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Intertwined History, Theology, and Scholarship
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Historically and theologically, the Holiness and Pentecostal movements are closely related and intertwined. They have been cordial and hostile “cousins” and competitors—and, at times, exclusivist regarding one another. This combination of shared heritage and tension has made scholarly discussion of the commonalities and differences between them challenging. Yet there are common values, histories, theologies, and practices, even as these shared elements have often been defined over against one another. Conversation at local and church leadership levels as well as in scholarly gatherings has been difficult. While there have been examples of respectful and fruitful church and scholarly dialogue between the two traditions, cooperative research, thinking, and publishing have languished. We hope this book contributes to filling this gap in the scholarship.

The volume presents chapters demonstrating that one way to understand the Holiness, Radical Holiness, and Pentecostal movements is to analyze them in relation to one another. The chapters support the thesis that the movements are indeed intertwined. The chapters are arranged under three rubrics: (1) “At the Beginning,” focusing on geographically diverse historical case studies; (2) “Unity and Diversity,” examining cultural images and metaphors, struggles with manifesting unity and social justice, and pneumatology; and (3) “Theological Engagement,” analyzing theologies of Spirit baptism and atonement, grace, and “full gospel.”
This book does not present an argument for, or critique of, the three most popular scholarly theories of the origins of Pentecostalism. That is beyond the purview of this work. The primary theses remain: the Parham thesis, the Seymour/Azusa thesis, and the multiple origins thesis. What can perhaps be deduced from the studies presented in this volume is that these theses require further research and reflection. Investigations that incorporate a larger base of more precise definitions, questions, and data may shed new light on the origins of Pentecostalism and its relationship to the Holiness Movement.

The introduction to this volume has three goals: (1) to describe the intertwining sources and trajectories of the Holiness and Pentecostal movements; (2) to discuss the rise and fall of scholarly interaction between the two traditions in the United States since about 1970; and (3) to provide an orientation to the chapters in this volume.

**INTERTWINED SOURCES AND TRAJECTORIES OF THE HOLINESS AND PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENTS**

Throughout the history of the Christian churches, there have been networks of earnest Christians formed to correct what they perceive to be the churches’ shortcomings. Some Protestant reform networks developed to revive and challenge the older churches of the sixteenth to twenty-first century. These reform movements often had their origins in the Pietist and Moravian experience (Ward) or that of French Protestantism following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (Vuilleumier). These movements were influential in Methodism and the Great Awakening. However, the Quakers, Baptists, and Congregationalists—as well as the Catholic Brethren of the Common Life in the Low Countries and Catholic orders—had similar goals. Inspiration from the Catholic tradition was drawn upon (e.g., Thomas à Kempis, Madame Guyon, François Fénelon, Catherine of Siena, St. John of the Cross) by many of these reformers, as were the theology and practice of the Protestant Reformation. French scholar Bernard Cottret has argued that there were three reformations: those of Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, with that led by the latter being more definitive. Significantly for later developments, the reforming or renewing movements generally had prominent pneumatic elements. As Finnish Pentecostal scholar Juhani Kuosmanen has demonstrated, pneumatic reformist and renewal movements have had a long history. Many nineteenth-century networks seeking to reform the churches and enhance the quality of Christian faith drew upon the diverse reformist sources, both Protestant and Catholic,
of earlier centuries. Throughout their history, the Holiness Movement, the Radical Holiness Networks, and Methodists have had ambiguous relationships with John Wesley, Wesleyan spirituality, and Wesleyan theological foci. Individuals and networks might claim varying aspects of this legacy, but rarely was that identity paramount. Historical, theological, and cultural analysis of the diverse holiness networks is a complicated project.

**Holiness Movements: Reforming the Churches in North America**

In North America, the Methodists, heirs of reformist networks, quickly attracted a following that eclipsed most colonial churches, including Anglicans, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians. Within Bishop Francis Asbury’s (1745–1816) lifetime, a network of not very prosperous lay and ordained preachers (women, men, white, black) developed to correct the Methodist Episcopal Church’s ill treatment of German “Methodist” Brethren and African American Methodists, as well as to provide alternatives to the silencing of women, most of whom understood the doctrine of sanctification (baptism with the Holy Spirit) as giving them freedom to address religious and wider moral issues. They found an unlikely leader/model in Lorenzo Dow (1777–1834), who was perhaps seen in person by a larger number of people than anyone before the development of television. He preached a combination of Methodist doctrine and “Americanism” (he did not always distinguish!) and reported converts in all denominations within the developing infrastructure of the new United States of America. Many of the next generation of religious leaders, including Brigham Young and Charles G. Finney, were influenced by him, probably indirectly. Dow requires extensive research to establish more clearly his role in developments in the United States during the early nineteenth century. His work in encouraging the formation of Primitive Methodism in the United Kingdom out of Wesleyan Methodism is well documented.

