

Keswick Theology and Continuationism or Anti-Cessationism: Vignettes of Certain Important Advocates of Keswick or Higher Life Theology and their Beliefs Concerning Spiritual Gifts and Other Matters: William Boardman, Andrew Murray, Frederick B. Meyer, Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis, A. B. Simpson, John A. MacMillan, and Watchman Nee

I. Introduction

Scripture¹ and history² require cessationism, the view that miraculous spiritual gifts and specific sign miracles ceased in apostolic days.³ Keswick, on the other hand,

¹ First Corinthians 13:8-13 teaches that tongues would cease before the completion of the canon of Scripture (as verified by the middle voice of *παύσονται* in v. 8), while the other gifts would cease by the time of the completion of the canon (as verified by the two uses of *καταργηθήσονται* in v. 8), “that which is perfect,” for “when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away” (1 Corinthians 13:10). The canon view of the “perfect” is ably demonstrated in “1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts,” R. Bruce Compton. (*Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 [2004] 97-144). In 1 Corinthians 13:8, *παύω* is not a deponent middle but retains its middle force:

There are three arguments against the deponent view [of *παύω* in the New Testament], however. First, if *παύσονται* is deponent, then the second principal part (future form) should not occur in the *active* voice in Hellenistic Greek. But it does, and it does so frequently. [A search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database revealed *hundreds* of such instances, normally bearing the meaning “stop something.” Further, the future middle of *παύω* was consistently used in the same period with the meaning of “stop” or “cease.”] Hence, the verb *cannot* be considered deponent. Second, sometimes Luke 8:24 is brought into the discussion: Jesus rebuked the wind and sea and they *ceased* (*ἐπαύσαντο*, aorist middle) from their turbulence. [Again, the *TLG* database revealed that the third principal part, like the second principal part, was an active form in Koine Greek.] The argument is that inanimate objects cannot cease of their own accord; therefore, the middle of *παύω* is equivalent to a passive. But this is a misunderstanding of the literary features of the passage: If the wind and sea cannot cease voluntarily, why does Jesus *rebuke* them? And why do the disciples speak of the wind and sea as having *obeyed* Jesus? The elements are personified in Luke 8 and their ceasing from turbulence is therefore presented as volitional obedience to Jesus. If anything, Luke 8:24 supports the indirect middle view. Third, the idea of a deponent verb is that it is middle in form, but *active* in meaning. But *παύσονται* is surrounded by *passives* in 1 Corinthians 13:8, not actives. [Although it is true that the future middle is occasionally used in a passive sense (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 390 [§1715]; Winer-Moulton, 319), it is apparently so with certain verbs because of a set idiom. Such is not the case with *παύω*.] The real force of *παύω* in the middle is *intransitive*, while in the active it is transitive. In the active it has the force of stopping some other object; in the middle, it ceases from its own activity. (pgs. 422-423, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace; two abbreviations expanded for clarity)

The New Testament contains further evidence for the cessation of tongues. One of the benefits of sign gifts was edification. Yet Ephesians 4:12-13 says the churches are edified by gifted ministers. Ephesians was written c. A. D. 64, five years after 1 Corinthians (A. D. 59). In A. D. 59 God was still getting the gospel to the whole world using sign gifts such as tongues (Mark 16:15-20), but no record of the continuing use of sign gifts appears in Ephesians (cf. Colossians 1:6, which, roughly contemporaneous with Ephesians, indicates that the gospel had by that time come to “all the world”). Hebrews 2:3-4, which was also written c. A. D. 64, indicates through the uses of the past tense verb “confirmed,” upon which the participle “bearing *them* witness . . . with signs and wonders . . . and with . . . miracles, and gifts” depends (*ἔβεβαιώθη . . . συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος*), that the confirmatory value of the sign gifts was a past event. By that point in the dispensation of grace, tongues had completed their purpose of confirmation and authentication. The Jews, for whom signs were given (1 Corinthians 1:9), had received ample evidence that the church had replaced Israel for the time being as God’s institution, that Israel had fallen under judgment (1 Corinthians 14:21; Deuteronomy 28:49; Isaiah 28:11-12; Jeremiah 5:15), and that Gentiles were included.

has possessed from the time of its founding a strong belief in continuationism, the view that all the spiritual gifts given to the first century churches continue to the present day. All of Keswick's most important advocates were continuationists.⁴ Indeed, in continuity

² After the Apostolic Age, tongues speaking cannot be historically verified among any group of orthodox Christians (cf. pgs. 87-92, *Tongues in Biblical Perspective*, Smith). Before the revival of what are called "tongues" in Pentecostalism near the beginning of the twentieth century, only various heretics and demon-possessed people, like the Shakers, Irvingites, and Mormons, laid claim to the Biblical gift of tongues (pgs. 16ff., *ibid.*), while pagans, practitioners of Voodoo, Buddhist and Shinto priests, and other worshippers of the devil practice "tongues" without affirming their continuity with the New Testament record (pgs. 20ff., *ibid.*). Meanwhile, "Christian Science, the Father Divine movement, and Spiritualism . . . [place] emphasis upon . . . divine healing and Spirit-inspired speech" (pg. 217, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

³ Cessationism is emphatically not, as it is sometimes represented by continuationists, a sort of modern Deism or rationalism that affirms that God no longer supernaturally interacts in the world. As strident a cessationist as B. B. Warfield affirms: "[N]o one who is a Christian in any clear sense doubts that God hears and answers prayer for the healing of the sick in a generally supernatural manner[,] [as taught by James 5:14-15.] . . . All Christians believe in healing in answer to prayer" (pgs. 214, 247, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield). The dispute between the cessationist and the continuationist is one of the continuation of the specific sign gifts of the apostolic age. "[T]he question is not: 1.) Whether God is an answerer of prayer; nor 2.) Whether, in answer to prayer, he heals the sick; nor 3.) Whether his action in healing the sick is a supernatural act; nor 4.) Whether the supernaturalness of the act may be so apparent as to demonstrate God's activity to all right-thinking minds conversant with the facts. All this we believe" (pg. 252, *ibid.*). Other cessationists and anti-continuationists similarly embrace God's continuing supernatural involvement in the world (cf. pg. 77, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

It is noteworthy also that just as B. B. Warfield is likely the most influential single advocate for classical evangelical piety and opponent of Keswick theology, so likewise "[h]e more than any other single writer has shaped evangelicals' negative attitude to Pentecostalism and charismatic renewal" (pg. 220, "Miracles, Charismata and Benjamin B. Warfield, Philip L. Barnes. *Evangelical Quarterly* 67:3 [1995] 219-43).

⁴ Other Keswick leaders not specifically examined below were continuationists. Keswick generally accepted that "[t]here may be . . . there are . . . supernatural manifestations made today . . . as were made 1800 years ago," as evidenced by testimonials of "multitudes of people" (pg. 312, *Keswick's Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson, in Canon Hay H. M. Aitken's message "Thirsty Christians" from 1902). Supernatural visions were expounded upon at Keswick conferences (e. g. pg. 158, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Keswick historians testified that "we cannot do without a vision . . . if such souls as Joan [of Arc] and Socrates needed visions, and had them vouchsafed to them, how much more do we[?]" (pgs. 13-30, *Visions; With Addresses on the First Epistle of John*, J. B. Figgis. London: James Nisbet, 1911. Figgis is the author of the Keswick history *Keswick from Within*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1914.). Continuationism was the belief of all early Keswick leaders.

Evan Hopkins once "claims to have had . . . a vision of Charles Haddon Spurgeon conveying a comforting message to him" (pg. 47, Price and Randall, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present and Future*). Although Spurgeon had died in 1892, and despite numerous and serious Biblical prohibitions on communicating with the dead, Spurgeon, it is said, knew Mr. Hopkins was feeling ill and came back from the dead to pay a visit in "January 1919[.] . . . [Evan Hopkins] told Mrs. Hopkins that Mr. Spurgeon had just visited him . . . and had repeated to him that great assurance of the New Testament, *All things are yours*[.] . . . 'It was very solemn,' he said, 'but it was not sad. It was bright and a comfort. . . . It made me cry. . . . [I]t was so kind of him. . . . Spurgeon . . . knew I was weak . . . and so he came.'" (pg. 219, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). No warnings against such visions were issued. On the contrary, Hopkins's "vision of the strongly evangelical Baptist, C. H. Spurgeon . . . appearing to him with a message of comfort . . . was a sign for Hopkins and others of the solidity of

Keswick's evangelical heritage" (pg. 47, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall)! It was clear that receiving visitations from the dead in visions validated Keswick's orthodoxy, especially when the visitations were from men such as Spurgeon, who rejected the Keswick theology when they were actually alive. Hopkins would also travel about seeking to heal people (pgs. 190-195, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie. Note that some of what Hopkins did is justifiable in that God is able to heal people in answer to prayer). However, Hopkins's healings, unlike those miraculous ones recorded in the Bible, would not always take effect right away (pg. 194). Indeed, at one point Hopkins was called to heal someone along with that great exponent of modern healing marvels, William Boardman, who was running the Faith-Cure Bethshan Faith Hospital at the time. Unfortunately, Boardman was not able to come to heal the person, as he could not heal himself, but died the very day he was to assist in the healing session with Hopkins (pg. 193).

G. Handley Moule, while expressing admirable cautions about signs and wonders (as, indeed, Evan Hopkins was also commendably more moderate than the body of later Pentecostalism), was nonetheless a continuationist: "I would not be mistaken, as if I meant to relegate off-hand to the apostolic age alone all manifestations of the presence and power of God through His people in the way of sign and wonder . . . [nor] deny *a priori* the possibility of signs and wonders in any age, our own or another, since the apostolic [time]" (pgs. 214-215, *Veni Creator*, Moule). As Evan Hopkins's communications with the dead supported his continuationism, so likewise did Moule's communications with the dead support his own continuationism. It was the Bishop's "sweet solace" to offer "[p]erpetual greetings to" his "beloved ones" who had "gone" to the grave. He stated: "I daily and by name greet my own beloved child, my dearest parents, and others precious to me" who had died. Prayers for the dead were "no sin," rather, communication with and prayers for the dead were a "sweet and blessed help" in the spiritual life. As a result of such communications with and prayers for the dead, Moule believed that "the Lord grants what can only be called visions," so that the dead return and grant an even greater level of communication with the living than can be obtained by invisible communication with the afterlife. Moule himself had had supernatural and "deeply sweet dreams" where dead people he communicated with and prayed for appeared to him and looked on him "with an extraordinary look of bliss" (pgs. 220-221, *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham: A Biography*, John B. Harford & Frederick C. Macdonald). Moule likewise commended others who had supposedly experienced "veritable vision[s] of God" Himself coming to them and telling them things. He encouraged and supported those receiving such visions to trust in the visions' veracity (pg. 287, *ibid*).

Pastor "Theodore Monod, of Paris, and . . . Stockmayer, of Switzerland, were probably the best known" representatives of Keswick theology on the European mainland and were also pillars of the "early [Keswick] meetings in England" who "took a leading share in the Convention in early days" (pgs. viii, 107, 162, 186, 198, 225, 230, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford; cf. pg. 58, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall). Both men were continuationists. Monod accepted the Higher Life continuationism of Robert P. Smith (cf. pg. 156, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). He had entered the Higher Life only "a few weeks" before the Oxford Convention; pg. 215, *ibid*), having heard of it at the spiritualist and continuationist Broadlands Conference of 1874 (pgs. 53-54, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

Stockmayer, who received his post-conversion Spirit baptism at the Oxford Convention under Robert Smith's leadership (pgs. 130-133, 208-209, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874), believed in and supported William Boardman in his Faith Cure practices, such as the idea that physical healing for every disease in this life was purchased by the atonement (pg. 45-46, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman). He likewise contributed to Andrew Murray's adoption of the Faith Cure (pgs. 113, 115, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger) and influenced for Pentecostalism the leading early German Pentecostal, Pastor Jonathan Paul (pgs. 239, 243, *ibid*; cf. pgs. 42-43, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee), and many others (cf. pg. 353, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger). Indeed, "Stockmayer . . . believed that sickness and death could be conquered in the life of a sanctified Christian" and proclaimed his views at special healing conferences (pg. 353, *ibid*). He was "one of the principal advocates of divine healing in Switzerland" (pg. 115, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis). Stockmayer "opened a house in . . . Switzerland for the reception of those seeking healing through

faith,” established an “institute for faith healing,” and published literature to spread the Faith Cure (pg. 90, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, Boardman; pg. 339, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis; pg. 143, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis). He was even recognized as the “theologian of faith-healing” (pg. 233, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield). He promoted the Keswick “holiness” doctrine of “pardon, sanctification, and physical healing . . . in the death and resurrection of Christ” when “accepted personally by us” as individual and separate benefits (pg. 224, *Life and Labours of the Rev. W. E. Boardman*, Mrs. Boardman).

William Graham Scroggie, who became Keswick’s leading figure in the 1950s, “did not deny the possibility of contemporary speaking in tongues” (pgs. 593-594, “Scroggie, William Graham,” *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, pgs. 593-594). On the contrary, “Scroggie . . . did accept that the gift of tongues might still be available to Christians” (pg. 71, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

A. T. Pierson expected a restoration of the sign gifts, and, indeed, greater manifestations of signs than took place in the Apostolic Era, when Christians entered into the Higher Life. Knowledge about a “new endowment” of power could come through a revelatory “dream of the night,” for “God himself, in midnight vision, revealed” facts such as the causes and character of diseases in this present day (pgs. 73, 349, *Forward Movements*, Pierson). Had not the missionary to Greenland, Hans Egede, “sought with prayers and tears the gift of healing . . . then ventured in the name of Christ, to lay his hands upon the sick, and scores of them were made whole,” as in “the apostolic age” (pg. 392)? (Egede’s Lutheran sacramentalism and his utter failure to perform apostolic healings are set aside.) Clearly, then, the people of God could look for the coming “a new Pentecost” in which “new displays of divine power might surpass those of any previous period,” even the “supernatural signs” of “the apostolic age” (pg. 401). Continuationism was validated by the triumphs of the Faith Cure:

[“S]igns,” similar to those of primitive days[,] appear to have been wrought by devoted missionaries and their simple converts, where the gospel has been brought into contact with a people rude, unimpressible [and] ignorant[.] . . . These statements were not generally doubted by believer[s] until zeal to overthrow the “faith-cure delusion” led to rash attempts to prove that all supernatural signs long since answered their purpose and entirely ceased; and so, classed with miracles, they have been treated as impossible[.] . . . Hans Egede . . . [received] . . . the gift of healing . . . [i]n Pastor Blumhardt’s Prayer cure . . . both body and soul are restored to wholeness in answer to prayer, and the only remedy applied is that divine panacea, the Gospel. . . . Edward Irving and many other such saints have risen from the sick bed to undertake for God work that demanded the full strength of body[.] . . . If, therefore, supernatural signs have disappeared in consequence of the loss of primitive faith and holiness, a revival of these latter may bring new manifestations of the former. Supernatural signs appear to have survived the apostolic age . . . [i]f in these degenerate days, a new Pentecost should restore primitive faith, worship, unity and activity, new displays of divine power might surpass those of any previous period. (pgs. 398-408, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Arthur T. Pierson. New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1905. While a continuationist, Pierson also affirmed admirable notes of caution; e. g., pg. 400.)

Furthermore, Pierson “did not condemn tongues *per se*, . . . [nor] deny that the gift of tongues was possible or claim that it belonged only to the apostolic age. . . . Pierson advocated judging each case on its own merits. . . . Pierson agreed with the [P]entecostals that the days of miracles had not passed with the apostolic age . . . [he] believed in miracles such as divine healing and revelation[.] . . . Pierson drew parallels between empowerment for holy living and divine healing” (pgs. 344-346, *Arthur Tappen Pierson and Forward Movements of Late-Nineteenth-Century Evangelicalism*, Dana L. Robert. Ph. D. Diss., Yale University, 1984). In Pierson’s view, all the sign gifts were for the present day, a view he tied in closely to his Keswick theology.

W. H. Griffith Thomas believed that “the true position” was that the sign gifts have not ceased but that on “most of the foreign fields . . . repetition of the signs” had appeared, so that “[m]issionaries could duplicate almost every scene in the Acts of the Apostles.” God “gives the signs” today, he explained, and to describe the first century as “the age of miracles [which is now] past” is an error (pgs. vii, 66, 91 *The Bible and the Body*, R. V. Bingham (Toronto, Canada: Evangelical Publishers, 1921 [1st ed.]).

The magazines of the Higher Life were continuationist also; for example, Carrie Judd Montgomery’s *Triumphs of Faith: A Monthly Journal Devoted to Faith-Healing, and to the Promotion of Christian Holiness*, became “a primary vehicle for spreading the doctrines of divine healing.” The periodical argued “that the pathway to bodily health followed the same route as the road to spiritual sanctification” —by faith alone, the Keswick doctrine (pgs. 92-96, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering*

with the advocacy of Faith Cure continuationism in the Broadlands, Oxford, and Brighton Conventions and the spiritualism that spread from Broadlands onward, an “emphasis on . . . faith healing and the ‘gifts of the Spirit’ . . . marked the Keswick movement.”⁵ At Brighton, meetings advocating both the Higher Life and the Faith Cure were held regularly from the time of the original Convention onwards. The Oxford Convention likewise stood in continuity with the Faith Cure practices of “the Faith Houses of Dorothea Trudel.”⁶ Rejection of medical means in favor of healing by prayer alone and the Keswick theology of sanctification were the physical and spiritual corollaries of the full blessing received immediately by faith alone. As a result, there was little to no cessationism in the Higher Life movement.⁷

Consequently, history indisputably records that the “immediate origins of the Pentecostal movement are to be found in the nineteenth century Holiness movement. . . . [T]he Pentecostal movement drew much of its membership and nearly all of its leadership from Holiness ranks.”⁸ Keswick perfectionism is intimately connected with

and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900, Heather Curtis). Citing the works of Stockmeyer and “the American Holiness evangelists” as examples of the tendency to purge Pentecostal ideas from Keswick and Higher Life compositions, Walter Hollenweger notes that “the writings of the ancestors of the Pentecostal movement,” the Keswick writers, have experienced “revision . . . since the Pentecostal movement proper started” (pg. 113, *The Pentecostals*).

⁵ Pg. 86, “The Non-Wesleyan Origins of the Pentecostal Movement,” William W. Menzies, pgs. 81-98 of *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. Menzies “is widely known as his church’s [the Assemblies of God] leading historian” (pg. 81).

⁶ Pg. 107, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874; cf. pgs. 97-98, 105-106, *The Lord that Healeth Thee*, W. Boardman. The teachings of the Oxford Convention and “the Faith Houses of Dorothea Trudel, at Mannedorf, Switzerland” were one (pg. 107, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). People at Oxford were reported healed by the Faith Cure when hands were laid on them (pg. 190): the Faith Cure and the Higher Life as taught by Trudel and at Oxford were one (pg. 242). At Oxford, it was proclaimed that today “Jesus does give signs and wonders,” even as He “has given them to some here” (pg. 114), through healing disease (cf. pg. 231) and other methods. Of course, the physical thrills of the Bridal Baptism taught by Robert P. Smith would also, in his mind at least, constitute a miraculous sign and wonder.

⁷ Pg. 133, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

⁸ Pg. 28, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; cf. pg. 228 for the continuationist background of “the vast majority of recruits to Pentecostalism” in the Holiness movement, emotionalistic revivalism, or continuationistic Catholicism.

Of course, even as Keswick itself was influenced by earlier perfectionisms, notably Wesleyan and Oberlin perfectionism, so Keswick was not the sole Higher Life or Holiness theological influence upon the rise of Pentecostalism; Methodist perfectionism and continuationism were likewise influential alongside Keswick perfectionism and continuationism. The “Finished Work” Pentecostal majority, who did not require an initial second blessing of consecration as a certain prerequisite to Spirit baptism and tongues, leaned more heavily upon the Keswick Holiness teaching. The “Second Work” minority, which required a second blessing of consecration before one could achieve the third blessing of Spirit baptism and tongues, was influenced more strongly by Methodist Holiness teaching (cf. pgs. 173-175, *ibid.*).

both the Faith or Mind Cure and the Pentecostal movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, respectively.⁹ On the other hand, “the cessationist view of miracles proved a major hindrance to th[e] embrace of faith cure.”¹⁰ An examination of forty-five representative Pentecostal pioneers indicated:

Nearly all¹¹ of the forty-five Pentecostal leaders . . . came out of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, or . . . other . . . Holiness factions that advocated healing and other gifts of the Spirit . . . All looked for a Second Pentecost having both collective and individual aspects, which would restore the miraculous gifts and powers of the Apostolic Church—a notion that lay at the heart of the Keswick movement . . . acceptance of the new movement seemed both logical and natural.¹²

In fact, Robert Pearsall “Smith himself spoke of the possibility of the restoration of the spiritual gifts of the Apostolic age,” a view that “was from the beginning an element in the [Keswick] movement,”¹³ as the Faith Cure continuationism, associated at Broadlands with spiritualism, was publicly proclaimed at the Keswick-predecessor Conventions. Mrs. H. W. Smith taught at Brighton that supernatural and “[g]reat manifestations” were received today, and that they were regularly from God. She preached: “[D]on’t think . . . that those who are favoured with [such manifestations] are enthusiasts.”¹⁴ Similarly, Robert P. Smith taught the Faith Cure doctrine that those who have entered into the Higher Life have Christ live both their spiritual and physical life vicariously—the Christ-life—as allegedly taught in Galatians 2:20. He assured those who entered into such a Christ-life that they would never be sick nor lose their “power to work all [their] days for the Lord Jesus.” Rather, he proclaimed, they “will not wear [themselves] out” but will live perpetually with bodies as healthy as youths; they will “live as children do,” for God

⁹ Compare pgs. 115ff., *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

¹⁰ Pg. 69, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

¹¹ The sole exception mentioned by Anderson was Howard Goss, who converted to Pentecostalism from atheism and then went over to the Oneness Pentecostal movement.

¹² Pgs. 110-112, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. Anderson provides many lines of very convincing evidence. Bruner indicates that “A. J. Gordon, F. B. Meyer, A. B. Simpson, Andrew Murray, and . . . R. A. Torrey . . . formed a kind of theological fund from which the Pentecostal theology of the Spirit has drawn heavily to establish itself” (pg. 45, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970). Pentecostalism developed from the teachings of the “Walter Palmers, the R. Pearsall Smiths (Hannah Whitehall Smith), W. J. Boardman . . . Andrew Murray, F. B. Meyer, A. B. Simpson, A. J. Gordon, and . . . R. A. Torrey” (pg. 62, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970).

¹³ “Die Heiligungsbewegung,” Chapter 6, *Perfectionism*, B. B. Warfield, vol. 1. Warfield, in context, mentions also that such continuationism was found in the German Higher Life movement that spread through the preaching of Robert P. Smith in that country and which led, as might be expected, to the rise and spread of German Pentecostalism (see Chapters 6-7, *ibid*).

¹⁴ Pg. 367, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

“will renew [their] youth like the eagle’s.”¹⁵ Likewise, in connection with severe misinterpretations of Scripture, Hannah Smith preached at Brighton the parallelism between the Higher Life for the soul and physical healing:

The secret of our sickly condition is shown to us in the 28th chap. Deuteronomy, verses 58, 59, 60[.] . . . This exhortation is addressed to Christian people[.] . . . It is not to unconverted people. . . . I am afraid this describes a great many Christians present. They have been delivered from Egypt, but they have not kept God’s law, and the diseases, which they thought were left behind, still cleave to them. This was my own experience after my conversion; I had two weeks of obedience and soul health, and then the diseases of Egypt came back again. Now, is there a way of deliverance, or must we go on as chronic invalids, and only expect to be healed when we get to heaven? . . . If the Lord heals, it seems to me we may with confidence say, “I shall be healed.” Then, in Exodus, xv. Chap., 26th verse, we have the Lord giving Himself such a wonderful name, “I am the Lord that healeth thee.” . . . [I]n Luke ix. 6, it says of Jesus, “He healed them that had need of healing.” . . . [H]e showed His power over both soul and body. . . . Is it not, then, as easy for the Lord to heal the soul as the body? . . . He came to heal both. . . . Do not ask your friend whether you may be healed. Do not ask your traditions or your prejudices, but ask your God, and if He says you may, I entreat of you to believe Him. . . . What we want is to find out whether we can be helped, and whether our disease comes within the reach of His healing power. Now, dear friends, we know that health is essential. . . . Get well, and then you can go and work for others. But *how*, you ask? First of all, I answer, it is utterly out of the question to even think of getting rid of disease ourselves; you cannot get at it . . . it is a thing that only God can do. . . . [P]ut your case now into His hands, and leave it with Him. Say to him, “Lord, here I am, sick and helpless; but I give myself to Thee to be healed. I believe Thou art able, and I trust Thee to do it.” And having done this, you must not worry yourselves about it any more, but you must simply obey His directions and trust Him. . . . [I]f the Lord . . . [says,] “I will take your case in hand; I will manage it for you; I will heal all your diseases,” [will] you . . . take Him at His word? . . . Why, dear friends, what did Jesus come to do if it was not to heal us? You know that He is willing. . . . [T]rust in Him. . . . [T]his [is the] secret of the Lord’s healing power[.]¹⁶

The Higher Life for the body and soul preached at Keswick led directly onward to Pentecostalism.

The Keswick theology was also influenced not only by the perfectionism but also by the continuationism of Wesley and the Methodist movement.¹⁷ The Oberlin

¹⁵ Pg. 338, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

¹⁶ Pgs. 28-34, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875. Mrs. Smith’s words, in her eyes, are applicable to both physical and “spiritual diseases” (pg. 33), for the Higher Life for the soul and body are exactly parallel. The Apostle Paul would disagree with Mrs. Smith’s affirmation that Deuteronomy 28:58-60 is addressed to the saved, as a simple comparison of Galatians 3:10 with Deuteronomy 27:26-28:68 makes abundantly clear. He would also disagree with Mrs. Smith’s doctrine of the Higher Life for soul and body. Additionally, Luke 9:6 does not say “of Jesus, ‘he healed them that had need of healing.’” The verse, speaking of the Twelve Apostles reads: “And they departed, and went through the towns, preaching the gospel, and healing every where.” Mrs. Smith must have meant Luke 9:11, but careful study of Scripture in context was not her strong point.

¹⁷ The Wesley brothers abandoned the dominant Protestant cessationism to adopt a continuationist doctrine, a view in which they were followed by the Methodist movement, and which explains much of the fanaticism that came to characterize Methodism (e. g., the bride mysticism that Hannah and Robert P. Smith learned from Methodists). Thus, nineteenth-century Methodists, writing to defend Keswick continuationism, noted:

[W]e dare to maintain that many of the phenomena of the Pentecostal times have been continued, are common, and ought to be expected in every age. . . . [Keswick] censors are exceedingly severe, [unjustly so, upon] the habitual reference made by the new [Keswick] teachers to the direct influence of the Holy Spirit . . . [as] a revealer as well as an interpreter of truth . . . speak[ing] to us not only by the written Word, but also by visions, or feelings, or aspirations, or impressions, independent of the Word; and extending even to what is sometimes claimed as a physical consciousness . . . [as by Keswick antecedent] Dr. Upham. (pg. 106, “The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents.” *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875)

Indeed, “much in Pentecostal teaching is a legacy from Anglicanism, [including the generally Anglican initial] Keswick Conventions . . . through the mediation of Wesley” (pg. 185, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger).

