

IV. Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis

Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis were the central minister and the most influential expositor,¹ respectively, of the Welsh holiness revivalism concentrated from “December 1904 to May 1905,”² co-opting and eclipsing a genuine revival movement in Wales that had already been taking place. Roberts received infant “baptism a few weeks after his birth on June 8, 1878,”³ and grew up in the Calvinistic Methodist denomination. His “name appears in the church roll for the first time in 1893-94” after taking a “preparation class,”⁴ but evidence of his own personal conversion is very weak at best.⁵ A minister claimed that he had been the instrument some time after 1898 of Roberts’ “conversion or consecration,”⁶ but Roberts himself does not appear to have affirmed that he was born again at that time—indeed, Roberts testified that he was not a Christian until a number of months before the onset of the holiness revival.⁷ The closest one can come

¹ Of course, other men were involved, such as “W. S. Jones,” who not long before 1904 “had a vision,” after which it “soon became evident that God had chosen him to be the first receiver and transmitter of Holy Spirit baptism. Around him there gathered a group of young pastors such as Keri Evans, W. W. Lewis and D. Saunders who sought the same experience” (pgs. xvi-xvii, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones). Nevertheless, “Evan Roberts . . . must be placed at the center of events” (Pg. xviii, *ibid.*).

² Pg. 65, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones. It is worth noting that practically all the resources employed in this study of Roberts, Penn-Lewis, and the Welsh revival are written by men sympathetic or even adulatory of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis and hostile to their critics. For example, one of the least adulatory and most even-handed writers, J. Vyrnwy Morgan, stated that “he would rather burn . . . [his] manuscript . . . than be the cause of adversely affecting the work of God through Mr. Roberts . . . I have . . . profound regard for Mr. Evan Roberts” (pg. 268, *The Welsh Religious Revival, 1904-5: A Retrospect and a Criticism*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1909). Morgan notes: “The title of this volume should not be taken as implying any hostility to revivals. Criticism is the science of discrimination, and it is the science upon which this [book] is based” (pg. xi). Other works cited frequently do not hesitate to attack the character, impugn the motives, and employ other unjustifiable tactics to oppose critics of Roberts, Penn-Lewis, and their ministries. They certainly were by no means out to put Roberts or Penn-Lewis in a bad light.

³ Pg. 3, *An Instrument of Revival: The Complete Life of Evan Roberts, 1878-1951*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

⁴ Pg. 5, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁵ Roberts’ very sympathetic biographer B. P. Jones believes that Roberts was converted “[a]t some point” (pg. 5, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones) but gives no specific or certain details or words of Roberts himself about this event which Jones affirms took place. Similarly, S. B. Shaw records Roberts’ birth, youth, and entrance into revivalistic work in the Welsh holiness revival with not a jot or tittle of reference to Roberts’ experience of personal conversion (pgs. 121-125, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905). Nor does W. T. Stead record a syllable that recounts a reasonable personal conversion testimony in his account of Evan Roberts’ life (pgs. 41ff., *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead)—Roberts passes from thinking he is not a Christian to being someone who has visions and encounters with supernatural forces and therefore concluding that he belongs to God.

⁶ Pg. 9, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁷ Pg. 41, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. “[A]ccording to his own account . . . he was not a Christian until little more than fifteen months” before Stead wrote his book in 1904 (*ibid.*).

from Roberts' own words to a conversion testimony appears to be a time when he was "taking steps to enter ministerial training" and seeking to be "baptized with the Spirit." Hearing a "voice . . . within his troubled heart" about willingness to receive the Spirit, "he went . . . to the chapel" where he was residing and at that meeting, affirmed:

What boiled in my bosom was the verse, "For God commendeth his love." I fell on my knees with my arms outstretched on the seat before me. The perspiration poured down my face and my tears streamed quickly until I thought the blood came out. Mrs. Davies of Mona, Newquay, came to wipe my face, and Magdalen Phillips stood on my right and Maud Davies on my left. I cried, "Bend Me, Bend Me, Bend Me. . . . OH! OH! OH! . . . After I was bended, a wave of peace and joy filled my bosom."⁸

Roberts affirmed that "Living Energy" came and "invaded his soul, burst all his bonds, and overwhelmed him," and he "gave his testimony at the afternoon service" about this experience "as if it were a kind of conversion or new birth"⁹ through seeking and receiving Spirit baptism. Evan Roberts testified that a "living energy or force enter[ed] his bosom till it held his breath and made his legs tremble,"¹⁰ which he took to be evidence that his sins were forgiven and that the spirit that entered him, hindering his breathing and making his legs wobbly, was the Holy Spirit. Such "bodily agitations . . . [and] convulsions were the natural and legitimate results of the new birth,"¹¹ in his view, although his landlady turned him out of the house, having "become afraid of him," fearing "he was possessed or somewhat mad."¹² Although there are not strong grounds to conclude that Roberts was, at whatever point, genuinely converted, and not just the subject of a variety of powerful religious experiences arising from his flesh or from the devil, at least "ever since he had been filled with the Spirit he had been physically conscious of the Spirit's prohibitions and commands"¹³ in voices and visions; he "began to have visions"¹⁴ from the time of his Spirit baptism and alleged conversion, so that "it is evident that Evan Roberts [was] conscious that he ha[d] received a gift of prophecy through his baptism of the Spirit."¹⁵ Roberts' experiences were comparable to those of "St. Teresa, Jakob Boehme, George Fox, [and] Ignatius Loyola,"¹⁶ having the same

⁸ Pg. 24, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Note the discussion by the headmaster of the school where Roberts prepared for the ministry for a few weeks on pgs. 110-112, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

⁹ Pgs. 23-24, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁰ Pg. 19, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones.

¹¹ Pg. 234, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

¹² Pg. 42, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

¹³ Pg. 108, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁴ Pg. 111, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁵ Pg. 178, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

¹⁶ Pg. 180, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

sources in the spirit world as such Roman Catholic, theosophist, and Quaker luminaries. When “Dr. Williams, the phrenologist[,]”¹⁷ . . . measured [his] cranium, deduced certain patterns,” and “told . . . the young miner, ‘You ought to be a preacher,’” an affirmation also confirmed by a minister who had heard Roberts pray publicly one time, Evan was guided no longer to be a miner but a minister.¹⁸ However, his education for the ministry was extremely limited, as was his education in general, although he was “deeply influenced” by “C. R. Sheldon’s *In His Steps*.”¹⁹ Roberts “left school at age twelve, laboured in coal mines for twelve years, undertook part-time study and a brief pre-college course . . . [and] had no pastoral or evangelistic experience”²⁰ when he became the center of the Welsh holiness revival in 1904, although a novice (1 Timothy 3:6), one whose “schooldays were few and irregular,”²¹ and “an unqualified preacher with only six weeks of adult pre-college education.”²² Incapable of careful exegesis of the Bible, he taught “experience-based doctrine” and held to “no dogmatic beliefs,” since he was “totally untrained” for “systematic theological instruction” or “expository preaching.”²³ “Evan Roberts was not intellectual . . . was moved more by his emotions than by his ideas . . .

¹⁷ “Franz Gall (1758–1828) and Johann Spurzheim (1776–1832) developed an early physiological psychology known as phrenology, which held three fundamental positions: the exterior conformation of the skull corresponds to the interior (brain); mind is analyzable into a number of functions (e.g., combativeness, hope, acquisitiveness, cautiousness, and secretiveness); and the functions of mind are differentially localized in the brain, and an excess in any function is correlated with an enlargement of the corresponding place in the brain. . . . [T]he term *phrenology* mean[s] literally the science of the mind. The theory asserted that personality and character traits could be judged by the location and size of bumps on the skull. . . . Some 37 localized areas of the brain were specified to contain independent and inherited regions relating to such character traits as self-esteem, conscientiousness, and spirituality. Three general character types—mental, motive, and vital—facilitated grouping of personalities. Phrenology maps were drawn to indicate the locations of particular faculties and were then used to analyze the corresponding bumps on the skull of a client. . . . Phrenology had a certain popular appeal; people thought personality could be determined by feeling an individual’s skull. However, phrenology was never accepted by scientists because its methodology was largely anecdotal. . . . The charlatanlike activities of Gall and Spurzheim and the multiplicity of faculties made phrenology the last faculty psychology” (pgs. 427, 790, 872, *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling* (2nd ed.), D. G. Benner & P. C. Hill. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999). Interestingly, one of Evan Roberts’ “heavily involved” helpers was “Annie May Rees, the daughter of a phrenologist” (pg. 52, see 76ff., *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones).

¹⁸ Pg. 10, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Pg. 110 mentions Evan’s interaction with another phrenologist later.

¹⁹ Pg. 6, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. “Sheldon, a Congregational minister, followed the liberal teaching of his day that Christ was merely an example,” and thus the book “promotes a social gospel rather than the Saving Gospel of Jesus Christ,” one of “[w]alking in the steps of Jesus” rather than “trust[ing] in His saving merits and vicarious satisfaction to get to Heaven” (*Calvary Contender*, 10/15/1997; elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, ed. David Cloud).

²⁰ Pg. xiii, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²¹ Pg. 55, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

²² Pg. 96, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; pg. 85, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

²³ Pgs. 253, 5, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

was more intuitive than inductive or deductive . . . had no fundamental doctrine, no system of theology, no distinctive ideal.”²⁴ He did not follow the pattern of Christ and the Apostles, as well as of earlier revival preachers such as Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield, or earlier instruments of revival in Wales,²⁵ by preaching boldly and specifically on sin, calling men to repentance, and strongly warning about hell and judgment to come (Matthew 5:22-30). Instead, Roberts set forth “no *dies irae* to terrify, but a *dies caritas* to win its way[.] . . . Sin—or at least vice—[was] seldom denounced[.]”²⁶ Indeed, Roberts stated: “What need have these people [in the Welsh holiness revival] to be told that they are sinners?”²⁷ Furthermore, “Roberts does not call his hearers to repentance . . . but speaks of having been called to fulfill the words of the prophet Joel. ‘Your old men shall dream dreams; your young men shall see visions.’” Rather than preaching repentance, Roberts “frequently describe[d] visions that had appeared to him.”²⁸ Surely describing visions will bring more to salvation than preaching repentance. He also “told his congregations that he had ‘not come to terrify them by preaching about the horrors of eternal damnation’” and “told reporters . . . ‘I preach nothing but Christ’s love,’” after the manner of the preaching of Hannah W. Smith.²⁹ Nevertheless, “his message was not so much Christocentric as pneuma-centric, a result of the influence of the Holiness movement, especially the teaching of Keswick,”³⁰ Roberts spoke at the Welsh Keswick Conference at Llandrindod Wells in 1905 at the height of the holiness revival excitement.³¹ While Keswick proper was key for Roberts, Keswick antecedents, such as the “experience . . . called ‘perfect love’ or Christian perfection’

²⁴ Pg. 55, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

²⁵ Thus, Vyrnwy Morgan noted “an unmistakable change of character . . . [in] the general record of revivals” in the years that led up to and included the Welsh holiness revival; “the notion of a material hell is gone, never to return[.] . . . There has been a change of emphasis. It used to be on hell; it is now on character; it used to be on wrath; it is now on conduct” (xiv-xvi, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan).

²⁶ Pg. 154, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. For example, Roberts said, “there’s no need to preach against the drink [alcohol]”—rather, a solely positive message was sufficient (pg. 54, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

²⁷ Pg. 49, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

²⁸ Pg. 47, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Stead quotes the *South Wales Daily News* of November 14, 1904.

²⁹ E. g., “Mrs. Smith went herself to a man in prison, who was condemned to death for murder. . . . She only told him how God loved him, and grieved over him, stayed with him, and told him again and again, till he was conquered” (pg. 163, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

³⁰ Pgs. 520-521, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

³¹ Pg. 171, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

taught by J. Wesley and J. Fletcher . . . [were also] given attention in this revival.”³² Thus, while earlier revivals had recognized that the Spirit of God did not speak of Himself, but of Christ (John 16:13-14), Evan Roberts stressed (as William Boardman had before him) that there “were thousands of believers in our churches who have received Christ, but had never received the Holy Ghost,” a change of emphasis from “[h]eretofore” when “the work of Christ ha[d] been the all-important truth.”³³ However, very often Roberts did not preach at all. Services became closer to the pattern, though not necessarily the volume, of the Quaker meeting, where everything was spontaneously enacted as led, allegedly, by the Holy Spirit.³⁴ Roberts’ meetings “remin[d] one of the Quakers . . . they would feel themselves thoroughly at home in [them].”³⁵ Earlier Welsh revival movements “exalted the preacher,” but this “feature . . . was missing in the Revival of 1904-5,”³⁶ which contributed to “the decline of the sermon.”³⁷ Indeed, the “pastor . . . was practically regarded as an alien in the Commonwealth of Israel. The prevailing sentiment was . . . [to] than[k] the Lord that He had shunted the ministers to the *sideline*. [One] never heard a word from the Revivalist in public in recognition of the Welsh ministry, nor saw a single act that showed appreciation of their position.”³⁸ Rather

³² Pg. 137, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

³³ Pg. 7, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

³⁴ In the words of the Quaker Jessie Penn-Lewis: “Pastors allowed the services to take any form that might arise from the movement of the Spirit. Anyone might rise to speak or lead in prayer without fear, and sermons were put aside when the need rose” (pg. 63, *The Awakening in Wales*), following the pattern of the Quaker meeting, and neglecting the fact that certain elements of worship, including preaching, were ordained by the sovereign authority of God the Holy Ghost for worship in the New Testament (cf. 2 Timothy 4:2).

³⁵ Pgs. 30-31, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Stead gives as an exception the quantity of singing in the holiness revival meetings, a point—the sole significant point—of discontinuity, although at times even this discontinuity was eliminated and “effective reversion to the practice of the Society of Friends” appeared (pgs. 50-51, *ibid*).

³⁶ Pg. 76, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. This neglect of Evan Roberts “helped to kill what otherwise might have been an impetus to reverence, peace, and vital religion in the land for years to come.” Furthermore, even when preaching was not abandoned, it “deteriorated in its quality . . . becoming excessively . . . superficial” as well as not being “doctrinal” (pg. 134, *ibid*).

³⁷ Pg. 177, *The Pentecostals*, Walter J. Hollenweger. London: SCM Press, 1972.

³⁸ Pg. 184, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original. Writing in 1909, Morgan continued: “During the Revival [ministers] were counted as nothing. Not a word of appreciation did they receive when emotionalism was at its height. They are still suffering. For ministers as a class Evan Roberts had not a single word of appreciation, though the harvest was the fruit of the seed that they and their predecessors had planted. . . . The same unsympathetic attitude was assumed by Evan Roberts towards aged Christians. . . . [T]aking a general view of the religious life of Wales today, the name ‘minister’ is not the call-word that it used to be. . . . It has been stripped of its former force, magnitude and richness. It means less in the home, the school, and the community at large. The average minister is now under toleration. . . . [A]t the time of the Revival [this downgrade in ministerial status] took a very acute form. Ministers were not in demand, their services were dispensed with and their claims to leadership denied. We are only beginning to realize its effect” (pgs. 188-189, 202-203, *ibid*). See also pg. 65, *The Great*

than emphasizing the study of and unquestioned obedience to Scripture, and exalting the preached Word, Roberts placed tremendous stress upon instant, immediate, and unquestioning obedience to the “voice from within,” that “voice” that drove him into public ministry and guided him in his work.³⁹ During significant portions of the Welsh holiness revival, “clergymen [noted that] [s]ince the revival began [Evan Roberts] has not taken a Bible verse and made comments as preachers do,”⁴⁰ indeed, “there was very little sermonizing of any kind,”⁴¹ as frequently “sermons [are] put aside for testimony.”⁴² “Those who came to hear a great sermon, or even *a* sermon, were disillusioned. [Roberts] was not an expositor or even a fluent speaker,” but rather gave forth “broken sentences” at intervals in his chaotic meetings.⁴³ People recognized that “[p]reaching is not generally acceptable at these spontaneous meetings.”⁴⁴ “Preaching, in the usual acceptation of the word, has . . . been entirely discarded,” as instead “services are throughout spontaneous, resembling a Quaker’s meeting.”⁴⁵ Indeed, “the Welsh revival might be regarded as a triumph for Quakerism.”⁴⁶ However, preaching the Word was not necessary, since Roberts had “no body of doctrine to present,” but instead gave out “prophetic messages and exhortations . . . in place of expository teaching.”⁴⁷ Following the pattern of the early Keswick conventions, Roberts declared that he never studied the Bible to prepare a message. “I never prepare what I shall speak, but leave that to Him,”

Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

³⁹ Pg. 61, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan; cf. pg. 45, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Compare the reproduction of Roberts’ principles, including that of unquestioned obedience to what one identifies as the Spirit, and the adulatory account of his work in the Welsh holiness revival along with an adulatory obituary in the articles “The Great Welsh Revival,” Ruth Russell and “Evan Roberts is Dead” (pgs. 11-12, *The Pentecostal Evangel* 1928 (April 1922, 1951).

⁴⁰ Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁴¹ Pg. 222, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

⁴² Pg. 64, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

⁴³ Pg. 55, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original. Also pg. 40, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

⁴⁴ Pg. 49, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Scripture never commands men to sing the gospel to every creature, and never teaches that congregational singing is evangelistic or man-directed rather than being God-directed worship, affirming on the contrary that “it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe” (1 Corinthians 1:21). Nevertheless, under Evan Roberts “the revival . . . has followed the line of song, not of preaching” (pg. 33-34, *The Great Revival in Wales*, Shaw).

⁴⁵ Pgs. 9, 106, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

⁴⁶ Pg. 190, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Shaw affirmed that the lack of order in the service is the most obvious similarity.

⁴⁷ Pg. 224, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pg. 99.

he declared. This was possible because Roberts had no substantive doctrine to communicate: “There is no question of creed or of dogma in this movement . . . only the wonder and beauty of Christ’s love.”⁴⁸ Instead of rightly dividing the Word, Roberts gave inspired “prophetic message[s]”⁴⁹ to others. It was not necessary to preach the inspired Bible when “people called ‘inspiration’” Roberts’ own words and marvels.⁵⁰ After all, Roberts testified: “We now, like the prophets of old, have . . . transmitt[ed] . . . ‘The Word of the Lord’ . . . to the Church.”⁵¹ Thus, “[o]ne of the most striking things about the Revival of 1904-5 was the comparative absence of teaching,” for it employed “little theology of a definite and systematic kind,” preferring “visionary and ecstatic” experiences.⁵² Observers noted:

[A meeting would] practically resolv[e] itself into a singing festival[.] . . . At times, while one section is singing a hymn, another section in the chapel starts off a wholly different one. This is interspersed with short, spasmodic addresses by Mr. Roberts, relating to visions he has witnessed. Singing is kept up hour after hour—the same tunes and words being interminably repeated—far into the early hours of the morning . . . young girls and women, fatigued with exertion, are strung up to a pitch of feverish excitement. Their emotions overpower them and they break out into wild cries and gesticulations . . . [which] are put down as a manifestation of the Spirit. Some participants have since been confined to their homes with nervous prostration.⁵³

In the sharpest contrast to the revivals in the book of Acts, in the work of Evan Roberts singing was employed “rather than . . . the Gospel message . . . being . . . preached. . . . The sermon is a poor thing compared with the . . . song.”⁵⁴ While in the Bible preaching brought supernatural conviction and conversion (Acts 2:37-42), the work of Evan Roberts recognized that the Welsh were “taught to death, preached to insensibility.”⁵⁵ “Evan Roberts . . . makes no sermons . . . is . . . no[t] a preacher. . . . [P]reaching is emphatically

⁴⁸ Pg. 34, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁴⁹ Pg. 121, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Jones records part of one particular message Roberts received to give to his former tutor, John Phillips, on pg. 121.

⁵⁰ Pg. 66, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. “According to the teaching of the ‘New Theology’ . . . Evan Roberts was inspired . . . undoubtedly. But if we fall back upon the old theology for our interpretation of inspiration, Evan Roberts was not inspired” (*ibid*, pgs. 67-68).

⁵¹ Pg. 180, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

⁵² Pg. 82, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. “[T]here . . . is . . . precious little . . . teaching[.] . . . Do you think that teaching is what people want in a revival?” (pg. 35, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905). Also pgs. 24-25, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

⁵³ Pgs. 263-264, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

⁵⁴ Pg. 31, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Comparison was also made to the liturgy of Eastern Orthodoxy, where preaching is most certainly set to the side (pg. 38, *ibid*). The “Singing Sisters,” who included “a professional singer . . . are as conspicuous figures in the movement as Evan Roberts himself”—they are “as indispensable as Mr. Sankey was to Mr. Moody.” (pgs. 49, 32, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead) Roberts testified: “[T]he Singing Sisters . . . [are] [m]ost useful. They go with me wherever I go. I never part from them without feeling that something is absent if they are not there” (pg. 49, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

⁵⁵ Pg. 26, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

not the note of this Revival[.] . . . If it has been by the foolishness of preaching men have been saved heretofore, that agency seems as if it were destined to take a back seat in the present movement.”⁵⁶ At least this was the case for the preaching of the Bible—but Roberts’s “inspired preaching,”⁵⁷ his “inspiration of the exalted and supernatural kind,”⁵⁸ was considered a sufficient replacement for the exposition of the Word. He asked, “Why should I teach [the Bible] when the Spirit is teaching?”⁵⁹ However, in places in Wales where “greater emphasis on preaching and teaching” was made, there were “more lasting and beneficial results” than there were from Roberts’ “lack of clear biblical teaching” and emphasis upon “what he claimed to be the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit,”⁶⁰ at least among traditional denominational groups such as the Baptists and Calvinistic Methodists, although Roberts’ method of neglecting the Word for other revelations was central to the rise of Pentecostalism.

Evan Roberts “claimed to have received over twenty ecstatic visions during the earlier part of 1904, which left him elated but strangely perplexed.” He placed an “emphasis on direct and unmediated divine inspiration,” so that his “near clairvoyant tendency . . . bec[ame] such a marked feature of his ministry [and] was given full rein. He would claim regularly . . . that he knew by divine intuition of particular individuals’ specific sins and of their need to repent openly in order for his meetings to continue. These claims caused some consternation.”⁶¹ Indeed, Roberts began his own ministry after he “claimed to have a vision”⁶² authorizing the beginning of his revival work and “hear[ing] a voice bidding him go . . . and speak.”⁶³ He felt “his whole body shaking and his sight also wavering,” after which “he seemed to see the people” of a certain city and “men sitting in rows” in a schoolroom, heard a “voice” telling him to go to them, and then saw the room where he was “filled with light [as] dazzling [as] . . . the glory as of the light of the sun in heaven,” and although he wondered if “this was a deceiving vision from Satan,” he concluded it was not, and left school to work for holiness revival because

⁵⁶ Pg. 38, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

⁵⁷ Pg. 163, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁵⁸ Pg. 73, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁵⁹ Pg. 49, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

⁶⁰ Pg. 101, *A Light in the Land: Christianity in Wales, 200-2000*, Gwyn Davies.

⁶¹ “Roberts, Evan,” *A Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Timothy Larsen.

⁶² Pg. 230, *The Making of the Modern Church: Christianity in England since 1800* (New ed.), B. G. Worrall. London: SPCK, 1993.

⁶³ Pg. 86, 112, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

of “the vision and the voice calling him” with “his support—the God of visions.”⁶⁴ During “the few weeks”⁶⁵ of his training for the ministry he “claim[ed] that he was under the Spirit’s command when he missed a class or forgot a study period or failed to finish an essay”⁶⁶ and “he would open a book, only to find it flaming in his hands . . . [t]his experience increased daily until the awe that possessed him made it impossible to battle on . . . [and] Dr. Hughes, an American specialist . . . [affirmed] that Evan was suffering from religious mania,”⁶⁷ so that Evan “came under personal attack as a lunatic at worst and eccentric at best.”⁶⁸ Concerning one vision, Evan testified: “For the space of four hours I was privileged to speak face to face with Him as a man speaks face to face with a friend,” a privilege Moses alone had among the Old Testament prophets (Exodus 33:11; Numbers 12:8). However, Evan’s visions went beyond even what Moses experienced. The Bible states that nobody has seen God the Father at any time, but only the Son of God has been seen (John 1:18), but Roberts claimed to regularly see “God the Father Almighty . . . and the Holy Spirit,” rather than only “Jesus Christ” as did the prophets of the Bible;⁶⁹ his experiences were comparable to those of Teresa of Avila, who likewise claimed she conversed with God the Father rather than Jesus Christ.⁷⁰ Indeed, Roberts testified: “I . . . sp[oke] face to face with Him [the Father] as a man speaks face to face with a friend” for “hours” every night “for three or four months,” and then “again retur[ned] to earth.”⁷¹ Unless Evan Roberts was a false prophet and under Satanic delusion, a greater than Moses was here, and so the possibility that “Roberts [was] . . . intending to set” a “notebook” with his writings “beside the writings of the New Testament” as a record of inspired revelations is explicable.⁷² At times “a tremor ran through him, and his face and neck were observed to quiver in a remarkable way.”⁷³ His

⁶⁴ Pgs. 17-19, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. See also pgs. 21, 25, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones; pg. 45, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead, gives the account in Roberts’ own words, including Roberts’ asking a confidant if his vision was “of the devil.”