A decade after Dow, from 1830 to the Civil War, the Methodist Episcopal Church erupted with a new network of reformers, including Orange Scott, La Roy Sunderland, Timothy Merritt, Sarah Worrall Lankford, Phoebe Worrall Palmer, and B. T. Roberts, some of whom left the Methodist Episcopal Church or were forced out. From outside of Methodism came figures such as William Boardman (Presbyterian), Asa Mahan (Presbyterian, Congregationalist), Thomas Upham (Congregationalist), and Charles G. Finney (Presbyterian, Congregationalist). Methodists and non-Methodists in these networks (with the possible exception of the Worrall sisters) understood sanctification (baptism
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with the Holy Spirit) to require the abolition of slavery, economic justice, and freedom for women to minister.⁹

From these leaders and their followers, the Holiness Movement emerged. It was a diverse network with multiple nodes. Often, they worked together to achieve goals, and sometimes they did not. A central driving force for them was the question, Can we not be better Christians tomorrow than we are today? All believed that sanctification required living lives of love for God and for their neighbor. They trumpeted their concerns in periodicals, including The True Wesleyan (Scott), Guide to Christian Perfection (Merritt), and Earnest Christian (Roberts). The movement was also promoted through a series of books: Merritt’s Christian’s Manual: A Treatise on Christian Perfection (1824), Mahan’s The Scriptural Doctrine of Christian Perfection (1839), Upham’s Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life (1843), Palmer’s The Way of Holiness (1843), and William E. Boardman’s The Higher Christian Life (1858), to name just a few. Timothy Smith, Victor Howard, and Douglas Strong have argued that this diverse Holiness Movement played a significant role in achieving its goal of emancipation of enslaved African Americans.¹⁰

From the Holiness Movement to the Radical Holiness Networks

After the Civil War, around the edges of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness (1867), which became the National Holiness Association (NHA), developed a more Methodist-focused version of the Holiness Movement. While it attracted participants from other churches (Baptists, Quakers, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, among others), the focus was Methodist theology and practice. The understanding of sanctification came to focus on personal purification and power for ministry, rather than engagement with social change. Many Methodists (and Free Methodists) in cooperation with disaffected Holiness advocates in the older churches developed Radical Holiness Networks. These people and groups were usually alienated from their own churches, due to social location, education, and conceptions of Christian ministry and mission. They adopted ideas that were not prominent in Methodist churches, including faith healing and premillennialism. By the 1890s, loose networks of Radical Holiness churches and ministries were forming into regional denominations, with diverse theologies and publications. These new networks and denominations constituted the Radical Holiness Networks.¹¹ Holiness churches founded before the Civil War (Wesleyan Methodist Church [1843], Free Methodist Church [1860])
firmed up their Holiness boundaries. Many members of the older Methodist churches, both white and black, remained faithful Holiness Movement–style Methodists.

Those outside the Methodist folds who were enthusiastic about sanctification/baptism with the Holy Spirit had diverse understandings of the experience. They were minimally interested in classic Methodist theology, and became proponents of the ministry of women, faith healing, “self-supporting” or “faith” mission, and premillennialism. Most relativized their earlier religious involvements, even while retaining connections and/or credentials in older denominations. The Radical Holiness Networks became their primary identity. Defections from the Methodist Episcopal Church were many; those from the Free Methodist Church included the Vanguard Mission (1881) and Pentecost Bands (1882). The Salvation Army (1880 in the United States), Church of God (Anderson [Indiana]) (1881), and the Christian and Missionary Alliance (1887) grew quickly. The Radical Holiness Networks and denominations gathered significant numbers of committed Christians from diverse denominations. Quaker Yearly Meetings became Radical Holiness as did Baptist Associations (e.g., Georgia and Arkansas). Both the Holiness and Radical Holiness movements established large numbers of educational institutions, rescue missions, and foreign mission agencies throughout the United States, as well as camp meetings. Crucial to maintaining the networks were the periodical publications. Every group and emerging denomination had one or several. Among those with significant national circulation were the Christian Witness and Advocate of Bible Holiness (Boston, Chicago, University Park [Iowa]), God’s Revivalist (Cincinnati), Pentecostal Herald (Louisville), and Burning Bush (Chicago, Waukesha).