John Wesley also rejected the doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness in justification, writing: “Does ‘the righteousness of God’ ever mean . . . ‘the merits of Christ’? . . . I believe not once in all the Scripture. . . . It often means, and particularly in the Epistle to the Romans, ‘God’s method of justifying sinners.’ . . . [Does] ‘the righteousness of God’ signif[y] the righteousness which the God-man wrought out[?] No. . . . It signifies ‘God’s method of justifying sinners.’” (pg. 217, *Aspasio Vindicated, and the Scripture Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness Defended, in Eleven Letters from Mr. Hervey to Mr. Wesley, in Answer to that Gentleman’s Remarks on Theron and Aspasio*, W. Hervey. Glasgow: J. & M. Robertson, 1762; & pg. 137, *Eleven Letters from the Late Rev. Mr. Hervey, to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley, Containing an Answer to that Gentleman’s Remarks on Theron and Aspasio*, W. Hervey. 2nd ed. London: J. & F. & C. Rivinot, 1789. cf. pg. 497, *The Doctrine of Justification*, James Buchanan. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1997 [orig. pub. 1867]). “Many Wesleyan Methodists, following the example of their founder, have . . . keenly opposed . . . the doctrine . . . of [Christ’s] imputed righteousness” (pg. 500, *The Doctrine of Justification*, Buchanan). Thus, “Wesley could not resist assimilating justification into sanctification—the latter being his preeminent and enduring interest. The . . . notion that the believer is *simul justus et peccator* (at once both righteous and a sinner) Wesley firmly rejected. Many Arminians [including Wesley] further assert that faith is not merely the *instrument* of justification but the *ground* on which justification rests. Thus Wesley wrote that ‘any righteousness created by the act of justification is real because of the ethical or moral dimension of faith’” (pg. 353, *The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation*, Bruce Demarest). Thus, Wesley wrote:

Least of all does justification imply that God is deceived in those whom he justifies; that he thinks them to be what, in fact, they are not; that he accounts them to be otherwise than they are. It does by no means imply that God . . . esteems us better than we really are, or believes us righteous when we are unrighteous. Surely no. . . . Neither can it ever consist with his unerring wisdom to think that I am innocent, to judge that I am righteous or holy, because another is so. He can no more, in this manner, confound me with Christ, than with David or Abraham. . . . [S]uch a notion of justification is neither reconcilable to reason nor Scripture. (pg. 47, *The Works of the Reverend John Wesley*, vol. 1. New York: Emory & Waugh, 1831—note that “reason” is mentioned before “Scripture” as a reason to oppose the Biblical doctrine of justification.)

John Wesley rejected key elements of the core gospel doctrine of justification.

The Wesley brothers and the Methodist denomination retained the Anglican belief in baptismal regeneration when they left the English state church to start their own religion (cf. “John Wesley’s View of Baptism,” John Chongnam Cho, *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7 (Spring 1972) 60-73). Commenting on John 3:5, Wesley affirmed, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit—Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it [he cannot enter into the kingdom of God].” Commenting on Acts 22:16, he wrote, “Baptism administered to real penitent[s] is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive Church bestow this on any, unless through this means.” On both texts John Wesley clearly affirmed that baptism is the means of the new birth. He also declared, “It is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition” (Wesley, sermon, *The New Birth*). In his *Doctrinal Tracts* (pg. 246, 251) he wrote, “What are the benefits . . . we receive by baptism, is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is the washing away of original sin, by the application of Christ’s death. . . . [T]he merits of Christ’s life and deat[h] are applied to us in baptism. . . . [I]nfants are . . . proper subjects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless [sin] be washed away in baptism. Infants need to be washed from original sin. Therefore they are proper subjects for baptism” (cited in chapter 9, *The Evils of Infant Baptism*, Robert Boyt C. Howell, accessed in the *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, 2003). He wrote elsewhere:

[T]he first of . . . the *benefits* we receive by baptism is . . . the washing away of the guilt of original sin by the application of the merits of Christ's death. . . . [T]he merits of Christ's life and death . . . are applied to us in baptism . . . baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this, our Church prays in the baptismal office that the person to be baptized may be "washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his heavenly washing" [A conflation of two prayers in The Ministration of Publick Baptism . . . *Book of Common Prayer* [BCP] (1662), sec. 375-376.]; and declares in the rubric at the end of the office, "It is certain, by God's Word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved" (BCP, pg. 388). And this is agreeable to the unanimous judgment of all the ancient Fathers. . . . By baptism we enter into . . . the new covenant which [God] promised to make with the spiritual Israel. . . [and our] sins and iniquities . . . [are] remember[ed] no more[.] . . . By baptism we are . . . united to Christ . . . [f]rom which spiritual, vital union with him proceeds the influence of his grace on those that are baptized[.] . . . By baptism, we who were "by nature children of wrath" are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our Church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith. Being "grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace" [BCP, pgs. 398-399]. . . . By *water*, then, as a means (the water of baptism) we are regenerated or born again. Nor does . . . [o]ur Church . . . ascribe . . . [merely] the *outward* washing [to baptism], but the *inward grace* which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused which will not be wholly taken away unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long-continued wickedness. . . . *Baptism doth now save us* . . . as it admits us into the Church here, so into glory hereafter. . . . In the *ordinary* way, there is no other means of entering into the Church or into heaven. . . . [S]ince infants are guilty of original sin, then they are the proper subjects of baptism, seing [that], in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism. . . . To sum up the evidence. If outward baptism be generally, in an *ordinary* way, necessary to salvation; and infants may be saved as well as adults . . . [we] ought . . . not to neglect . . . any means of saving them[.] (pgs. 321-328, *On Baptism*, John Wesley, in *John Wesley*, ed. Albert C. Outler. New York, NY: Oxford University Pres, 1964. Italics in original.)

John's brother, the Methodist hymn-writer Charles Wesley, wrote against the Baptists, "Partisans of a narrow sect/ Your cruelty confess/ Nor still inhumanly reject/ Whom Jesus would embrace./ Your little ones preclude them not/ From the baptismal flood brought/ But let them now to Christ be saved/ And join the Church of God." (*Charles Wesley's Journal*, 18 October 1756, 2:128). Only their Arminian theology led the Wesleys to call adults who had been sprinkled in infancy to conversion. Since they rejected the Biblical truth that once one is saved, he is always saved (Romans 8:28-39), they held that one who was regenerated in infant baptism could fall away and become a child of the devil again, at which time he would need a second new birth. Wesley consequently preached as follows to Anglicans who were, as he thought and as he preached, born again through infant baptism but needed to be born again one more time because they had lost their salvation through sinning:

[That the] privileges . . . [of] being born again . . . being the son or a child of God, [and] having the Spirit of adoption . . . are ordinarily annexed to baptism (which is thence termed by our Lord [as] . . . being "born of water and of the Spirit") we know[.] . . . The question is not, what you was [*sic*; also in the following] made in baptism, but, ["What are you now?"] . . . I ask not, whether you was born of water and of the Spirit; but are you now the temple of the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in you? I allow you was "circumcised with the circumcision of Christ;" (As St. Paul emphatically terms baptism;) but does the Spirit of Christ and of glory now rest upon you? Else "your circumcision is become uncircumcision." . . . Say not then in your heart, "I was once baptized, therefore I am now a child of God." Alas, that consequence will by no means hold. How many are the baptized gluttons and drunkards, the baptized liars and common swearers, the baptized railers and evil-speakers, the baptized whoremongers, thieves, extortioners? What think you? Are these now the children of God? Verily, I say unto you, unto whom any of the preceding characters belongs, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the works of your father ye do." . . . Unto you I call, in the name of Him whom you crucify afresh[.] . . . Lean no more on the staff of that broken reed, that ye were born again in baptism. Who denies that ye were then made children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven? But notwithstanding this, ye are now children of the devil. Therefore ye must be born again. . . . To say, then, that ye cannot be born again, that there is no new birth but in baptism, is to seal you all under damnation, to consign you to hell, without help, without hope. . . . You will say, "But we are washed;" we were born again "of water and of the Spirit." So were . . . these common harlots, adulterers, murderers. . . . This, therefore, hinders not at all, but that ye may now be even as they. . . . And if ye have been baptized, your only hope is this,—that those who were made the children of God by baptism, but are now the children of the devil, may yet again receive "power to become the sons of God;" that they may receive again what they have lost[.] (Sermon 18, "Marks of the New Birth," John Wesley, Elec. Acc. Wesley Center Online, <http://wesley.nnu.edu/john-wesley-the-sermons-of-john-wesley-1872-edition/sermon-18-the-marks-of-the-new-birth/>)

perfectionism and continuationism of Asa Mahan also was an important influence.¹⁸ Furthermore, the expectation of the presence of continuing miracles,¹⁹ whether wrought by graven images, holy relics, transubstantiated wafers, or other abominations present in the theology of medieval Roman Catholicism (cf. Revelation 13:14; 16:14; 19:20)²⁰ and in the mysticism of Madame Guyon, Fénelon, and other Romanist mystics,²¹ influenced Keswick continuationism and the Pentecostalism that developed from it²² both indirectly through Wesley and Methodism²³ and directly through the impact of Romanist mystical

Whoever would deny that Anglicans were born again in baptism, John Wesley was not among their number. However, Anglicans who became unsaved by sinning after being sprinkled as infants were again lost and needed to be re-saved as adults.

¹⁸ Mahan's "publications were translated, wholly and in part, into various European languages. They were quite influential in the development of Holiness and Pentecostal thought throughout Europe. Mahan was also involved with the Bethshan Healing Centre and helped to awaken interest in divine healing throughout Europe" (pg. 405, "Mahan, Asa," *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen), since Mahan was a continuationist who wrote prominently in favor of the Faith Cure (pg. 134, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

¹⁹ It is not surprising that the papacy has endorsed the charismatic movement and that there are now millions of Roman Catholic charismatics (see, e. g., pg. xxiv, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan)—Romanism has always accepted continuationism. Nor is it surprising that Pentecostals promoted Romanist mystics like Madame Guyon (see, e. g., pg. 24, *The Latter Rain Evangel*, September 1922).

