; reprint, Wilmore, KY: Francis Asbury Publishing Company, Inc., 1984.

- Lyon, Robert W. "Baptism and Spirit-Baptism in the New Testament." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 14 (Spring 1979):14-26.
- Metz, Donald S. *Studies in Biblical Holiness*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1971.
- Morrison, Henry Clay. *Baptism with the Holy Ghost*. Louisville, KY: Pentecostal Publishing Co., 1900.
- Nicholson, Roy S. *True Holiness*. Salem, OH: Schmul Publishing, 1985.
- Peters, John L. *Christian Perfection and American Methodism*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press, 1985.
- Purkiser, W. T. *Conflicting Concepts of Holiness*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1953.
- . *Exploring Christian Holiness*, Vol. 1. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1983.
- . *Interpreting Christian Holiness*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1971.
- Raser, Harold E. *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought*. Lewiston, NY; Queenston, OT: Edwin Mellen Press, 1987.
- Smith, Timothy. *Called Unto Holiness, The Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962.
- . *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-19th Century America*. New York, NY: Abingdon Press, 1957.
- Steele, Daniel. *The Gospel of the Comforter*. Boston: Christian Witness, 1897; reprint, Salem, OH: Schmul Publishers, reprint, 1973.
- Taylor, Richard S. *Exploring Christian Holiness*, Vol. 3. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1985.
- . *Great Holiness Classics*, Vol. 3. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1985.
- . *Life in the Spirit*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1976.
- . *Preaching Holiness Today*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1987.

- Turner, George Allen. *The Vision Which Transforms*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1970.
- Tuttle, Robert G. *John Wesley: His Life and Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Van Wormer, H. C. *God's Absolute Standard, Entire Sanctification*. Salem, OH: Allegheny Publications, 1980.
- White, Charles Edwin. *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist and Humanitarian*. Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press of Zondervan Publishing House, 1985.
- White, Stephen Solomon. *Eradication Defined, Explained, Authenticated*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1954.
- Wilcox, Leslie. *Be Ye Holy*. Cincinnati, OH: The Revivalist Press, 1965.
- , ed. *Profiles in Wesleyan Theology*, 3 v. Salem, OH: Schmull Publishing Co., 1983-85.
- Wiley, H. Orton. *Christian Theology*, 3 v. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Publishing House, 1940, 1941, 1943.
- Williams, Colin W. *John Wesley's Theology Today*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Wittlinger, Carlton O. *Quest for Piety and Obedience The Story of the Brethren in Christ*. Nappanee, IN: Evangel Press, 1978.
- Wood, Laurence W. *Pentecostal Grace*. Wilmore, KY: Francis Asbury Publishing Co., 1980.
- Wynkoop, Mildred Bangs. *A Theology of Love; The Dynamic of Wesleyanism*. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1972.
- Yocum, Dale Morris. *The Holy Way: Studies in the Doctrine of Holiness*. Salem, OH: Schmull Publishing Co., 1976.

## **PUBLISHERS NOTES**

### **CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE**

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at...

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

### **WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?**

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to “make the words of the wise available to all —inexpensively.” We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

### **ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?**

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

### **HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?**

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

### **ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?**

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at AGES Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or

otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

### **WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?**

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation.