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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"The construct of the church has generally signified a type of religious organization which accepts the social order and integrates existing cultural definitions into its religious ideology. The sect, as a contrasting type, rejects integration with the social order and develops a separate sub-culture, stressing rather rigid behavioral requirements for its members. While these types have been useful in historical and theoretical analysis, there have been few efforts to apply them empirically to contemporary religious phenomena."  

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In Religious Sects, Bryan Wilson talks about the transition of Pentecostalism from sect to church type. "If Pentecostalism was not to burn itself out in a congeries of small meetings, with ecstatic styles of worship, regulation and routinisation has to occur. As it did, with increasing effect, so Pentecostal sects came to be increasingly nearer to the denominations from which originally they had distinguished themselves."  

---


Ernst Troeltsch contrasts the sect-type with the church-type in his book entitled, The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches. Although he makes no attempt to examine any particular sect which might be in transition from sect to church, it is possible to examine a sect in transition based upon his views of a sect-type as contrasted with a church-type.

Religion, Society, and the Individual, by J. Milton Yinger, has a section entitled, "From Sect to Church," by Walter Muelder. In Muelder's work, "A brief survey is made of recent studies on the West Coast as they bear on the problem of institutional development from sect-type groups into church-type denominations. His findings concluded that Pentecostal leaders in the great Central Valley recognize clearly that certain Pentecostal churches are losing their sect characteristics." \(^1\)

**HISTORY AND BACKGROUND**

"C. F. Parham, an early white Pentecostal pioneer who headed a bible school in Topeka, Kansas, had convinced W. J. Seymour, a black preacher, to become a pentecostal. Seymour was then invited to Los Angeles by Neeley Terry, a black woman preacher of the Church of the Nazarene. There the ground was prepared by Joseph Smale, a Baptist, who was under the influence of the revival in Wales and the nervous Frank Bartleman. Seymour arrived with his two assistants, J. A. Warren and Luey P. Farrow in Los Angeles and preached on Acts 2:4: "A person who is baptized in the spirit, will necessarily speak in tongues" although Seymour himself had not yet received the gift of tongues. The older members had claimed the baptism of the Holy Spirit for years, and here was a stranger telling them they were only

\(^1\)J. Milton Yinger, *op. cit.*, p. 480.
'sanctified' and that there was yet another spiritual experience. This was more than they could accept, and they rejected the new doctrine as heresy. Finally Neeley locked Seymour out of the church.1

"Nevertheless, Seymour was invited into private homes and on April 9, 1906, 'the fire fell' in a prayer meeting on Bonnie Brae Street. It seems that among the many people, mostly members of the Church of the Nazarene but including other holiness denominations, the first person to receive the baptism of the spirit in Los Angeles was an eight year old Black boy. Seymour, then rented an old Methodist church at 312 Azusa Street and it is this Azusa Street Mission that is considered by pentecostal writers as the cradle of the world-wide pentecostal revival. During three uninterrupted years prayer meetings were held with speaking and singing in tongues and prophecies."2

"The beginning revival met considerable resistance from some of the holiness denominations and other churches, and was ridiculed by the press. The New York American of March 12, 1906 reported: "Faith gives quaint sect new languages to contact Africa. Votaries of odd religion nightly see 'miracles' in west side room, led by Negro elder. The leaders of this strange movement are for the most part Negroes." Therefore, the first issue of Apostolic Faith, the periodical of the Azusa Street Revival, identified the press with the devil. But in fact the hostile articles served as gratis propaganda. In the beginning Parham was the leader of the Azusa Street Revival, but by November 1906 his name no longer appeared on the

1Department on Studies in Evangelism, Concept (Geneva 20, Switzerland, June 1970), pp. 11-12.

2Ibid., p. 12.
official letterhead. And, by 1908 all the white members had withdrawn from Azusa street.\textsuperscript{1}

\textbf{STATEMENT OF PROBLEM}

The pentecostal movement from early inception to recent times conforms to the characteristics of a sect type. However, the pentecostal movement is in transition from a sect-type to a church-type which is most evident in the neo-pentecostal movement which has crossed denominational lines.

\textbf{METHODOLOGY}

This work is accomplished in four basic parts. The first section will deal specifically with the church in contrast with the sect. The characteristics of a sect are examined in totality as viewed by several religious writers and contrasted with those of the church.

The second section will be concerned with the emergence of Pentecostalism.

In the third section, the writer will deal specifically with the emergence of Neo-Pentecostalism. Also in this section, four denominations will be used to exemplify the transition of Pentecostalism from a sect-type to a church-type.

The last section will be a summarization and analyzation of Chapters II, III, and IV.

\textsuperscript{1}Department on Studies in Evangelism, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 13-14.
CHAPTER II

SECT-TYPE CONTRASTED WITH CHURCH-TYPE

The traditional society appears to be a sacred order to its members. Customs, mores, relationships and authority are seen as a continuation of the divine order that embraces both nature and society. Even the sophisticated classical societies of antiquity believed social mores and values to be divinely natural. When challenge to the existing order occurs in the traditional society, it is necessarily a religious challenge based on a new apprehension of the divine: hence the importance of the charismatic leader. In primitive societies such a figure is almost always the source of new religious movements, and is often so in feudal societies. Occasionally such charisma has become the basis for the restructuring of the social order; more usually it has led to the emergence of a sect. Sects facilitate the crystallisation of new social groupings, and provide social cohesion within a self-selected community, but it is not always the case that sects are charismatically inspired, particular in industrial societies.