²⁰ "Luther, Calvin, and most of the Reformers rejected miracles, visions, and the like as no longer having any role to play in the life of the Church, [but] Catholic theology and piety have always acknowledged a place for them" (pg. 174, "The Hidden Roots of the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church," Edward O'Connor, pgs. 169-191 in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan). As Pope Pius XII wrote, "[M]embers gifted with miraculous powers will never be lacking in the Church" (paragraph 17 of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943 ed., of the papal encyclical *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 193-248, cited on pg. 182, *ibid*). Expanding on the teaching of Pope Pius XII and other earlier Roman Catholic dogma, Vatican II indicated: "[C]harismatic gifts . . . are to be received with thanksgiving and consolation[,] for they are exceedingly suitable and useful for the needs of the Church" (pg. 185, *ibid*).

²¹ Indeed, marvels of healing of the sort manifested in the Faith and Mind Cures, and then in the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements, were "for the greater part of Christian history . . . mainly centered in relics," so that "the great majority of the [alleged] miracles of healing which have been wrought throughout the history of the Roman Church have been wrought through the agency of relics. Not merely the actual graves of the saints, but equally any places where fragments of their bodies, however minute, have been preserved, have become healing shrine[s] to many of which pilgrims have flocked in immense numbers[.] . . . We are here at the very center of the miracle-life of the Church of Rome" (pg. 137, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield).

²² "The case for an Anglo-Catholic and Roman rootage of Pentecostal theology is perhaps strengthened in that these traditions have also tended to maintain a sense of continuation of the 'miraculous' into the present day, not only within their sacramental systems, but also by affirming certain miracles of healing (often in relation to their understanding of sainthood) and by preserving ancient rites of exorcism and the laying on of hands for the sick" (pgs. 36-37, pgs. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

²³ Roman Catholic mysticism was key to the development of the perfectionism and continuationism of John Wesley. "John Wesley . . . says that he began his teaching on Perfection in 1725 . . . [although he] was not converted [on his own testimony] until 1738 . . . [h]ow did he come to teach it? His father and mother . . . had both been interested in . . . Roman Catholic mystical teaching . . . and had read a great deal

writings on Hannah Whitall Smith²⁴ and others.²⁵ Thus, “proponents of faith cure . . . [drew] heavily upon the classic works of mystical authors such as Madame Guyon and

of it. . . . John Wesley had read [in addition to other Romanist mystics such as] . . . Tauler . . . Thomas à Kempis . . . [and the] ‘Protestant mystic . . . [who] wrote a book on Perfection . . . William Law,’ but he was influenced “in particular [by]. . . Madame Guyon . . . [and] the Roman Catholic Archbishop Fénelon,” although the Romanist mystic “Marquis or Baron de Renty” was probably Wesley’s single “favorite author,” eclipsing even Guyon and Fénelon (pgs. 307-308, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, Lloyd-Jones). Thus, Wesley could speak of “that excellent man, the Marquis de Renty” although he knew the Catholic was infected with “many touches of superstition, and some of idolatry, in worshipping saints, the Virgin Mary in particular” (cf. Sermon 72, series 2, Sermon 133, series 4, *Sermons, on Several Occasions, and to which reference is made in the trust-deeds of the Methodist Chapels, as constituting, with Mr. Wesley’s notes on the New Testament, the standard doctrines of the Methodist connexion*, John Wesley. Orig. pub. 4 vol., 1771. Elec. acc. *Logos Bible Software*).

Wesley was also profoundly influenced by the ascetic, Romanist, and Eastern Orthodox “monastic piety of the fourth-century ‘desert fathers’” during his time in the “Holy Club” at Oxford University:

[T]he consideration of Macarius the Egyptian and Ephraem Syrus and their descriptions of “perfection” (*teleiosis*) as the goal (*skopos*) of the Christian in this life [were influential in] shaping . . . Wesley’s . . . doctrine of Christian perfection . . . John Wesley . . . was . . . in touch with Gregory of Nyssa, the greatest of all the Eastern [Catholic] teachers of the quest for perfection. Thus, in his early days, [Wesley] drank deep of this Byzantine tradition of spirituality at its source and assimilated its concept of devotion as the way and perfection as the goal of the Christian life. . . . The devotional works . . . of two Latin [Roman Catholic] traditions of mystical spirituality . . . [and] the traditions of Eastern Orthodoxy—Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Macarius of Egypt, and others . . . introduced [important] factors of . . . [Wesley’s] understanding of perfection. . . . Wesley . . . was inclined to go beyond logical subsequence [in justification and sanctification] to experiential subsequence because of the deep influence of the Eastern Fathers on him in terms of the relation of perfection to process and goal. (pgs. 93-97, “‘Dialogue’ Within a Tradition: John Wesley and Gregory of Nyssa Discuss Christian Perfection,” John G. Merritt. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22:2 (Fall, 1987) 92-117)

Thus, Wesley received his idea of Christians’ entering into perfection or a second blessing from Catholic mysticism, and transferred his two-stage notions into the Higher Life movement and into Pentecostalism. “John Wesley . . . under the influence of Catholic works of edification, distinguished between the ordinary believer and those who were ‘sanctified’ or ‘baptized with the Spirit.’ . . . This view was adopted . . . by the evangelists and theologians of the American Holiness movement . . . such as Asa Mahan and C. G. Finney . . . [and] the early Pentecostal movement” (pgs. 21, 322, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger).

Along with perfectionism, Wesley also adopted the ancient and medieval Catholic continuationism (cf. pgs. 44-45, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton) that had provided key support in the Catholic apologetic for their doctrinal deviations from Scripture. Image worship in the iconoclastic controversy and at other times, as well as worship of the saints themselves, transubstantiation, and other idolatries, were regularly validated by the marvels performed by the graven images of and relics culled from the saints, transubstantiated bread, and so on (cf. pgs. 135ff., *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield).

Interestingly, Dayton references Wesley’s statement: “[I]f the Quakers hold the same perceptible inspiration with me, I am glad” (“Letter to ‘John Smith,’ March 25, 1747; elec. acc. Wesley Center Online: Wesley’s Letters, 1747, <http://wesley.nnu.edu/john-wesley/the-letters-of-john-wesley/wesleys-letters-1747>. Compare pg. 43, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton. Note, however, that Wesley went on to guard this declaration from much of the fanaticism that could be derived from it, and he was discussing the meaning of Romans 8:16 and the question of the immediate testimony of the Spirit in assurance when he made it.).

²⁴ Thus, for example, Robert and Hannah Smith could reference and promote Guyon and Fénelon at the Brighton Convention (cf. pgs. 140, 367, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875).

Partially through openness to Romanism and its miraculous relics, and partially through openness to other heresies and the inability to practice Biblical separation that were almost necessarily inherent in its nature as a State-church in a relatively free country, late eighteenth century Anglicanism, from which Keswick largely drew, was also not strongly cessationist but was open to continuationism (cf. pgs. 29-33,

Fenelon[.]”²⁶ Indeed, many continuationist marvels, such as speaking in tongues, require the rejection of the activity of the mind²⁷ and the self-emptying exalted by the Higher Life theology that has been of the essence of Quietism since its flowering in medieval Romanism, just as in the even earlier openly heathen and polytheistic Quietism. What is more, since “the central persons [in the development of Keswick were] Friends, and still cl[ung] to the ‘inward light,’”²⁸ the Quaker theology, with its doctrine of the continuation of revelation through inner light in Hannah Whitall and Robert Pearsall Smith’s background and preaching, as well as that of Robert Wilson, Jessie Penn-Lewis, and other early Keswick leaders, provided crucial background for the strong Keswick continuationism.

From the time of the earliest conference at Broadlands that led to the Keswick Convention, “[t]he ‘Seed,’ of which George Fox [the founder of Quakerism] spoke, was rooted in them all.”²⁹ The Keswick theology thus perpetuated the acceptance of continuing revelation and miracles as affirmed by Quakerism. Robert Barclay, the premier Quaker theologian, wrote:

Revelations of God by the Spirit, whether by outward voices and appearances, dreams, or inward objective manifestations in the heart, were of old the formal object of [believers’] faith, and remain yet so to be; for the object of the saints’ faith is the same in all ages, though set forth under

62, *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield; pg. 41, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

²⁵ For example, A. T. Pierson recognized that the “Mystics . . . deserve a very prominent place . . . [a]mong all the leaders of th[e] holiness movement . . . [it] is inseparable from this great current of thought that is associated with such as Jacob Böhme, St. Theresa, Catherine of Siena, Madame Guyon, Fénelon, Tauler, and William Law” (pgs. 11-12, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, Pierson).

²⁶ Pg. 114, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis.

²⁷ E. g., when Azusa Street leader Frank Bartleman received his special Pentecostal baptism and its charismatic tongues, he testified to the necessity of quietistic passivity and rejection of mental activity (contrast 2 Timothy 1:7) for the receipt of the ability to babble in gibberish:

I was . . . ceasing from the works of my own natural mind fully. . . . The Spirit had gradually prepared me for this culmination in my experience . . . I had . . . my spirit greatly subdued. A place of utter abandonment of will had been reached . . . purified from natural self-activity. . . . My mind, the last fortress of man to yield, was taken possession of by the Spirit [or, on a cessationist view, by evil spirits]. . . . I was possessed . . . fully. My mind . . . had caused me most of my trouble in my Christian experience. . . . Nothing hinders faith and the operation of the Spirit so much as . . . the wisdom, strength and self-sufficiency of the human mind. . . . In the experience of “speaking in tongues” I had reached the climax in abandonment. . . . From that time the Spirit began to flow through me in a new way. . . . “[T]ongues” . . . necessarily violat[e] human reason. It means abandonment of this faculty for the time. The human mind is held in abeyance fully in this exercise. (pgs. 73-75, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan)

Bartleman explained further that “[n]othing hinders God more . . . when waiting on Him for the ‘baptism’ [and receipt of tongues] . . . than . . . [having the] mind always at work” (pg. 126, *ibid*).