The conflict between the NHA Methodist-oriented Holiness Movement and the Radical Holiness Movements came to a head in Chicago in 1901. William Kostlevy described the trauma of the two networks sharing meeting and ministry venues as they competed for the heart and minds of the religious seekers of Chicago, church people, and donors. The Radical Holiness Networks “won” these contests and the NHA became more Radical Holiness.

Holiness, Radical Holiness, and Pentecostal

Pentecostalism as we now know it was arguably initially defined for the United States during the period 1906–19. There were certainly earlier revivals in which glossolalia and other elements claimed as Pentecostal “distinctives” played
important roles. However, the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles provided crucial, if brief and illusory, cohesiveness. Azusa Street served as a quasi-historical (mythic) icon within which converts to Pentecostalism sometimes sought to understand their spirituality. Most of the leadership of this and other similar revivals around the world involved Radical Holiness believers and leaders. The unity through the experience of baptism with the Holy Spirit envisaged by William Seymour (1870–1922) and his team splintered quickly into Hispanic, European American, African American, and other ethnic and language traditions. It also fragmented theologically (between Trinitarian and Oneness Pentecostals, and between Holiness and “Finished Work” views of sanctification) and regionally in the United States. Within a short time, there were Pentecostal denominations and ministries on six continents. Those who identified with the Azusa Street icon were, at the same time, independent of it. There was no magisterium to enforce uniformity, even within the United States, much less beyond.

The Radical Holiness churches lost much of a generation of charismatic leaders to the new movement. Many of the newer and smaller Holiness denominations consolidated in the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene or in the Pilgrim Holiness Church. New networks formed out of the Pentecostal revival in Los Angeles. In 1919, the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene left the term Pentecostal behind, and took firmer stances against religious enthusiasm in its midst. In the context of the larger American culture, which understood them as “Holy Rollers,” a term reborn following the 1904–6 trials of Franz Creffield and George Mitchell in Portland and Seattle, both the Radical Holiness and Pentecostal movements were considered deviant by the older churches, not only for their religious enthusiasm and theologies but also for their multiracial ministry efforts, women preachers, and lower-class adherents. Both movements were caught between the mainline churches and the Fundamentalists, which, despite their differences, generally agreed on their negative views of the Holiness, Radical Holiness, and Pentecostal churches. The shared general (but not absolute) alienation from North American religious culture only increased their competition and tendency toward differentiation.

Some of the predominantly white Holiness and Pentecostal churches sought refuge from American religious conflict and hoped for a more unified future within the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) following its establishment in 1942. It was founded by the ecumenically committed leader of the New England Fellowship, J. Elwin Wright, whose father left the Free Methodist Church and became Pentecostal with the assistance of, among others,
Bishop Leslie R. Marston (Free Methodist) and Harold John Ockenga, who grew up in the Methodist Episcopal Church and graduated from the Holiness, Methodist-related Taylor University (1927). The NAE worked to make space for the Holiness and Pentecostal churches. It is important to note that most denominations of both traditions did not join, including the Church of the Nazarene, Salvation Army, Church of God in Christ, and Pentecostal Assemblies of the World.

Outside North America, relationships between Radical Holiness and Pentecostal movements and other churches varied from country to country and are too diverse to summarize here. Despite occasional irenic moments, Holiness, Radical Holiness, and Pentecostal churches remained largely divided along racial and class lines. Actualizing the dream of all these movements at the beginning of the century to transcend the divisions of humanity through baptism with the Holy Spirit remained, and remains, elusive.

Another opportunity appeared with the development of the Charismatic Movements and Jesus People networks. Some local relationships developed between Holiness and Pentecostal churches and Jesus People. Occasionally, positive connections were made between Pentecostals and Charismatics, but usually not between Charismatics and Holiness churches.