⁶⁵ Pg. 85, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

⁶⁶ Pg. 18, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. It is noteworthy that, in his revival meetings, “[a]rriving late [was] usual” for Roberts (pg. 71, *ibid.*).

⁶⁷ Pgs. 18-19, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁶⁸ Pg. 28, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁶⁹ Pg. 44, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

⁷⁰ Pgs. 44-45, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. One recalls Hannah W. Smith’s satisfaction with the “bare God” who could be approached apart from Christ.

⁷¹ Pg. 43, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

⁷² Pg. 181, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; cf. Henri Bois, *Le Reveil dans le pays de Galles*, pgs. 460-461.

⁷³ Pg. 86, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

work in the Welsh holiness revival teemed with “experiences of visions, voices, and ecstasies.”⁷⁴ “His bodily agitations were awful to behold. They filled the hearts of children with fear, bewildered and astounded men of mature years, and caused hysterical women to faint.”⁷⁵ On at least one occasion he records in his diary: “I was commanded not to read my Bible”⁷⁶ for an entire day by a voice.⁷⁷ It was not necessary, however, for Roberts to get guidance by searching the Scriptures, for he “adopted the practice of writing down a problem, placing the paper on to an open Bible and leaving the room for the Holy Spirit to write down an answer,”⁷⁸ and in this way he could get solutions to his problems.

In 1906, the same year he went to the Keswick Convention and was invited to give a special address,⁷⁹ Roberts moved into the Penn-Lewis household after Jessie Penn-Lewis had visions about him,⁸⁰ leaving behind “the confusion of South Wales where there were disorderly meetings at Carmarthen, dancing and barking at Llannon, a prophesying curate at Llanelly, [and] a persuasive woman healer in Swansea,”⁸¹ while by 1907 there were “many instances . . . [of] prostrations and trance visions and such manifestations as *guiding lights* and *angelic helps*.”⁸² Indeed, Roberts experienced almost innumerable visitations from the spirit world and made “many statements about special guidance by vision and voices”⁸³ both before, during, and after the Welsh holiness revival. “[H]e claims as his guide . . . the inner voice . . . the Spirit tells him when to speak and when to be silent, to whom he may grant an audience and whom he must refuse, what places to visit and the places he must avoid.”⁸⁴ Thus, Roberts was directed

⁷⁴ Pg. 165, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

⁷⁵ Pg. 234, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁷⁶ Pg. 116, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

⁷⁷ Roberts also taught that it was acceptable to read only one verse of the Bible a day (pg. 52, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead), although reading more of the Bible was commendable.

⁷⁸ Pg. 523, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

⁷⁹ Pg. 129, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

⁸⁰ Pgs. 159-160, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

⁸¹ Pg. 160, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

⁸² Pg. 170, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

⁸³ Pg. 60, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. For further visions not listed below, see, e. g., pgs. 47ff., *The Revival in the West*, Stead.

⁸⁴ Pg. 89, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

by visions of Satan and sundry other spiritual beings concerning where he should go to hold meetings.⁸⁵ In one often-mentioned vision⁸⁶ he claimed he “was taken up into a great expanse without time or space—it was communion with God. Before this it was a far-off God that I had. . . . I was frightened that night . . . [s]o great was my shivering that I rocked the bed and my brother awakened [and] took hold of me, thinking I was ill. After that I was awakened every night a little after one” to experience similar communion, although without the same fear, “for about four hours. . . . About five I was allowed to sleep[.]”⁸⁷ Frequently his visions “caused his body to shake.”⁸⁸ He had a “vision . . . [of] a kind of arm stretching out from the moon in the direction of earth,”⁸⁹ “many visions about the sufferings of Jesus,”⁹⁰ a “terrifying vision of hell,”⁹¹ a “vision . . . [of] a great conflict between Satan and the Archangel of God,”⁹² a “vision of a white horse and of a key which opened the Gate of Life,”⁹³ a vision of “a person dressed in white, with a glittering sword in his hand, striking the devil until he fled and vanished,”⁹⁴ various “visions of the devil and of the blessed Saviour,”⁹⁵ and “dreams . . . such as that

85

As Roberts recounted to the local newspaper:

He [Roberts] said . . . It was . . . at Newcastle Emlyn. For days he had been brooding over the apparent failure of modern Christian agencies; and he felt wounded in the spirit that the Church of God should so often be attacked. It was about four p. m. Suddenly, in the hedge on his left, he saw a face full of scorn, hatred, and derision, and heard a laugh as of defiance. It was the Prince of this World, who exulted in his despondency. Then there suddenly appeared another figure, gloriously arrayed in white, bearing in hand a flaming sword borne aloft. The sword fell athwart the first figure, and it instantly disappeared. He could not see the face of the swordbearer. “Do you not see the moral?” queried [Roberts], with face beaming with delight. “Is it not that the Church of Christ is to be triumphant? . . . “I know what I saw. It was a distinct vision. There was no mistake. And, full of the promise which that vision conveyed, I went to Loughor, and from Loughor to Aberdare, and from Aberdare to Pontycymmer. And what do I see? The promise literally fulfilled. The sword descending on all hands, and Satan is put to flight. Amen.” (pgs. 47-48, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead, reproducing an article from the *South Wales Daily News*, November 19).

86

Roberts’ experience paralleled that of Madame Guyon, who testified: “It seemed to me that God came at the precise time and woke me from sleep in order that I might enjoy Him” (pg. 43, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

87

Pg. 86, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905); cf. pgs. 14-15, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones, pgs. 60-62, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

88

Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

89

Pgs. 25-26, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; Pgs. 79, 136, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

90

Pg. 97, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. See pg. 138 for one example, where the figure that appeared to Roberts and was identified as “Jesus” was “looking smiling and pleasant,” and so Roberts was sure that the particular “mission” he was then on “would succeed.”

91

Pg. 521, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

92

Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

93

Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

94

Pg. 79, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

95

Pg. 136, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

of Satan’s face sneering at him in the midst of some garden shrubs”⁹⁶—although Satan not only sneered at Roberts in gardens in dreams, but also appeared while Roberts was walking in a garden hedge, until a glorious figure in white—the Church—struck Satan and made him disappear.⁹⁷ Thus, “Evan Roberts . . . speaks of God and the devil with the assurance not only of one who has had communication with them, but who has actually seen them. The devil grins at him in his garden, he goes back into the house, and when he returns Jesus Christ is there smiling at him.”⁹⁸ After seeing a book called *The Gospel in Art*, he “experienced a new series of visions, each of which was centered upon biblical scenes,” although the pictures in the book “bore a striking resemblance to his visions” of the actual events.⁹⁹ Because of “visions and voices,” in his revival meetings he said, “I have to say strange things,”¹⁰⁰ and services, the large majority of the time, had “the scripture readings and . . . sermon” omitted for people getting up “to sing or speak” without any order.¹⁰¹ In his meetings, “the din was tremendous . . . constant interruptions [of] the speakers [took place as] excited men and women [rose] to pray, testify, sing, ask questions, recite verses, etc. . . . formal preaching [was] an impossibility.”¹⁰² “Pentecostal enthusiasm” required that there “was no preaching . . . for . . . months” in various congregations.¹⁰³ This de-emphasis upon preaching was accounted for by the conclusion that “Evan Roberts had a ‘ministry of gifts’ rather than a ‘ministry of the Word,’”¹⁰⁴ but while there was not much preaching of God’s Word, at least there appeared to be plenty of alleged gifts, as Roberts believed that all the spiritual gifts of the Apostolic age were to be present and active in his day. On those instances where Roberts did attempt to preach, he might be “interrupted about thirty times by pleas and excited

⁹⁶ Pg. 18, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁹⁷ See pgs. 47-48, *The Revival in the West*, Stead.

⁹⁸ Pg. 188, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Roberts said: “When I go out to the garden I see the devil grinning at me, but I am not afraid of him; I go into the house, and when I go out again to the back I see Jesus Christ smiling at me. Then I know all is well” (pg. 54, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

⁹⁹ Pg. 105, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁰⁰ Pg. 40, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁰¹ Pgs. 48-49, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; cf. pg. 99.

¹⁰² Pg. 48, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. Compare the account of women and young girls leading Andrew Murray’s congregation in prayer, and the entire congregation in confusion, on pgs. 194-198, *The Life of Andrew Murray*, DuPlessis, where, however, Murray did not actively encourage such confusion as Evan Roberts did—a commendable course of action by Mr. Murray—although he did allow women to lead the congregation in prayer.

¹⁰³ Pg. 79, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. In the particular congregation discussed on pg. 79, preaching was eliminated for two months.

¹⁰⁴ Pg. 522, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

comments,” as his meetings “sounded chaotic.”¹⁰⁵ “He made no preparation beforehand concerning what he should say” even when he did preach; “all was spontaneous response” to what was supposed to be the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁶ “Well-structured expository preaching . . . was just unworkable . . . [since] each service was dominated by testimonies, prayers, pleadings, and songs,”¹⁰⁷ as indeed, his meetings had a veritable “Babel of voices . . . breaking forth simultaneously in prayer and song . . . [and] people . . . praying in several languages simultaneously,”¹⁰⁸ as at times people would sing “again and again” a handful of lines from a song “twenty times,”¹⁰⁹ or even hear a “chorus . . . sung, perhaps, a hundred times”¹¹⁰ in a meeting. It “was a new experience” to many churchgoers “to hear a large crowd sing over and over again for 15 or 20 minutes, without a moment’s pause,” a one-line “refrain” from a song.¹¹¹ Such practices prepared the way for the “Pentecostal movements . . . [that] put their own seal on such worship”¹¹² soon after the end of Roberts’ ministry. Roberts also encouraged people to pray the same words “over and over together, or every one separately, as [they were] inspired by the Holy Spirit.”¹¹³ In many of his meetings in southern Wales “Mr. Roberts gradually

¹⁰⁵ Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pg. 125 for a description of some representative chaos.

¹⁰⁶ Pg. 522, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

¹⁰⁷ Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁰⁸ Pgs. 72-73, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pg. 79, 86; pgs. 40-43, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁰⁹ Pg. 86, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Cf. pgs. 44-45, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹¹⁰ Pg. 173, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. Cf. pg. 14, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

¹¹¹ Pgs. 87-88, “Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival,” A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). In the particular instance mentioned, the crowd was repeating “*Diolch iddo, diolch iddo, Byth am gofio llwch y llawr* (Thanks to Him: always for remembering the dust of the earth)” the entire time. Compare pg. 31, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead. Contrast Matthew 6:7 and the type of worship found in the inspired songs of the Psalter.

¹¹² Pg. 177, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹¹³ Pg. 521, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope. Roberts instructed those who had been encouraged to stand up in his meetings, and were counted as converts for that reason, to “repeat th[e] [following] prayer in his or her turn:

Send the Spirit *now*, for Jesus Christ’s sake.

Send the Spirit *powerfully* now, for Jesus Christ’s sake.

Send the Spirit *more powerfully* now, for Jesus Christ’s sake.

Send the Spirit *yet more powerfully* now for Jesus Christ’s sake.

[Professed converts were to] [p]ray No. 1 over and over . . . Then No. 2 in the same way. Then No. 3. No. 4 after that” (pg. 521, *ibid*). Thus, the eight words that constituted the body of this prayer were to be repeated over and over and over, with the addition of the words “more,” “powerfully,” and “yet” at certain times, in direct contradiction to the command of Christ: “when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do*: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking” (Matthew 6:7; note also the

ceased to speak at his own meetings. He [rather would] . . . sit silently in the pulpit and take no part—a spectacle rather than a prophet.”¹¹⁴ “Evan Roberts accepted everything,” all the people who “acted strangely,” with the sole exception of “loud shrieking and wild gestures.”¹¹⁵ “[E]ven in the most orderly meetings confusion reigns . . . Roberts generally preaches but little, sometimes not at all.”¹¹⁶ “[H]ysteria [was] . . . a sign and proof of the apprehension of spiritual truths . . . [e]verything was in confusion, without order, without purpose, and often without decency,” despite the fact that “[w]e have no record that such physical results followed the preaching of our Lord or the ministry of the apostles.”¹¹⁷ No one must “reduce the interruption[s],” and Roberts forbade his helpers from trying to do so, because “the Spirit’s prompting . . . must never be ignored or questioned.”¹¹⁸ In fact, “[s]ometimes he threatened to leave a meeting if anyone tried to interfere in any shape or form.”¹¹⁹ “One day he was in a chapel where ninety percent were English speaking, yet he refused to speak in English, not because he was unused to this but because ‘the Spirit has forbidden me,’”¹²⁰ the spirit world leading Roberts to speak in what was an unknown tongue to the overwhelming majority of his hearers, despite the Pauline prohibition on such action in 1 Corinthians 12-14. Answering criticism for downplaying preaching and the reading of the Word, Roberts answered: “Why should I teach when the Spirit is teaching?”¹²¹ After all, “the wonderful eloquence displayed by unlettered persons in prayer and speaking” was “proof of direct Divine inspiration,”¹²² was it not?

tremendous contrast between the model for prayer set forth by the Lord in the following verses with the model set forth by Roberts). Roberts would also have whole congregations repeat this prayer over and over again, and then “would-be convert[s] would suddenly rise and declare . . . ‘I have now received salvation.’ . . . [T]his occurred scores of times” (pg. 36, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones; cf. pgs. 31-33). The vain repetitions were consequently responsible for the production of many professions in Roberts’ meetings.

It is noteworthy that the rote prayer Roberts taught people to repeat fits in with the apparent confusion in his life between his alleged Spirit baptism and his alleged conversion.

¹¹⁴ Pg. 141, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Jones affirms that, in contrast, preaching did actually take place in various of Roberts’s meetings in northern Wales later on.

¹¹⁵ Pg. 50, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹¹⁶ Pg. 88, “Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival,” A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹¹⁷ Pg. 235, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

¹¹⁸ Pg. 57, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹¹⁹ Pg. 59, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹²⁰ Pg. 106, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹²¹ Pg. 49, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹²² Pg. 91, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

Although Scripture states that the knowledge of men’s hearts is restricted to the omniscient God (1 Kings 8:39), Roberts could see into men’s hearts and “discern souls in conflict,” so that although “some called it telepathy,” his supernatural powers were “accepted as one more sign that Evan Roberts was being led continually by the Spirit,”¹²³ and charges that “the revival depended on his hypnotic skills and magnetism”¹²⁴ were rejected. After all, “in the midst of another mass meeting in [a] 6,000 seat [auditorium], Evan detected that a hypnotist had entered the meeting and was trying secretly to control him. . . . [T]he man confessed to a theatre audience that this was the truth,”¹²⁵ so Roberts was not using hypnotism himself but had clear power from the spirit world. Roberts knew “when anyone g[ot] up unmoved by the Spirit”¹²⁶ in one of his meetings and could “see . . . insincerity and hypocrisy.”¹²⁷ He “kn[ew]” when “people . . . [were] prompted by false motives . . . in their prayers” and would consequently interrupt them and stop them from praying.¹²⁸ He recognized when people had been truly converted, so that at times he would announce that someone had “decided” for Christ and the person would then reveal himself; for example, “at Saron, Evan predicted a dozen individual decisions to turn to Christ,” and “[e]ach time someone surrendered,” validating “his strange new powers.”¹²⁹ He “displayed a remarkable gift of detecting those souls who were secretly trying to come to Jesus.”¹³⁰ In another meeting, “he began to cry out: ‘There is a soul lost because someone has been disobedient to the promptings of the Spirit. . . . Too late! Too late!’ . . . Oh! Dear people, it is too late! . . . [H]e explained that he was prohibited from praying for the soul that was lost.”¹³¹ In a different meeting, at the “peak moment, Evan stopped the meeting and announced that there was someone in the congregation who wouldn’t speak to his brother. He called for that person to confess his sin, threatening him with divine judgment and ordering him to leave. Because no one admitted this fault, the people had to remain on their feet a very long time. . . . Some accepted this kind of rebuke from a man whom they took to be a prophet; others felt it

123 Pg. 47, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

124 Pg. 49, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

125 Pg. 126, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

126 Pg. 70, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

127 Pg. 77, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

128 Pg. 60, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

129 Pgs. 82-83, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; the pages record substantial numbers of situations where Roberts exercised his powers to recognize true conversions in a great variety of settings.

130 Pg. 89, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

131 Pgs. 90-91, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

was a mistaken act done by an overtired young man,”¹³² since Roberts continued “months . . . of serial meetings, all-night sessions, and crises.”¹³³ Others called Roberts “an unbalanced crowd stirrer, an exhibitionist, a hypnotist, and even an occultist . . . a prophet of Baal calling down false fire by his incantations.”¹³⁴ Roberts, however, had an answer for those who said he lacked sleep. Such a lack was not a problem for him. He said: “God has made me strong and manly. . . . My body is full of electricity day and night and I have no sleep before I am back in meetings again.”¹³⁵ For months, as the holiness revival progressed in 1904 and 1905, “he ate and slept little,”¹³⁶ getting “two or three hours of sleep each night,”¹³⁷ but the electricity that filled his body kept him going—at least until he experienced one his several serious nervous breakdowns.¹³⁸ In meetings he would often have “nervous collapses” from which, however, he would usually “recover suddenly”¹³⁹ and continue the meeting in most cases—at least until he came to the point in 1906 where he was “unable to stand or walk for almost a twelvemonth,” remaining in “convalescence” in the Penn-Lewis household.¹⁴⁰ In another meeting “he called to a man to confess his sin” and said, “The Spirit has given me that man’s name and age,” and this fact was, Roberts said, to lead those who were “skeptical of the reality of this manifestation” to have “no doubt about it.”¹⁴¹ On a different occasion “Evan Roberts became visibly upset and started to threaten someone with divine punishment for ‘making a mockery of what was so divine . . . [m]ocking what has cost God his life-blood.’ . . . After carefully scanning the congregation, again he urged someone to ask for forgiveness and then declared that the meeting could not proceed until the obstacle had been removed. . . . The remonstrance went on for another ten minutes, but no one owned up.”¹⁴² Later in a meeting he “lay a limp, inert mass on the reading desk, with

132 Pg. 88, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

133 Pg. 91, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

134 Pg. 98, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

135 Pg. 41, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

136 Pg. 41, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

137 Pg. 51, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

138 By September 1906 he had already had four. See pg. 161, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. His breakdowns were “a divine plan to equip [Roberts] to do battle against Satanic powers and to train others for battle,” resulting in the teachings of *War on the Saints* (pg. 174, *ibid*).

139 Pgs. 113-114, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

140 Pgs. 165-167, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. It appears that Jessie Penn-Lewis’s doctrine that “on the basis of Romans Six you may put in your claim for the healing of any bodily disease” (pg. 134, *Overcomer*, 1914) failed to heal Evan Roberts.

141 Pg. 120, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

142 Pg. 90, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

outstretched arms as if pleading. Suddenly he straightened up . . . pointed to the gallery and declared that some person there possessed a heart full of scorn, skepticism, and sarcasm. That was an obstacle to the path of the Spirit, and the cause must be removed. He tearfully appealed to him to repent or quit the building,” and “continue[d] to sob, with his face buried in his hands,” but “[n]o response was made from the gallery.”¹⁴³ He would “place his hand on his neck, as if pressing something down. There was a jerking back of the head . . . as in persons whose nervous systems are somewhat deranged. . . . [T]hese . . . tremors . . . [are] attribute[d] . . . to Divine influence.”¹⁴⁴ Roberts also had a time when he was told to “remain in the house for six days in a silence which had been commanded by the Spirit” and “cancelled all mission engagements,”¹⁴⁵ after a fashion similar to what had taken place with the prophet Ezekiel,¹⁴⁶ while on various occasions he would “walk out of meetings after five minutes because he claimed to have discovered [spiritual] obstacles there.”¹⁴⁷ Surely such actions, and such abilities to see men’s hearts, were evidence of the powerful supernatural forces that were at work in Evan Roberts.

While Baptist church membership, and that of old-school evangelicalism, began to decline after Evan Roberts finished his revivalistic course, Pentecostalism boomed, as Roberts’s influence had led many others in the holiness revival to have supernatural encounters with the spirit world similar to those he had experienced. “It is impossible, and would be historically incorrect, to dissociate the Pentecostal Movement from . . . the Welsh Revival [through which] . . . the spiritual soil was prepared . . . for [its] rise.”¹⁴⁸

Jessie Penn-Lewis wrote:

[T]he Pentecostal character of the Awakening in Wales is unmistakably clear . . . the wider fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy [in chapter two about signs and wonders through Spirit baptism] is at hand. Undoubtedly we are in a new era of the world’s history, when we may expect supernatural workings of God such as have not been known since the days of the primitive Church. . . . [B]y [receiving] a baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire, “signs and wonders” w[ill] follow.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴³ Pg. 119, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁴⁴ Pg. 89, “Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival,” A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁴⁵ Pg. 91, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. cf. pgs. 89-90, 114-115, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). Roberts broke his silence on the seventh day.

¹⁴⁶ Pgs. 110-112, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁴⁷ Pg. 100, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁴⁸ Pgs. 5-6, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

¹⁴⁹ Pgs. 77-78, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

Not Roberts only, but very many saw visions and heard voices.¹⁵⁰ Prominent ministers and witnesses testified that Wales was seeing what “was spoken by the prophet Joel . . . the promise [is] now evidently fulfilled in Wales”: “If you ask for proof of that assertion, I point to the signs. ‘Your young men shall see visions!’ That is exactly what is happening. . . . It does not at all matter that some regular people are objecting to the irregular doings. . . . If you ask me the meaning of the Welsh revival, I say—IT IS PENTECOST CONTINUED, without one single moment’s doubt.”¹⁵¹ Consequently, throughout the holiness revival of 1904-5 there were “many stories of aerial lights, aerial choirs, flashes and visions.”¹⁵² “Dreams, religious and otherwise, were registered by the score.”¹⁵³ “During the Revival many persons vowed that they had heard voices in the air calling them by name and speaking to them in distinct tones and words.”¹⁵⁴ The multiplication of such marvels from the spirit world was natural, since “[v]isions were looked upon as the gift of the Holy Spirit, a mark of Divine favour, and one of the concomitants of true conversion,” and with the neglect of the Word of God “there were many who appeared to know more about their visions than about their Bible.”¹⁵⁵ Thus, “Miss Florie Evans,” Evan Roberts’s coworker, “could speak of visions and messages . . . [and] prophesied.”¹⁵⁶ The marvels attending Roberts made it clear that women were to preach and teach men:

The old objection of many of the Welsh Churches to the equal ministry of women has gone by the board. . . . Women pray, sing, testify, and speak as freely as men . . . the toppling of the hateful . . . ascendancy of the male. . . . Paul, it is true . . . found it necessary, while addressing the Church of Corinth, to draw a very hard and fast line limiting the sphere of female activity . . . Christianity, however, is at last sloughing the Corinthian limitation[.] . . . The Quakers began the good work. . . . Now in South Wales we see the fruit of this devoted testimony . . . [i]n the present Revival women are everywhere to the fore, singing, testifying, praying, and preaching.¹⁵⁷

Indeed, the visions were innumerable, but unlike Biblical visions, where God revealed real, specific, and knowable truth, the visions of the holiness revival either set forth all sorts of meaningless foolishness or specifically taught unbiblical errors. “[P]arishoners . . . heard bells chiming . . . a thunder clap followed by lovely singing in the air . . . [others heard] strange music, similar to that caused by the vibration of telegraph wires, only

¹⁵⁰ Pgs. 22-23, 100, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

¹⁵¹ Pg. 87, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. Capitalization reproduced from the original.