²⁸ Pg. 103, “The Brighton Convention and Its Opponents.” *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875.

²⁹ Pg. 62, *Evan Harry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie. The Quaker influence was passed down to subsequent generations of Higher Life advocates; e. g., the Christian and Missionary Alliance can commend George Fox as an example of spiritual life and spiritual victory (“The Four Laws of Victory,” C. H. Chrisman. *Alliance Weekly*, June 14, 1919, 179).

divers administrations. Moreover, these divine inward revelations . . . we make absolutely necessary for the building up of true faith[.] . . . [T]hese divine revelations are . . . not . . . to be subjected to the examination, either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or of the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain rule or touchstone; for this divine revelation, and inward illumination, is that which is evident and clear of itself; forcing, by its own evidence and clearness, the well-disposed understanding to assent, irresistibly moving the same thereunto[.] . . . [T]he Scriptures . . . are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate primary rule of faith and manners. . . . [T]hey are . . . subordinate to the Spirit . . . for . . . by the inward testimony of the Spirit we alone do truly know them.³⁰

Bushnell explains:

The sect of Friends, from George Fox downward, have had it as a principle to expect gifts [and] revelations[.] . . . Led on thus by Fox, the Friends have always claimed the continuance of the original gifts of the Spirit in the apostolic age, and have looked for them . . . in the ordinary course of their . . . demonstrations. We are not surprised to find [them] . . . believing as firmly in the prophetic gifts of [their] [Quaker] friend[s] as in those of Isaiah or Paul.”³¹

Hannah Whitall Smith described the practical result of this Quaker Inner Light teaching she received in her youth in pointing sinners away from the objective work of Christ on the cross for salvation to the “light within,” and away from *sola Scriptura* to alleged personal revelations. She wrote:

Our Quaker education had been . . . to refer us under all circumstances to the “light within” for teaching and guidance, and we believed that only when God should reveal Himself there, could we come really to know Him. In an old Quaker tract which I have found among my papers, called “What shall we do to be saved?” there is a passage that sets forth clearly the sort of teaching with which we had grown up. It is as follows:

I cannot direct the searcher after truth who is pensively enquiring what he shall do to be saved, to the ministry of any man; but would rather recommend him to the immediate teaching of the word nigh in the heart, even the Spirit of God. This is the only infallible teacher, and the primary adequate rule of faith and practice: it will lead those who attend to its dictates into the peaceable paths of safety and truth. . . .

The natural result of this teaching was to turn our minds inward, upon our feelings and our emotions, and to make us judge of our relations with God entirely by what we found within ourselves. What God had said in the Bible seemed to us of not nearly so much authority as what He might say to us in our own hearts, and I have no recollection of ever for a moment going to the Scriptures for instruction. The “inward voice” was to be our sole teacher.³²

Keswick maintained the continuationism at the heart of Quaker belief and practice, preparing the way for the arrival of the Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements.³³ As today there are “Quaker Pentecostals,”³⁴ and Quakers were associated with the

³⁰ Pgs. iv-v, Proposition 2, “Concerning Immediate Revelation,” Proposition 3, “Concerning the Scriptures,” *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: being an Explanation and Vindication of the Principles and Doctrines of the People called Quakers*, Robert Barclay.

³¹ Pg. 325, *Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the One System of God*, Horace Bushnell. London: Richard D. Dickinson, 1880.

³² Pgs. 151-152, *The Unselfishness of God*, Hannah W. Smith.

³³ Word of Faith leaders have, they aver, “inspired thoughts” that “are the Word of God” just as the “New Testament” is “inspired thoughts” (pg. 109, *God’s Laws of Success*, Robert Tilton).

³⁴ Cf. pg. 418, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; pg. 103, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

Pentecostal movement from its very beginning,³⁵ similarly “the early Quakers . . . experienced glossolalia,”³⁶ and there were “prominent Quaker Pentecostal[s] . . . in Pentecostal leadership.”³⁷ “Certainly the impact of Keswick thought had a substantial influence on the shaping of Pentecostal theology, not only in the English-speaking world, but elsewhere, particularly in continental Europe. . . . Keswick theology was accepted . . . readily by Pentecostals. . . . Keswick influence quickly gained currency in the young Pentecostal movement.”³⁸ Keswick theology permeated the institutions promulgating Pentecostalism.³⁹ The “Keswick movement” made “extremely important contributions to

³⁵ Thus, for example, Quakers were students at Charles Parham’s Bethel Bible College when the modern tongues movement began (pg. 48, *The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Pentecostal Movement*, Klaude Kendrick).

³⁶ Pg. 126, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. “The early Quakers . . . had the Gift of Tongues” (pg. 3, *The Apostolic Faith* I:1 (Los Angeles, September 1906), reprinted on pg. 3, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of “The Apostolic Faith” (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

³⁷ Pg. 101, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*, ed. Edith L. Blumhofer. It is not in the least surprising that Pentecostal founder Charles Parham adopted second blessing theology and its companion the Faith Cure through the influence of a “holiness Quaker” whose daughter he married at a ceremony performed by a Quaker minister (pg. 49, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). Parham also rejected hell for annihilationism and rejected the precept of water baptism through this same Holiness Quaker influence, while proceeding to open a Faith Cure home. “In short, he was a typical Holiness preacher of the Keswick variety” (pg. 50, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; Parham later changed his mind on water baptism and affirmed that one should be immersed “in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost” (pg. 255, *ibid*). Parham’s “College of Bethel,” which he opened only a few months before tongues broke out, also included students who had been ministers and religious workers in Quaker congregations (pg. 51, *ibid*).

“Quaker Seth Cook Rees, a figure prominent in the founding of both the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene and the Pilgrim Holiness Church,” who argued that “signs and miracles have reappeared with every Holy Ghost revival,” is an example of a significant Quaker Pentecostal leader (cf. pgs. 91, 93, 174-175, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

³⁸ “Keswick and the Higher Life,” <http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm>. The perfectionisms of Wesley, the Oberlin theology, and the Keswick theology together birthed the Pentecostal movement, even as they mutually influenced each other. However, the “Keswick view of sanctification started to dominate the Pentecostal movement in 1908,” overtaking the Wesleyan perfectionist influences that were initially stronger at Azusa Street (“Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements,” Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. <http://www.pneumafoundation.org>). Althouse explains how the Keswick view of the second blessing came to dominate in the Assemblies of God, the largest Pentecostal denomination in the United States. He likewise relates the manner in which the “Keswick understanding of sanctification had direct historical and theological influences upon the early Pentecostal movement,” both among those Pentecostal leaders who believed in two acts of grace (the second blessing) and those who believed in three acts of grace, an “issue [that] would fracture the fledgling movement. Nevertheless, the Keswick notions of sanctification not only influenced the more . . . Keswick [two acts of grace] Pentecostals, but Holiness [three acts of grace] Pentecostals as well” (*ibid*).

³⁹ “The Bible school of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, Georgia, one of the earliest Pentecostal denominations, based its curriculum on . . . Keswick works[.] . . . *The Pentecostal Holiness Advocate*, an early Pentecostal periodical, advertised the works of . . . Keswick writers regularly. Furthermore, the Assemblies of God, a Pentecostal denomination with . . . Keswick leanings, was dominated by Christian and Missionary Alliance people such as Elderidge, J.W. Welch and D.W. Kerr. The Assemblies of God

the development of pentecostalism,”⁴⁰ laying the groundwork that made the rise of the charismatic movement essentially inevitable:

Keswick leaders . . . concluded that [there] would be a great world-wide revival that would give every living person a last chance to accept the gospel. They expected that the Holiness movement would culminate in a Second Pentecost in which the Holy Spirit would endow believers with extraordinary powers[.] . . . The twin themes of a coming Pentecostal revival, sometimes called “the latter rain,” and of a Spirit baptism of power, run through . . . Keswick . . . literature. References to the gift of healing as a characteristic of both the revival and “the Baptism” are abundant; [references also appear] to speaking in tongues[.] . . . The Keswick movement . . . was absolutely crucial to the development of Pentecostalism. . . . The doctrinal basis for [Pentecostal] Christianity was laid by the Keswick wing of the Holiness movement, while an atmosphere heavy with hopes of a new Pentecost and inspired by the Welsh revival provided a favorable milieu. . . . Keswick-oriented people . . . in the Holiness movement . . . found the Pentecostal movement attractive . . . because its message fit so well into the general outlook already held by them.⁴¹

“It is thus no accident that Pentecostalism emerged when it did. All that was needed was the spark that would ignite this volatile tinder.”⁴² The Keswick and Higher Life movement provided the theological fuel for Pentecostalism—all that was needed was a spark to set the whole continuationist mass ablaze.⁴³

With Keswick continuationism came a practical undermining of *sola Scriptura* in favor of an experiential or allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, a phenomenon

course for ministers also included works by . . . Simpson, Murray and Pierson” (“Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements,” Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. <http://www.pneumafoundation.org>; cf. pgs. 110-112, 267, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

⁴⁰ Pg. 81, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

⁴¹ Pgs. 40-43, 46, 81, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. It was the “fundamental and nearly universal notion during the first few years of the [Pentecostal] movement” that the coming of the Second Pentecost with the restoration of tongues was so that missionaries could go to the ends of the earth to preach without learning native languages in preparation for the end of the world: “[T]he primary purpose of speaking in tongues was to make possible the fulfillment of the last sign of the end—the miraculous propagation of the gospel in the languages of all the peoples of the world[.]” To that end many Pentecostal missionaries went to foreign fields expecting natives to understand their gibber-jabber, although they were not successful in even a single instance (pgs. 90-92, 139, *ibid*), leading later Pentecostals to revise their earlier almost universally held belief and leading Pentecostal apologists to downplay the evidence of history on their earlier view.