BRINGING SCHOLARSHIP ON THE HOLINESS AND PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENTS TOGETHER

Despite the shared history, theology, and praxis, as well as limited engagement within the NAE and other agencies, the development of Holiness and Pentecostal historiography has been fragmented. As the churches evolved separately along class, racial, regional, and denominational lines, demarcations were made clear by differentiated theologies. Scholars, whose financial survival often depended on the denominations, wrote extensively for publication within the denominations. They tended perforce to ignore connections to other parts of the traditions and focused on the part of the movement to which they were confessionally tied. Radical Holiness and Pentecostal students had difficulty being accepted into doctoral programs of the universities. While a few succeeded in gaining access, it was not until the late 1950s and 1960s that a critical mass had the education that could support creative intellectual work. On the model of other scholarly societies, the Wesleyan Theological Society (WTS) was organized in 1965. The Society for Pentecostal Studies (SPS) was founded in 1970. SPS had a larger vision, including dialogue with the Charismatic Movement and
Wesleyan-Holiness scholars. The early dialogues were published in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins* and in *Pneuma*, the scholarly journal of SPS.26

There were three primary centers for this initial Wesleyan-Holiness and Pentecostal encounter: Cleveland, Tennessee; Franklin Springs, Georgia; and Wilmore, Kentucky. At Franklin Springs College, Vinson Synan (1934–2020), with his PhD degree from the University of Georgia, was beginning to reach out to other scholars, primarily through the publication of his thesis, about which more is said below. At Lee College (now University) in Cleveland, R. Hollis Gause (1925–2015) was celebrating more than two decades of teaching, as he and others worked to found what is now known as Pentecostal Theological Seminary. He was also in his own educational transition as a PhD student at Emory University. There he encountered the Wesleyan tradition of the Methodists. He was crucial to the founding of SPS. At the 1972 SPS, his presidential address, “Issues in Pentecostalism,” noted that there were some connections between Pentecostalism and “Wesleyanism.”27 Through his life, thanks primarily to his discussions with Henry H. Knight III and Steven J. Land, he moved from being a Holiness-Pentecostal to being a Wesleyan-Holiness-Pentecostal, as is evidenced in a 1970 lecture on “Worldliness” and the two editions of his book, *Living in the Spirit*.28 In the words of historian and archivist David Roebuck, Gause moved toward “situating his identity in a historical movement.”29

At the same time, developments were taking place at Asbury Theological Seminary, a Wesleyan-Holiness institution, that led to early exploration of histories, theologies, and concerns of the Holiness, Keswick, and Pentecostal movements. Dr. Susan A. Schultz Rose (1911–2011), a Librarian and Professor at Asbury Theological Seminary, employed Donald W. Dayton (1942–2020) (a Collection Development Librarian), D. William Faupel (Reference Librarian), and David Bundy (as a work study student bibliographer).30 She understood the connections among the three religious movements and commissioned her three disciples to write about them: Dayton on the Holiness Movement, Faupel on the Pentecostal Movement, and Bundy on the Keswick-Higher Life Movements. To avoid criticism from the senior faculty, all were written and published as bibliographical essays.31

Then, on the same day, Dayton and Bundy purchased the first two copies of a version of the University of Georgia doctoral dissertation of Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States* (1971), to arrive at the seminary bookstore.32 Now, half a century later, it is difficult to imagine the excitement produced by this book that hyphenated the two movements in its title. Among other things, it provoked the work of Herbert McGonigle,
followed by Timothy L. Smith (1924–1997), and Donald Dayton in the WTS to insist on varying degrees of commonality and distance among the Methodist, Wesleyan-Holiness, and Pentecostal churches, an analysis based, in part, on perceived differences in language between John Wesley and John Fletcher. Out of this grew Dayton’s *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (1987).

Another formative moment was Donald Dayton and David Bundy’s visit to Franklin Springs, Georgia, in January 1972, to meet Vinson Synan. He received us graciously and we discussed his book. During the discussion, Bundy asked whether Synan would come to lecture at Asbury Theological Seminary in March 1972 if a way could be found to invite him. At the time, Asbury required all Pentecostals and Charismatics to undergo psychological testing and therapy if they were admitted at all. Bundy, editor of *The Short Circuit*, the Asbury Seminary student newspaper, widely circulated in Wilmore, Kentucky, organized the “*Short Circuit* Forum,” which paid Synan’s transportation and guestroom. Susan Schultz agreed that the library lecture room could be used if “Don as a member of the library staff would take responsibility.” The audience overflowed into the hallways and library. The next morning Bundy was summoned to the president’s office to explain the “irrational and unwise decision.”