Advanced societies are marked by increasing division of labour, in which men are increasingly related according to their roles. In most social relationships the total personalities of individuals are not engaged; they are involved only in role obligations and role expectations. Consequently, personal trust is not invoked in the way in which it is essential to primary relationships. In these societies there tends to be a disbelief of the
special powers of any individual.

Advanced societies leave little room for the manifestation of charisma, except perhaps in extreme conditions of social strain when whole societies feel their way of life threatened. When a charismatic figure does arise, it becomes evident to all that the trust he wins depends on the manipulation of highly technical facilities, particularly in the mass-media, and these things are in themselves profoundly anti-charismatic. Charismatic claims are found only at the fringe of the social system.

Religion is that social institution in which non-rational dispositions and super-rational claims are stock-in-trade. Supernatural power is expected to operate in religious gatherings, even if, as among Quakers and Pentecostalists, the expectation is for a highly diffused charismatic experience. There are modern sects that arise in response to charismatic claims of a more traditional type, such as the followers of the Dutch fisherman, Lou, and the group that accepts the messianic claims of George Roux in France. But these sects become more marginal and less typical of sects in general. The extent to which charismatic claims have become tempered by rational considerations is also evident. Thus, Mrs. Eddy, Founder of Christian Science, evolved a religion that claimed to be a science and, as well churches, instituted teachers and courses of instruction in imitation of the rational, educational every-day world. The religious prophet now acquired new appeal by adopting the model of the scientist and educationalist. These are indications of the waning of the credibility of charismatic claims in the modern world. Modern sects cannot be regarded as simply new examples of the type of sectarianism that was common in the medieval
Emergence of the Sect

The social doctrines of the Christian church had a dualistic tendency which caused them to flow in two channels. The strict law of the scriptures, the radical law of nature, monasticism, and the theological theory of the primitive state there revealed themselves as motives and expressions of a second tendency which accompanied the compromise of the church.²

In the central period of the middle ages, however, this second tendency broke forth afresh with extraordinary power. This took place precisely at the moment when the ecclesiastical unity of civilization and its inclusive attitude towards the world had become intellectually complete in Thomism.³

In opposition to the modifications of the moral law of Jesus which compromised with the world-order, there arose the strict radicalism of the ethic of the gospel, wholly directed towards self-conquest and brotherly love; it appealed both to the Divine Law of the Gospel and to the Natural law of the primitive state, which also was considered to have had no other ideal except that of holiness and generous love, an ideal which left no room for secular political and economic inequalities and cruelty. Since the church, in its organization of a universal Christian society and of civilization, allowed no scope for these radical ideas, or, rather, was only able to tolerate them in the form of a special class, serving her own

---

¹Bryan Wilson, op. cit., p. 20.
³Ibid., p. 330.
purposes, i.e., in monasticism, these ideals were forced to find a way of development alongside of the church. The contrast between the radical law of the scriptures and the way of life of genuine christians which was measured by this standard, and the ecclesiastical ethic and social doctrine, with its relative and inclusive tendency, led to the formation of sects.¹

The word "sect" gives an erroneous impression. Originally the word was used in an apologetic sense, and it was used to describe groups which separated themselves from the official church, while they retained certain fundamental elements of christian thought; by the fact, however, that they were outside the corporate life of the ecclesiastical tradition—a position, moreover, which was usually forced upon them—they were regarded as inferior side-issues, one-sided phenomena, exaggerations or abbreviations of ecclesiastical christianity.²

The importance of sects to sociologists is that they provide by far the most numerous examples of self-conscious attempts by men to construct their own societies, not merely as political entities with constitutions, but as groups with a firm set of values and mores, of which they are conscious. Such groups have a carefully ordered structure of social relationships and clearly established patterns of social behavior and control.³

The pioneer of the study of sects was Ernst Troeltsch, who took as his basic data information about sects that had arisen in medieval and modern christendom.

¹Ernst Troeltsch, op. cit., p. 330.
²Bryan Wilson, op. cit., p. 22.
³Ibid., p. 22.
In Troeltsch's contrast of the sect with the church, firstly, he saw the church as that type of organization which is overwhelmingly conservative, which to a certain extent accepts the secular order and dominates the masses; in principle, therefore, it is universal. The sects, on the other hand, are comparatively small groups; they aspire after personal inward perfection, and they aim at a direct personal fellowship between the member of each group. From the beginning, they are forced to organize themselves in small groups and to renounce the idea of dominating the world. Their attitude towards the world, the state, and society may be indifferent, tolerant, or hostile; since they have no desire to control and incorporate these forms of social life; on the contrary, they tend to avoid them. Hence their aim is usually either to tolerate their presence alongside of their own body, or even to replace these sociological institutions by their own society.