See also *The Apostolic Faith* I:1 (Los Angeles, September 1906) & I:2 (October 1906) reprinted on pgs. 1, 5, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of “The Apostolic Faith” (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove.

⁴² Pg. 108, 143, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton. Dayton explains:

[T]he rise of faith healing . . . may be seen largely as a radicalization of the Holiness doctrine of instantaneous sanctification in which the consequences of sin (i. e., disease) as well as sin itself are overcome in the Atonement and vanquished during this life. . . . [T]he whole network of popular “higher Christian life” institutions and movements constituted at the turn of the century a sort of pre-Pentecostal tinderbox awaiting the spark that would set it off. . . . [W]hen Pentecostalism emerged . . . leaders of the Holiness movement recognized that it was only the gift of tongues that set it apart from their own teachings. . . . [They were] at the time but a hairs-breadth from Pentecostalism. (pgs. 174-176, *ibid*)

⁴³ There is no such tie between dispensationalism and Pentecostalism as there is between the Higher Life theology and Pentecostal continuationism. While Pentecostals may be dispensationalists, a consistent dispensationalism actually leads to cessationism, not continuationism (cf. pgs. 145-147, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

also passed on to the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements, and one that distinguished the Keswick and Pentecostal movements from fundamentalism.⁴⁴

Donald Dayton explains:

[There is a] distinct hermeneutic, a distinctively Pentecostal manner of appropriating the Scriptures. In contrast to magisterial Protestantism [and Baptist orthodoxy] . . . Pentecostalism reads the rest of the New Testament through Lukan eyes . . . [placing] [n]arrative material [over] . . . didactic . . . Pauline texts. . . . In making this claim, Pentecostalism stands in a long tradition of a “subjectivizing hermeneutic.” . . . The “higher life” antecedents to Pentecostalism in the nineteenth century used a similar approach to Scripture in appropriating elements of the Old Testament *Heilsgeschichte* devotionally. The exodus from Egypt, the wilderness wanderings, and crossing Jordan River into the Promised Land all became stages in the normative pattern of the spiritual pilgrimage from conversion into the “second blessing” (“Beulah Land”).⁴⁵

Consequently, it is unsurprising that Keswick taught: “There are times in our Christian life in which we have . . . to . . . accept as children from God things which often seem to be, and are, in contradiction with what appears to us the teaching of Scripture.”⁴⁶

Adopting this Keswick idea and accepting what was contrary to what one thought was the teaching of Scripture was very important if one was to embrace charismatic fanaticism. Thus, in the infancy of Pentecostalism at Azusa Street in Los Angeles, “[T]he operative hermeneutical principle [was that] . . . ‘the literal Word could be temporarily overruled by the living Spirit.’ . . . [I]n order to continue the [Pentecostal] revival, it was necessary for God to act independently of the regulating structure provided in the written Word.”⁴⁷

⁴⁴ “The strong concern for the exact meaning of the printed word . . . is one of the principal things that distinguish fundamentalism from other less intellectual forms of American revivalism or from the more experientially oriented holiness tradition or . . . pentecostalism” (pg. 61, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, George Marsden).

⁴⁵ Pgs. 22-24, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

⁴⁶ Pg. 183, *Keswick’s Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson. The quotation is from the famous and influential sermon “The Sufficiency of Grace” (pgs. 183-188, *ibid*) by the renowned Keswick leader and Faith Cure continuationist Otto Stockmayer and was preached at Keswick in 1896 (pg. 140, *ibid*). Stevenson’s compilation of Keswick messages in his *Keswick’s Authentic Voice* was, as validated and endorsed by many Keswick leaders, from the General Director of the China Inland Mission, J. Oswald Sanders, to the Chairman of the Keswick Convention Council, A. T. Houghton. The book, and Otto Stockmayer’s sermon, does present “indeed ‘Keswick’s Authentic Voice’” through the “outstanding addresses” selected (pgs. 9, 11, *ibid*), including Stockmayer’s.

⁴⁷ Pgs. 90-92, “Glossolalia at Azusa Street: A Hidden Presupposition?” Charles S. Gaede. *Westminster Theological Journal* 51:1 (Spring 1989) 77-92. Gaede, a professor at the Southwestern Assemblies of God College in Waxahachie, Texas, explains, in more detail:

[T]he operative hermeneutical principle [was that] . . . “the literal Word could be temporarily overruled by the living Spirit.” . . . (1) there was an awareness of the scriptural regulations governing public glossolalia, and (2) [Azusa street leaders] were unwilling to apply the provisions of the written Word consistently. Why were they willing to let the inconsistency continue? . . . [“We] have seen over and over again during the past fifteen months, that where Christian workers have suppressed these manifestations [because of Scriptural teaching], the Holy Spirit has been grieved, the work has stopped. . . . Who are we to dictate to an all-wise God as to how He shall work in anyone? [”] . . . [I]n order to continue the revival, it was necessary for God to act independently of the regulating structure provided in the written Word . . . pragmatism was the method used to solve this problem[.] The existence of the third presupposition would explain the practice of the selective application of biblical authority. On certain issues biblical authority was asserted vehemently; on other issues it was viewed as antagonistic to the acts of God by his Spirit. That is particularly true with

The rules regulating the gift of tongues specified by Paul in 1 Corinthians were “ignored . . . in all the early Pentecostal meetings.”⁴⁸ Pentecostal historians recognize that their movement arose and is propagated by events and experiences, not by careful preaching of the Word, interpreted grammatically and historically.⁴⁹ For the charismatic, the “*exegetical* difficulties which may arise [in Pentecostal doctrine] are, in the final analysis, more than balanced for Pentecostals by the *experiential* proofs.”⁵⁰ The mind must not be used to interpret Scripture.⁵¹ Experience⁵² is superior to Biblical theology and logical study of Biblical teaching.⁵³ Thus, both through continuationism and through the rejection of a literal interpretation of Scripture for an exaltation of experience, the Higher Life theology of Robert P. and Hannah W. Smith “gave birth to the Keswick Convention . . . and Pentecostal movements.”⁵⁴

In addition to Quaker theology, William Boardman’s healing doctrine, developed out of antinomian, Oberlin, and Wesleyan continuationism and perfectionism, was passed on to the Higher Life movement and is prominent in the writings of Andrew Murray, A. B. Simpson, and many other Keswick leaders. That is, the continuationism of the Faith

respect to their beliefs and practices of glossolalia. The three presuppositions would be implemented by the hermeneutical principle of pragmatism. . . . The desire and attempts to perpetuate the revival developed an unacknowledged presupposition that the imposition of any structure, including that set forth in the written Word, nullified the experiential activity of God. An implementing hermeneutical principle of pragmatism flowed from that presupposition. (pgs. 90-92, “Glossolalia at Azusa Street: A Hidden Presupposition?” Charles S. Gaede. *Westminster Theological Journal* 51:1 (Spring 1989) 77-92)

⁴⁸ Pg. 146, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. “Pentecostals . . . were not overly concerned with the problem of reconciling their experience with 1 Corinthians, chapter 12” (pg. 163, *ibid*).

⁴⁹ Synan writes:

Pentecostal Christianity tends to find its rise in events . . . [and recognizes the] priority of “event.” . . . These events . . . giv[e] a distinct focus to one’s reading of Scripture. The focus is upon the realistic, even the empirical, results . . . a dramatic breakthrough of supernatural power, a display of charismatic phenomena. It is not the case of a teaching that gains a hearing, but events that attract a following. . . . [F]undamentalists have consistently criticized pentecostals for departing from a theological accent on God’s “propositional revelation” in the Scripture. (pgs. 25-27, 209, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan)

⁵⁰ Pg. 62, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, F. D. Bruner, citing pg. 26, *The Heavenly Gift: Studies in the Work of the Holy Spirit*, Pearlman (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1935) and pg. 39, *Systematic Theology*, Williams, vol. 1.

⁵¹ “Under rational inquiry pentecostalism falters” (pg. 206, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan), as does its Higher Life precursors.

⁵² Bruner notes:

The modern family-book of Pentecostalism has . . . the following main chapters: Wesley—revivalism—Finney—the holiness movement. In each chapter personal experience is given special stress . . . [and] in the Methodist and holiness movements, the personal experience most stressed was that which was subsequent to . . . conversion . . . the experience which came in the Pentecostal movement to be called the baptism in the Holy Spirit. (pg. 47, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970)

⁵³ Compare pg. 6, “A Plea for Experience,” *The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God*, 448-449, June 10, 1922.