This event marked a beginning of friendships, dialogues, and intensified historical research. It was not easy. Later that year, at the Wesleyan Theological Society, Donald Dayton moved that the WTS send greetings to its “sister” society, SPS. Only two people (Dayton and Bundy) voted for the motion; a motion to expunge the motion, the discussion, and vote from the record passed. The next year (1973) a group of Asbury Theological Seminary faculty (David Bundy, D. William Faupel, Delbert R. Rose, and future faculty member Melvin E. Dieter) as well as Donald W. Dayton, by then a librarian at North Park Theological Seminary and doctoral student at the University of Chicago, attended the SPS meeting in Cleveland, Tennessee. The WTS, which had very restrictive membership policies, refused to allow Vinson Synan to join and rescinded an invitation for him to give a paper. The next decade saw some thawing of relationships from the Wesleyan-Holiness side. In 1988, the Wesleyan-Holiness Studies Project, created by Bundy and Faupel at Asbury Theological Seminary, hosted both WTS and SPS, albeit at different times. At that SPS meeting, a “Post-Meeting Session,” cochaired by Howard A. Snyder and Vinson Synan, featured presentations and discussion of “The Holiness and Pentecostal Traditions in Dialogue.”

In Cleveland, R. Hollis Gause was developing (from 1975) the Church of God School of Theology (later Pentecostal Theological Seminary), often team
teaching with Steven J. Land, who for some of this time was a PhD student at Emory University. Crucial to the shift to “Wesleyan” were the discussions begun in 1983 between Henry H. Knight III and Land in the context of Emory University. Gause and Knight were both on Land’s doctoral examination committee in 1991.38 Knight, a United Methodist, taught courses on John Wesley’s theology and subsequent Wesleyan movements at Church of God Theological Seminary as an adjunct professor in 1990, 1995–96, and 2000. Land’s theological perspective was refined in extensive discussions with Knight.

Most of the faculty and Church of God leadership were shaped by Gause and Land, especially through Land’s book, *Pentecostal Spirituality*.39 Among these was Cheryl Bridges Johns, a prolific scholar and ecumenist. She was already involved in discussion with Dayton, Bundy, Faupel, and Knight. In the summer of 1992, she and Jo Anne Lyon, future General Superintendent of the Wesleyan Church, participated in the summer workshop “Ecumenism Within Us,” sponsored by the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research held at Saint John’s Abbey and University in Collegeville, Minnesota. They developed an enduring friendship as they discussed the estrangement of the Wesleyan-Holiness and Pentecostal traditions.

A year later at the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order, which took place at Santiago de Compostela, Spain, August 3–14, 1993, with the theme “Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness,” Cheryl Bridges Johns met Susie C. Stanley, a prolific author, founder of Wesleyan-Holiness Women Clergy, and then Professor at Western Evangelical Seminary, near Portland, Oregon. They discussed the possibility of SPS and WTS having a joint meeting as a form of ecumenical affirmation of their common heritages and missions. In 1992–93, they were presidents of the two societies: Susie C. Stanley headed WTS, and Cheryl Bridges Johns, SPS. Their energy and vision for enlarging the discussion made possible the first joint meeting of SPS and WTS at the Church of God Theological Seminary in Cleveland, Tennessee, in 1998.

The cooperation between the two societies was facilitated by a close working relationship between William Kostlevy (WTS) and D. William Faupel (SPS). Kostlevy, an Archivist, Special Collections Librarian, affiliate Professor of Church History, and Associate Director of the Wesleyan / Holiness Studies Center at Asbury Theological Seminary, was elected Secretary-Treasurer of WTS (1991), and Faupel, Librarian and Professor at Asbury Seminary, was elected Executive Secretary of SPS (1997). The offices of the two organizations were in the B. L. Fisher Library of Asbury Theological Seminary.
After the success of the initial event, a second joint WTS-SPS meeting (2003) was hosted by the Wesleyan / Holiness Studies Center of Asbury Theological Seminary. As in the initial joint gathering, there were common themes, sessions featured both WTS and SPS scholars, and plenary addresses were scheduled so that all participants could attend all plenary events. The third joint meeting held in 2008 at Duke Divinity School continued that tradition.