¹⁵² Pg. 249, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁵³ Pg. 73, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

¹⁵⁴ Pgs. 136-137, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

¹⁵⁵ Pg. 139, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

¹⁵⁶ Pg. 89, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁵⁷ Pgs. 55-56, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

much louder. . . . The Vicar¹⁵⁸ of a parish . . . heard voices singing . . . [g]radually the voices seemed to increase in volume until they became overpowering. . . . It was as real to his senses as anything he ever heard and the words were distinct, in Welsh.”¹⁵⁹ A “young girl, 18 years of age” who was “almost illiterate” was supernaturally enabled to pray with “the most refined and literary sentiments, couched in admirable phraseology[,]” and her “changed appearance” was very striking, becoming “much more gentle. Her face, previously course, has now quite a refined appearance . . . [becoming] a Madonna-like face” as she also has gained “contact with . . . her mother, though she has been dead about 15 years. . . . [S]he seems to feel her mother’s unseen influence, certainly seeing and perhaps helping her in her difficulties.”¹⁶⁰ Another woman “heard the voice of her dead son, and [affirmed] that the conversations that had repeatedly passed between them were as real to her as those that had passed between them in the days of his flesh.”¹⁶¹ A “young man . . . heard a voice speaking distinctly. The Spirit said (in Welsh)” a variety of things, including a command that “in the most public place” the young man was to deliver the message: “Tell them that hypocrisy is the worst sin against Me . . . [t]he Spirit,”¹⁶² a message contradicting what Christ said was the worst sin against the Spirit, to blaspheme Him (Matthew 12:31; Mark 3:29-30; Luke 12:10).¹⁶³ The man also testified: “I had a vision . . . a beautiful light, pure, and brighter than any light I have ever seen, and clusters of something very soft and white falling upon me gently and covering me all over. I called them blessings.” He also had other “dreams,” although he said, “I doubted whether it was the Holy Spirit.”¹⁶⁴ The minister Joseph Jenkins was “clothed with strength from above, and he knew it,” receiving power from the spirit world, after “a strange blue flame took hold of him until he was almost completely covered. It rose . . . from the floor of the room and billowed up, encircling him. It retreated and returned a

¹⁵⁸ Scripture teaches that no mortal is a Vicar; such a title demeans the glory of the Son of God.

¹⁵⁹ Pgs. 93-94, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁶⁰ Pgs. 135-138, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905); cf. Deuteronomy 18:9-14 and the many other prohibitions in Scripture on contact with the dead.

¹⁶¹ Pg. 137, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

¹⁶² Pg. 94-95, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁶³ Of course, hypocrisy is very wicked and should in no wise be condoned.

¹⁶⁴ Pgs. 94-95, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

second time, and then retreated and returned again.”¹⁶⁵ People professed conversion and were led to become members of congregations because of the marvels they experienced. In a “Revival service” at “St. Mary the Virgin’s Church,” a “young man . . . saw a lighted candle emerge from the font [for administering infant baptism and, according to Anglican dogma, regenerating infants thereby] and the figure of an angel shielding it with his wing¹⁶⁶ from the draught that came from the open door. The flame was very small, and the least breath of wind would have extinguished it but for the protecting wing. Before the service was ended he gave his adhesion to the Church.” He testified: “I did not believe in Christ before [the vision] that He was our God and my Saviour. I had always denied Him, but never again, for I believed then [at the time of the vision].”¹⁶⁷ A woman who was hostile to the holiness revival, but whose husband was part of “the Church Army,” “began to feel very queer,” saw “the room” where she was become “all dark,” and “it seemed as if the room was full, or like a swarm of bees around [her, and she] heard some sound . . . like the buzzing of bees,” and then saw her “four children [who] had died in infancy . . . singing the hymn, ‘O Paradise,’” and then “saw the children again and Jesus Christ . . . [a]s natural as you see Him on a picture¹⁶⁸ . . . behind them, and the children said, ‘Crown Him, Mam,’¹⁶⁹ and they disappeared.” As a consequence she “has been quite a different woman and is present in all the services.”¹⁷⁰ A boy whose father was far away testified: “I distinctly saw my father in the [revival] service [in a vision]. He knelt alongside of me and looked at me with a pitiful face and said, ‘My dear

¹⁶⁵ Pg. 17, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones. Another vision received by Jenkins was connected to the events that led to Evan Roberts beginning to see visions himself and commencing his revivalistic course (pgs. 58-60, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

¹⁶⁶ While in Scripture the cherubim and seraphim have wings, no angel (ἄγγελος/ ἄγγελος) is said to be winged.

¹⁶⁷ Pgs. 95-96, 123-124, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁶⁸ Pictures of Christ are idolatry and a violation of the second commandment, for “the acceptable way of worshipping the true God, is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imagination and devices of men, nor the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scriptures” (*2nd London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689*, 22:1; Exodus 20:4-6).

¹⁶⁹ While the children in her vision commanded this woman to crown Jesus Christ, the Bible never tells Christians to crown Him, since the one who crowns another has authority over the one who is crowned. As the eternal Son of God, Christ has reigned from eternity and will reign immutably to eternity (Hebrews 1:8-10), so nobody crowns Him, while as the God-Man, the Father exalted Christ as Mediator at the time of His ascension (cf. Psalm 110), so that, while the terminology of crowning Christ is not even used in connection with the ascension, the Father’s exaltation of the Son of Man is the closest thing to such an affirmation in Scripture. The dead children, therefore, tell the woman to do something that is contrary to the Bible.

¹⁷⁰ Pgs. 93, 130-133, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

boy, pray for me.’ . . . I had never taken religion very seriously before, but I do now.”¹⁷¹

Another man’s testimony was noteworthy:

[He saw] a faint light playing over his head. As it came nearer it increased in size . . . he saw . . . a man’s body in a shining robe. The figure had wings . . . every feather in the wings . . . was heavenly beyond description. . . . [I]t did not touch the ground. He looked at the hand and saw the prints of the wounds . . . recognized Him as Jesus . . . [and] shouted—“O my Jesus,” and the figure ascended . . . on His wing . . . out of sight.¹⁷² He felt filled with love, and from that time he can love every one without difference.¹⁷³

A lady felt that she had been cut off from God until she saw a “vision of Christ in his kingly robes . . . that had set all right.”¹⁷⁴ At another meeting people were filled with “agony . . . men and women jumping in their seats . . . others testifying that they had received the Holy Spirit, and one person said, ‘Don’t try to understand this, but throw yourself into it. It surpasseth all understanding.’” Here a person who “did not believe much in the Revival” was “caught in his hat and began walking down the staircase, when he was instantaneously knocked (as it were) unconscious. He ran down the stair, and he then jumped five of the steps to the floor[.] . . . He looked like a madman . . . and shouted out, ‘Here is reality to-night.’ . . . [H]e ran into the chapel, and on by the pulpit. He jumped on top of a seat, and he threw his hat with all his might up towards the ceiling of the church, and with a loud voice” gave out his experience. “It is above all understanding,” he said. He remained partly unconscious for a fortnight . . . and he saw a vision of a place beautifully white, and a voice came to him that God would be his refuge and strength. . . . He was moved by the Spirit twice after this fortnight to unconsciousness. How he escaped from injury while jumping and passing across seats was marvellous . . . he received such physical strength that he thought he could move away a tremendous weight.”¹⁷⁵ Another man, at a holiness revival meeting, testified:

I had a thrill through my body, causing great pain. I cried bitterly; why, I don’t know. . . . [For a few days] I felt great pain, and . . . I lost all appetite for food. . . . [at a] prayer meeting . . . there

¹⁷¹ Pg. 125, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁷² Since the Lord Jesus Christ does not have wings, this man did not see the Jesus who is the Son of God, but another “Jesus” (2 Corinthians 11:4); and the fact that he felt certain emotions as a result of his supernatural experience is no reason whatsoever for thinking that his experiences came from the Holy Spirit of God.

¹⁷³ Pgs. 95-96, 139-141, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). Further details, unpleasant to repeat to those who rejoice to spiritually see Jesus by faith rather than seeking after His physical appearance, in accordance with the fact that even those who “have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth [must] know . . . him no more” (2 Corinthians 5:16), have been omitted. It is worth noting that the Apostle Paul testified that he was the “last of all” to see a bodily appearance of Christ (1 Corinthians 15:8).

¹⁷⁴ Pg. 56, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

¹⁷⁵ Pgs. 127-128, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

was great agony through my body. Why, I know not. But it remained through the week. . . . I prayed unto God to forgive my sins and reveal unto me Himself. I don't remember the prayer. I lost all consciousness that night. . . . I perspired very much, so that I thought that water had been thrown over me. . . . A voice told me that [a particular person was] in the meeting to-night by the door. And I said, 'No, he is not here[.]' . . . Then the voice told me the second time exactly the same words, and I answered him back[.] . . . I was astonished when I found [out that the voice was] true. Had the voice only told me once, I would [not] have believed . . . but when I heard the voice the second time, I was surprised [and found out what it said was true]. . . . [M]y body lost all its pain on that Saturday night . . . [and] I am happier than ever[.]¹⁷⁶

By means of such visions, voices, excitements, and marvels—rather than by means of clear preaching of the gospel—vast numbers were professedly converted.¹⁷⁷

The “subject which has perhaps caused more excitement in the public mind than any other feature of the Revival” were the “mysterious lights . . . associated with the name of Mrs. Jones of Islaw'rffordd,” a woman preacher and a “homely farmer's wife”¹⁷⁸ in the holiness revival.¹⁷⁹ After reading “Sheldon's book, *In His Steps*,”¹⁸⁰ and “being much moved by it . . . she began her ministry early in December 1904” as an “evangelist” among the “Calvinistic Methodists” and others, receiving confirmation of her call to a preaching ministry “after seeing a strange light on her way from Islaw'r Ffordd to Egryn chapel.”¹⁸¹ She affirmed that she had seen “quickly vibrating lights, as though full of eyes. She had seen light hovering over some hilltops. The light . . . frequently accompanied her, leading the way as she went.”¹⁸² Witnesses stated that she “is attended by lights of various kinds wherever she goes,” which were well attested and seen by a great number of people. These lights are “tokens of heavenly approval of Mrs. Jones and the Revival.” Indeed, “Mrs. Jones solemnly stated . . . that [the planet] Venus . . . was a new star, had only appeared since the Revival, and was situated a short distance above her house.” One man saw a mysterious light “from the beginning of the Revival [in his area] six weeks ago. Sometimes it appears like a motor-car lamp flashing and going out . . . other times like two lamps and tongues of fire all round . . . other times a quick flash and going out immediately, and when the fire goes out a vapour of smoke comes in its

¹⁷⁶ Pgs. 129-130, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁷⁷ Further records of visions appear on pgs. 95, 100, etc., of *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁷⁸ Pg. 179, “The Revival in Wales.” *The East and the West: A Quarterly Review for the Study of Missions*. (1905) 174-188.

¹⁷⁹ Similar lights were also testified to in the Pentecostal works in India and Los Angeles that arose under the influence of the Welsh holiness revival.

¹⁸⁰ As already noted above, the Social Gospel advocate and heretic Sheldon influenced Evan Roberts very strongly as well.

¹⁸¹ Pg. 184, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁸² Pg. 137, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

place; also a rainbow of vapour and a very bright star.” Lights were seen both by those professedly converted in the Revival and those who were not, “Chapel members and non-members alike.” Another entire family saw lights “hovering above a certain farmhouse . . . as three lamps about three yards apart, in the shape of a Prince of Wales’s feathers, very brilliant and dazzling, moving and jumping like a sea-wave . . . continu[ing] so for ten minutes.” Others, “a few minutes afte[r] Mrs. Jones . . . pass[ed], on the main road, . . . [saw] a brilliant light twice, tinged with blue.” A woman “saw two very bright lights . . . one a big white light, the other smaller and red in colour. The latter flashed backwards and forwards, and finally seemed to become merged in the other.” Another saw a large light “and in the middle of it something like [a] bottle or black person, also some little lights scattering around the large light in many colours. Last of all the whole thing came to a large piece of fog, out of sight.” Another person saw a “pillar of fire, quite perpendicular, about two feet wide and three yards in height.” Others saw “a cross and two other crosses [of light] . . . [t]he two crosses came nearer . . . and stood not far [away], and dozens of small balls of fire [were dancing back and fro behind the crosses . . . [while they] heard a voice singing.” A “medical man” saw “a globe of light about the size of a cheese plate, or nearly the apparent diameter of the moon, over the chapel where Mrs. Jones was that evening preaching. . . . Mrs. Jones . . . declared that she had also seen it, but from within the chapel.” At another meeting where “Mrs. Jones” was preaching and many were “very much affected . . . religious fervour was intense and the service lasted until 1 a. m.,” people present saw “a ball of light about the size of the moon,” with a “slight mist over it. The stars began to shoot out around it, [and] the light rose higher and grew brighter but smaller.” Others saw a “block of fire” rising “from the mountain side and moving along for about 200 or 300 yards. It went upwards, a star” then “shot out to meet it, and they clapped together and formed into a ball of fire,” the appearance changing into “something like the helm of a ship.” Others present saw “a ball of fire, white, silvery, vibrating, stationary.” From the ball “two streamers of gray mist [were] emanating . . . in the space between them a number of stars.” A “meeting of the Salvation Army” in the same location was visited by “a black cloud from which emerged first a white light, then a yellow, and finally a brilliantly red triangle.”¹⁸³ Evan Roberts was very far from the only one experiencing marvels in the Welsh holiness revival.

¹⁸³ Pgs. 97-107, 145-161, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). Many other marvels are documented by Fryer that are not reproduced here. Of course, not every minister or revival proponent endorsed every one of these marvels as divine, or even investigated all of them carefully; however, Biblical cessationism was hardly in great evidence in the Welsh holiness revival. Fryer simply documents the marvels that appear to be well attested.

Indeed, “the revival in Wales under Evan Roberts” not only “produced [these] psychological and physical abnormalities” among others in Wales, but “sparked them also in other countries (California, Norway, Denmark, Hesse, Silesia),” leading to “speaking in tongues and similar phenomena as a renewal of the gifts of Pentecost and powerful evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit” that produced the Pentecostal and charismatic movement.¹⁸⁴ While such “tokens of heavenly approval” of women preachers “and the Revival” are radically different in character than Biblical miracles, possessing far greater similarity to pagan marvels and the marvels of medieval Romanism, they certainly proved that the religious excitement was not merely the work of men, but that the spirit world was powerfully at work in the Welsh holiness revival.

It was important for Roberts to have supernatural abilities to discern true and false conversion, since the methodology he employed in the Welsh holiness revival to produce regeneration was not, as in the Bible, bold, powerful, and clear preaching of the gospel (Romans 10:17; 1 Peter 1:23-25), but getting people to stand up.¹⁸⁵ Those who stood up were assumed to have been converted. Roberts would “walk up and down the isles,” look at specific people, and ask them, “Are you ready to stand up now and confess Christ?”¹⁸⁶ People would think, “Why can’t I? I am religious!” and then “stand up to confess” when Roberts asked them to.¹⁸⁷ Roberts would, at times, call on “[a]ll who love Jesus to stand,” as well as “all church members” and “[a]ll who love Christ more than anything else,”¹⁸⁸ and was able to get great crowds to stand up in this way.¹⁸⁹ In an atmosphere charged with extreme emotion, but little careful preaching, Roberts called on

¹⁸⁴ Pg. 159, *Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 4: Holy Spirit, Church, and New Creation*, Bavinck. An illustration of the Higher Life theology moving into Pentecostalism is found on pgs. 178-179, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton.

¹⁸⁵ Sometimes those who stood up would also come to a “big seat” at the front of a church building. For example, one person who professed conversion “had a vision,” and consequently “went to the big seat to tell [the congregation] . . . [‘Jesus Christ has forgiven my sin.’]” (pg. 32, cf. 72-73, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones). Another example of the methodology of standing up to be born again is found on pg. 147, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

The practice of equating standing up with conversion was present in Keswick and Higher Life circles from the origin of the movement; for example, at the Brighton Convention a Quaker leader reported that “manifest converting power” was present, evidenced by “some hundreds [who] rose to witness that they were recipients of salvation” (pg. 399, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875; pg. 462, *The Friends’ Quarterly Examiner*, 9:23-26. London: Barrett, Sons & Co, 1875).

¹⁸⁶ Pg. 34, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; cf. pg. 182, “The Revival in Wales,” A. T. Fryer.

¹⁸⁷ Pg. 30, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁸⁸ Pg. 49, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁸⁹ E. g., pgs. 60-61, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

unsaved people to stand,” and then “men” would “rise up and confes[s] Christ.”¹⁹⁰ “[A]midst prayers and exhortations in Welsh and English,” people “rose one by one” and were assumed to be converted because they did so, while the “press circulated stories about Evan Roberts’s irreverence, hysteria, mesmerism, and improper pressures upon impressionable females.”¹⁹¹ Roberts’ coworkers described scenes of “feverish emotionalism” where “the air was electrical” as “young men, nerved by the sympathetic atmosphere . . . r[ose], from floor and gallery [of a chapel meeting house, and] followed the formula set by the first, ‘I get up to confess Christ.’”¹⁹² Large groups would go to the front of church buildings, and, in the words of one of Roberts’ converts, be “asked . . . to confess Jesus Christ as our Saviour. . . . I did not understand it . . . [t]he thing was entirely new to me . . . but I accepted everything from him because I looked up to him . . . [by this confession] we had an interest in heaven.”¹⁹³ If not enough people stood up, Roberts would ask again. For example, “at the meeting in Van Road, Caerphilly . . . Evan asked, ‘Will everyone who will confess Christ rise?’ When only forty responded, Evan professed to be astonished. ‘What! Is this the number?’ he cried. . . . So the people were challenged again. They realized that they had not come to be entertained but to ‘show their side.’”¹⁹⁴ Sometimes, however, getting up one time would not work, and one would need to stand up more than once to go to heaven; for example, one man stood up twice because a spirit being told him in a vision that he had lost his salvation. “I could stand up to confess since I had been faithful to all the chapel meetings and was morally upright . . . I did stand up to confess Christ . . . [but a few days later] I saw . . . I felt Jesus coming to me and I was going to him . . . and as He came towards me—He was on the cross—He moved His hand and pushed me away. ‘If God has deserted me,’ [I thought], ‘only a lost state awaits me.’” The man therefore “stood up” again and said, “Dear friends, God has departed from me; I have no hope; only total loss awaits me; pray for me.” People responded, “[I]f you are lost, where are we others?”¹⁹⁵ At another meeting, Roberts exercised his supernatural powers to predict that “everybody present in that meeting was going to ‘come to Christ’ that day,”¹⁹⁶ indicating that all present, including ministers and

¹⁹⁰ Pg. 52, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Compare pg. 44, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁹¹ Pg. 81, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁹² Pgs. 70-71, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁹³ Pgs. 32-33, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁹⁴ Pg. 60, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

¹⁹⁵ Pgs. 29-30, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

¹⁹⁶ Pg. 121, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

Roberts himself, were unconverted and were going to be saved that day by standing up, or that equating standing up with conversion produces incredible confusion and many false professions—unless the prophecy was to be taken allegorically. However, at the end of the day, “all . . . had stood up to declare themselves followers of Christ,”¹⁹⁷ so it appears that Roberts’ prophecy was not simply an allegory. A very sympathetic eyewitness described Roberts’ procedure of producing conversions by putting pressure on people to stand up:

Mr. Evan Roberts, toward the close of the meeting, asks all who from their hearts believe and confess their Saviour to rise. At the meetings at which I was present nearly everybody was standing. Then for the sitting remnant the storm of prayer rises to the mercy seat. When one after another rises to his feet, glad strains of jubilant song burst from the watching multitude.¹⁹⁸

Since getting people to stand up, repeating such calls to stand when not enough do so, putting pressure on the unconverted to stand up by having everyone watch them, and getting people to think that all who do not stand at Mr. Roberts’s call are at that instant claiming to be openly and actively against Christ, is radically different from Biblical evangelistic methodology and a horrible recipe for producing spurious salvation decisions—and it was even immediately apparent that often people would stand and “confess Chris[t] to escape notice” that would come on them were they to stay seated¹⁹⁹—one must be a firm believer in Evan Roberts’s supernatural powers to accept the validity of such a procedure. Only the authority of the marvels surrounding Roberts’s work could validate what would otherwise be a very clearly anti-supernatural, fleshly, and devilish rejection of truly supernatural regeneration for the natural work of arising from a chair. For unless Roberts could do what no other man could, and see into everyone else’s heart, the overwhelming majority of people whom he deceived into thinking that standing up is a sure sign of supernatural conversion and the new birth were in fearful danger of remaining unconverted, being deceived, and being eternally damned, while churches would end up filled with religious but unregenerate people, to the destruction of Christianity and the glory of the devil. Supernatural conversion by the miraculous power of the Spirit through the preached Word would be replaced with supernatural marvels performed by Evan Roberts and a merely natural outward response erroneously equated with regeneration.

Roberts, however, was able to use his supernatural powers to detect when people stood up but were not born again on that account.

¹⁹⁷ Pg. 122, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905).

¹⁹⁸ Pg. 32, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

¹⁹⁹ Pg. 60, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

[On] one occasion Roberts refused to leave the building, when the service had been declared closed by the ministers, because he said that one man in an indicated gallery, a Welshman, he was certain had not confessed Christ as he ought to have done. The minister in charge of that gallery “tested” the people and reported that every one had confessed Christ. Roberts was not satisfied: six times was the appeal made during the next 25 minutes and not until the sixth test did a man come forward and admit that he had not been sincere in professing as a convert with the rest. Roberts directed the minister to speak to the man, and after a short talk he too gave in.²⁰⁰

In such a manner, false professions apparently could be avoided. Furthermore, visions from the spirit world confirmed that people had indeed been truly saved through the ministry of Evan Roberts. A man who became an evangelist after professing conversion through Roberts’s ministry recounted that he had felt “petrified . . . tossed about . . . puzzled . . . crushed . . . disturbed . . . and . . . mobbed,” but then saw “a panoramic vision of Jesus moving through a crowd and a blind, beseeching beggar, whom he recognized as himself, pleading, ‘Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me.’” The man related, “A sweet voice spoke within my spirit so clearly, unmistakably, [and] audibly, that the voices of all creation could never succeed in drowning its message: ‘Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.’ Heaven came into my heart that very moment.”²⁰¹ Ministers also claimed to be converted because of visions. For instance, an elder testified: “I was led up to the great white throne, where the Father was seated in his eternal glory. The Holy Spirit came to me and dressed me in the Son’s righteousness. When He had clothed me in white raiment He introduced me to the Father. ‘Here he is for you,’ said He to the Father, ‘what do you think of him in the Son’s righteousness?’ . . . Thanks be to Him!”²⁰² While in Scripture people are not converted because they see visions telling them they have been saved, and in previous works of genuine revival concluding one was converted because of visions of such a kind was plainly warned against as soul-damning error,²⁰³

²⁰⁰ Pgs. 90, 120-121, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905). “211 had already accepted Christ” by standing up or raising their hands that night, and the Welshman was number 212.

²⁰¹ Pg. 185, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

²⁰² Pg. 189, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. In the Apostle John’s vision, in Revelation 20:11-15, Jesus Christ is the One on the great white throne, not the Father, and only the damned are going to be judged at the great white throne. The Apostle’s vision contradicts the vision of this minister in the Welsh holiness revival.

²⁰³ The words of the great theologian of the First Great Awakening, Jonathan Edwards, identify the confusion in such a “conversion” by means of a vision with painfully and frighteningly pinpoint accuracy:

Persons having religious affections of many kinds, accompanying one another, is not sufficient to determine whether they have any gracious affections or no. . . . It is evident that there are counterfeits of all kinds of gracious affections; as of *love to God*, and *love to the brethren*, as just now observed; so of *godly sorrow for sin*, as in Pharaoh, Saul, Ahab, and the children of Israel in the wilderness; [Exod 9:27; 1 Sam 24:16-17 and 1 Sam 26:21; 1 Kings 21:27; Num 14:39-40] and of the *fear of God*, as in the Samaritans, *who feared the Lord, and served their own gods* at the same time, (2 Kings 17:32-33) and those enemies of God we read of, Ps 66:3, *who through the greatness of God’s power, submit themselves to him*, or, as it is in the Hebrew, *lie unto him, i.e. yield a counterfeit reverence and submission: so of gracious gratitude*, as in the children of Israel, who sang God’s praise at the Red Sea, (Ps 106:12) and Naaman, the Syrian, after his miraculous cure of his leprosy (2 Kings 5:15, etc.). So of *spiritual joy*, as in the stony-ground hearers, (Matt 13:20) and particularly

many of John the Baptist's hearers, (John 5:35). So of *zeal*, as in Jehu, (2 Kings 10:6) and in Paul before his conversion, (Gal 1:14; Phil 3:6) and the unbelieving Jews, (Acts 22:3; Rom 10:2). So graceless persons may have earnest religious *desires*, which may be like Balaam's desires, which he expresses under an extraordinary view of the happy state of God's people, as distinguished from all the rest of the world, (Num 23:9-10). They may also have a strong *hope* of eternal life, as the Pharisees had.

And as men, while in a state of nature, are capable of a resemblance of all kinds of religious affection, so nothing hinders but that they may have many of them together. And what appears in fact, abundantly evinces that it is thus very often. Commonly, when false affections are raised high, many of them attend each other. The multitude that attended Christ into Jerusalem, after that great miracle of raising Lazarus, seem to be moved with many religious affections at once, and all in a high degree. They seem to be filled with *admiration*; and there was a show of high affection of *love*; also a great degree of *reverence*, in their laying their garments on the ground for Christ to tread upon. They express great *gratitude* to him, for the great and good works he had wrought, praising him with loud voices for his salvation; and earnest *desires* of the coming of God's kingdom, which they supposed Jesus was now about to set up; and they showed great *hopes* and raised expectations of it, *expecting it would immediately appear*. Hence they were filled with *joy*, by which they were so animated in their acclamations, as to make the whole city ring again with the noise of them; and they appeared great in their *zeal* and forwardness to attend Jesus, and assist him without further delay, now in the time of the great feast of the *passover*, to set up his kingdom.