The church-type represents the longing for a universal all-embracing ideal, the desire to control great masses of men, and therefore the urge to dominate the world and civilization in general. Paulinism, in spite of its strongly individualistic and enthusiastic features, had already led the way along this line: it desired to conquer the world for Christ; it came to terms with the order of the state by interpreting it as an institution ordained and permitted by God; it accepted the existing order with its professions and its habits and customs. The only union it desired was that which arose out of a common share in the energy of grace which the Body of Christ contained; out of this union the new life ought to spring up naturally from within through the power of the Holy Spirit, thus preparing

1Ernst Troeltsch, _op. cit._, p. 331.
the way for the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God, as the real universal end of all things. The more that Christendom renounced the life of this supernatural and eschatological fulfillment of its universal ideal, and tried to achieve this end by missionary effort and organization, the more was it forced to make its Divine and Christian character independent of the subjective character and service of believers; henceforth it sought to concentrate all its emphasis upon the objective possession of religious truth and religious power, which were contained in the tradition of Christ, and in the Divine guidance of the Church which fills and penetrates the whole body. From this objective basis subjective energies could ever flow forth afresh, exerting a renewing influence, but the objective basis did not coincide with these results. Only thus was it possible to have a popular church at all, and it was only thus that the relative acceptance of the world, the state, or society, and of the existing culture, which this required, did no harm to the objective foundation. The divine nature of the church was retained in its objective basis, and from this centre there welled up continually fresh streams of vital spiritual force. It was the aim of the leaders of the Church to render this basis as objective as possible, by means of tradition, priesthood, and sacrament; to secure in it, objectively, the sociological point of contact; if that were once firmly established the subjective influence of the Church was considered secure; it was only in detail that it could not be controlled. In this way the fundamental religious sense of possessing something divinely "given" and "redeeming" was ensured, while the universalizing tendency was also made effective, since it established the Church, the organ of divine grace, in the supreme position of power. When to that was added the sacrament of penance, the power of spiritual direction, the law against heretics, and
the general supervision of the faith, the Church was then able to gain an inward dominion over the hearts of men. Under these circumstances, however, the church found it impossible to avoid making a compromise with the state, with the social order, and with economic conditions. The sect appeals to the ever new common performance of the moral demands, which, at bottom, are founded only upon the law and the example of Christ. In this, it must be admitted that they are in direct contact with the teaching of Jesus. Consciously or unconsciously, therefore, this implies a different attitude to the early history of Christianity, and a different conception of Christian doctrine. Scripture history and the history of the Primitive Church are permanent ideals, to be accepted in their literal sense, not the starting-point, historically limited and defined, for the development of the church. Christ is not the God-Man, eternally at work within the church, leading it into all truth, but he is the direct head of the church, binding the church to himself through his law in the scriptures. On the one hand, there is development and compromise, on the other literal obedience and radicalism. It is this point of view, however, which makes the sects incapable of forming large mass organizations, and limits their development to small groups, united on a basis of personal intimacy; it is also responsible for the necessity for a constant renewal of the ideal, their lack of continuity, their pronounced individualism, and their affinity with all the oppressed and idealistic groups within the lower classes.

A second aspect of Troeltsch's contrast of sect-type with church-type is that both types are in close connection with the actual situation and

---

1Ibid., p. 339.
2Ibid., p. 336.
with the development of society. The fully developed church, however, utilizes the state and the ruling classes, and weaves these elements into its program; the church becomes an integral part of the existing social order, from this standpoint, then, the church both stabilizes and determines the social order, in doing so, however, she becomes dependent upon the upper classes, and upon their development. The sects, on the other hand, are connected with the lower classes, or at least with those elements in society which are opposed to the state and to society; they work upwards from below, and not downwards from above.¹

Thirdly, the church relates the whole of the secular order as a means and a preparation to the supernatural aim of life, and it incorporates genuine ascetism into its structure as one element in this preparation, all under the very definite direction of the church. The sects refer their members directly to the supernatural aim of life, and in them the individualistic, directly religious character of asceticism, as a means of union with God, is developed more strongly and fully; the attitude of opposition to the world and its powers, to which the secularized church now also belongs, tends to develop a theoretical and general asceticism.²

The asceticism of the church is a method of acquiring virtue, and a special high watermark of religious achievement, connected chiefly with the repression of the senses, or expressing itself in special achievements of a peculiar character; otherwise, however, it presupposes the life of the world as the general background, and the contrast of an average morality

¹Ibid., p. 331.
²Ibid.
which is on relatively good terms with the world.¹

The asceticism of the sects, on the other hand, is merely the simple principle of detachment from the world, and is expressed in the refusal to use the law, to swear in a court of justice, to own property, to exercise dominion over others, or to take part in war. The sects take the Sermon on the Mount as their ideal; they lay stress on the simple but radical opposition of the kingdom of God to all secular interests and institutions. They practice renunciation only as a means of charity, as the basis of a thorough going communion of love, and, since their rules are equally binding upon all, they do not encourage extravagant and heroic deeds, nor the vicarious heroism of some to make up for the worldliness and average morality of others. The ascetic ideal of the sects consists simply in opposition to the world and to its social institutions, but it is not opposition to the sense life, nor to the average life of humanity.²

Another aspect of Troeltsch's comparison is that the essence of the church is its objective institutional character. The individual is born into it, and through infant baptism one comes under its miraculous influence. The priesthood and the hierarchy, which hold the keys to the tradition of the church, to sacramental grace and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, represent the objective treasury of grace, even when the individual priest may happen to be unworthy; this divine treasure only needs to be set always upon the lampstand and made effective through the sacraments, and it will inevitably do its work by virtue of the miraculous power which the church contains. The one virtually important thing is that every individual should come