⁵⁴ July 27-28, *The Christian’s Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter.

and Mind Cure movement, which grew out of Methodist and other pre-Keswick perfectionist theologies, was very influential on Keswick. McConnell explains:

[H]ealing . . . w[as] very much alive in the nineteenth-century Faith-Cure movement led by Charles Cullis and spread by William Boardman, Andrew Murray, Adoniram Gordon, Carrie Judd Montgomery, and A. B. Simpson. . . . [T]he Faith-Cure disciples of Charles Cullis . . . [provided] the divine healing movement with the production of a permanent literature . . . transcended denominational distinctions and drew supporters and practitioners from every background . . . [and had] lasting significance . . . [as seen in] the explosion of the Pentecostal movement in the first decade of the twentieth century. The Pentecostal movement was built upon the theological foundation of the Faith-Cure movement.⁵⁵

The Quaker and Faith Cure continuationism, adopted and strongly promulgated by so many of the leaders of the Keswick theology—and strongly opposed by, or separated from, by none of them—is profoundly connected to the modern Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements.⁵⁶ Charles Parham, the “theological father of the . . . Azusa Street revival . . . which ushered into being the worldwide twentieth-century pentecostal renewal,” adopted the key doctrinal distinctive of Pentecostalism—tongues-speech as the necessary evidence of present-day post-conversion Spirit baptism—at the Faith Cure home he had founded as a Higher Life minister, where he taught “the standard teachings of the holiness movement that were current in his day . . . sanctification as a second work of grace [and] divine healing[.]”⁵⁷ William Seymour, the central figure of Azusa Street, learned the Pentecostal theology at the Bible school associated with Parham’s Faith Cure home.⁵⁸ Keswick—the Higher Life of the spirit and of the body—laid essential groundwork for the rise of charismatic fanaticism. Indeed, the leadership

⁵⁵ Pgs. 204-205, *Another Gospel*, D. R. McConnell. McConnell leaves out especially unsavory but prominent advocates of Faith Cure such as John H. Noyes, who joined the doctrine to extreme perfectionism, communism, and rampant sexual immorality or “free love” among the men and women who adhered to his principles, known by those whom he deluded as “complex marriage” (cf. “Socialism,” *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, Strong & McClintock). Compare pgs. 10, 20, 81-87, 107, 119, 159-160, 200 & 239, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*, Heather Curtis, for Carrie Judd Montgomery’s healing by an Adventist, cultist, and woman preacher, Sarah Mix. Curtis also documents Montgomery’s transition from preaching the Faith Cure and preaching against the Christian use of medicine with Cullis, Boardman, and Simpson into the Pentecostal movement.

⁵⁶ As healing was the sign of the earlier Higher Life outpouring, so tongues were the sign of the later Pentecostal outpouring (pg. 161, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan).

⁵⁷ Pg. ix, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Justification by faith and premillennialism were also said to be standard holiness teachings, to which could be added other items such as the inspiration of Scripture, monotheism, the resurrection of Christ, and so on. However, post-conversion crisis-sanctification and the Mind or Faith Cure were doubtless the two special doctrinal distinctives—the Higher Life of the spirit and the Higher Life of the body.

⁵⁸ Pgs. ix-xi, xix, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. “Seymour . . . invited Parham, his ‘father in the gospel,’ to preach at Azusa Street[.] . . . Seymour and his Azusa Street leaders began publication of their own paper, entitled *The Apostolic Faith* . . . [a] name . . . taken from Charles Parham’s Apostolic Faith movement” (pg. xix, *ibid.*).

for the early Pentecostal movement had direct, personal contact with Keswick leaders and drew countless adherents of Keswick into their ranks. “Many of the early Pentecostal leaders in Britain attended Keswick meetings.”⁵⁹ For example, prominent English Pentecostal “Alexander Boddy . . . was a Keswick evangelical,” while “George Jeffreys . . . the . . . founder of another Pentecostal denomination, the Elim Church, had attended Conventions where he was taught to receive [t]he Baptism of the Holy Spirit . . . the Keswick message.”⁶⁰ It is very clear that “Keswick . . . played an important role as a precursor to the Pentecostal and charismatic movements”⁶¹—indeed, the “[t]he Keswick movement . . . was absolutely crucial to the development of Pentecostalism.”⁶² Not surprisingly, “the early Pentecostal understanding of sanctification was . . . a view emanating from the Keswick understanding of consecration and surrender to the Holy Spirit.”⁶³ When tongues broke out in Los Angeles, “great holiness denominations, already in existence by the time of the Azusa street revival, were swept almost overnight into the pentecostal fold.”⁶⁴ The “workers at ‘Azusa’ . . . were largely called and prepared . . . from the Holiness ranks.”⁶⁵ History demonstrates:

[O]ne can find in late nineteenth century holiness thought and life every significant feature of pentecostalism . . . the ground had been well prepared. . . the emergence of pentecostalism . . . may be seen as a natural development . . . connections are very apparent. . . [T]he holiness revival of the late nineteenth century . . . was the cradle in which the pentecostal revival was rocked.⁶⁶

⁵⁹ Pgs. 178-179, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁶⁰ Pgs. 178-179, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Even up to “1929 . . . [t]he hope was expressed by the Elim movement . . . that Keswick leaders would . . . be compelled to admit that Pentecostal teaching was correct” (pg. 179, *ibid*).

⁶¹ Pg. 253, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁶² Pg. 43, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Mapes Anderson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1979/1992.

⁶³ “Wesleyan and Reformed Impulses in the Keswick and Pentecostal Movements,” Peter Althouse. Pneuma Foundation. <http://www.pneumafoundation.org>. “Of all the writers in the Assemblies of God who have written clearly on the doctrine of sanctification, none is more significant than William I. Evans. . . . Evans outlines a position on sanctification in the classic Keswickian language which reaches through the [Christian and Missionary] Alliance, through A. B. Simpson, all the way to A. J. Gordon, Robert Pearsall Smith, F. B. Meyer, and others who traveled the Keswick circuit” (pgs. 89-90, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan).

⁶⁴ Pg. 93, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. For example, the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church entered the Pentecostal movement wholesale (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* 1:8 (Los Angeles, May 1907), reprinted on pg. 34, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of “The Apostolic Faith” (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

⁶⁵ Pg. 81, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁶⁶ Pgs. 51-52, 97, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. In more detail: [C]entral to the whole [rise of] . . . the pentecostal movement . . . was the change in the evangelical mood created in large measure by the American holiness revival. . . . [T]he American holiness movement of the nineteenth century mediated Wesleyan theology and experience through American revivalism to almost the

Pentecostalism was simply a further development of the evil fruit of unscriptural doctrine and practice found in the holiness and Higher Life movements.⁶⁷

whole of evangelicalism around the world. It won broad acceptance of a “second blessing” . . . the common point [for] the holiness, Keswick, pentecostal, and charismatic movements . . . expectations of a new age of pentecostal power were aroused . . . and finally, in the nineteenth century holiness revival, the pentecostal movement found a large number of its founding leaders and organizations. . . . Out of the world-wide Holiness movements the Pentecostal movement was born. (pgs. 58-59, *ibid*)

⁶⁷ Harry Ironside, having been delivered in the mercy of God from second-blessing perfectionism, wrote in 1912 of the connection between the Higher Life, false professions and pseudo-conversion, a lowering of the level of true holiness, Faith Cure, and Pentecostalism:

And now I began to see what a string of derelicts this holiness teaching left in its train. I could count scores of persons who had gone into utter infidelity because of it. They always gave the same reason: “I tried it all. I found it a failure. So I concluded the Bible teaching was all a delusion, and religion was a mere matter of the emotions.” Many more (and I knew several such intimately) lapsed into insanity after floundering in the morass of this emotional religion for years—and people said that studying the Bible had driven them crazy. How little they knew that it was lack of Bible knowledge that was accountable for their wretched mental state—an absolutely unscriptural use of isolated passages of Scripture! . . . I observed that the general state of “sanctified” people was as low, if not often lower, than that of those whom they contemptuously described as “only justified.” . . . Very few of our “converts” stood. “Backsliders” often outnumbered by far our “soldiers.” . . . One great reason for this . . . [was] that the holiness doctrine had a most baneful influence upon the movement. People who professed conversion . . . struggled for months, even years, to reach a state of sinlessness which never was reached; and at last they gave up in despair and sank back in many instances to the dead level of the world around them.

I saw that it was the same with all the holiness denominations, and the various “bands,” “Missions,” and other movements that were continually breaking off from them. The standard set was the unattainable. The result was, sooner or later, utter discouragement, cunningly concealed hypocrisy, or an unconscious lowering of the standard to suit the experience reached. . . . I went to the Home of Rest[,] . . . Closely allied to the Home were other institutions where holiness and faith-healing were largely dwelt upon. . . . [T]he manifestly carnal gloried in their experience of perfect love! Sick people testified to being healed by faith, and sinning people declared they had the blessing of holiness! . . .

Since turning aside from the perfectionist societies, I have often been asked if I find as high a standard maintained among Christians generally who do not profess to have the “second blessing” as I have seen among those who do. My answer is that after carefully, and I trust without prejudice, considering both, I have found a far higher standard maintained by believers who reject [the second blessing] than among those who accept it . . . a far lower standard of Christian living is found among the so-called holiness people.

The reasons are not far to seek . . . the profession of holiness induces a subtle spiritual pride . . . and frequently leads to the most manifest self-confidence . . . tends to harden the conscience and to cause the one who professes it to lower the standard to his own poor experience. . . .

Superstition and fanaticism of the grossest character find a hotbed among holiness advocates. Witness the present disgusting “Tongues Movement,” with all its attendant delusions and insanities. An unhealthy craving for new and thrilling religious sensations, and emotional meetings of a most exciting character, readily account for these things. Because . . . people get to depend so much upon “blessings,” and “new baptisms of the Spirit,” as they call these experiences[,] . . . they readily fall a prey to the most absurd delusions. In the last few years hundreds of holiness meetings all over the world have been literally turned into pandemoniums where exhibitions worthy of a madhouse or of a collection of howling dervishes are held night after night. No wonder a heavy toll of lunacy and infidelity is the frequent result. . . . Holiness . . . doctrines . . . are the direct cause of the disgusting fruits I have been enumerating. Let a full Christ be preached, a finished work be proclaimed, the truth of the indwelling Spirit be scripturally taught, and all these excrescences disappear. (pgs. 24-40, *Holiness: the False and the True*, Harry Ironside)