It is easy from the nature of the affections, to give an account why, when one affection is raised very high, that it should excite others; especially if the affection which is raised high, be that of counterfeit *love*, as it was in the multitude who cried *Hosanna*. This will naturally draw many other affections after it. For, as was observed before, love is the chief of the affections, and as it were, the fountain of them. Let us suppose a person, who has been for some time in great exercise and terror through fear of hell; his heart weakened with distress and dreadful apprehensions, upon the brink of despair; and who is all at once delivered, by being firmly made to believe, through some delusion of Satan, that God has pardoned him, and accepts him as the object of his dear love, and promises him eternal life. Suppose also, that this is done through some vision, or strong imagination suddenly excited in him, of a person with a beautiful countenance smiling on him—with arms open, and with blood dropping down—which the person conceives to be Christ, without any other enlightening of the understanding to give a view of the spiritual, divine excellency of Christ and his fullness, and of the way of salvation revealed in the gospel. Or, suppose some voice or words coming as if they were spoken to him, such as these, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee;" or, "Fear not, it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," which he takes to be immediately spoken by God to him, though there was no preceding acceptance of Christ, or closing of the heart with him: I say, if we should suppose such a case, what various passions would naturally crowd at once, or one after another, into such a person's mind! It is easy to be accounted for, from the mere principles of nature, that a person's heart, on such an occasion, should be raised up to the skies with transports of joy, and be filled with fervent affection to that imaginary God or Redeemer, who, he supposes, has thus rescued him from the jaws of such dreadful destruction, and received him with such endearment, as a peculiar favourite. Is it any wonder that now he should be filled with admiration and gratitude, his mouth should be opened, and be full of talk about what he has experienced? That, for a while, he should think and speak of scarce any thing else, should seem to magnify that God who has done so much for him, call upon others to rejoice with him, appear with a cheerful countenance, and talk with a loud voice? That however, before his deliverance, he was full of quarrellings against the justice of God, now it should be easy for him to submit to God, own his unworthiness, cry out against himself, appear to be very humble before God, and be at his feet as tame as a lamb; now confessing his unworthiness, and crying out, *Why me? Why me?* Thus Saul, who, when Samuel told him that God had appointed him to be king, makes answer, "Am not I a Benjamite, of the smallest of the tribes of Israel, and my family the least of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin? Wherefore then speakest thou so to me?" [1 Sam 9:21]. Much in the language of David, the true saint, 2 Sam 7:18, "Who am I, and what is my father's house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?" Is it to be wondered at, that now he should delight to be with them who acknowledge and applaud his happy circumstances, and that he should love all such as esteem and admire him and what he has experienced? That he should have violent zeal against all who make nothing of such things, be disposed openly to separate, and as it were to proclaim war with all who are not of his party? That he should now glory in his sufferings, and be very much for condemning and censuring all who seem to doubt, or make any difficulty of these things? And, while the warmth of his affections last, that he should be mighty forward to take pains, and to deny himself, and to promote the interest of a party favouring such things? Or that he should seem earnestly desirous to increase the number of them, as the Pharisees compassed sea and land to make one proselyte? [Matthew 23:15]. I might mention many other things, which will naturally arise in such circumstances. He must have but slightly considered human nature, who thinks that such things as these cannot arise in this manner, without any supernatural interposition of divine power. (pgs. 250-251, *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*, Jonathan Edwards)

under Evan Roberts such work was set forth as evidence that the spirit world was accomplishing its ends and many were being truly born again. Indeed, even the widespread circulation of the idea that 100,000 people were converted in the Welsh holiness revival was a product of a “mystical experience” of Evan Roberts where he “receive[d] from God a piece of paper on which the figure 100,000 was written—giving rise later to the belief that 100,000 would be converted during the revival.”²⁰⁴ “Evan Roberts had asked the Lord for 100,000 for Jesus Christ, and . . . he had actually seen Jesus presenting a cheque to His Father, and on it the figure ‘100,000.’”²⁰⁵ One who accepts Roberts’ prophetic status would be quite correct in promulgating this figure, while those who believe that the Apostles and prophets were the foundation of the church (Ephesians 2:20), and, in consequence, their offices have ceased, would want far better evidence for 100,000 people being regenerated than a vision of Evan Roberts—evidence which is, however, lacking.²⁰⁶ Roberts himself, because of the lack of evidence of the new birth in many, eventually “saw that [many] had been touched emotionally but not truly convicted and converted during [many of his] revival meetings.”²⁰⁷ He “lived to see many of his converts, some of them the most striking among the records of the Revival, go back, tired of their new home,” to the world, the flesh, and the devil.²⁰⁸ However, this recognition came too late and did not affect the fundamental errors in his methodology during the holiness revival, as throughout he continued to employ techniques that were certain to produce many false professions. Consequently, “Evan Roberts grew more and more discouraged as he saw some groups of converts following after cults in which they

²⁰⁴ Pg. 523, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope. This figure is an instance of the “folk memory of the revival, much of it elaborated by the passage of time” so that the recollection of events “as time progressed, became increasingly divorced from the events themselves” (pgs. 516, 534, *ibid.*). Unfortunately, such inaccurate folk tales too often pass for real history and are propagated in many popular-level Christian biographies, histories, and other narratives, so that, far too often, the people of God accept as factual what is merely legendary. See also pg. 20, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Brynmor P. Jones; pg. 48, *The Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead.

²⁰⁵ Pg. 60, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan; cf. pg. 66.

²⁰⁶ Apart from the visions of Evan Roberts, evidence for the 100,000 figure is derived from people who have sought to keep track of the numbers of people who stood up in meetings (cf. pg. 153, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905); some have also tried to tally, at least generally, increases in membership rolls.

In the Bible, those who professed salvation through repentant faith in Christ alone, submitted to believer’s immersion, and then continued faithful to the Lord in His church and manifested evidence of a new heavenly nature were counted as converts (cf. Acts 2:41-47)—a standard not a little higher than that of standing up under extreme emotional pressure in a meeting, or than receiving a vision with the number 100,000 in it.

²⁰⁷ Pg. 147, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁰⁸ Pg. 80, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

barked at the devil, danced and swooned, or followed healers and prophetesses,”²⁰⁹ and critics of Roberts affirmed that he erred greatly in “assuming that remorse and confession were the same as true regeneration” as it “became sadly evident that the Spirit of God had been quenched.”²¹⁰ Roberts’ practices contributed to laxity in guarding the membership of Calvinistic Methodist assemblies and other denominations influenced by his ministry, thus filling them with unregenerate members²¹¹ and ministers. Indeed, Roberts did not merely confuse regeneration and Spirit-produced repentance and faith in the crucified Christ with an outward response in his methodology, but his message itself was confusing enough that it could well be considered—by those who rejected his prophetic status and went by Scripture alone—a very unclear gospel. Evan Roberts did not regularly preach with any kind of careful clarity the gospel of salvation for totally depraved sinners based on the substitutionary death of the crucified and resurrected Christ and applied through regeneration to sinners who, in supernaturally produced repentant faith, looked away from themselves to Him for redemption (1 Corinthians 15:1-4; John 3:1-21). Instead, Roberts taught that the unregenerate must both sympathize with and love Christ before they can come to Him for salvation, thus denying the Biblical depravity of man (Romans 3:11) and affirming Pelagianism.²¹² It is not at all surprising that Roberts “did not at any time emphasize the necessity for the creation of a new will in and by the power of Christ.”²¹³ On the contrary, he commanded: “[Y]ou need to turn that sympathy . . . I know you . . . listeners [already have] . . . into a flame of love before you can embrace Him as Saviour.”²¹⁴ Furthermore, he taught: “Christ . . . has a rope of three strands. First ask him to take you as you are. Then ask Him to forgive your sins. Then ask Him for strength for the future. This three-stranded rope of salvation is enough for the

²⁰⁹ Pg. 158, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²¹⁰ Pg. 175, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²¹¹ The rigors of early Calvinistic Methodist assembly membership are set forth on pgs. 103-122, *Fire in the Thatch: The True Nature of Religious Revival*, Eifion Evans.

²¹² Roberts carried his Pelagianism with him into his doctrine of the Christian life; e. g., while Philippians 2:13 affirms that God works in the believer both to will and to do, Roberts believed: “God . . . will work in you up to the point of willing; but He cannot ‘will’ for you! He works in you up to the point of your will, and then through your act of ‘will’—He will energize you for the ‘doing’ (Phil. ii. 13.)” (pg. 5, “Revival and Prayer,” *Overcomer* 1910). It is astonishing that Roberts would quote Philippians 2:13 and in the same sentence deny that God energizes the believer both to will and to do.

Jessie Penn-Lewis likewise, with the Keswick theology in general, denied that God works in believers to both will and do, affirming rather that the Almighty is helpless without our independent choice: “God must get the consent of our wills for everything He does” (pg. 181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913; she misinterpreted Philippians 2:13 in a manner similar to Evan Roberts, pg. 132, *The Overcomer*, 1914).

²¹³ Pg. 88, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

²¹⁴ Pg. 53, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

present, the past, and the future salvation of every sinner.”²¹⁵ Along these lines, Roberts counseled his helpers to find people who needed to stand up to be saved, and act as follows: “Put one hand on their shoulder, and the other hand in their hand. Ask them to pray God to forgive their sins for Jesus Christ’s sake. Then ask them, do they believe in God; and if they will say they do, ask them to thank God for that.”²¹⁶ However, the Biblical response to the gospel is not “ask,” but “believe,”²¹⁷ and belief in “God” is not enough (James 2:19); one must be supernaturally enabled to rest upon the crucified Christ and His substitutionary atonement (cf. John 3:1-21). Worst of all, Roberts’s salvation message was summarized by those who heard him as: “He says that if we would have Jesus save us, we must save ourselves first. He says that we must do all that we know is right, first. He says that we must leave off the drink and all that is bad; he says that we must pray and we must work, we must work hard. He says if Jesus Christ is to save us we must work along with Him, side by side, or, he says, the saving will never be done.”²¹⁸ The Welsh revivalism under Evan Roberts “is of a social and altruistic nature, and . . . differs from those [revivals] which have preceded it whe[re] the doctrine was one almost exclusively of faith rather than works.”²¹⁹ Jessie Penn-Lewis recounted:

Mr. Roberts would “test” the meeting, and put to it the four definite steps necessary to salvation . . . (1.) The past must be made clear by sin being confessed to God, and every wrong to man put right. (2.) Every doubtful thing in the life must be put away. (3.) Prompt and implicit obedience to the Holy Ghost. (4.) Public confession of Christ. Forgiveness of others as an essential to receiving the forgiveness of God was often emphasized, as well as the distinction between the Holy Spirit’s

²¹⁵ Pg. 143, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²¹⁶ Pg. 49, *Voices from the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

²¹⁷ Much of modern fundamentalism and evangelicalism also replaces supernatural conversion by repentant faith in the Christ who died as a Substitute for sinners and rose again with the repetition of a “sinner’s prayer,” based upon a misinterpretation of Romans 10:9-14 and Revelation 3:20. Note the careful discussion of these passages, and defense of justification by repentant faith alone instead of justification by faith and prayer, in “An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians,” by Thomas Ross, available at <http://faithsaves.net>. While Evan Roberts affirmed that to “confess Christ was . . . an initial act of faith” (pg. 145, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones), the Bible teaches that one must believe and receive Christ’s righteousness before one can genuinely confess Christ (Romans 10:10-11). However, at other times Roberts would, at least according to certain writers, correctly state that the gospel is to believe on Christ (cf. pg. 134, *ibid.*).

²¹⁸ *Between College Terms*, Constance Louisa Maynard. (James Nisbet & Co.: 1910). Elec. acc. <http://books.google.com> & <http://www.welshrevival.org/misc/maynard/01.htm>. Maynard notes: “He says we must save ourselves first.’ Here is indeed a different Gospel from that of 1859.” Compare the salvation message taught by the Pentecostals of Azusa Street: “When we preach a sinless life, some people say we are too strict. They say we will not get many to heaven that way. But, beloved, God cannot save contrary to His Word. All salvation contrary to the Word is not saving salvation” (pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:9 (Los Angeles, June-September 1907), reprinted on pg. 37, *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).

²¹⁹ Pg. 167, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

work in conversion, and in baptizing the believer with the Holy Ghost . . . the full Gospel as preached at Pentecost.²²⁰

Nevertheless, despite radical discontinuity between Roberts's message and the Biblical gospel of free grace in Christ, by equating with the new birth people abandoning a sitting position to assume a standing one, and changing the preaching of repentance and faith to the spiritually dead to calling on unsaved men who somehow allegedly love Christ to ask Him to help them have strength for the future, work hard, and then receive forgiveness, "hundreds of souls would rise"²²¹ to receive salvation by standing up and be counted as converts every night.²²² In a poor meeting, "only 760 decisions had been recorded"²²³— in better ones, many, many more. Furthermore, believers did not obtain assurance of salvation by looking to Christ and also by seeing in the reflex act of faith²²⁴ the evidences of regeneration recorded in 1 John; rather, the doctrine of Roberts and his followers was, "Believe you are saved, and then confess it" to obtain "assurance of faith."²²⁵ Nobody

²²⁰ Pgs. 48-49, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Note that Jessie Penn-Lewis found acceptable such a method of receiving salvation, although it is clearly a false gospel. These four conditions of receiving "salvation" were also the way that an "outpouring of the Holy Spirit" was received (pg. 51, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead), further evidence that Roberts confused post-conversion Spirit baptism with the gospel, even as in his own personal history a great confusion of conversion and Spirit baptism is evident. Indeed, the four conditions also were the way through which ecumenical unity among those holding false and true doctrine would come to pass, and the one-world Church—a desirable goal, in Roberts' view—would be inaugurated (pg. 53, *Revival in the West*, W. T. Stead).

²²¹ Pg. 49, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

²²² Pg. 128, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²²³ Pg. 129, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²²⁴ "By the direct act of faith, we embrace Christ as our Savior; by the reflex act, arising out of the consciousness of believing, we believe that He loved us and died for us, and that nothing can ever separate us from his love. These two acts are inseparable, not only as cause and effect, [but as] antecedent and consequent; but they are not separated in time, or in the consciousness of the believer. They are only different elements of the complex act of accepting Christ as He is offered in the Gospel" (pg. 100, *Systematic Theology*, Charles Hodge, vol. 3). "[T]he direct act of faith is occupied with the object presented to it, the promises of the gospel in Christ, and the reflexive act, being of a different nature, is concerned with looking back on the direct act which assures the soul of personally being a partaker of Christ. This reflexive act of faith is the gift of the Holy Spirit also, and must be ratified by His inward testimony" (pg. 68, "Does Assurance Belong to the Essence of Faith? Calvin and the Calvinists," Joel R. Beeke. *Master's Seminary Journal* 5:1 (Spring 1994) 43-73).

²²⁵ Pg. 107, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones. Note that, since Roberts was a Methodist, it is not surprising that "Wesley and Fletcher" held to a related doctrinal error of an improper "immediate enjoyment of personal assurance" (pg. 180, *The Doctrine of Justification*, James Buchanan). Early in his ministry, "John Wesley summed up his thoughts on this subject in a letter written in January, 1740: 'I never yet knew one soul thus saved without what you call the faith of assurance; I mean a sure confidence that by the merits of Christ he was reconciled to the favour of God' [pg. 200, *Wesley's Standard Sermons*]. Thus the *cognition* that saving grace had worked in a life was seen as the final means to ascertain if saving grace had indeed been present. The implications of this teaching, taken by itself, seem to lead to a condition in which superficial self-analysis ('yes, I've got the witness') results in spirituality while the kind of doubt which assailed such people as Luther and even at times John Wesley himself results in a loss of the hope of salvation" (pg. 171, "John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance," Mark A. Noll. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132:526 (April 1975). However, by 1755 Wesley had moderated his position slightly, so

who does not possess the ability to see people's hearts can rightly conclude that people standing up is the same thing as the supernatural production of repentance and faith within a dead sinner's heart by the Spirit of God, enabling a sinner to spiritually come to the Lord Jesus Christ and trust in His work on the cross for justification, a new heart, and eternal life. Furthermore, Biblical assurance is not obtained by simply convincing oneself that he is saved and then saying to others that he is. Consequently, the practice of equating people standing up with conversion will produce horrific numbers of false professions and spurious conversion decisions when practiced by anyone who does not have the kind of insight into the heart claimed by Evan Roberts.

that one could be shaken in his assurance without losing his salvation, although a total lack of assurance was still only compatible with a lost estate: "I know that I am accepted: And yet that knowledge is sometimes shaken, though not destroyed, by doubt or fear. If that knowledge were destroyed, or wholly withdrawn, I could not then say I had Christian faith. To me it appears the same thing, to say, 'I know God has accepted me'; or, 'I have a sure trust that God has accepted me.' . . . [Nonetheless,] justifying faith cannot be a conviction that I am justified. . . . But still I believe the proper Christian faith, which purifies the heart, implies such a conviction" (pgs. 452-453, Letter DXXXII, July 25, 1755, in *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley*, vol. 12, 3rd ed., with the last corrections of the author. London: John Mason, 1830). Furthermore, Wesley affirmed that objective marks cannot be elaborated to distinguish between the witness of the Spirit to one's regenerated state and self-delusion; "this kind of defense based on intuition . . . raised the specter of enthusiasm for some of Wesley's critics" (pg. 174, *ibid.*). In this doctrine of assurance Wesley's view was similar to that of Jacob Arminius: "Arminius thought that no one would be a true Christian who did not have a present assurance of present salvation. He wrote: 'Since God promises eternal life to all who believe in Christ, it is impossible for him who believes, and who knows that he believes, to doubt of his own salvation, unless he doubts of this willingness of God.'" (pgs. 164-165, "John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance," Noll, citing pg. 348, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation*, Carl Bangs. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971. Compare *The Doctrine of Assurance, with Special Reference to John Wesley*, Arthur S. Yates. London: Epworth, 1952).

Wesleyan confusion about conversion and assurance appeared in various preachers influenced by his theology, not Evan Roberts alone; thus, for example, Seth Joshua wrote: "[People] are entering into full assurance of faith coupled with a baptism of the Holy Ghost. . . . I also think that those seeking assurance may be fairly counted as converts" (pg. 122, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan, citing Mr. Joshua's diary. Of course, some people who think that they are in need of assurance truly are unconverted, but such clarity appears to be lacking in Mr. Joshua's comments. Spirit baptism has nothing to do with obtaining assurance in the Bible.). Methodist confusion on assurance passed over into the Pentecostal movement, which taught that assurance was of the essence of saving faith: "If God for Christ's sake has forgiven you your sins, you know it. And if you do not know it better than you know anything in this world, you are still in your sins. When you go down in the atonement, in the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, you are accepted. And if you are accepted, and He has given you a clean heart and sanctified your soul, you know it. And if you do not know it, the work is not done" (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:2 (Los Angeles, October 1906), reprinted on pg. 6, *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).

Scripture teaches that all believers can have assurance of salvation, but that assurance that one has personally passed from death to life is not of the essence of saving faith (cf. *London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689*, 18:1-4). However, Wesley's acceptance of baptismal regeneration was an even more dangerous error than his confusion on assurance (see "John Wesley's View on Baptism," John Chongnam Cho. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7 (Spring 1972) 60-73).

Evan Roberts believed and taught many other ideas denied in or absent from the Bible. Following, Boardman, Murray, and many other Keswick leaders and exponents, Roberts taught that believers could escape physical death and become immune to disease by faith. The “missionary who is in a district where there is malarial fever . . . becomes immune by recognizing that he must not be a victim to the enemy—death. . . . He goes into the midst of it, but in faith it cannot touch him.”²²⁶ While living with the Penn-Lewis household, Jessie and Evan practiced “binding Satan,”²²⁷ while “Evan Roberts . . . spent about eighteen sleepless hours a day in prayer.”²²⁸ Mr. Roberts’s “prayers,” out of which were birthed the book *The War On The Saints*, “were Divinely inspired.”²²⁹ The doctrines in *War on the Saints* show how a believer who has experienced post-conversion Spirit baptism “can have the authority to bind Satan,” and even “co-work with God in the last defeat of Satan and all his hosts.”²³⁰ Thus, after Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis had, they affirmed, bound Satan, and while practicing Throne Life prayer and experiencing a great mystic Higher Life, as Evan Roberts allegedly “entered into the sufferings of the Saviour/High Priest” and thus obtained a “position” from “which he could intercede continually for Christ’s servants and witnesses who were exposed to deception,”²³¹ Roberts received in a vision “the Translation Message given in October, 1913,”²³² in which he predicted “The Coming of Christ . . . the descent of the Lord to meet His Bride . . . the great procession of the King Bridegroom, the Son of the Most High, the Lord of Hosts . . . in 1914,”²³³ after hearing Penn-Lewis preach that Revelation

²²⁶ Pg. 10, *Overcomer*, 1914.

²²⁷ Pg. 166, *Overcomer*, 1914.

²²⁸ Pg. 167, *Overcomer*, 1914.

²²⁹ Pg. 189, “The Prayer Ministry of Evan Roberts,” *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914, elec. acc. <http://www.rewlach.org.uk/books/Overcomer1914/index.htm>.

²³⁰ Pg. 174, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Commanding Satan was practiced in the Welsh Revival, as recorded by Jessie Penn-Lewis (pg. 66, *The Awakening in Wales*).

²³¹ Pg. 191-193, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Roberts continued in his “gained position of intercession” in which he “entered into the sufferings of the . . . High Priest” for “nine years.” Happily, Jesus Christ, the real High Priest, ever lives to make intercession for His own, and He does not stop after nine years, nor does He sleep, have indwelling sin, or the vast number of other sins and imperfections of fallen men—nor does the real High Priest need anyone else to enter into His sufferings, as His sufferings on the cross were sufficient once and for all (Hebrews 10:14).

²³² Pg. 190, “*War on the Saints*: A brief review of its dispensational significance,” in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914. The Translation Message was specifically given on October 19, and its public proclamation was commanded by the same spirits that gave the message in the first place in November (pgs. 183-184, *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

²³³ *The Overcomer*, December 1914. At first Roberts was less specific, simply prophesying that Christ would return in his lifetime (pgs. 196-197, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones), and then predicting that Christ would return in under a decade (pg. 177, *The Overcomer*, December 1913), until finally 1914 became the specific year in which the Translation would take place. Perhaps Roberts believed he had an

12:4 was about “Satan’s all-out attack on the ‘Man-Child Church,’ which would occur just before Christ’s coming to rapture His people away from this last warfare.”²³⁴ Or, more accurately, according to Jessie Penn-Lewis, Evan Roberts, Otto Stockmeyer, and other Keswick leaders, the Rapture would be partial, taking away only those who have taken the third step of conquering death by faith—those who only believed in justification by faith, and then sanctification by a special post-conversion act of faith, would be left behind, the Rapture only taking the “‘man-child’ born of the church”:

By the simple expectation that the Lord may come any day to take away the Church, whether ready or unready, we shall never come to be translated. That is not the way. Justification is by faith, and is received by faith; sanctification is by faith, and is received by faith; and equally TRANSLATION CAN BE OBTAINED BY FAITH. Believe then . . . [that] Christ . . . is able, by the Spirit, to form a group of those to whom the Lord can manifest His salvation, full and entire, and whom He may take away before others, without dying, to His throne.²³⁵

After all, at the heart of the Keswick theology is the idea the blessings of Christ’s death are inactive until they are especially appropriated by a distinct act of faith—so since “all the fruits of the sufferings of Christ ought to be obtained by faith,” the believer who has entered into the Highest Life of the Higher Life rises up and is “CONQUERING DEATH BY FAITH,” guaranteed not to suffer physical death but to be Raptured by a specific act

“intimation of the summons” to heaven in the Rapture that G. A. Pember spoke of (pg. 195, *Earth’s Earliest Ages*), although such an intimation is Biblically impossible (Matthew 24:36).

Pentecostals were reprinting Evan Roberts’ prophecy—the earlier version that Christ would come in his lifetime—for decades (cf. the reprint of Roberts’ false prophecy on pg. 5, *The Pentecostal Evangel*, 1681 (July 27, 1946). The *Pentecostal Evangel* was the official periodical of the *Assemblies of God* denomination.). For obvious reasons, Roberts’ prophecy that Christ would return in his lifetime was more easily propagated after 1914 than his date-setting prophecies.