Some scholars worked to further build these bridges. From 2004 to 2009, Henry H. Knight III hosted “The Wesleyan/Pentecostal Consultation,” an annual two-day event that met at the conference center of Nazarene Theological Seminary in Kansas City, Missouri. Funded by a grant from the Louisville Institute given to Saint Paul School of Theology, where Knight is on the faculty, thirty scholars and pastors, representing twelve denominational traditions, discussed the intersections of the Wesleyan and Pentecostal traditions. Most presentations appeared in *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street* (2010). Long-lasting scholarly friendships and collaborations resulted. Knight’s *Anticipating Heaven Below* (2014) is best understood as arising from the context of that Consultation.

After changes of leadership in the two societies, the fourth joint meeting of SPS and WTS in 2013 at Seattle Pacific University featured two societies meeting on the same campus, about a half-mile apart. There was little collaboration in programming or visioning. The same occurred at the 2018 joint meeting at Pentecostal Theological Seminary, Cleveland, Tennessee. During the 2020 WTS meeting, the Executive Committee put forward a motion to discontinue joint meetings with SPS. No discussion was allowed. The motion passed.

Wanting to promote fruitful engagement between the Wesleyan-Holiness and Pentecostal traditions and perceiving a decline of discussions and shared research between SPS and WTS scholars, David Sang-Ehil Han, the Dean of the Faculty, Vice-President for Academics, and Professor of Theology and Pentecostal Spirituality at Pentecostal Theological Seminary; Geordan Hammond, a Senior Lecturer in Church History and Wesley Studies at Nazarene Theological College and Director of the Manchester Wesley Research Centre; and David Bundy, Associate Director of the Manchester Wesley Research Centre, met during the March 2018 joint WTS-SPS meeting to discuss the possibilities of a program of research. Since the Manchester Wesley Research Centre was already a “Related Scholarly Organization” of the American Academy of Religion, it was agreed to create an AAR Annual Meeting session sponsored by the Manchester Wesley Research Centre and Pentecostal Theological Seminary on the intertwined Holiness and Pentecostal movements.
THE PRESENT VOLUME

The diachronic and synchronic histories sketched above provide context for the chapters in this volume. The contributions are arranged into three sections: (1) “At the Beginning,” (2) “Unity and Diversity,” and (3) “Theological Engagement.” The chapters in the first section, “At the Beginning,” focus on the shared experiences of Holiness and Pentecostal leaders at the turn of the twentieth century. They reveal that while the intertwined elements of the Radical Holiness and Pentecostal movements evolved differently in the United States, India, South and Southeast Asia, and the United Kingdom, the two movements had deep and complex connections.

The second group of chapters, “Unity and Diversity,” reveals that the Radical Holiness and Pentecostal movements shared cultural images, struggles with manifesting unity and social justice, and pneumatology. The final contributions, gathered as “Theological Engagement,” examine the concepts of Spirit baptism and atonement, grace, and “full gospel,” demonstrating that commonalities of theological language, values, and methods shape the theological reflection of the Holiness and Pentecostal movements.

At the Beginning

David Bundy, “The Preachers and Their Students: God’s Bible School as a Seedbed of Radical Holiness and Pentecostal Leaders, 1892–1910,” focuses on the Cincinnati ministry and institution founded by Martin Wells Knapp that trained several formative leaders for both the Radical Holiness and Pentecostal movements. Examining the theology and social commitments of Knapp and the God’s Bible School faculty members, Bundy places the Radical Holiness Movement in Populist and Progressive America, indicating parallels to the Industrial Workers of the World (Wobblies).