¹Ibid., p. 332.
²Ibid.
within the range of the influence of these saving energies of grace; hence
the church is forced to dominate society, compelling all the members of
society to come under its sphere and influence; but, on the other hand, the
stability of the church is entirely unaffected by the fact of the extent
to which her influence over all individuals is actually attained. The
church is the great educator of the nations, and like all educators it
knows how to allow for various degrees of capacity and maturity, and how to
attain her end only by a process of adaptation and compromise.\(^1\)

The sect is a voluntary community whose members join it of their own
free will. The very life of the sect, therefore, depends on actual per-
sonal service and co-operation; as an independent member each individual
has his part within the fellowship; the bond of union has not been in-
directly imparted through the common possession of divine grace, but it is
directly realized in the personal relationships of life. An individual
is not born into a sect; he enters it on the basis of conscious conversion.
In the sect spiritual progress does not depend upon the objective imparta-
tion of graces through the sacrament, but upon individual personal effort;
sooner or later, therefore, the sect always criticizes the sacramental idea.
This does not mean that the spirit of fellowship is weakened by individual-
ism; indeed, it is strengthened since each individual proves that he is
entitled to membership by the very fact of his services to the fellowship.\(^2\)

The sects that provided Troeltsch with his data were principally those
that attached great importance to the second advent of Christ and the sub-
sequent millennium, and his concept of the sect was unduly coloured by this.

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 338.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 339.
Again, although the idea that sects are fellowships of love does tell something about the sectarian spirit as it is contrasted with the church, it is known that many sects today are very large organizations. Although the sense of fellowship is undoubtedly fostered in the local congregation, sectarians in such movements have, nonetheless, a conception of headquarters and sometimes of decisions taken at levels quite remote from that of their own local fraternal group.¹

For Troeltsch, sects recruited from the lower class, and in feudal societies this was perhaps often the case. But as class structure has been diversified, and as industrial societies have grown complex, other forms of social differentiation have become evident. There have been unaccommodated ethnic groups, immigrants, frontier populations cut off from the culture of cities and the assumptions of orthodoxy, people moving rapidly up the social scale seeking agencies of adjustment to new social status; there has been a diversification of class positions with fine differences of status and assumptions. Add to these structural changes, the rapid, and now perhaps overwhelming diffusion of information, the challenge to traditional religion from humanist and secularist sources and from the purveyors of religious ideas from other cultures, and one sees that men are very variously exposed to diverse philosophies, ideologies, gobbets of knowledge and propaganda that are now available. Thus structurally and intellectually there are many possible new situations in which sects might spring up.²

In reality there are two different sociological types. This is true

¹Bryan Wilson, op. cit., p. 24.
²Ibid., p. 25.
in spite of the fact that incidentally in actual practice they may often impinge upon one another. If objections are raised to the terms "church" and "sect", and if all sociological groups which are based on and inspired by monotheistic, universalized, religious motives are described as "churches" it would then be necessary to make the distinction between institutional churches and voluntary churches.¹ The importance should not be placed on terminology, but rather that both types are a logical result of the gospel, and only conjointly do they exhaust the whole range of its sociological influence, and thus also indirectly of its social results, which are always connected with the religious organization.

¹J. Milton Yinger, op. cit., p. 420.
CHAPTER III

EMERGENCE OF PENTECOSTALISM

Roots of the Pentecostal Movement

The Pentecostal movement, generally is considered to be a distinctively American product, but anyone in the movement would trace its origins back to the Early Christian Church of New Testament times. Pentecostals point out that many believers in the churches of Paul were endowed with special charismatic gifts, the most common of which was "speaking in tongues," just as the Apostles did on the Day of Pentecost. They look back with admiration to the montanists of the second century A.D. and rejoice in the fact that one of the pillars of the primitive church, Tertullian, championed their cause and became their first theologian. Although the charismatic gifts had begun to disappear by the beginning of the fourth century not to appear again in any significant movement, until the time of the Quakers and the Anabaptists, most Pentecostals would assert that there is a "pneumatic line" which, though hidden has continued unbroken from the time of the early apostles, and that it is now reappearing with full clarity in the modern pentecostal movement. This is to say that the pentecostal experience is not a religious innovation, and that in one form or another it has manifested itself throughout the history of the Christian Church.¹

In mid-eighteenth century America, the gift of tongues was predominant among the Shakers, and frequent statements appeared at that time that the controversial prophetess, Mother Ann Lee, sang and prayed in an unknown tongue. But the real beginnings of the Pentecostal movement in Modern Protestantism can be attributed to Edward Irving and the Irvingite movement which arose in England in the early years of the nineteenth century. By 1832, reports John A. Hardon, Irving had started a new congregation which engaged in prayer which produced unusual blessings, and in speaking in tongues.

Yet, theologically, the Pentecostals are the children of John Wesley. Pentecostalism was able to develop out of the Wesleyan emphasis, both in the United States and in Europe, on Christianity as a "religion of experience," "assurance of salvation, justification as something "inferior" and different from the 'new birth,' the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the individual, ecclesiological and sacramental doctrines based on Pietistic insights, and, most of all, holiness and sanctification as the goal attainable by every true Christian. 