²³⁴ Pg. 195, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. See also pgs. 194-199. Revelation 12:4 speaks about Satan’s attempt to kill Christ when He was born in Bethlehem (Matthew 2:16-18); the verse has nothing to do with events in early twentieth century Great Britain. Mrs. Penn-Lewis similarly allegorizes the “Man Child” as the church in Chapter 11 of *War on the Saints*. Compare Charles Parham’s allegorization of the “Man Child” described on pg. 85, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

²³⁵ “Prepare!” by Otto Stockmeyer, pg. 185 in *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Mrs. Penn-Lewis had Stockmeyer’s article printed immediately after her record of Evan Roberts’ Translation Message.

Penn-Lewis’s argument for the partial-Rapture of the “Man-Child,” so that to “have part in the rapture we must be sanctified and holy and live the life of a full overcomer,” was proclaimed in almost identical language by Pentecostalism (cf. the detailed exposition on pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:12 (Los Angeles, January 1908), reprinted on pg. 50, *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; see also pg. 4, *The Apostolic Faith* I:10 (September 1907), reprinted on pg. 44, *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 & pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:11 (October-January 1908), reprinted on pg. 45, *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). The identification of full overcomers who are ready for the Rapture with those only who have spoken in tongues (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:5 (January 1907), reprinted on pg. 18, *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), however, would not be followed by Penn-Lewis.

of faith to that end.²³⁶ Only when, being already justified, one exercises a specific act of faith to activate sanctification does one receive this second blessing—to affirm otherwise is to return to the despised orthodox, non-Higher Life doctrine—and in exactly the same fashion, one will not partake of the Rapture without a specific, post-sanctification act of faith toward that end. God is so unable to Rapture those who do not specifically exercise faith to that end that even after the first group is taken away, subsequently other little groups will go up during the Tribulation period as they finally enter into the Translation plane of the Throne Life. That is, at the Rapture those with the Highest Life will rise “in the air just above our planet,” where they will be judged while the Tribulation proceeded on earth. Those believers who were left behind will “ascend to Him” in little “after companies” as they finally grasped, as the Tribulation period went on, the truths taught in the inspired writings of Mrs. Penn-Lewis, and were purified enough to ascend to join their brethren in the air above the planet. A group would go here, and a group there; the “Parousia of Christ means His Presence in the air just above our planet, where His saints will gather unto Him,” as “in successive Translations during the period of Tribulation on earth which will culminate in Armageddon.”²³⁷ As people enter into the Throne Life, “[f]rom time to time various companies of saints who were not ready for the first Rapture [will] disappear from the earth and join their fellows.”²³⁸ Since it was essential to have the Translation Faith truths taught by Mrs. Penn-Lewis to be Raptured, and nobody could discover these truths simply by reading the Bible, Mrs. Penn-Lewis wrote an article describing how one was to enter into the blessing of Translation faith: “How to get it, use it, and keep it,” so that people do not fall back to the lower plain of the Christians who miss the Rapture.²³⁹ It was also essential to note that the Translation Message was for those “who understood that, like Enoch,” Evan Roberts “walked daily with God,”²⁴⁰ and them only. People like Jessie Penn-Lewis and other followers of the Higher Life “find the witness in their own spirit” to Evan Roberts’s prophecy, so that “they believe his message.”²⁴¹ When “his family [did] not believe his present messages,” he “did not want to meet [them] anymore,” and so he “rejected every attempt by [his] family” at restoration, recognizing that his “special vision and . . . burden message”²⁴² required “the

²³⁶ “Prepare!” by Otto Stockmeyer, pg. 185 in *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Italics and capitalization in original.

²³⁷ Pg. 203, “The Overcomer Literature Trust Fund,” *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

²³⁸ Pg. 193, “The Change of Dispensations,” *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

²³⁹ “The Spirit of Translation,” pgs. 201-202, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

²⁴⁰ Pg. 196, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁴¹ Pg. 184, *The Overcomer*, December 1913.

²⁴² Pgs. 203-204, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones.

absolute isolation of his spirit from those who do not believe his testimony.”²⁴³ He refused “to meet or correspond with his closest relatives,” and when “his father went up to see him . . . Evan . . . would not talk.”²⁴⁴ His “family [was] shown the door” so that he could, every moment, give himself to prayer.²⁴⁵ He persisted in this rejection of his family to the extent that he did not even attend his mother’s funeral.²⁴⁶ Recognizing the truth of the end of the world in 1914, Roberts and Penn-Lewis ceased to publish the *Overcomer* magazine in that year—there would be no more need of it once the return of Christ took place,²⁴⁷ as Roberts and Penn-Lewis knew from the spirit world, “the End-Age of the Son of Man was dawning,”²⁴⁸ and *The Overcomer* would no longer be necessary, for as Evan Roberts prophesied, “Translation is at hand! We know in the spirit that our ministration to the Church is ended! . . . WE AWAIT TRANSLATION.”²⁴⁹ However, a permanent literature trust was set up, as Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s writings would be “needed by others after the departure of the watching believers,” that is, those Christians who missed the partial Rapture would need her works to find out what went wrong.²⁵⁰ Penn-Lewis, Roberts, and others “were all in high spirits . . . and decided to celebrate the end of the spiritual warfare[.] . . . All went out in raincoats and galoshes to the rocks where Mrs. Penn-Lewis dashed a bottle of eau-de-cologne on the rock, saying, ‘In the Name of the Triune God I dash this bottle against the rocks in honour of the finished warfare with the Prince of Death.’”²⁵¹ The groundwork for the Translation message had been prepared for some time; in 1902 Mrs. Penn-Lewis had written *Studies in Job*, which described “the mystery of the suffering which will be a message for the

²⁴³ Pgs. 182-183, *The Overcomer*, December 1913.

²⁴⁴ Pg. 170, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. His “nervous condition” was also the stated reason for why “when his mother went seriously ill, the news was not passed on to Evan” (pg. 170, *ibid.*).

²⁴⁵ Pg. 193, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁴⁶ Pg. 210, Review of “*Glory Filled The Land, A Trilogy On The Welsh Revival Of 1904–1905*,” Richard Owen Roberts, ed.; H. Elvet Lewis, G. Campbell Morgan and I. Neprash. Wheaton, IL: International Awakening Press, 1989,” Jim Elliff, in *Reformation and Revival* 8:2 (Spring 1999) 206-213.

²⁴⁷ “An Accomplished Ministration,” by Evan Roberts, in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914, pgs. 178-181. As Jessie Penn-Lewis declared: “God Himself will speak to His watching saints to make ready for His Coming; for if the Holy Spirit is preparing to withdraw from the world, we may reasonably expect that He who so definitely led His servants in the past, has now as clearly led to the closure of their service in the *Overcomer*, as a work completed, ere the Church ascends” (pg. 186, *The Overcomer*, December 1914).

²⁴⁸ Pg. 201, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁴⁹ Pg. 179, “An Accomplished Ministration,” *The Overcomer*, December 1914. Capitalization retained from the original.

²⁵⁰ Pg. 176, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

²⁵¹ Pg. 247, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

church in its final stages on the eve of the ‘Translation.’”²⁵² Evan Roberts then received “a revelation by the Holy Spirit of . . . our Lord[’s] coming . . . in our life-time . . . the ‘translation’ . . . is at hand.”²⁵³ Furthermore, “the Revival which broke out in Wales in 1904 had a *dispensational* significance, and was actually, speaking in a general sense, the beginning of the period in which God set His Hand to close up the Christian dispensation,” as the “issue of *War On The Saints* had a [similar] dispensational significance [which] can be seen if it be considered in relation to the Welsh Revival . . . because of the ‘Time of the End,’ in which it appeared,” namely, the few years before the end of the world which was to take place in 1914.²⁵⁴ The “latter rain” spoken of by Joel, both Penn-Lewis and Pentecostalism knew, was not actually a prophecy about rain, as the context of Joel 2:23 would indicate, but an allegory about the Holy Spirit being poured out;²⁵⁵ “the Revival in Wales” was the “beginning of the ‘latter rain’ which [would] prepare the Church of God for the Lord’s appearing.”²⁵⁶ *War on the Saints* was written so that the Church could make the second coming of Christ take place, as Christian overcomers learned to bind the devil and “drive the forces of Satan from their place in the heavenlies” by warfare prayer, “making way for the Church to ascend to her place of triumph with the Lord. . . . The . . . greatest, ultimate result of the operation of the truths concerning the deceptive workings of Satan and the way of victory [brought to light in *War on the Saints*], is in connection with the dispensational position of the Church, in view of the closing days of the age, and the Millennial Appearing of the Ascended Lord.”²⁵⁷ “The dispensational significance of the Revival in 1904 meant . . . the beginning of the decade allotted by God for the awakening, maturing and preparation of those who belonged to the Body of Christ—all in view of ultimate Translation . . . [and] the Coming Reign of Christ” ten years²⁵⁸ after the 1904 Welsh holiness revival.²⁵⁹ The

²⁵² Pg. 91, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor P. Jones. North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos, 1997.

²⁵³ Pg. 177, *The Overcomer*, December 1913.

²⁵⁴ Pg. 190, “*War on the Saints*: A brief review of its dispensational significance,” in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

²⁵⁵ This allegorization, of course, was central in the “latter rain” doctrine of Pentecostalism; the “latter rain” concept was believed and taught by even the earliest Pentecostals such as Charles Parham (cf. “The Strange Early History of Pentecostalism,” by David Cloud, and numerous other resources on the *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*; also pg. 81, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; pgs. 26-28, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

²⁵⁶ Pg. 17, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

²⁵⁷ Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

²⁵⁸ Pg. 194, “The Change of the Dispensations,” in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

²⁵⁹ Pg. 190, “*War on the Saints*: A brief review of its dispensational significance,” in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

fact that the “Translation” of the overcomers in the church to heaven was coming was evident because of signs: “The week of the Advent Message witnessed such events in the world that it was called the ‘Black Week,’” for that week “the following were some of the notable disasters which occurred. In Wales the Senhenydd Colliery disaster; the collapse of a Zeppelin in the North Sea; the burning of a liner in mid-ocean; the wreck of an express in Liverpool; a railway accident in London; and in Russia so many railway disasters that a special commission of enquiry was appointed—all occurring within the one week.”²⁶⁰ Such were evident signs that the period of “fiery tribulation” had come and of the end of the world in 1914.²⁶¹ The *Overcomer* magazine “picked up its readers in 1909, drawing out, as with a magnet, from the midst of others, those who knew in any degree the two-fold message of the Cross, as taught in Romans vi., and then led them on, line upon line, precept upon precept, through the earlier stages of the Baptism of the Spirit, the experimental pathway of death with Christ, the life joined in spirit with Christ in God, and the war in the heavenlies, depicted in Ephesians vi. The culmination was reached in 1913 in the Translation message, which in 1914 has been amplified more in detail concerning experimental preparation for the imminent Coming of the Lord. . . . [T]he paper has been a Testimony committed to certain members of the Body of Christ, to declare to other members of the Body, for the specific leading of them on in the deep things of God in preparation for their reigning with Christ,” so that those who “were among the most spiritual of the Church six years ago, and . . . were then able to recognize the truths set forth as of God” in the paper, were by 1914 fully equipped by it for the reign of Christ which was to come in that year.²⁶² Indeed, at times even an exact day was pointed out. On April 16, 1914, Evan Roberts “entered the breakfast room dressed in his going-out suit. When he came back he told [all those present], ‘The Translation is very near. Prepare!’” All present “got tickets to mark everything and . . . went to [their] rooms to put all straight.”²⁶³ However, the world did not end, neither on that day, nor in that year. Such a false prophecy (cf. Deuteronomy 18:20-22), however, was not really a false prophecy, nor were Roberts and Penn-Lewis false prophets for making, endorsing, promulgating, and defending it—on the contrary, it was evident—at least *ex post facto*—

²⁶⁰ Pg. 191, “*War on the Saints: A brief review of its dispensational significance*,” in *The Overcomer* magazine, December 1914.

²⁶¹ When the world did not end in 1914, Jessie Penn-Lewis retained much of the theology developed around her and Evan Roberts’ date-setting; thus, she preached in 1927, the “great tribulation” was almost upon the world, and “with prophetic words . . . she spoke of days of persecution which the Church w[ould] face in the near future” (pgs. 296, 301, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard).

²⁶² Pg. 174, “The Finished Testimony,” by Jessie Penn-Lewis, in *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

²⁶³ Pg. 248, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

that the sin was not in Roberts and Penn-Lewis, but in the universal church. While at first this explanation for failure was not clear, since in late 1915 Penn-Lewis was still “striving ‘to hold fast the ‘Translation Faith’ . . . thinking of how near . . . was the ‘heavenly call,’”²⁶⁴ it finally became apparent that the abysmal failure of the prophecy—which had been widely proclaimed in the secular press²⁶⁵—was not because of the sins of those who had made and propagated it. “[T]he delay factor [was] caused by lack of full spiritual unity,” Roberts and Penn-Lewis taught—“Divisions must cease, disunity must be confessed, hasty judgments must be canceled, warnings against each other destroyed, certain books withdrawn, and tears of repentance shed”²⁶⁶ by others—though not, it appears, by them for their false prediction. In fact, part of the reason for the failure of Christ to return in 1914 was criticism of Evan Roberts for making such a prophecy.²⁶⁷ Had the false prophecy been received rather than rejected, it would have come to pass. While it was therefore evident that those who rejected the supernatural visitations of Roberts and Penn-Lewis were the real problem, around this time there arose “deep depression in Evan’s spirit and new forms of pain in Jessie’s body,” and not only did publication of *The Overcomer* cease, but “the prayer watch was . . . moved elsewhere, and the book production slowed down and suspended.”²⁶⁸ The *Overcomer* magazine did not return until 1920,²⁶⁹ by which time, it seems, the fallout from Roberts’s and Penn-Lewis’s blatantly false prophecy had been mitigated.

Roberts’s “claims to special insights and divine orders and supernatural visitations” led critics to say that his “overheated imagination . . . [was] a fatal blow to real . . . religious movements,”²⁷⁰ but the critics surely were not correct, although after Roberts’ ministry had run its course, in the areas where he had preached “the revival disappeared, and [Roberts’ work] has made those valleys in Wales almost inaccessible to

²⁶⁴ Pg. 249, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. The eschatological views of her later years are recorded on pgs. 281-290, *ibid*.

²⁶⁵ Pg. 178, *The Overcomer*, December 1913. *The Overcomer* magazine itself had a worldwide influence, reaching “the spiritual section of the Church in every land,” being distributed in “Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Soudan [*sic*], Egypt, North Africa, Japan, Korea, China, Thibet [*sic*], India, Burmah [*sic*], Northern and Southern Europe, North and South and Central America, and isle after isle on the seas” (pg. 186, *The Overcomer*, December 1914).

²⁶⁶ Pg. 214, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. One notes that this requirement that spiritual unity and holiness increase as a prerequisite for the coming of Christ is exactly the opposite of what Scripture affirms the last days will be like (2 Timothy 3:1ff.)—but since setting dates for the return of Christ is also exactly the opposite of the teaching of Scripture (Matthew 24:36), perhaps one ought not to be surprised.

²⁶⁷ Pgs. 196-199, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁶⁸ Pg. 216, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

²⁶⁹ Pg. 218, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

²⁷⁰ Pg. 101, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

any further divine intervention.”²⁷¹ “Many . . . voiced criticism of the revival for its failure to achieve any long-lasting results,”²⁷² and Roberts himself, some time later, “explained [as] tragic errors” a variety of his supernatural declarations, affirming that they were “evidence of Satan’s power to exercise control . . . by entering into the heart, influencing the mind, and troubling the spirit,”²⁷³ so Evan Roberts himself affirmed that Satan had entered his heart, and affected his mind and spirit, in the Welsh holiness revival.²⁷⁴ “Roberts later became very critical of the revival for its emphasis on emotional excess and what he saw as the influence of demonic powers.”²⁷⁵ He declared: “[D]uring the revival in Wales, I, in my ignorance, did not escape the wiles of the enemy.”²⁷⁶ Indeed, Evan Roberts confessed that he had not “escaped the wiles . . . [of] the arch-fiend,” but had “deep, varied, and awful experiences of the invisible powers of darkness.”²⁷⁷ “In “later years . . . he . . . would question whether it was the Holy Spirit who commanded these things,”²⁷⁸ and “he confessed to a fear that he had been tricked by Satan.”²⁷⁹ In fact, he came to see that many of the “visions and voices he had known and all the examples of his strange power to look into people’s thoughts and feelings” were “proof that he . . . had been deceived” during the Welsh holiness revival, and he recognized that in important aspects of his holiness revival message also “he had been deceived by the father of lies,”²⁸⁰ although not all of his encounters with spirits were evil, to be sure—only some of them were, and the “antidote to deception” was not *sola Scriptura* and cessationism, but the doctrine of the Cross that Jessie Penn-Lewis had herself learned by a vision in accordance with her belief in the Quaker Inner Light.²⁸¹ However, Roberts acknowledged that “he began to find it hard to distinguish Satanic suggestions from the Spirit’s promptings, and even harder to discern which ‘voices’ were only echoes of desires within his own mind.” He “could not always see when his visions and voices were . . . spiritual” and when they were not, saw that he needed help so that he

²⁷¹ Pg. 183, *The Pentecostals*, Walter Hollenweger.

²⁷² Pg. 527, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope. The “social effects of the revival,” although significant, lasted “only for a short time” (pg. 528, *ibid.*). “Concern was expressed in the denominational press as early as 1907 that the chapels were emptier than they had been” (pg. 529, *ibid.*).

²⁷³ Pg. 102, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁷⁴ Cf. also pg. 521, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

²⁷⁵ Pg. 525, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

²⁷⁶ Pg. 168, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁷⁷ Pg. 180, *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

²⁷⁸ Pg. 120, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁷⁹ Pg. 126, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸⁰ Pg. 159, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸¹ Pg. 173, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

could get to the place where he could “differentiate [the] voice [of the] Lord . . . from the cunning of the Evil One,”²⁸² and even “told . . . [an assembly of] students that he was not even sure whether the Spirit suggested things or actually spoke,”²⁸³ although another time he contradicted himself and said: “I am as certain that the Spirit has spoken to me as I am of my own existence,” as he was “[a]t the time . . . hearing this actualized voice” as he was “heading for a bout of nervous prostration and depression and perplexity.”²⁸⁴ Sometimes a spirit would speak to Evan in Welsh, sometimes in English, and sometimes in both.²⁸⁵ He had such close connections with the spirit world that “a voice” even told him things as small as to “draw a fourth line” underneath a word he had underlined three times or to command: “[R]ise from your bed.”²⁸⁶ A “voice” led Evan on the “journey which ended in a full acceptance of the doctrine of identification with the Crucified One”²⁸⁷ learned by vision and then preached by Jessie Penn-Lewis. In any case, although Satan had entered his heart, many of Roberts’ visions “were truly inspired,” and these marvels validated that the statements in Joel 2:28-32 and Acts 2:17-21 about visions were being fulfilled in Wales,²⁸⁸ as, after all, Roman Catholic “monks” and “Welsh heroes” had experienced similar supernatural guidance.²⁸⁹ Since only some of his supernatural

²⁸² Pg. 113, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸³ Pg. 105, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸⁴ Pg. 108, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸⁵ Pgs. 110-112, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸⁶ Pg. 114, 116, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸⁷ Pg. 113, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁸⁸ Pg. 104, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. The historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism correctly notes that Acts 2:17-21 and Joel 2:28-32 do not refer to events taking place after the first century and before the seventieth week of Daniel 9; see “Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism,” by Thomas Ross. Elec. acc. <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>. **Change this b/c of adding paper in.**

²⁸⁹ Pg. 109, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Further instances of visions, voices, and similar manifestations, some of which Roberts affirmed were from God, and others from Satan, are recorded on pgs. 25, 26, 29, 31, 35, 40, 48, 77, 84, 104, 113, 135, 154, 267, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

Penn-Lewis argued: “Joel said *in those days* will I pour out my Spirit.’ The expression [i]s in the long Hebrew tense, expressing continuance of action, literally an *incoming, unfinished, and continuous* outpouring[.] It therefore appears that the words ‘in those days’ cover the whole dispensation of the Spirit, beginning with the Day of Pentecost” (pgs. 14-15, *The Awakening in Wales*). For this reason, although Joel is actually not speaking about the “dispensation of the Spirit” in the church age in context, since “those days” (Joel 2:29; 3:1, **בַּיָּמִים הַהֵלֵלִים**) refers to the Tribulation period (3:1ff.), Penn-Lewis nonetheless goes on to argue in later portions of *The Awakening in Wales* that the signs and wonders of Joel 2 should be expected in her time and in the remaining portion of this age. Her alleged proof from the fact that the Hebrew verb **אֶשְׂפֹּךְ**, “I will pour,” is in the imperfect tense, which is exactly what Joel would use to express a simple future, and which cannot possibly bear her “incoming, unfinished, and continuous” idea the overwhelming majority of the time the verb appears in the imperfect tense in the Bible (Genesis 37:22; Exodus 29:12; Leviticus 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; Deuteronomy 12:16, 24; 15:23; 2 Kings 19:32; Job 16:13; Psalm 42:4; 102:1; 142:2; Isaiah 37:33; Jeremiah 7:6; 22:3; Ezekiel 7:8; 33:25; Daniel 11:15; Hosea 5:10; Joel 2:28–29) is not a little curious, but since she knew no Hebrew, perhaps it is understandable.

encounters were Satanic, when Roberts emerged briefly from two decades of seclusion in the Penn-Lewis household in the “Little Revival” of 1928-1930, which was “short-lived” and restricted to “the faithful ones in and near Gorseinon and Loughor” rather than being “a national awakening,”²⁹⁰ he again employed his powers of seeing people’s hearts, and also was involved in “healings, exorcisms, and . . . prophesyings,” since all such “gifts of the Spirit were scriptural” for the present day, a view he had held since at least the time of the 1904 Welsh holiness revival on.²⁹¹ “It was hardly surprising that some thought that Evan Roberts had become an Apostolic or Pentecosta[.].”²⁹² However, it was “an unpleasant shock for” Roberts to discover that already in “1931” there were “few signs of the [1928-1930] revival’s lasting influence.”²⁹³ “One year later he went into final retirement and vanished into the shadows of history,”²⁹⁴ becoming “almost a forgotten man.”²⁹⁵ Many considered his lack of attendance at prayer meetings and other church events in favor of discussions among poets and attendance at “theatres” a “proof of serious backsliding.”²⁹⁶ Roberts “abandoned his rigorist ethics, went to football matches and smoked a pipe.”²⁹⁷ In 1942, advising David Shepherd in a letter, Roberts “said nothing at all about praying” and wrote: “The only word I would have you receive from me is, ‘Use your commonsense. Revelation tends to undermine it. Harness your intellectual powers and drive hard.’” This advice was very “unlike the man who saw visions . . . and even more unlike the great intercessor and valued adviser of *The Overcomer* period. Surely some kind of personal declension had overtaken him.”²⁹⁸ He lived a reclusive life in his old age, living off from the gifts of “Welsh friends . . . which supplemented his pension and the quarterly allowance from the Aged and Infirm Fund.”²⁹⁹ He “show[ed] little enthusiasm . . . when people began to talk about a fortieth year anniversary meeting of the revival . . . [in] 1944 . . . and he finally sent his

²⁹⁰ Pg. 216, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁹¹ Pg. 221-223, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁹² Pg. 221, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁹³ Pg. 224, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Indeed, in the 1930s there was “a serious decline . . . [in the] thousand nonconformist chapels of Welsh Wales . . . [a great] decline in spiritual vitality” (pg. 225, *ibid.*), a decline, indeed, that set in immediately after and as a result of Roberts’ ministry in the holiness revival of 1904. Roberts wrote about the decline in Welsh Christianity in the years after the holiness revival in 1904 through the 1930s: “Where are the multitudes which used to grow on the rich meadows of the precious Gospel?” (pg. 269, *ibid.*).

²⁹⁴ Pg. 224, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁹⁵ Pg. 225, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁹⁶ Pgs. 228, 248, cf. 225-258, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁹⁷ Pg. 182, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

²⁹⁸ Pgs. 239-240, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

²⁹⁹ Pg. 247, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

excuses.”³⁰⁰ After leaving the home of Jessie Penn-Lewis, he “spent most of the rest of his life in lodges in Cardiff. Although initially dedicating himself to a ministry of intercessory prayer,” he evidenced growing “dissatisfaction as he grew older. Notebooks in which he wrote during the last decade of his life reveal him as a lonely and somewhat bitter figure and are . . . almost totally devoid of religious zeal. Witness the following verse, written in English and dated 1 December 1944:

I’ve changed, I doubt it not, I’ve changed a lot,
I know I feel a change as great as odd,
To think I have come home and am forgot
As much by kin as I have been by God.³⁰¹

He died in a Cardiff nursing home on 29 January 1951.”³⁰² Roberts’ final testimony was, sadly, far more like that of Demas (2 Timothy 4:10),³⁰³ and like those who confused standing up with conversion and regeneration in Roberts’ holiness revival meetings, than that of the Apostle Paul: “I have fought a good fight, I have finished *my* course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day” (2 Timothy 4:7-8).