Robert A. Danielson, “Pandita Ramabai, the Holiness Movement, and the Mukti Revival of 1905,” examines the library of Ramabai as well as some of her relationships with people connected to the Holiness and Radical Holiness movements. Particular attention is paid to Albert Norton, who worked closely with and visited her at the Mukti Mission, E. F. and Phebe Ward, the Pentecost Bands, and William Godbey, a peripatetic Radical Holiness theologian and professor at God’s Bible School. Danielson argues that the Mukti Revival of 1905 is better understood in the context of those relationships.
Kimberly Ervin Alexander, “Alexander A. Boddy, the Pentecostal League of Prayer, and the Wesleyan Roots of British Pentecostalism,” examines the understudied relationship between Richard Reader Harris, Harris’s Pentecostal League of Prayer, and Alexander A. Boddy, one of the founders of Pentecostalism in the United Kingdom. The study provides an example of the separation between the Holiness and Pentecostal movements in the United Kingdom.

Finally, Luther Oconer, “A World Tour of Evangelism: Henry Clay Morrison’s Radical Holiness Meets ‘Global Holiness,’ 1909–10,” discusses the significance of the eleven-month “world tour of evangelism” by Morrison, soon to be elected president of Asbury College, conducting “Pentecostal meetings” in Asia, most particularly in India, Korea, and Japan. The chapter argues that Morrison’s tour provides an opportunity to examine not only a brand of Radical Holiness that developed after the birth of the Pentecostal Movement (1906), but also the contours of a different form of holiness spirituality that persisted in the mission field, or what has been called “global holiness.” It also demonstrates that the reception of Morrison’s work in countries where he found great success serves as a barometer for understanding how Pentecostalism would take root in these locations. It establishes that the rise and growth of Pentecostalism in these countries depended initially on the preexistent “global holiness” networks. The work of Danielson, Alexander, and Oconer demonstrate the complex Holiness and Pentecostal interaction outside the United States.

Unity and Diversity

Daniel Woods, “‘Spiritual Railroading’: Trains as Metaphor and Reality in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements, ca. 1880–ca. 1920,” continues the focus on the early twentieth century. He examines in detail the relationships between Holiness and Pentecostal language developed around railroads and the engagement of the two movements with modernity during the Progressive Era. Woods demonstrates that this language served as a vehicle for developing and communicating theological ideas, social analysis, and religious practices, all in dialogue with the biblical texts. The chapter provides an example of the complex relationship between the two religious movements and modernity.

Cheryl J. Sanders, “Black Radical Holy Women at the Intersection of Christian Unity and Social Justice,” explores the contributions of black women leaders whose social witness influenced the emergence of the Radical Holiness Movement in the nineteenth century and of Pentecostalism in the twentieth century.
Three models of Christian social witness explore their exilic ecclesiology of being “in the world, but not of it”: (1) the cosmopolitan evangelism of Amanda Berry Smith; (2) the egalitarian revivalism of the Azusa Street washwomen; and (3) the sanctified civic engagement of the Church of God in Christ church mothers, Lizzie Robinson and Lillian Brooks Coffey. H. Richard Niebuhr’s *Christ and Culture* provides a framework for analyzing the exilic ecclesiologies of these women. Because of their race, gender, and social class, these black radical holy women were uniquely positioned to confront and dismantle barriers to Christian unity and social transformation.

Insik Choi, “Pneumatology as a Basis for Ecumenical Dialogue Between the Korean Methodist, Holiness, and Pentecostal Traditions,” argues that the shared pneumatical heritages, differentiated because of cultural contexts, the work of non-Korean theologians, and the internal logic of the Korean expressions of the three traditions, provide a place to begin ecumenical discussions. The chapter briefly discusses the development of the three traditions in Korea in relation to each other.

**Theological Engagement**

Frank D. Macchia, “Baptized in the Spirit and Fire: The Relevance of Spirit Baptism for a Holiness and Pentecostal View of the Atonement,” argues that historically, Christology in the West was secured as the redemptive event through the linkage between the incarnation and the atonement. This connection protected Christology from adoptionism or the subordination of Christology to pneumatology. Left unanswered by this linkage was the role of Jesus as the Baptizer in the Spirit and fire as announced by John the Baptist. Macchia addresses this question drawing from Holiness and Pentecostal sources, developing the idea that Jesus is sanctified in his own baptism in the Spirit and fire through his passage from death to life in order to baptize others in the Spirit.