By the end of the second awakening, however, it was becoming clear that Methodism had departed from its original purpose, which was to spread "Christian holiness" over the new land of America. In addition, the rapid urbanization of American life, which threatened the foundations of society, coupled with the rise of big industry and its resultant evils, as well as the moral depression of the early post-civil war years, gave rise to the modern holiness crusade which eventually resulted in the "third force" of

Thus the Holiness Movement prepared the way for the Pentecostal Movement. And while it may not be entirely true that "the Pentecostal emphasis is simply an extension of the earlier Holiness concepts, as C. W. Conn claims, it is certainly a fact that the Pentecostal Movement found its roots deeply imbedded in the Holiness Movement. One factor which prevents a too-easy acceptance of the view that the Pentecostal Movement is merely an extension of the Holiness crusade is that of the prominence of the early revivals, which were not completely Wesleyan-Holiness in nature. Indeed Synan indicates that the most famous outbreak of enthusiastic, pentecostal-like religion in American history occurred in the great cane-ridge camp meeting in Logan County, Kentucky, in 1800. This camp meeting was begun and led by three Presbyterian ministers. And in the revival at the University of Georgia in 1800-1801, students engaged in "jerks" and speaking in unknown tongues.\footnote{Winson Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Erdmans, 1971), p. 25.}

A further boost was given to the cause of Pentecostalism by the publishing, in 1895, of R. A. Rorrey's book, Baptism with the Holy Spirit. Torrey's position was that every Christian is entitled to receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit, that the ensuing gifts are available for all who ask for them, and that there is no basic difference between the Early Christian Church and the church today.

**Beginnings of the Pentecostal Movement**

The beginnings of the Pentecostal Movement center about two men: Charles Fox Parham and William J. Seymour. Parham was White and Seymour Black. It is this particular aspect of the Pentecostal Movement which gives...
it even more uniqueness among the religious movements of the twentieth century.

Parham had been a lay preacher in the congregational church from the time that he was fifteen years old. Later he joined ranks with the Methodists, only to leave them to become a part of the growing Holiness movement. Parham believed that while many Christians had already experienced great degrees of sanctification, there still lay in store for all Christians a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit. He believed that the tongues mentioned in Acts 2 actually meant a gift of languages; so he told his pupils at Bethel Bible College

"that if God had ever equipped his ministers in that way he could do it today. . . . Anybody today ought to be able to preach in any language of the world if they had horse sense enough to let God use their tongue and Throat."

When Parham left his college on New Year's Eve, 1900, on a mission trip, he instructed his students to study the Scriptures and seek to discover whether there was any special gift which give evidence to a person's having received the Holy Spirit. In his absence, the students concluded from their Bible study that speaking in tongues was the initial, universal evidence of baptism in the spirit. They asked for this gift themselves, and Agnes Oznam received it.

After Miss Ozman's experience of the "reality of Pentecost," classes were suspended in the Topeka, Kansas, school for the entire month of January, during which time the majority of the students and Mr. Parham received the baptism of the Spirit and spoke in tongues. Thus in January, 1901, Topeka,

---

1 John Thomas Nichol, op. cit., p. 27.
Kansas, became an important date and place for marking the birth of twentieth century Pentecostalism.

This experience of Miss Ozman and the other students was significant. But as Nichol points out, it was significant not because they spoke in tongues, for there had been outbursts of tongue-speaking throughout the history of the Christian Church. The importance of these events in Topeka was that "for the first time the concept of being baptized (or filled) with the Holy Spirit was linked to an outward sign--speaking in tongues. This was a momentous decision, for from this time on for Pentecostals the evidence that one had been baptized with the Holy Spirit would be that he also spoke in an unknown tongue."

The two years that followed this dramatic event, however, were not exciting for Parham. On the contrary he and his students were rejected by society. They suffered persecution and frustration. It was not until two years later, in 1903, when Parham engaged in a successful healing campaign, not in Topeka but in Galena, Kansas, that Parham won acclaim for himself and his cause. By 1905 he had established "Pentecostal" meetings in Kansas, Missouri and Texas. It is reported that by the winter of 1905, Texas alone had 25,000 pentecostal believers and about 60 preachers—all the direct result of Parham's consecrated efforts.

Parham established another Bible school in Houston patterned after the one in Topeka, which had been forced to close its doors. Out of this Bible school was to come a student, William J. Seymour, whose destiny it was to light the fires of the modern Pentecostal movement.

William J. Seymour was completely unaware of what lay in store for

---

1Ibid., p. 27.
him when he left Parham's Bible school to accept the call to become the pastor of the Nazarene Mission on Santa Fe Avenue in Los Angeles. But it was not long before he began to get an idea of the rocky path which lay before him. The text of his first sermon in Los Angeles was Acts 2:4, and he preached about the new Pentecostal experience throughout Texas, informing his Holiness hearers that anyone who truly believed, and as a result he was locked out of his church before the afternoon service.

Undaunted by their refusal to hear him, Seymour began holding worship services in the home of friends. But when seven seekers on April 9, 1906, received the baptism of the Holy Spirit and began to speak in tongues, people began to appear from everywhere. Thus Seymour was forced to procure an old building on Azusa Street to contain the massive crowds that were now coming to hear him preach and to receive the baptism of the spirit. And, it was this address--312 Azusa Street, Los Angeles, that was to become one of the most important addresses in Pentecostalism.

During the summer of 1906, people from every race and nationality flocked to services to hear Seymour's new messages. White preachers came from Georgia and all over the south to receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit from this Black servant of God. And the report was the same from all who attended: There was no racial prejudice in the services. There were no separate altar calls, rather all men were drawn out of their barriers because of the "love of Jesus." One man was heard to exclaim that the color line was washed away in the blood.