While Roberts’ testimony of the new birth is far from certain, he affirmed that during his work in the holiness revival Satan had entered his heart, and he died with scarcely a glimmer of Christian piety, throughout the Welsh holiness revival Roberts’ “spiritual input” was “through ministering the gifts of the Spirit,” leading Welsh Christendom to a “new respect for the possibilities of supernatural happenings, such as visions, guidances, and discerning of spirits . . . prophesyings and healings,” releasing “vital forces into chapels and churches of his day,” which were spread to “revival converts” and then “all over the world through the literature and conferences of *The Overcomers*,” so that “charismatic and other fellowships . . . have inherited his teaching.”³⁰⁴ “Amongst the ‘children of the revival’ . . . from Wales speaking in tongues became very prominent in the early days of the Pentecostal movement,”³⁰⁵ so that through them Pentecostalism spread all over Wales.³⁰⁶ The practices of Evan Roberts,

³⁰⁰ Pg. 249, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

³⁰¹ Calvinistic Methodist Archive, National Library of Wales, 25632, cited pg. 526, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

³⁰² Pg. 526, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

³⁰³ Contrast the inaccurate statement that Roberts died “a man of rare charm and spirituality” on pg. 129 of *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck. Polluck would have done well to dig more deeply rather than simply reproducing the hagiography of Roberts’ obituary.

³⁰⁴ Pg. 254-256, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

³⁰⁵ Pg. 184, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³⁰⁶ Already by 1908 Pentecostalism had filled South Wales; pgs. 34-37, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

and those influenced by him in the Welsh holiness revival, were almost identical with those of Pentecostalism. Higher Life leaders recognized that a “similar gracious work of the Spirit to that in Wales is in progress [in Los Angeles at Azuza Street],”³⁰⁷ since “the Welsh revival . . . served as an inspiration and model for the Pentecostal revival.”³⁰⁸ The only significant difference was that Roberts was a passionate continuationist who prepared the way for the restoration³⁰⁹ of ecstatic jibber-jabber, but had not personally added that particular marvel to his roster, while the Pentecostals took over the marvels and continuationism of Roberts and added a gift of babbling to them. As Roberts’s revival was, so the Pentecostal Azuza Street revival was anti-doctrinal, anti-creedal, and ecumenical.³¹⁰ Both works were filled with marvels of healing of the Faith Cure variety,³¹¹ visions of and encounters with what were affirmed to be the Lord Jesus, Satan, and other supernatural beings,³¹² and supernatural lights.³¹³ Both works were

³⁰⁷ Pg. 86, *Way of Faith* (Columbia, S. C.), September 6, 1906, quoted in *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As it Was in the Beginning*, 2nd ed., Frank Bartleman. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, n. d. orig. pub. 1925.

³⁰⁸ Pgs. 141-142, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

³⁰⁹ The onset of the Pentecostal movement was, indeed, new—ecstatic babbling did not exist among true churches or orthodox Christianity, although it was found in association with demon possession among spiritualists and others:

[T]he Church came to regard speaking in tongues as an infallible sign of demon possession. Yet, with few exceptions, the Pentecostals have maintained that speaking in tongues has had a continuous history from the Apostolic age to the present. Although, they say, the practice fell into eclipse at an early point, a succession of small groups kept it alive until its full restoration to the Church in the 20th-century Pentecostal revival. . . . Pentecostals have constructed a history of the “true,” or at least “spiritual,” Church from the days of Pentecost to the present. They have compiled long lists of “authorities” to show that tongue-speaking was practiced by the sub-Apostolic church, the Waldenses, the Albigenses . . . Anabaptists. . . . and many others; and that Luther, Finney, and Moody spoke in tongues while Wesley endorsed it. These claims are, with the exception of the [grossly heretical] Camisards, Shakers, and Mormons, without factual foundation, as [even] some Pentecostal writers . . . have recognized. Some [advocates of the invented Pentecostal history of orthodox Christian tongues-speech] depend upon forced interpretations of primary sources, others are based upon secondary works presumed to be authoritative. . . . [T]he only groups . . . for whom speaking in tongues is well attested were the . . . Camisards in the late 17th century, Ann Lee’s Shaking Quakers, . . . and the Irvingite, Mormon, and Spiritualist movements, which grew out of the . . . revivalism of the 1830’s and 1840’s. . . . [S]peaking in tongues has apparently been non-existent in the . . . historic Christian churches since the Apostolic era . . . while modern Pentecostalism is phenomenologically related to . . . the Shakers, Mormons, Irvingites, and Spiritualists—who had previously practiced tongues-speaking. (pgs. 25-27, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson)

³¹⁰ Pgs. xiv, xxiv-xxv, 16, 24, 34, 68, 75, 83, 167-173, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³¹¹ Pgs. xii-xiii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³¹² Pgs. xii, 17, 25-26, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³¹³ Pg. 60, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. The supernatural lights, comparable to those of the Welsh holiness revival, were also affirmed to be present, among many other instances, when Parham first spoke in tongues (pg. 54, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson) and when the father of European Pentecostalism, T. B. Barratt, did so, whose influence “in connection with the Pentecostal Revival . . . would be difficult to

characterized by disorganized meetings that went on for hours and hours and were led by supernatural powers, with total spontaneity as to what took place,³¹⁴ rather than organized meetings directed by preachers or other church officials,³¹⁵ people falling to the ground as “slain by the Spirit,”³¹⁶ a heavy emphasis upon testimonial as a validation of their work and a corresponding absence of careful exposition of Scripture,³¹⁷ predominant support from those not well-grounded in Scripture and opposition from church leadership,³¹⁸ a rejection of grammatical-historical interpretation of Scripture for experience-based interpretation and a downplaying of doctrine,³¹⁹ prophetic exhortations delivered not by men only, but also women and children, to the entire congregation,³²⁰ and little preaching³²¹ or no preaching at all.³²² The sole difference of note in Pentecostalism was an increased amount of babbling,³²³ the spawn of the spirits that produced identical

overestimate” (pg. 189, cf. 14-15, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee; cf. pgs. 49, 84, 124, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Cf. pg. 121 for Barratt’s connection to A. B. Simpson and to Azuza Street). Indeed, “Balls, streaks, and pillars of fire were seen so often that they were known as ‘the “like as of fire,”’ referring to and misusing Acts 2:3 (pg. 263, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

³¹⁴ Pgs. 57-59, 131, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³¹⁵ Pgs. 16, 84, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³¹⁶ Pgs. 59-60, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³¹⁷ Pgs. xxi, 87-88, 175, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed.

Synan.

³¹⁸ Pg. 27, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³¹⁹ Compare pgs. 154-155, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

³²⁰ Pgs. 59, 103, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

One of the twelve “elders” of the Azuza Street Mission was a ten-year-old girl; her mother was another “elder” (pg. 70, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.). Either both the mother and her ten-year-old daughter were “the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly” (Titus 1:6), or the spirits at work at Azuza led the leaders there to reject what Paul recorded through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

³²¹ Pg. 84, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan; pg. 68, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

³²² Pgs. 87-88, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³²³ The question is not one of the absence in Wales or presence in Pentecostalism of unintelligible speech. The holiness revival under Roberts featured the practice, rooted in pre-Christian Welsh paganism, of the Welsh *hywl*. The Welsh *hywl* was an “ancient and sacred” Welsh practice (pg. 45, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson) found in the Welsh holiness revival as “speaking in a strange, weird, curious mesmeric manner: it is a unique kind of incantation” (E. Cynolwyn Pugh, “The Welsh Revival of 1904-1905,” *Theology Today* XII (July 1955) 226-235, elec. acc. <http://www.revival-library.org/catalogues/1904ff/pugh.html>). While the *hwyl* was not identical with modern Pentecostal gibberish-speech, nonetheless “[s]ome observers of the Welsh revival, hearing unfamiliar speech in prayer and preaching . . . the . . . Welsh ‘hwyl,’ . . . reported that worshippers were speaking in tongues” (pg. 45, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson). See also pg. 147, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

babbling in many pagan religions as a result of demon possession.³²⁴ A description of a meeting at Azuza Street, and one where Evan Roberts ministered marvel-working power, is almost identical. The following eyewitness description of the Pentecostal Azuza Street Mission could, with a change of a few minor details and with the removal of the specific added marvel of babbling as an alleged restoration of Biblical tongues, be a description of many a meeting with Evan Roberts:

Breathing strange utterances and mouthing a creed which it would seem no sane mortal could understand, the newest religious sect has started in Los Angeles. Meetings are held in a tumble-down shack on Azuza Street . . . and devotees of the weird doctrine practice the most fanatical rites, preach the wildest theories and work themselves into a state of mad excitement in their peculiar zeal. Colored people and a sprinkling of whites compose the congregation, and night is made hideous in the neighborhood by the howlings of the worshippers who spend hours swaying forth and back in a nerve-[w]racking attitude of prayer and supplication. They claim to have “the gift of tongues,” and to be able to comprehend the babel.

Such a startling claim has never yet been made by any company of fanatics, even in Los Angeles, the home of almost numberless creeds. Sacred tenets, reverently mentioned by the orthodox believer, are dealt with in a familiar, if not irreverent, manner by these latest religionists.

An old colored exhorter [William Seymour], blind in one eye, is the major-domo of the company. With his stony optic fixed on some luckless unbeliever, the old man yells his defiance and challenges an answer. Anathemas are heaped upon him who shall dare to gainsay the utterances of the preacher.

Clasped in his big fist the colored brother holds a miniature Bible from which he reads at intervals one or two words—never more. After an hour of exhortation the breth[ren] present are invited to join in a “meeting of prayer, song, and testimony.” Then it is that pandemonium breaks loose, and the bounds of reason are passed by those who are “filled with the spirit,” whatever that may be.

“You-oo-oo gou-loo-loo come under the bloo-oo-oo bloo-oo,” shouts an old colored “mammy,” in a frenzy of religious zeal. Swinging her arms wildly about her, she continues with the strangest harangue ever uttered. Few of her words are intelligible, and for the most part her testimony contained the most outrageous jumble of syllables, which are listened to with awe by the company.

One of the wildest of the meetings was held last night, and the highest pitch of excitement was reached by the gathering, which continues to “worship” until nearly midnight. The old exhorter urged the “sisters” to let the “tongues come forth” and the women gave themselves over to a riot of religious fervor. As a result a [plump] dame was overcome with excitement and almost fainted.

³²⁴ “Speaking in tongues as a sign of Spirit possession has a history whose origins very likely lie deep in mankind’s past. Reports of the practice extend from ancient to modern times in virtually every region of the world. What astonishes the novice student of tongue-speaking is how extraordinarily common this seemingly exotic [to those in Christendom] practice has been and still is. The phenomenon has certainly been far more extensive and frequent among non-Christians[.] . . . [S]peaking in tongues [was] evident in the inspired prophecies of the Oracle of Apollo at Delphi . . . the Thracian cult of Dionysius, the Egyptian cult of Osiris and Isis, the Syrian cult of Adonis, the Phrygian cult of Attis and Cybele, and the Persian cult of Mithras. . . . [The] Spirit . . . through possession, gave men all sorts of miraculous powers. The pneumatic state was one of ecstasy in which pneuma banishes the human ‘nous’ [or] ‘mind’ and acts or speaks through man. The deity [demon] spoke out of the pneumatic’s mouth in words that neither he nor anyone else could understand unless they were translated by the Pneuma itself. To prove that he was indeed a pneumatic, a person had to demonstrate the presence of the Pneuma within him by engaging in ecstatic behavior, especially ecstatic speech” (pgs. 20-21, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

Undismayed by the fearful attitude of the colored worshipper, another black wom[an] jumped to the floor and began a wild gesticulation, which ended in a gurgle of wordless prayers which were nothing less than shocking.

“She’s speakin’ in unknown tongues,” announced the leader, in [an] awed whisper, “keep on sister.” The sister continued until it was necessary to assist her to a seat because of the bodily fatigue. Among the “believers” is a man who . . . claims to have been miraculously healed and is a convert of the new sect. Another speaker had a vision in which he saw the people of Los Angeles flocking in a mighty stream to perdition. He prophesied awful destruction to this city unless its citizens are brought to a belief in the tenets of the new faith.³²⁵

Indeed, “the most enduring effect of the [Welsh] revival was the contribution it made to the development of Pentecostalism in Britain. . . . The revival . . . creat[ed] new, Pentecostal denominations. . . . it was the Pentecostals who would continue the revival emphases[.]”³²⁶ It is very clear that the “origins of the British Pentecostal movement” are found “in the revival in Wales . . . which played such an important part in the origins of Pentecostalism”³²⁷ as a whole, since the “British Pentecostal movement . . . [was of] decisive importance . . . for many European Pentecostal bodies,”³²⁸ and so the Welsh holiness revival was truly at the root of European Pentecostalism in general. Donald Gee, a “very influential figure in the growth of the Assemblies of God,”³²⁹ and, indeed, the “greatest teacher of the Pentecostal movement . . . was brought to the Pentecostal movement by the revival in Wales” after being “converted in 1905, during the revival in Wales.”³³⁰ Gee went on to become the chairman of the British Assemblies of God and the president of the Bible School of the Assemblies of God in London. He took long worldwide journeys to spread the Pentecostal message everywhere.³³¹ Indeed, if “one looks through a year’s issues of almost any Pentecostal journal, it is virtually impossible not to come across an article by him.”³³² Keswick theology permeates the Assemblies of God and other Pentecostal denominations.³³³ Gee “compares Evan Roberts with the

³²⁵ *Los Angeles Times*, April 18, 1906, pg. 1, reprinted on pgs. 175-177, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³²⁶ Pg. 530, “Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905,” Robert Pope. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57:3 (July 2006) 515-534; cf. pgs. 213, 222, etc., *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

³²⁷ Pgs. 176, 183, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³²⁸ Pg. 208, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³²⁹ Pg. 107, *A Light in the Land: Christianity in Wales, 200-2000*, Gwyn Davies.

³³⁰ Pg. 208, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. Gee made a salvation decision through the preaching of Seth Joshua (pg. 34, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Gee).

³³¹ Pg. 208, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³³² Pg. 209, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³³³ “For years a standard Assemblies of God theology was Myer Pearlman’s work, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*. What Pearlman taught about sanctification is right in line with Keswick ideas. [See pgs. 249-267, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible* (Pentecostal Classics), Myer Pearlman. Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, rev. ed., 1981; note, e. g., his reference to the “Victorious Life” movement on pg. 264.] This is also true of the teaching of Ernest S. Williams, for twenty years the general superintendent

healing evangelists of Pentecostalism.”³³⁴ Daniel Powell Williams professed conversion through Roberts’ ministry and went on to found the Pentecostal Apostolic Church.³³⁵ George Jeffreys, founder of the Elim Pentecostal Movement with his brother Stephen, were leading spiritual products of the holiness revival.³³⁶ George Jeffries had “responded totally to Evan Roberts’s call to obey the Spirit in everything,” and was possessed by the “revival fire” along with his brother Stephen, so that they became the “evangelists and founders of great Pentecostal movements,”³³⁷ as George Jeffries came to spread not only Pentecostal marvels and healings but also British Israelism.³³⁸ After being “drawn into the revival in Wales . . . George and Stephen Jeffreys . . . brought into being . . . [t]he Elim Pentecostal churches.”³³⁹ Stephen participated in “large . . . healing campaigns” that perpetuated within Pentecostalism the characteristics of Faith Cure healings, namely, “mechanical and auto-suggestive methods of healing . . . relatively small numbers healed, [and] the considerable difference [in number] between those who ‘professed conversion in the campaigns’ and those who later joined”³⁴⁰ churches. Furthermore, the “father of the British Pentecostal movement . . . [and] a leading personality in the international Pentecostal movement . . . the Anglican priest A. A. Boddy, took part in the revival movement in Wales and worked with Evan Roberts. He was convinced that the Pentecostal movement was a direct continuation of the revival.”³⁴¹ Soon he was hosting

of the Assemblies of God. [See pgs. 31-61, *Systematic Theology*, Ernest S. Williams, vol. 3. Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, 1953, where Keswick writers such as Evan Hopkins, J. Elder Cumming, and Andrew Murray are cited and a Keswick view of sanctification is espoused; Wesleyan influence appears also in vol. 2, pgs. 256-264.] More recently, the preeminent theologian in the American Assemblies of God has been Stanley Horton. His teaching fits well with that of his earlier colleagues. [See pgs. 167-196, *What the Bible Says About the Holy Spirit*, Stanley M. Horton. Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, 1976.] The Assemblies of God is not unique in the Pentecostal movement in its tight correlation with Keswick views. Representative of the Foursquare Church is the standard theology written by Duffield and Van Cleave. In this one can see the same patterns as are found in Keswick, too. [See pgs. 291-324, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1983.) There is no question that the Keswick movement had an important role in the shaping of the theology of much of the Pentecostal world” (“Keswick and the Higher Life,” <http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm>).

³³⁴ Pgs. 176-177, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³³⁵ Pg. 530, “Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905,” Pope.

³³⁶ Pg. 530, “Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905,” Pope.

³³⁷ Pg. 185, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

³³⁸ George Jeffries prominently preached British Israelism as he, after 1940, founded the “Bible-Pattern Church Fellowship,” another Pentecostal denomination he originated some years after he co-founded the Elim Pentecostal movement (cf. pgs. 186-187, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee).

³³⁹ Pg. 197, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. “[M]ost of the . . . Elim congregations . . . had been founded by George Jeffreys” (pg. 207, *ibid*).

³⁴⁰ Pg. 207, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. Cf. pgs. 148-151, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

³⁴¹ Pgs. 184-185, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. “Boddy was . . . the acknowledged leader of early Pentecostalism in Britain” (pg. 60, “Boddy, Alexander,” *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed.

“national and international Pentecostal conferences” in his Anglican church.³⁴² As an Anglican priest wanting to spread charismatic doctrine and practices, “Boddy . . . was fortunate in having a Bishop who was exceptionally lenient, and even sympathetic, [to] the notorious Pentecostal meetings” he held, namely, the great Keswick continuationist “Handley G. Moule,” who “raised . . . no ecclesiastical hindrances . . . to those remarkable scenes in connection with a Parish Church in his diocese” because of his sympathy for Boddy.³⁴³ “Boddy . . . [also] brought the Keswick understanding of ‘baptism in the Spirit’ as an endowment of power into the British Pentecostal movement,”³⁴⁴ so that “through his influence, a Keswickian understanding of ‘baptism of the Holy Spirit’ became normative for most Pentecostal movements.”³⁴⁵ The Anglican priest distributed thousands of copies of his charismatic promotional work *Pentecost for England* at the Keswick Convention in 1907, leading many into the experience of Pentecostal tongues,³⁴⁶ for at the 1907 Keswick “[t]hose who [had] tongues [were] present, and unable and unwilling to control them when moved by the Spirit.”³⁴⁷ Boddy went on to found the “Sunderland Conventions,” which from “the point of view of the early history of the Pentecostal Movement in the British Isles . . . must occupy the supreme place in importance. . . . From those early Sunderland Conventions the

Larsen). Boddy’s personal testimony to his association with Evan Roberts and the parallels between the Welsh holiness revival and the Pentecostal revival appears on pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:6 (Los Angeles, February-March 1907), reprinted on pg. 21, *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. Note also pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:8 (May 1907) & pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:9 (Los Angeles, June-September 1907), reprinted on pgs. 33, 37, *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.

reprinted on pg. 37, *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)

³⁴² Pg. 71, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

³⁴³ Pgs. 23-24, 88, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

³⁴⁴ “Keswick and the Higher Life,” <http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm>.

³⁴⁵ Pg. 253, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

³⁴⁶ Pgs. 20-21, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

³⁴⁷ Pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:6 (Los Angeles, February-March 1907), reprinted on pg. 21, *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. The article is predicting what would take place: “‘Tongues’ at Keswick.” Pentecostals were present at, promoted, and enjoyed Keswick from the time of the rise of Pentecostalism; see, e. g., the account of Pentecostal attendance at Keswick on pgs. 12-13 of the Pentecostal *Latter Rain Evangel* of September, 1922; a message from the 1922 Convention, where the Keswick speaker testifies that he was healed by the Higher Life of the body from arm pain, is reproduced on pgs. 19-24.

Pentecostal Flame was carried into practically every corner of the British Isles.”³⁴⁸ Similarly, Pentecostals were engaged in prominent proselytizing at the 1908 Keswick.³⁴⁹ Indubitably, the British “prominent Pentecostal streams were . . . deeply influenced by the revival in Wales”³⁵⁰ and its Keswick continuationism.

The Welsh holiness revival was central to the spread of Pentecostalism on the European continent, as it was in Britain:

[G]lossolalia gained renewed attention through the phenomena that accompanied the revivals in Wales, Los Angeles, Christiania, Hamburg, Kassel, and other places. . . . [T]he revival in Wales under Evan Roberts produced . . . psychological and physical abnormalities . . . and sparked them also in other countries (California, Norway, Denmark, Hesse, Silesia)[.] . . . [O]pinions . . . strongly diverged. [Pentecostals] viewed speaking in tongues and similar phenomena as a renewal of the gifts of Pentecost and powerful evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit, but others . . . pronounced everything to be a work of the devil and a deception of the antichrist.³⁵¹

News of the Welsh holiness revival brought “expectation . . . almost to a boiling point . . . [i]n Germany in 1904.”³⁵² The groundwork for Pentecostalism had been laid by Keswick continuationist “American Holiness evangelists”³⁵³ such as Robert Pearsall Smith and the central German Higher Life advocate, the Lutheran Theodore Jellinghaus.³⁵⁴ Jellinghaus recognized that “the ‘doctrine of the Keswick Conventions’ which he . . . taught for many years [was] the source [of] . . . the rise of the Pentecostal movement.”³⁵⁵ Soon after 1904

³⁴⁸ Pgs. 37-39, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

³⁴⁹ For example, the Pentecostal journal *Confidence* records:

At Keswick [in 1908] . . . We had heard a message on the power of the Christ Life. The mid-day meal over, we were on the lake, a happy Pentecostal party. . . . Our hearts were full of praise, as we sang: . . . “Jesus . . . Blessed Saviour, Sanctifier, Glorious Lord and coming King. . . . Keswick Convention this year was again the meeting-place for very many of the Lord’s Children, and we were glad to see there faces we had looked into at the [Pentecostal] Sunderland Conference. There were also hungry ones there longing to know experimentally the secret of victory and of power.

A brother from Jersey was telling those to whom the Lord led him, how he had left Keswick for three days to visit Sunderland, and had there received a mighty deliverance, a Vision of Jesus and of his own nothingness, and the overwhelming Baptism of the Holy Ghost with the Sign of Tongues. . . .

We saw other friends with copies of [the Pentecostal periodical] ‘Confidence’ under their arms ready for enquirers. . . . Many of us thank God for Keswick in the past. . . . [T]he Lord . . . is calling His people to an experimental Pentecost, their Birthright because of the Shed blood of Calvary. (pgs. 13-14, *Confidence: A Pentecostal Paper for Great Britain*, 5 (August 15, 1908).

³⁵⁰ Pg. 107, *A Light in the Land: Christianity in Wales, 200-2000*, Gwyn Davies.

³⁵¹ Pg. 503, *Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 3: Sin and Salvation in Christ*, Bavinck & pg. 159, *Reformed Dogmatics, Volume 4: Holy Spirit, Church, and New Creation*, Bavinck.

³⁵² Pg. 221, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³⁵³ Pg. 221, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³⁵⁴ See chapters 6-7 of *Perfectionism*, vol. 1, B. B. Warfield, for an analysis of the rise and progress of the German Higher Life movement and a study of the embrace and promulgation of Higher Life theology by Jellinghaus through the influence of Robert P. Smith at the Oxford Convention (cf. pg. 225, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874), along with the later Jellinghaus’ and German evangelical repudiation of the Higher Life and the Pentecostal doctrine that logically develops from it.

³⁵⁵ Pg. 225, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. The affirmation of Jellinghaus was true for not Germany only, but Pentecostalism in general (cf. pg. 45, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee).

“[e]very [German] Evangelical journal published enthusiastic reports of the beginnings of the Pentecostal Movement in Wales and India,”³⁵⁶ and, through such testimonials, charismatic phenomena began to arise all through Germany in hearts prepared for Pentecostalism by Keswick theology. “Objections based on the Bible and systematic theology were insolently rejected,” for Pentecostals argued: “We do not need to investigate whether it is biblical to speak of a baptism of the Spirit and a new experience of Pentecost, for we can see all around us men and women, and not only individuals, who can testify from their own blessed experience that there is such a thing.”³⁵⁷ In line with the Welsh holiness revival’s repudiation of the mind, logic, and systematic theology, Pentecostals taught: “We need no more theology or theory. Let the devil have them. . . . Away with such foolish bondage! Follow your Heart!”³⁵⁸ Although Pentecostal founders knew that “many ‘winds of doctrine’ blew at Azuza Street” and there were “intrusion[s] of spiritualists and mediums into their midst,” nonetheless it was clear to the charismatics that the work was a real “revival [and] the beginning of a historic awakening.”³⁵⁹ The international impact of the Welsh holiness revival, as the source of European Pentecostalism, was truly profound.