Henry H. Knight III, “The Presence of the Kingdom: Optimism of Grace in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements,” insists the two movements are shaped and motivated by the promise that through the power of the Holy Spirit, the life of the coming kingdom of heaven is already being realized in this age. This optimism of grace, centered in the presence and power of God, grounds a spirituality of openness to God and expectant faith and hope. The reception of new life in turn provides motivation for mission, enabled by the reception of power from the Spirit, in which the good news of Jesus Christ is proclaimed through word and deed, the church is renewed, and there is ministry to bodies
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as well as souls. These movements are a distinct alternative to both liberal theologies shaped by the Enlightenment and Reformed scholasticism.

Chris E. W. Green, “Fulfilling the Full Gospel: The Promise of the Theology of the Cleveland School,” describes and analyzes the development of theologians, all shaped by and shapers of Pentecostal Theological Seminary, which is self-defined as Wesleyan-Pentecostal. He explores and evaluates the key theological claims of the Cleveland School—especially its Christ-centeredness, synergism, liberationism, apocalypticism, and affectivity—and asks what those claims mean for the future of Pentecostal theology in particular, and the Christian tradition more broadly. Attention is given to the limits of the fivefold gospel paradigm, which some in the Cleveland School consider essential, and an alternative paradigm is suggested, one that privileges the apocalyptic.

CONCLUSION

These studies demonstrate elements of the shared historical and theological experience of the Holiness and Pentecostal movements. They provide evidence that the movements are closely related and intertwined, sharing values, histories, theologies, sources, and practices. The chapters also point to important differences of this common heritage. Both movements are diverse within themselves. This diversity relates to theology, geography, race, gender, class, and many other factors, including charismatic leadership, a subject implicit in these chapters, but requiring additional analysis. Because of the intertwined trajectories of the two movements for more than a century, these divided and subdivided traditions have often defined the larger movements from which they came in relationship to the key issues that led to separation. These chapters suggest that nuanced approaches to historical and theological analysis of the two movements and their relationships remain desiderata for research.

The Penn State University Press series, “Studies in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements,” seeks to honor complexities of the movements and the multidimensionality of their internal and external relationships. The purpose of this series is to examine particularities of each movement and tradition, as well as the relationships between them in a multidisciplinary fashion. The goal is a better understanding of the Holiness and Pentecostal movements as global religious traditions, together and separately.
NOTES


5. The definitions of “entire sanctification” and “baptism with the Holy Spirit” became foci of differentiation in the Wesleyan, Radical Holiness, and Pentecostal traditions, largely depending on interpretations of the biblical Pentecost narratives. Methodists and Methodist Holiness believers understood them as equivalent terms referring to a postconversion experience. Generally, Wesleyan Pentecostals, Sanctified Churches, and Oneness Pentecostals also understood them to be subsequent to conversion, with sanctification being the prerequisite for baptism with the Holy Spirit accompanied by glossolalia. On the other hand, the Assemblies of God and similar groups merged conversion and sanctification, to be followed by another experience, baptism with the Holy Spirit, evidenced by glossolalia.

6. Dow has not received the scholarly attention he deserves. No one has yet definitively established the bibliography and biography of Dow. The best treatment is Nathan O. Hatch, The Democratization of American Christianity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).


9. For information on each of these individuals, except Dow, see William Kostlevy, ed., The A to Z of the Holiness
15. Anderson, Spreading Fires.
17. Jim Phillips and Rosemary Gartner, Murdering Holiness: The Trials of Franz Creffield and George Mitchell (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2003); T. McCracken and Robert B. Blodgett, Holy Rollers: Murder and Madness in Oregon’s Love Cult (Caldwell, ID: Caxton Press, 2002). The term “Holy Roller” was first used in the 1840s but gained new currency in the twentieth century because of sensationalized worldwide press coverage of a murder trial that included reference to several Radical Holiness and future Pentecostal leaders of the Pacific Northwest.


21. Among those who have contributed to this section through discussions, interviews, and emails are Kimberly Ervin Alexander, Dale M. Coulter, Donald W. Dayton, D. William Faupel, David Sang-Ehil Han, Cheryl Bridges Johns, Henry (Hal) Knight III, William Kostlevy, Jo Anne Lyon, David Roebuck, and Vinson Synan. David Bundy has personal notes for many of the events discussed. These are cited only when direct quotations are used. Most people interviewed were also present at several of the events discussed. We are grateful for their contributions.


Introduction


37. Roberts, Society for Pentecostal Studies, 25.


39. Land, Pentecostal Spirituality.
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