This striking interracial phenomenon occurred in the very years of America's most racist period, those from 1890 to 1920. In an age of social darwinism, jim crowism, and general white supremacy, the fact that Blacks and whites worshipped together in virtual equality among the Pentecostals
was a significant exception to prevailing racial attitudes. Even more significant is the fact that this interracial accord took place among the very groups that have traditionally been most at odds, the poor whites and the poor Blacks.

In the period when most holiness and Pentecostal groups were forming into recognizable denominational bodies the racial lines were often very indistinct, with Blacks serving as officials, preachers, and church members. Only after the various movements began to unite into formal denominations did divisions occur along racial lines. The reasons for these later separations on the basis of race may be found in the existing pattern of race relations in the United States when the Pentecostal movement began in 1906. As an exception to the social pattern of the nation, and particularly of the south, the interracial pentecostal groups were subjected to great social pressure to conform to the pattern of segregation which with the beginning of the twentieth century dominated all aspects of American life.

By 1900 the racial lines in American religious life had already been clearly drawn by the harsh realities of the post-civil war era. The freeing of the slaves had caused a grand division of protestantism along racial lines. One of the most cherished dreams of the Negro slave was to have his own church where he could worship in the manner most congenial to his nature. With the end of the war came freedom from white surveillance of the Negro worship services which had been one of the slaveholders' major concerns. Although worship services continued to be integrated immediately after 1865, deep problems soon arose which led to all-white and all-Negro denominations. By 1929, 90 per cent of all Negro christians belonged to churches restricted to their own race.
The Black contribution to the origins of the Pentecostal Movement is an issue that would merit serious research on the part of the Church historians. James S. Tinney, who teaches Black Studies at Central High School in Kansas City, Missouri, has furnished an introduction to the October 8, 1971 issue of Christianity Today. He points out that the news media has given much attention to the resurgence of the pentecostal experience among White christians, but almost completely ignores the million and a half member all-Black Pentecostal denominations in the United States. He further points out that although the Pentecostal movement is racially divided today, it is the result of a conservative socio-political mentality rather than a doctrinally inspired action. Certainly he is correct in remarking that "in its original form the movement was inspiring for its truly interracial character, achieved largely through the spirit's ingenuity rather than man's planning." Tinney pleads for the present-day charismatic movement to recognize its unique opportunity to rebuild interracial cooperation by recognizing the African origins of many of these experiences. Actually, the gift of the Holy Spirit with the manifestations goes beyond either European or African origins, back to Pentecost itself, so perhaps Tinney is on surest ground when he pleads that "through the Holy Spirit, blind emphasis on race and dogma could be replaced by a fulfillment of our Lord's Prayer that they all may be one."\(^1\) It behooves white christians from outside the Pentecostal movement as well as those within to examine the interracial beginnings of the Pentecostal movement in the United States and seek to discover a mentality, or perhaps even a pattern, that could contribute to the racial unity of all believers.

CHAPTER IV

NEO-PENTECOSTALISM

The Neo-pentecostal movement is a distinct, authentive movement from the older classical pentecostals. It is significant that individuals such as David J. DuPlessis have engaged in a ministry to "tongue-speakers" in the historic churches, and that the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International furnishes guidance for members of these historic churches who do receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless both Neo-pentecostals and classical pentecostals would be quick to admit that the actual movement among members of historic churches was not a movement from classical pentecostalism to neo-pentecostalism, but rather a fresh, spontaneous movement of the Holy Spirit himself, in response to the prayers of men and women who had been awakened to the fuller dimensions of the Christian life through the willingness of the classical pentecostalists to share their experiences.

There is a sense in which the gift of the Holy Spirit as an existencial reality in the life of the believer could be ignored by historians as long as it was confined to the churches which came into existence solely, or almost solely, because of this one doctrine. Indeed perhaps there was a tendency even on the part of historians who were supposedly in pursuit of scientific truth to belittle the experience of tongue-speaking or other gifts manifested by the spirit, dismissing them lightly as the actions and
attitudes of people who were "somewhat different." However, now that large numbers of christians from the other historic churches are participating in this same experience and manifesting a new way of life which also is "somewhat different," the issue has become one of renewed interest to historians and other "church-watchers."

When did the charismatic, or new-pentecostal, movement begin in the major denominations? McCandlish Phillips writes in the *Saturday Evening Post*, "The charismatic movement began on a tiny scale in the major denominations in about 1956, with perhaps 20 ministers openly involved." However, as a definite movement, neo-pentecostalism can be traced to April 3, 1960, when Dennis J. Bennett, rector of St. Mark's Episcopal Church in Van Nuys, California reported to the members of his congregation that he had "received the baptism in the Holy Spirit." He further testified to the great spiritual benefit he had received from the experience. Yet, innovations seldom come without sacrifice and pain, and this was true also of Father Bennett, who was asked by his vestry to resign. Nichol emphasizes the finality of the decision when he adds: "Bishop Francis Eric Eloy of Los Angeles sent a new priest to St. Mark's and issued a pastoral letter in which he banned the recurrence of tongues speaking under church auspices."2

Fortunately for the Episcopalians, perhaps, the movement proved to be larger than Bishop Eloy, for Phillip Weeks, minister of the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd in Charleston, West Virginia, reported in the closing month of 1971 that "There is within the discipline and worship of
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2Ibid., p. 240.
the Episcopal Church a growing number of people who are discovering that life is experienced in its abundance through the empowering of the Holy Spirit."^1

Since 1960 Christians in many other mainline denominations have attested to their experiences in receiving the empowering gift of the Holy Spirit, and to their resulting feeling of unity with one another, regardless of denomination. Although in the beginning they underwent heavy criticism and were tempted to leave their denominations, most have opted for full participation in their respective denominational lives.