Not only was the Welsh holiness revival the spark of Pentecostalism in Britain and on the European continent, but it was central to the rise of American Pentecostalism also. The Azuza Street Mission, where “the Pentecostal movement ignited,”³⁶⁰ was “regarded by Pentecostal publicists as the place of origin of the world-wide Pentecostal movements,” was established by W. J. Seymour, who had been seeing visions from his youth and had adopted the Faith Cure theology of the Higher Life for the body, after which he suffered from smallpox and became permanently blind in one eye.³⁶¹ “Seymour . . . in common with Evan Roberts’ leadership in the Welsh Revival . . . preached very

³⁵⁶ Pg. 222, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. The Welsh holiness revival was key to the spread of Pentecostalism to India. “Wales was . . . the cradle . . . India . . . the Nazareth . . . Los Angeles . . . [the] world-wide restoration of the power of God” in the Pentecostal movement, for “[m]en who had been both in the Wales and India revivals declared this [charismatic one] to be the deepest work of all” (pgs. 90, 107, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan).

³⁵⁷ Pg. 222, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

³⁵⁸ Pg. 92, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. The teaching at Azuza Street, that “[w]hat the people need is a living Christ, not dogmatic, doctrinal contention” (pg. 101, *ibid*) is fine, ecumenical, non-dogmatic Keswick theology.

³⁵⁹ Pgs. xx-xxi, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁶⁰ Pg. 43, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.

³⁶¹ Pg. 595, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

little, and more or less allowed things to go their own way.”³⁶² Seymour’s work found fertile soil in Los Angeles because of the preparatory work of “Joseph Smale and Frank Bartleman . . . preachers who had been influenced by the revival in Wales.”³⁶³ As the Higher Life continuationist foundation for Pentecostalism was being laid in Los Angeles, the “religious life of the city was dominated by Joseph Smale, whose large First Baptist Church had been transformed into the ‘New Testament Church’ due to the effects of the Welsh revival which were being felt in Los Angeles at the time.”³⁶⁴ Smale’s transformation from a Baptist into a continuationist gift-seeker is paradigmatic of the type of influence the Welsh holiness revival under Evan Roberts exerted. The methodology and practices of Evan Roberts had swept into Los Angeles in 1905, being concentrated in Smale’s First Baptist Church.³⁶⁵ “The revival in Smale’s church was sparked by news of the great Welsh revival of 1904-5 led by Evan Roberts. A trip to Wales by Smale and an exchange of letters between Bartleman and Evan Roberts demonstrate a direct spiritual link between the move of God³⁶⁶ in Wales and the pentecostal outpouring in Los Angeles in 1906.”³⁶⁷ After Smale “returned from Wales,” having “been in touch with the revival [there] and Evan Roberts, [he] was on fire to have the same visitation and blessing come to his own church in Los Angeles. . . . They were waiting on God for an outpouring of the Spirit there.”³⁶⁸ Smale began to “preac[h] . . . on the revival in Wales,”³⁶⁹ instead of

³⁶² Pg. 12, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee. In a manner also reminiscent of Evan Roberts’ actions in the pulpit, in Seymour’s meetings “[h]e usually kept his head inside the top . . . [of] two empty shoe boxes . . . during the meeting, in prayer” (pg. 58, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan). Indeed, “[w]hile Brother Seymour kept his head inside the old empty box in ‘Azusa’ all was well” (pg. 89, *ibid.*).

³⁶³ Pg. 22, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger. Hollenweger affirms that Smale and Bartleman were Baptists, but they were only so in the sense that Jezebel (Revelation 2:20) or Diotrephes (3 John 9) or Judas (Acts 1:25) were Baptists before they publicly apostatized. The meeting and coworking of Seymour and Bartleman is described on pgs. 41ff., *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁶⁴ Pg. xi, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. See pgs. 13-42 for a detailed description of how the separation from Baptist doctrine and the adoption of Pentecostalism took place. While the statement above is a reasonable summary of events, a more detailed description would note that Smale actually left—with much of his congregation—the First Baptist Church to establish the New Testament Church; there was a church split, with some wishing to continue to practice Baptist doctrine instead of adopting wholesale the practices of Evan Roberts.

³⁶⁵ Pg. xv, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁶⁶ That is, one who accepts Pentecostalism would consider both the work of Evan Roberts and the work of Pentecostalism a move of God in revival blessing. One who rejects Pentecostalism would also need to reject the work of Evan Roberts in Wales.

³⁶⁷ Pg. xvi, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁶⁸ Pg. 13, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Scripture never teaches believers in the church age to seek another outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit was poured out in the book of Acts, and He is now present. The Lord will not pour Him out again until the Tribulation period after the Rapture of the saints.

preaching only the Bible. Meetings in his church were carried on in a manner identical to that of those with Evan Roberts.³⁷⁰ Soon “Pastor Smale [was] prophesying of wonderful things to come. He prophesie[d] the speedy return of the apostolic ‘gifts’ to the church,” as others, prepared by the testimonials to the Higher Life and marvels worked in Wales, had “been expecting just such a display of . . . power for some time,” thinking that “it might break out any hour.”³⁷¹ After fifteen weeks of daily meetings, Smale and those he had led away from Baptist convictions separated themselves from those who wanted the old paths and organized the “New Testament Church” to continue to spread the innovations and strange fire from Wales.³⁷² As tongues began to break out at the Azusa Street Mission,³⁷³ “Brother Smale had to come to ‘Azusa,’” for many of his church members were there, speaking in gibberish. Smale “invited them back home, promised them liberty in the Spirit,” and tongues were “wrought mightily at the New Testament Church also.”³⁷⁴ “Brother Smale was God’s Moses, to lead the people as far as to the Jordan” in preparing them to speak in tongues by introducing the practices of Evan Roberts—then “Brother Seymour led them over” into the tongues experience.³⁷⁵ Tongues were present “at Azusa Street [and] at the New Testament Church, where Joseph Smale is pastor; some of his people were among the first to speak with ‘tongues.’”³⁷⁶ Not long afterwards “Brother Elmer Fisher” led the “baptized saints”—those who had spoken in tongues—“from the New Testament Church” to found “the ‘Upper Room’ mission,” which “became for a time the strongest mission in town” to spread the Pentecostal experience.³⁷⁷

³⁶⁹ Pg. 27, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁷⁰ See a description on pgs. 20-21 of *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. A simple change of names from “Smale” to “Roberts” would be the only thing necessary to change the description from a meeting in Los Angeles to one in Wales.

³⁷¹ Pg. 16, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁷² Pgs. 26-27, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁷³ The tongues-speech present at the precursors to Azusa at 214 North Bonnie Brae Street, etc. are described by Anderson on pgs. 64ff. of *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*.

³⁷⁴ Pg. 54, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁷⁵ Pg. 62, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁷⁶ Pg. 86, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁷⁷ Pgs. 84-85, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan; pg. 70, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson. Smale’s New Testament Church experienced a split over Pentecostalism, even as Smale’s First Baptist Church did over Evan Roberts’ Welsh revivalism.

Frank Bartleman³⁷⁸ was likewise profoundly impacted by the Welsh holiness revival on his journey to becoming an Apostle of Pentecostalism. He was born to a Quaker mother, adopted the Gospel of Wealth form of pseudo-Christianity, a form of religion dependent on Social Darwinism³⁷⁹ and with similarities to the Word of Faith doctrine that all believers should be rich, through the preaching of Russell Conwell, “author of the gospel of wealth classic, *Acres of Diamonds*.”³⁸⁰ Conwell baptized Bartleman and licensed him to preach, at which time Bartleman “decided to ‘trust God’ for his body. A lifelong devotion to the doctrine of divine healing followed,”³⁸¹ although Bartleman was “in his own words . . . a ‘life-long semi-invalid’ who ‘always lived with death looking over my shoulder’”³⁸² and lived in “poor health to the end.”³⁸³ Furthermore, as an unregenerate person, Bartleman was able to reject the Trinity and the true gospel by working with and accepting the modalism and works-salvation of the Oneness Pentecostal movement, becoming an important leader in the “Jesus-only” heresy shortly after it began.³⁸⁴ Nevertheless, Bartleman, “[s]tirred by the revival in Wales in 1904 . . . quickly became part of the Azusa Street meetings and the new movement.”³⁸⁵

³⁷⁸ Bartleman’s book is the “only extant narrative by a participant in the April 1906 events” associated with the founding of the worldwide Pentecostal movement in Los Angeles (pg. 49, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970).

³⁷⁹ Pg. 31, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Mapes Anderson.

³⁸⁰ Pg. xii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. While Paul defined preaching the gospel as proclaiming the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and salvation for sinners through faith in Him (1 Corinthians 15:1-4), the Gospel of Wealth preached a different gospel (Galatians 1:8-9). “Exhorting his audiences—who paid for admission—Conwell, in his ‘Acres of Diamonds’ address, said: ‘I say that you ought to get rich, and it is your duty to get rich . . . to make money honestly is to preach the gospel’” (pg. 174, *Who’s Who in Christian History*, ed. Douglas & Comfort). Conwell may have held to the true gospel, but his writings and sermons are either entirely devoid of it or almost entirely so, and he failed to preach it, if he believed in it at all, with anything close to the clarity with which he preached the need to get rich.

³⁸¹ Pg. xii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁸² Pg. xii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Bartleman’s father was also a continuationist, as a Roman Catholic. Bartleman, despite his belief in the Faith Cure, wrote in 1925: “My health had been poor, from a child” (pg. 1, *ibid*. Bartleman’s grammar leaves not a little to be desired throughout his book.) Nor was Bartleman able to heal his own child, who tragically died in 1905 (pg. xv, *ibid*). Bartleman also, despite Romans 13, “occasionally ran afoul of the law” for regularly creating what was essentially Christian graffiti (pg. xiv, *ibid*)—if one can call law-breaking and producing graffiti Christian, which is very highly dubious.

³⁸³ Pg. xxiii-xxiv, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. “Frank Bartleman, like Parham, was afflicted with ailments from infancy: gastric fever, double vision, varicose veins, frequent toothaches, and almost daily sick headaches and dyspepsia” (pg. 102, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson; quote marks in the original source, Bartleman’s *From Plow to Pulpit: From Maine to California*, pgs. 6-12, have been removed).

³⁸⁴ Pg. xxii, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁸⁵ Pg. 74, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

After hearing F. B. Meyer testify to the marvels going on in Wales through the work of Evan Roberts—a work which Meyer associated with the presence of the miraculous gifts of 1 Corinthians 12,³⁸⁶ where tongues are included—Bartleman’s heart was passionately stirred to see the same marvels take place in Los Angeles also. He read chronicles of the Welsh holiness revival and began to distribute many thousands of copies of such works, which were used to “spread the fire in the churches wonderfully.” He “spoke . . . on the revival in Wales” in religious organizations such as the “Friends Church” and other congregations committed to the Higher Life continuationism.³⁸⁷ He also received the ability to prophecy from supernatural spirits, and he “prophesied continually of a mighty outpouring” that was to come.³⁸⁸ Indeed, among those brought under the influence of Evan Roberts, the “spirit of prophecy began to work . . . on a large scale,” as people prayed for the gifts of “discernment of spirits, healing, [and] prophecy.”³⁸⁹ Through testimonies about what was going on in the Welsh holiness revival, the expectation of a soon-coming mighty restoration of all the sign gifts spread rapidly through the already very sympathetic Higher Life assemblies. Evan Roberts and his holiness revivalism brought a widespread expectation of the restoration of all the sign gifts, including tongues.³⁹⁰ Bartleman began to correspond with Evan Roberts, exchanging letters “which linked us [in Los Angeles] up with the revival there [in Wales].” Roberts and Bartleman rejoiced together that in Wales and Los Angeles many a “soul [was] finding its way to the White Throne.”³⁹¹ Roberts called the prophesying, marvel-working Bartleman “[m]y dear brother in the faith” and his “comrade” in the “terrible fight” with the “kingdom of evil,” as both engaged in the warfare with spirits described by Roberts and Penn-Lewis in *War on the Saints*. Following the pattern of Evan Roberts,³⁹² Bartleman plunged into “a constant conflict in prayer with the powers of darkness,” experienced much “Soul Travail,” was “deal[t] with . . . much also about the ‘blood,’” and learned much about “‘the fellowship of His sufferings’ in prayer,” with the result that, again

³⁸⁶ Pg. 172, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

³⁸⁷ Pg. 29, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁸⁸ Pgs. 7-12, 19, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁸⁹ Pg. 19, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁹⁰ See pgs. 63-68, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

³⁹¹ Pg. 33, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Since only the damned, not the saved, will be judged at the White Throne judgment recorded in Revelation 20, many souls appearing before the White Throne would also be something that would cause Satan and his demons to rejoice—if anything can cause them to rejoice.

³⁹² E. g., pg. 22, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

following the pattern of Evan Roberts,³⁹³ his “nerves were getting very worn.”³⁹⁴ Roberts wrote to Bartleman concerning the marvels that were taking place in Los Angeles:³⁹⁵ “I was exceedingly pleased to learn the good news of how you are beginning to experience wonderful things.”³⁹⁶ A vision of a being that Bartleman and another wonder-worker thought was Jesus Christ confirmed that an outpouring was going to come.³⁹⁷ “Slowly but surely the conviction is coming upon the saints of Southern California that God is going to pour out His Spirit here as in Wales. . . . Wales will not long stand alone in this glorious triumph . . . ‘Pentecost’ is knocking at our doors . . . in the very near future . . . a deluge . . . will sweep all before it.”³⁹⁸ Although the Lord Jesus repeatedly warned: “An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign,”³⁹⁹ nonetheless, while working with Smale at the New Testament Church, where both men were charter members,⁴⁰⁰ in February 1906 Bartleman began to “ask the Lord to pour out His Spirit speedily, with ‘signs following.’”⁴⁰¹ It became evident what was coming: “A final call, a world-wide Revival. Then judgment upon the whole world. Some tremendous event is about to transpire.”⁴⁰² “It was into this charged atmosphere that Seymour came, early in 1906. In his first sermon . . . he preached on Acts 2:4,” declaring that the initial evidence of Spirit baptism was speaking in tongues to those who already believed that tongues were “one of the gifts that were to be poured out upon sanctified believers”⁴⁰³ because of Higher Life continuationism and the Welsh holiness revival. The soil was ripe. Very shortly thereafter tongues—or at least gibberish claiming to be tongues⁴⁰⁴—had broken out in

³⁹³ “I can sympathize with Evan Roberts’ nervous breakdown, after the revival in Wales,” Bartleman wrote, after being forced to a period of extended rest himself from doing the same sort of work as Roberts (pg. 93, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan).

³⁹⁴ Pgs. 39-40, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Bartleman misinterprets the passages he speaks of in the same manner that Roberts and Penn-Lewis misinterpreted them.

³⁹⁵ It is noteworthy that Jessie Penn-Lewis’s *Overcomer* magazine was also being read in Los Angeles, and that “Los Angeles” was recognized as “the *centre* of this country [the USA] for Occultism of all kinds” (cf. pg. 2, *The Overcomer*, January 1910).

³⁹⁶ Pgs. 15, 22, 25, 31, 33, 64-65, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁹⁷ Pg. 17, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁹⁸ Pg. 37, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

³⁹⁹ Matthew 12:39; 16:4.

⁴⁰⁰ Pg. 27, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁴⁰¹ Pg. 40, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁴⁰² Pg. 42, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁴⁰³ Pg. 65, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

⁴⁰⁴ Robert Anderson notes:

In the earliest years of the Pentecostal movement, the German scholar Mosiman carefully investigated many cases of Pentecostal tongues-speech . . . [n]ot once did he hear any foreign language, nor was he able to

Los Angeles. “Sunday Morning, April 15, [at] the New Testament Church . . . [a] colored sister was there and spoke in ‘tongues.’ . . . It seemed like Pentecostal ‘signs.’ . . . [A] few nights before, April 9,” at a “little cottage on Bonnie Brae Street . . . the Spirit had fallen” and a “number had spoken in ‘tongues.’ . . . The pioneers had broken through, for the multitude to follow.”⁴⁰⁵ The spiritual warfare taught and modeled by Roberts and Penn-Lewis had come to its fructifying point. “Demons are being cast out, the sick healed, many blessedly saved, restored, and baptized with the Holy Ghost and power.”⁴⁰⁶ The Power behind the marvels of the Welsh holiness Revival had moved into Los Angeles. The signs that had been sought for had come. The Welsh holiness revival had given birth—the world-wide Pentecostal movement had come forth in Los Angeles.

Pentecostal pioneers, having been brought by the influence of the Welsh holiness revival to the point where tongues had been restored, spread Pentecostalism from Azusa Street in Los Angeles, California onward to the rest of the world with an astonishing rapidity,⁴⁰⁷ so that the spirits that authored the confusion of the Welsh meetings authored also the babbling that was allegedly a restoration of the gift of tongues and the many other heretical doctrines and practices found at Azusa Street and budding Pentecostalism.⁴⁰⁸ British Israelism, the partial-Rapture theory,⁴⁰⁹ modalism, and

authenticate a single claim that any tongue-speaker had spoken in a language previously unknown to him. . . . [N]early every non-Pentecostal observer of tongue-speakers has recognized its non-linguistic, ‘gibberish’ character. . . . [S]tudies now completed or in progress have concluded that speaking in tongues is incoherent, repetitive syllabification having neither the form nor the structure of human speech. . . . [L]inguistic analysis of speaking in tongues . . . [indicates that Pentecostal] tongue-speech . . . lacked all of the elements essential to any language, even a hypothetical or newly created one: vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and a systematically related phonological-semantic structure . . . speaking in tongues bears no systematic resemblance to any natural language, living or dead[.] . . . Where it is asserted that non-Pentecostals confirmed the real linguisticity of tongue-speech, these witnesses are either unnamed, cannot be found, or are incompetent to judge. The only reliable evidence is the growing volume of recorded tongue-speech which in every single instance flatly and unambiguously contradicts Pentecostal claims to xenoglossy . . . speaking in a language unknown to the speaker. (pgs. 16-18, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson)

Anderson discusses and provides further sources for numbers of scientific studies, not a one of which gives a shred of evidence that Pentecostal “tongues” are anything other than meaningless babbling.

It is also noteworthy, in light of the claim by modern gibberish-speakers that they are speaking a “heavenly language,” that one who was caught up to heaven and heard a real heavenly language declared under inspiration that “it is not lawful for a man to utter” on earth the heavenly speech he heard (2 Corinthians 12:4).

⁴⁰⁵ Pgs. 42-43, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. The cottage at Bonnie Brae Street was the place the fanatical meetings were held before the Azusa Street location was acquired.

⁴⁰⁶ Pg. 64, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁴⁰⁷ Compare the description on pgs. 71ff., *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

⁴⁰⁸ E. g., a well-documented summary of some of the extremely numerous, bizarre, and stomach-turning heresies of Parham, Seymour’s mentor, covers pgs. 83-89 of *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

practices such as unmarried men and women kissing each other, all accompanied with many supernatural marvels, were blazed abroad everywhere.⁴¹⁰ Bartleman and Smale⁴¹¹ were not by any means exceptional in their transition from Welsh holiness revival and Keswick influences into Pentecostalism; vast numbers of men in Higher Life and “holiness leadership . . . promptly took places of leadership in the pentecostal revival. It was the Kings, the Tomlinsons, the Seymours, the Bartlemans, the Barrats, the Pauls, the Parhams, the Masons, the Ebys—all of the holiness movement . . . that dominated the pentecostal revival’s formative years.”⁴¹² Throughout the American “south . . . there were significant shifts of groups of holiness churches to the new movement . . . other holiness bodies were also affected.”⁴¹³ First in Los Angeles,⁴¹⁴ and then in the rest of the world, huge numbers of Higher Life churches and individuals moved into Pentecostalism. For example, all the members of the Southern Florida Holiness Association except three became Pentecostals in the Church of God, and their camp meeting became a pentecostal center, while all the Nazarene churches in Florida, except one, turned Pentecostal.⁴¹⁵ Entire Higher Life denominations, such as the Pentecostal Holiness Church, the Fire Baptized Holiness Church, the Church of God, the United Holy Church of America, and the Pentecostal Free Will Baptist Church, entered the charismatic fold wholesale after receiving the strange fire arising from Azuza Street. The majority of the Church of God in Christ turned Pentecostal after its leader became a charismatic at Azuza Street.⁴¹⁶ “Most important for the rapid dissemination of the Pentecostal message was its propagation at convocations of Holiness people gathered from all across the nation and around the world. . . . From these places the Pentecostal evangel was carried . . . back to the innumerable religious groups and locals from which they came. . . . Initially, the use

⁴⁰⁹ Many early Pentecostals taught that “the Pentecostal movement was ‘the Bridal call’ and that only those who accepted it would be taken up in the Rapture and receive high rewards in the coming Kingdom, while those who rejected it would suffer the terrors of the Tribulation and hold positions subordinate to the Pentecostals in the Millennium” (pg. 148, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson).

⁴¹⁰ Pg. 23, cf. 199, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger; pg. 69, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

⁴¹¹ See pgs. 23, 27, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger.

⁴¹² Pg. 75, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

⁴¹³ Pg. 75, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

⁴¹⁴ Pg. 71, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson, describes the torrent of members of Higher Life churches and workers in Holiness associations turning to Pentecostalism in Los Angeles, while whole Holiness churches closed their doors and moved to Azuza Street with their congregations or adopted Pentecostalism where they were.

⁴¹⁵ Pg. 75, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan.

⁴¹⁶ Pgs. xix-xx, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan

of Holiness resources and institutions was of enormous, perhaps crucial, significance for spreading the Pentecostal movement.”⁴¹⁷ The supernatural spirits that led Evan Roberts throughout the Welsh holiness revival unleashed an incalculable impact on the United States and the rest of the world through the rise of worldwide Pentecostalism. As people came from all over the world to see the marvels in the work of Evan Roberts, and took from Wales the same strange fire to their own countries, so people came to Azusa Street from across American and from other continents, took the Pentecostal fire with them,⁴¹⁸ and returned home to bring countless others, especially those already prepared for Pentecostalism by the continuationism of Keswick and the Higher Life theology, into the Pentecostal fold.⁴¹⁹ “The Welsh Revival” was “the last ‘gap’ across which the latest sparks of the holiness enthusiasm leapt igniting the Pentecostal movement.”⁴²⁰ Pentecostalism was the true child and heir of the Welsh holiness revival work of Evan Roberts. It is historically certain that the “world-wide . . . Pentecostal . . . revival was rocked in the cradle of little Wales . . . becoming full grown in Los Angeles.”⁴²¹

In addition to his central role in the rise of Pentecostalism, Roberts also influenced Christendom to adopt the practice of women leading men in public congregational prayer⁴²²—something without example in Scripture,⁴²³ although

⁴¹⁷ Pgs. 73-75, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

⁴¹⁸ Pgs. 149, 159, 178-179, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan. Nonetheless, Pentecostal missionaries had to learn the languages of the foreign peoples they sought to reach (pg. 178, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.), as the gibber-jabber of tongues were not real languages, as were the tongues on Pentecost (Acts 2).

⁴¹⁹ Pgs. xix-xxi, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁴²⁰ Pg. 46, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*, Frederick Dale Bruner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.

⁴²¹ Pg. 19, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

⁴²² “Throughout the nineteenth century women were banned from any public role in church life, but now they were set free to pray and praise openly,” because of Evan Roberts’ misinterpretation of Joel 2:29 (Pgs. 37-38, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones; cf. pg. 43). At times he would have church services run by the women who helped him (pg. 80, *ibid.*). His practice of having little children likewise direct in prayer, song, and testimony (cf. pg. 79, *ibid.*) has not been as widely adopted. Compare pgs. 82-83, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*, A. T. Fryer. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. 19 (December 1905); pgs. 163-165, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. The New Measures propagated by Charles Finney had likewise included women leading mixed congregations in prayer.

⁴²³ Of course, the Bible does record prayer meetings where both men and women were present, but it is noteworthy that in such passages the grammar of the texts do not affirm that women led the congregation in prayer; e. g., Acts 1:13-14 states that “these” (v. 14)—the male leaders of v. 13—“continued . . . in prayer and supplication,” while “the women” were simply “with” them, so that the natural interpretation of the passage is that the men, and in this case, the male spiritual leadership, led in prayer, while the rest of the church, including the women, prayed silently in agreement with the words addressed to God by the ministers. That is, the οἱ τοὶ πάντες ἦσαν προσκατεροῦντες of v. 14 are Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Φίλιππος καὶ Θωμᾶς, Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Ματθαῖος, Ἰάκωβος

encouraged by Roberts' Keswick forefather, Robert Pearsall Smith⁴²⁴ in line with Quaker opposition to Biblical complementarian gender roles—and the holiness revival played a significant role in “chang[ing] attitudes towards the public role to be fulfilled by women” as women led in “speaking . . . giving testimony . . . and, occasionally, preaching” in the holiness revival meetings.⁴²⁵ Furthermore, the holiness revival broke down denominational walls for an ecumenical setting aside of doctrinal differences.⁴²⁶ Anglicans, with their false sacramental gospel, and many independent congregations of a tremendous variety of doctrinal persuasions, were united⁴²⁷ in leading meetings in State-

Ἄλφαιου καὶ Σίμων ὁ Ζηλωτής, καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου of v. 13, while these male spiritual leaders were simply σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ Μαρίας τῆ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ.