The experience was not limited to ordained ministers but rather embraces laymen from the various denominations, and even swept the Yale University campus in 1962. The remark of one student who experienced the filling of the spirit furnishes us with the unique perspective of students when he said, after seeing the spiritual renewal taking place in an Episcopal Church led by a Baptist Minister: "I was stunned by this combination. I discovered that Baptist Minister + Episcopal Church + Healing = the Holy Spirit."^2 Even the chaplains of the university were convinced that there had taken place an authentic experience.

Reports are being made public even at the present time from various denominations regarding the new movement. The Holywood First Presbyterian Church reports that there are nearly six hundred persons in that one church alone who speak in tongues.

Both the United Presbyterian Church in the USA and the Presbyterian Church, U.S., known also as the Southern Presbyterian Church, have adopted

---


^2 Ibid., p. 31.
papers at their respective General Assemblies which recognize that the charismatic movement is evident within the Presbyterian Church, and which further recognize the validity of the manifestations of the Holy Spirit in the lives of individual believers. Further, many ministers of the Presbyterian Church who have received the baptism of the Holy Spirit have organized the Charismatic Communion of Presbyterian Ministers, an organization which claims a membership of 300 ministers and which held a conference on the Holy Spirit in January, 1971.

Against a background of protestant reception of the pentecostal experience, it was inevitable that the movement would find a place within the bounds of the Roman Catholic Church as well, nevertheless, it was not expected. Edward D. O'Connor makes the revealing statement in his book, The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church, that by and large the pentecostals had been deeply hostile toward the Catholic Church, which in their eyes was the epitome of that formalism and organization which suffocate the spirit. They assumed that any Catholic who sought and received the baptism in the Holy Spirit would have to leave his church. On the other hand, most Catholics have either not taken the Pentecostal seriously, or have drawn back from the "over-enthusiasm and fanaticism" of the Pentecostals. ¹ Nevertheless Pope John XXIII, who "Opened up the windows of the church to let in some fresh air," had indeed already begun the search for a "new Pentecost." In his Humanae Salutis he prayed:

"... May the Divine Spirit deign to answer in a most comforting manner the prayer that rises daily to him from every corner of the earth: 'Renew your wonders in our time, as though for a new Pentecost, and grant that the holy

church, preserving unanimous and continuous prayer,... may increase the reign of the Divine Savior, the reign of truth and justice, the reign of love and peace. Amen.\textsuperscript{1}

Thus, it should not have taken Catholics by surprise that the Catholic Pentecostal movement began within the Catholic Church rather than outside, and that the persons who have experienced the reality of Pentecost prefer to remain within the Catholic Church rather than leave it. At the same time O'Connor maintains that the Catholics who have experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit have found it to be fully in keeping with their traditional faith and life.

Stirrings in the Catholic Church began first at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, in 1966, when students began to search for the deeper gifts of the spirit after reading and discussing together The Cross and the Switchblade, a stirring account of the ministry of David Wilkerson, pastor who ministers to drug addicts and other cop-outs in New York City. From there it spread to Notre Dame University, where similar stirrings had already begun. The first Pentecostal prayer meeting on the Notre Dame campus was held on March 4, 1967, at the home of Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan. From this campus the movement began to sweep the entire country and no institution or area has been immune to its influence.

Many attempts have been made to explain the Pentecostal happening at Notre Dame, as there have been in the case of nearly all other churches. Some have said that the movement attracted people with emotional problems, or people who are fanatics or "off the deep end." However, the National Catholic Reporter maintains that the situation is not that simple:

\footnote{Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, \textit{As the Spirit Leads Us} (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), p. 1.}
It would be so convenient to say that these Catholic Pentecostals were underfed, high-strung, groping intellectual misfits in a wholesome atmosphere of all-American football hood. It would be convenient, but it would also be quite untrue. There seems to be no one level of conformity in the group except a common experience.¹

In addition to Christians in organized churches, the charismatic movement has penetrated other groups, most notable of which is the Jesus movement. Like the Pentecostal movement, the Jesus movement itself is not actually a movement in the sense of having been organized deliberately with a specific purpose. It, too, is a movement only in the sense that the people in it are all going in the same general direction, that they are like stalks of wheat being blown by the same wind. Many are the people who have wondered at the strangeness of the Jesus Movement, at their unusual sense of joy, at their fervor in personal witness to Jesus Christ, at their uncommon thirst for the Bible. Strange it is indeed, until it is understood that the Jesus movement itself is a part of the Neo-Pentecostal, or charismatic, renewal, and that they are led, with the exception of those who have perverted the movement, by a power that is not their own.

The Pentecostal movement has far outgrown the older holiness movement around the world. Indeed, by the middle of the twentieth century, the Pentecostals were burgeoning into what some called "the third force in Christendom." Surveys of the world wide Christian scene were revealing that three-fourths of all Protestants in Latin America were Pentecostals, that two-thirds of all non-Catholics in Italy were Pentecostals, and that the majority of all Christians in South Africa were Pentecostals. Furthermore, the largest free churches in Russia, Scandinavia, and France were

¹Ibid., p. 38.
Pentecostal and the growth rates indicated vastly greater growth for the future.1

By 1970 it was impossible to give precise figures of the size of the Pentecostal Movement in the United States and the world. This uncertainty was due to the fact that the Pentecostals were adverse to keeping accurate statistics and also to the fact that there existed so many independent groups that it was impossible to make a definitive count. The best-informed guesses were that by 1970 there were about four million persons in the United States who could be classified as being Pentecostal. About half of these were in the mainline organized denominations and the other half in the thousands of independent storefront churches and missions that dotted the nation's cities and countryside. In addition there were uncounted thousands of "Neo-Pentecostals" in the traditional denominations who were Pentecostal in experience and belief and generally designated themselves "the Charismatic movement."

The worldwide size of the movement was even more difficult to estimate than that of the United States. Using various standards of defining exactly what constituted a Pentecostal and educated guesses concerning statistics, estimates of the world constituency of the movement have ranged from 12,000,000 to 35,000,000. The Pentecostals themselves accept a figure in the range of 10,000,000 to 15,000,000, while officials of the World Council of Churches tend toward the 35,000,000 figure. Whatever the actual number might be, it is evident that the movement has experienced phenomenal growth since its first faltering days at the beginning of the century.2
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1 Vinson Synan, op. cit., p. 213.
2 Ibid.
The growth of Pentecostalism into a large worldwide family of churches also resulted in a new generation of Bible schools and colleges to serve the movement. Beginning with Holmes Bible College at Greenville, South Carolina, in 1898, the Pentecostal movement saw the founding of a score of colleges between that year and 1950. The first denominationally owned college was Lee College, founded in 1918 by the Church of God in Cleveland, Tennessee. The following year the Pentecostal Holiness Church founded Emmanuel College in Franklin Springs, Georgia. The Assemblies of God founded their first denominational school, called Central Bible Institute, in Springfield, Missouri, in 1922. It was not until 1955, however, that denomination opened its first liberal arts college, Evangel College, also located in Springfield.

In the early days, there were many Pentecostals who feared liberal arts education as a possible Trojan horse that might eventually cool the fires of revival ardor that had produced the movement. But by the fifties and sixties, no efforts were being spared in the upgrading of denominational schools and having them gain regional accreditation. One event that seemed to promise much for the future of Pentecostalism was the creation of a school billed as the first distinctly Pentecostal University in the nation--Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Founded by two Pentecostal Holiness preachers Oral Roberts and R. O. Corvin, this institution began classes in 1965 with plans for a hundred million dollar campus that would house a first-rate university, offering, in time, doctoral programs in several fields. One of its first schools was the Graduate School of Theology, headed by Corvin, which was accepted as the first Pentecostal Seminary to
offer post-graduate degrees. Symbolic of increasing acceptance by the traditional churches of the pentecostals was the fact that Billy Graham assisted in the act of dedication in April of 1967.¹

The history of the Pentecostal people in American society is in many respects similar to that of the Methodists and Baptists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Beginning as total outcasts, they were to gain a status of suspicious toleration, followed eventually with a full acceptance by the community. The early history of the Pentecostals in society was in reality a story of mutual rejection. The Pentecostals rejected society because they believed it to be corrupt, wicked, hostile, and hopelessly lost, while society rejected the Pentecostals because it believed them to be insanely fanatical, self-righteous, doctrinally in error, and emotionally unstable. In such an atmosphere it was inevitable that much prejudice, hostility, and suspicion would mar the relationship of the early Pentecostals to society at large.

The Pentecostal movement, with beginnings from 1901 to 1906 was interracial in character. 1901 to 1924 were years of growing racism in the United States, this phenomenon of interracial worship by the lower classes of whites and Blacks was a significant exception to the racial mores of the times. Proof of this fact was the position of Seymour as the leader of the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles. Although the Pentecostal movement claims no single person as its founder, Seymour comes as close as any man to qualifying for the role.
The Pentecostal groups entered a period of institutional development that was to last until the present. By 1918, the Church of God had begun its first college, which eventually became known as Lee College. The Pentecostal Holiness Church followed a year later with Emmanuel College. The Assemblies of God created their first Bible school in 1922 in Springfield, Missouri, but waited until 1955 before founding their first liberal arts college. In addition to these institutions of higher education, the Pentecostal Churches had by 1970 created dozens of Bible colleges, high schools, printing presses, orphanages, retirement homes, and urban rescue missions.

Also, it was conceded that the Pentecostal churches were almost the fastest growing Christian religion in the world. It was also becoming increasingly apparent that they were appealing to an ever widening spectrum of American citizens from all socio-economic groups. Because of this phenomenal growth, the attitude of other churches was beginning to change from mere toleration to one of active interest. This attitude indicated that the era of passive toleration which began in the middle-twenties was ending and that a new era of acceptance and cooperation was beginning.

The growth of Pentecostalism into a large worldwide family of churches; its appeal to a wide spectrum of American people; its educational development; and especially its penetration into other church bodies exemplifies the gradual shift of Pentecostalism from social ostracism to social acceptability. Also, this shift from social ostracism to social acceptability is evidence of Pentecostalism's gradual transition from sect-type to a Church-type.
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