⁴²⁴ In Robert P. Smith's “meetings everyone who felt inwardly moved to it, led in prayer. Even women were permitted to do so,” because of the “baptism of the Spirit,” as Smith “longed for the return of the Apostolic age” with its signs and wonders. It is noteworthy that while Smith was preaching, “by his side in the pulpit there stood or sat men who interrupted the discourse with prayers and songs,” a matter also comparable to the disorder found in Evan Roberts's meetings, although not to the same extent (“Die Heiligungsbewegung,” Chapter 6, *Perfectionism*, B. B. Warfield, vol. 1). Compare the record of Smith praying a single sentence, followed by people praying single sentences throughout the gathered assembly, sometimes in various languages, on pg. 291, *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th, 1875*. Brighton: W. J. Smith, 1875.

⁴²⁵ Pg. 533, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

⁴²⁶ Cf. pg. 63, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Pentecostals such as Donald Gee, George Jeffries, Alexander Boddy, and Frank Bartleman, who were products of the Welsh holiness revival, continued this emphasis upon ecumenicalism (cf. pgs. 198, 206-213, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger & pgs. 167-173, *Azuza Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan). It is not surprising that, following its Higher Life antecedents, “the first beginnings of classical pentecostalism were decidedly ecumenical,” and the “neo-pentecostal movement, since its beginnings . . . has been *de facto* ecumenical” (pgs. 33-34, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan). Parham's belief about how ecumenism is to be achieved is described on pg. 84, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

⁴²⁷ One Anglican minister testified:

No one dependent for information on the newspapers can have any idea of the extent to which the [Anglican] Church has participated in the movement. . . . [In a] typical . . . instance . . . [the] Vicar . . . atten[d] revival services under Evan Roberts[.] . . . [He then] began to hold . . . meetings . . . himself. . . . Dissenters proposed to continue the meetings and to invite [Anglican] Churchmen to attend their buildings . . . The meetings . . . dr[ew] us all together in a wonderful way, and we have come to know each other and trust each other more thoroughly than would otherwise have been possible in many years. . . . The better spirit between [State] Church and Dissent is not confined to one or two localities. . . . Baptist preacher[s] sent . . . to the priest of th[eir] district . . . the names of . . . people . . . who had given their names for Confirmation at his Revival services. . . . In a well-known town a Baptist preacher holding services in the streets . . . urged any [State] Church listeners who had not been confirmed to give in their names to the clergy. . . . [A] man . . . applied at once to his Vicar in consequence of this appeal. . . . [T]he [Anglican] Church's mission services have been attended by hundreds, and probably thousands, of Dissenters. . . . Compare Evan Roberts' teaching and questioning with that of some of the [Anglican] Church missionaries and the difference is barely discoverable, so far as the general line is concerned. Where Roberts stops short, on the sacramental life, the [Anglican] missionaries were, of course, strong, [since] in the sacramental life lies the way of preservation[.] (pgs. 183-185, “The Revival in Wales,” A. T. Fryer. *The East and the West: A Quarterly Review for the Study of Missions*. (1905) 174-188)

Shame on the Baptist preachers who rejected Christ's command for separation from all false religion, including sacramentalism (2 Corinthians 6:14-18), and joined with Evan Roberts in promoting a false and unbiblical unity between truth and error.

church facilities and free church chapels alike, teaching that there must be a united one-world church in preparation for the return of Christ.⁴²⁸ All denominations celebrated united prayer meetings⁴²⁹ and “sectarianism [was] almost annihilated,”⁴³⁰ as Evan Roberts’s teaching led the many Biblical commands about ecclesiastical separation to be ignored. Rather, it was taught that “the Holy Ghost is no respecter of denominations.”⁴³¹ “Mr. Roberts said: ‘Don’t talk about denominations these days,’” pounding the pulpit as he spoke—“Away with all that.”⁴³² Evan Roberts and his revivalism taught Anglicans that they did not need “a new . . . Prayer Book, Creed, or Church,”⁴³³ although Anglicanism taught baptismal regeneration. As the sayings of the Druids were acceptable at the Broadlands Conferences,⁴³⁴ so one of Roberts’s “finer sermons” was “based upon the Archdruid’s call . . . [for] peace and unity at every level of life,”⁴³⁵ for “Evan Roberts preached about the power of Pentecost to sweep away divisions of . . . denomination,”⁴³⁶ as the spirit powers behind his preaching did not lead people to separate from false religion and join true churches, but to unite the false and true in one ecumenical unity. Thus, not only Pentecostalism and charismatic phenomena, but also feminism and ecumenicalism, were products of Roberts’s work.

While Pentecostals, feminists, and advocates of ecumenicalism had much to cherish from the work of Evan Roberts, his work had many critics among Baptists and other advocates of the older orthodoxy and theology of revival. Critics of Evan Roberts affirmed that his work was destroying a genuine revival movement in Wales that had already been taking place, “particularly, though not exclusively, among the Baptists . . . prior to Roberts beginning his mission.”⁴³⁷ They thought that “[d]elusions and extravagances in various forms were countenanced and even fostered . . . the wave of

⁴²⁸ Pgs. 61, 67, 127, 142-143, 197-198, 207, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. There will, indeed, be a united one-world “church” before the revelation of Christ at the end of the Tribulation period, but God calls it “the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth” (Revelation 17:5), so it is not a little unwise to prepare the way for it.

⁴²⁹ Pg. 126, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

⁴³⁰ Pg. 119, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

⁴³¹ Pg. 62, *The Awakening in Wales*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

⁴³² Pg. 75, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905.

⁴³³ Pg. 161, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

⁴³⁴ E. g., pgs. 88-89, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

⁴³⁵ Pg. 61, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁴³⁶ Pg. 80, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁴³⁷ Pg. 517, “Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905,” Robert Pope. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57:3 (July 2006) 515-534.

inordinate emotionalism with its accompanying evils . . . undoubtedly was one of the causes that silenced the Spirit, and drove [Him] from among the people.”⁴³⁸ They argued that “violent bodily exercises . . . contortions and prostrations . . . did not possess any specific spiritual value, and did not convey any moral lesson[,] [nor left any] salutary impression . . . behind[,] [but were] the weakness of man rather than the power of God.”⁴³⁹ For example, Roberts’ opponents affirmed his work “sounded the death-knell of the Revival in the Avan Valley. The flame was there, but it was extinguished. The tide began to ebb, and ebb it did; and the last state of that Church is worse than the first.”⁴⁴⁰ At “Zoar, Neath,” church leaders and congregants averred, “[Roberts] has spoilt our meeting,” as “people seemed to have turned their faces away from God, and were looking to the Revivalist.”⁴⁴¹ In “[n]umerous other instances . . . vast multitudes . . . [experienced] the Revival wave, feeling that they were face to face with the realities of life, conscious of the Divine presence in their midst, only to be told by Evan Roberts within five minutes of his appearance that the Holy Spirit was not there, because *they* had hindered His operations and refused to give obedience.”⁴⁴² The “Tabernacle Baptist Church on the Hayes, Cardiff” was a “case in point” of the fact that “in the majority of cases [Roberts’] appearances had a dispiriting effect. Many were converted who had neither seen nor heard Evan Roberts; and some of the most successful meetings were held in the districts and towns to which Evan Roberts had refused to go on the ground that the Holy Spirit had not given him any message for them.”⁴⁴³ In those “Nonconformist places of worship where the ministers and elders were strong and wise enough to curb the . . . impulsive and excitable . . . and to keep the movement within due and proper limits[,] . . . [t]housands were converted, and the vast majority of them remain[ed] faithful[.]”⁴⁴⁴ Roberts was influenced by “the Keswick movement and holiness teaching” and his theology of revival placed him “in the same camp as the American revivalist, Charles G. Finney;” his beliefs were, consequently, in contrast to and “beyond the tradition of the Welsh revivals” of the past, which had held a notably

438 Pg. 141, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

439 Pg. 238, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

440 Pg. 51, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

441 Pg. 53, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

442 Pgs. 53-54, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original.

443 Pg. 77, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

444 Pgs. 113-114, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Unfortunately, Morgan mentions that such Nonconformist churches were a minority; the majority that fell under the influence of Evan Roberts and his methods were central in the decline in Welsh Nonconformity after the passing of the holiness revival.

different theology of revival, affirming that it was “wholly dependent on the grace of God.”⁴⁴⁵

The evangelical Congregationalist minister Peter Price “believed a genuine revival was taking place apart from Roberts’ activities”⁴⁴⁶ and “stated that Roberts’ emphasis on direct and unmediated divine inspiration denied the need for the objective preaching of the person and work of Christ and so created ‘a sham revival,’ which was hindering ‘the true revival’ that had long preceded Roberts’ work.”⁴⁴⁷ For example, “for nearly two years the Revival flame was ablaze in Cardiganshire . . . before Evan Roberts was heard of . . . and it was a pure work of God in that county. That pure stream became impure under the hoof of the enemy” as Roberts’ methods took hold.⁴⁴⁸ In Price’s important “letter to the *Western Mail* . . . he wrote that there were two revivals in Wales, one a true revival based on the substitutionary atonement of Christ and the other a sham revival based on emotionalism for which Evan Roberts was the major spokesman.”⁴⁴⁹

Price wrote:

I write the following in the interest of the religion of Jesus Christ, and because I sympathize with visitors who come from long distances to see the Revival in South Wales.

Now, I think I can claim that I have had as good an opportunity as most people to understand what is really going on in South Wales; and I have come to the conclusion that there are two so-called Revivals going on amongst us. The one, undoubtedly, from above—Divine, real, intense in nature, and Cymric⁴⁵⁰ in its form. . . . the real Divine thing. . . .

[But] people . . . may attempt to make the thing, and lo! there comes out a calf and not a God. . . . Those who will do this are the shallow ones, the noisy ones, those who think themselves filled the most with the Spirit, but who are the least. They are, in fact, the imitators, who say, “There’s something wrong here. The Spirit is not here. I have had a vision[.]” . . . the stock sayings of Evan Roberts . . . [also] repeated . . . by . . . [his] imitators[.] . . . Others may be found imitating his bodily contortions, sighs, etc. This mimicry is . . . done by the would-be Evan Robertses quite as much for their own sakes as for the sake of their visitors. Breaking into song while another prays, or speaks, or preaches, is another form of the attempt to imitate Evan Roberts’s meetings.

⁴⁴⁵ Pg. 520, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope. Affirming that revival is wholly dependent upon the grace of God does not mean that God does not answer the prayers of His people for revival; rather, it recognizes that even such prayers, and not answers to them only, are a product of His grace.

⁴⁴⁶ Pg. 231, *The Making of the Modern Church: Christianity in England since 1800*, B. G. Worrall.

⁴⁴⁷ Pg. 555, “Evan Roberts,” *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen.

⁴⁴⁸ Pg. 112, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan; cf. pg. 116-117 for other examples of revival before Evan Roberts. Other men began to copy the practices of Evan Roberts. “These men . . . followed Evan Roberts from place to place, picked up his platitudes and broken sentences, [and] went about the country repeating them and imitating his methods and contortions. Thus it was that some of the finest elements in our Christian religion, so far from being strengthened in this Revival, were actually discouraged. So great was the passion for results that men forgot what was due to reverence and even to decency. Sensationalism was consecrated” (pg. 140, *ibid*).

⁴⁴⁹ Pg. 525, “Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905,” Robert Pope. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57:3 (July 2006) 515-534; also D. J. Roberts, *Peter Price*, Swansea 1968, pgs. 90-109.

⁴⁵⁰ Welsh in language or culture, from the Welsh *Cymru* “Wales,” *Cymry*, “the Welsh,” etc.

But these things are merely the accidents of the true Revival, and form no part of its kernel. For there is a kernel, which is overwhelming in its Divine power, and many thousands have experienced it, and there are ample signs that many thousands more will be touched by it.

There is, then, a Revival which is of God—of God alone—yes, a most mighty—an Almighty Revival . . . due to the earnest prayers of godly men and women for many years, and also to the extremely earnest preaching of the Gospel, emphasizing especially the Atonement, meaning by the Atonement the substitutionary death of our Lord Jesus Christ for the sins of the world.

Some preachers, again, laid great emphasis upon the Person and ministry of the Holy Ghost. Others, again, gave attention to the ethical aspect of our religion, but with less effect, in my opinion, as far as the present Revival is concerned. I have witnessed bursts of this real Revival as far back as two years ago. I understand that there are several would-be originators of the Revival; but I maintain that the human originator of the true Revival cannot be named. And this, to me, is one of the proofs that it is of Divine origin. I have witnessed indescribable scenes of this real Revival, effects that can never be put on paper. Hence, I have a right to say that the real Revival has not been and cannot be reported.

But there is another Revival in South Wales—a sham Revival, a mockery, a blasphemous travesty of the real thing. The chief figure in this mock Revival is Evan Roberts, whose language is inconsistent with the character of anyone except that of a person endowed with the attributes of a Divine Being. If not, what is he? Are there four persons in the Godhead, and is Evan Roberts the fourth? If so, I would call him the Commander of the Third Person, or the Master of the Spirit, for the . . . words which I myself heard from him on Monday night last at Bethania Chapel, Dowlais. The Spirit being somewhat reluctant to obey him, he said, “He must come”; but the Spirit (of whom he talked most glibly, just as a child speaks of its toy, but somewhat more off-handedly) would not obey the orders. . . . [H]e spoke as if the Spirit was entirely in his grip . . . judging by his behaviour and talk, the Holy Spirit is led by Evan Roberts!

My honest conviction is this; that the best thing that could happen to the cause of the true religious Revival amongst us would be for Evan Roberts and his girl-companions to withdraw into their respective homes, and there to examine themselves, and learn a little more of the meaning of Christianity, if they have the capacity for this, instead of going about the country pretending to show the Way of Life to people many of whom know a thousand times more about it than they do. Why, we have scores of young colliers in Dowlais with whom Evan Roberts is not to be compared either in intellectual capacity or spiritual power.

But it is this mock Revival—this exhibition—this froth—this vain trumpery—which visitors see and which newspapers report. And it is harmful to the true Revival—very harmful. And I am horrified lest people who trust to what they see at Evan Roberts’s meetings and to newspaper reports should identify the two Revivals—the true and the false—the Heavenly fire and the *ignis fatuus*.

Before Evan Roberts visited Dowlais, we had the holy fire burning brightly—at white heat; and at my own church alone we could count our converts during the last five or six months by the hundreds. But what happened when Evan Roberts visited the place? People came from all parts anxious to see the man, to understand something of the movement, and to get some of the fire to take home with them. I suppose that most of them did see the man; but I doubt whether they understood the movement—even the mock movement. They had no chance to understand the true movement, nor had they a chance of catching any of the true fire, for it wasn’t there. I will say that with much effort Evan Roberts, together with his co-operators (and, evidently, they understand one another thoroughly, and each knew his or her part well and where to come in), managed, by means of threats, complaints and incantations, which reminded me of the prophets of Baal, to create some of the false fire. But never in my life did I experience such agony—the whole procedure being utterly sacrilegious. I should say that Evan Roberts must have seen and felt that he was a failure at Dowlais; but to cover the circumstance of failure, there appeared in the paper, after he had proved himself so, a prophecy concerning certain misgivings of his as to whether he ought to have undertaken a mission to Dowlais.

I should like to ask Evan Roberts a few questions; I have many more which I might ask; but I will be satisfied now with a few: . . . He said that there was someone in the lobby who was accepting Christ; but no one did. What Spirit told him this lie? . . . Why does he wait until the meetings attain the climax of enthusiasm before he enters? If help is valuable at any stage, is it not

mostly so at the commencement, in order to kindle the fire? . . . Why does he visit places where the fire has been burning at maximum strength for weeks and months? Would it not be more reasonable for him to go to places which the fire has not reached? . . . What spirit makes him bad-tempered when things don't come about exactly as he wishes? . . . What spirit makes him say, "Ask God to damn the people if you don't ask anything else?"

"Yes, but he has a lovely face and a beautiful smile," so some women say. This is the last resort.

May I repeat that I have written the above in the interest of the religion of Jesus Christ, and out of sympathy with visitors who come to see the Revival. I may have to suffer persecution for writing the above—even by Spirit-filled (!) men; but I don't seek the renown of the martyr; still, if martyrdom for the truth be necessary, I am ready. To the true Revival—the gloriously real Revival—I will say and pray with all my soul,

"Cerdd ymlaen, nefol dân"

But to the bogus Revival I will say with all my soul,

"Cerdd yn ol, gnawdol dân."

Peter Price, January 31, 1905⁴⁵¹

Thus, in the view of Price and other advocates of the older theology of revival, a real "Revival, of which [Roberts] was not the originator, not the medium, and not the feeder," had already been going on. "There had been for months and years—there were even then—influences at work that were independent of [Roberts'] initiative or control,"⁴⁵² but his revivalism was quenching this genuine work of God. "Evan Roberts had no controlling or constructive influence over the real Revival[,] . . . [but] was out of touch with [it]. . . . This [real Revival] . . . was the result of spiritual forces that had been quietly at work for years. . . . Evan Roberts was . . . the embodiment of the . . . rubbish . . . the waves of hysteria . . . [and] psychic manifestations . . . [that] were looked upon as necessary adjuncts to a successful meting, and became at last, in the estimation of the

⁴⁵¹ See *The Western Mail*, February 1-6, 11, 1905. The Welsh portion of his letter desires heavenly fire and wishes for the end of sensual fire.

Price's letter is reproduced on pgs. 141-145 of *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan, who also includes responses by readers to Price, both negative (pgs. 146-154, arguing that "Mr. Roberts . . . without doubt is inspired," is "the mouthpiece of the Living God," and is "a prophet of the present age" while Price is a "mean, jealous, cad, whose actions are too contemptible to find words for," who must be "a shareholder in a Brewery," since "Jesus Christ don't want [*sic*] us to judge and point out things" and Price should be "warn[ed] . . . against the awful harm you are doing *even if you are right* [emphasis in original]." Price is "blasphem[ing] the Holy Ghost" and he must "ask God to forgive you and to save you" since he is "not a Christian," not "born again," and one whose letter "will . . . land you into Hell [*sic*]" which will "burn your never dying soul"), and positive (pgs. 154-161, "I feel there is a sad deficiency in the leading of Mr. E. Roberts besides doubtful teaching from a scriptural point of view," "Sir—I am in entire sympathy with you in the noble stand you have made in the interest of 1.) Pure Christianity 2.) Moral Courage and 3.) Sincerity," "[T]here are hundreds today who believe the same [as you] but have not the courage to openly and frankly admit so[,] and honestly Evan Roberts is a great stumbling block to this Revival as we at Treorky found to our cost when we had him. He placed a damper on every Meeting," "Your remark about E. R. as in command of the Holy Spirit . . . I have often denounced as blasphemous and also [something that] would drive the weak minded insane and the doubters to unbelief," "You have won the admiration of hundreds of fellow Christians (if that matters any) by your dauntless courage. Oh that the virtue of having the courage to express one's convictions were one that was not so rare," etc.).

⁴⁵² Pg. 57, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

press and the public, *the* characteristic marks of the Revival.”⁴⁵³ As fanaticism and revivalism displaced true revival produced by the Holy Ghost, “Evan Roberts” became “the central figure in the Revival of 1904-5; but he was not its *originator*, much less its *conceiver*.”⁴⁵⁴ Price “by no means st[ood] alone in his attitude. . . . Many other ministers share[d] his opinions . . . [about] ‘the sham Revival’ . . . of which . . . Mr. Evan Roberts [was] the chief exponent,” hindering the “real Revival” that had been going on.⁴⁵⁵ “[T]housands of sane, righteous people fully endorsed the opinions of Price . . . many eminent, spiritually-minded pastors and laymen agreed[.]”⁴⁵⁶ The pastor of the Baptist church at Builth Wells wrote to Mr. Price:

Permit me to thank you for your frank and straightforward speaking . . . on the “Double Revival.” . . . For some time I have longed to see someone who resided in the zone of fire, to rise and repudiate the gross excrescences which are passing for the real thing in the Revival in Wales. It is something monstrously base to tolerate without protest the barbarous falsehoods that are being accepted in the name of Christianity. My Dear Sir, we are in for one of the greatest religious siftings that Wales ever experienced. . . . From all sane and thinking men, who love true Religion and who try to augment its forces with intelligent thought, you will only receive the gratitude you merit.

God bless you for your stand and bravery. I shall . . . accumulate facts . . . and join you in your fight for true Christianity.⁴⁵⁷

Indeed, as time passed, not only those who had been critical of Roberts’ practices from the beginning, but “even sympathetic ministers felt the Word was being dethroned and the singing too exalted . . . [in] Evan Roberts’ work.”⁴⁵⁸ “[G]ood men, and . . . godly . . . were seen looking very frowningly upon the . . . Revival, critically and reprovably too[.]”⁴⁵⁹ The “Baptist minister . . . Dr. Davies” thought much of Roberts’ ministry was “mass hysteria.”⁴⁶⁰ Other ministers “object[ed] to the visions seen” and to “women” leading in “public prayer, exhortation, [and] testifying.”⁴⁶¹ “[O]fficial disapproval was not confined to the Baptists, and one c[ould] find strong words from . . . leaders in other denominations.”⁴⁶² Many objected when people would “burst into song, or prayer, or testimony in the middle of the sermon, or sometimes from the start of the service so that

453 Pgs. 68-69, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

454 Pg. 112, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

455 Pg. 181, “The Revival in Wales,” A. T. Fryer. *The East and the West: A Quarterly Review for the Study of Missions*. (1905) 174-188.

456 Pg. 270-271, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

457 Pg. 158, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

458 Pg. 124, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

459 Pg. 262, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

460 Pg. 251, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

461 Pg. 259, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

462 Pg. 261, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

the preacher could only listen.”⁴⁶³ “Many of the ministers did not preach for months,”⁴⁶⁴ and many recognized that such a downgrade of the preached Word did not fit Scripture at all. Even “[g]rumblings about the inferior quality of the new revival hymns grew louder and louder.”⁴⁶⁵ People warned that the “flippancy manifested, especially by the young and others who had just [adopted revivalistic ideas] . . . helped to kill the [real] Revival.”⁴⁶⁶ Many noticed that “the conversions in the chapels attended by Evan Roberts were fewer than in the chapels where he was *not* present.”⁴⁶⁷ The true “Revival . . . transfigured many individual souls . . . [who] never saw Evan Roberts . . . never had . . . tumultuous gatherings . . . [but] owe[d] all that [they were] to the agency of [their] own pastor.”⁴⁶⁸ Criticism poured in, affirming: “In the present revival, the Bible is ignored, and it is claimed that visions and new revelations are received . . . the elders are condemned as heretics if they do not yield, and conform to the methods of the young [cf. 1 Peter 5:5]. The officers of the churches are at present ignored, although they have been set apart in office by the churches; thus, the Apostles of the Lamb are ignored; the hand of God is ignored; the Holy Spirit is ignored; and that by some other spirit that has possessed our young people.”⁴⁶⁹ “Evan Roberts’s claims to direct Spirit guidance” were considered “profane, and his visions blasphemous, because he was not, as were the Apostles, endowed with Spirit gifts, [proven in] healing the sick, raising the dead, giving sight to the blind,”⁴⁷⁰ and other Apostolic miracles (2 Corinthians 12:12). “Baptist leaders in Gwent” considered various practices of Roberts “unseemly and disorderly,” while “senior ministers and laymen in Pembrokeshire . . . were responsible for the early opposition of the Welsh Baptists there.”⁴⁷¹ One “fervent Baptist minister . . . split a revival meeting” by stating the obvious truth, clearly taught by the Holy Ghost in Scripture and patterned in the real revival in the book of Acts, that “baptism by the Spirit did not dispense with the need for water baptism. . . . [He] carried on his attack on the revivalists for preaching obedience to the Spirit yet not practicing that virtue by being baptized themselves.”⁴⁷² The newspaper “*Y Celt Newydd* . . . sounded a warning note

463 Pg. 262, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

464 Pg. 42, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

465 Pg. 264, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

466 Pg. 35, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

467 Pg. 77, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

468 Pgs. 259-262, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

469 Pg. 262, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

470 Pgs. 270-271, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

471 Pg. 260, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

472 Pg. 261, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.

about voices and visions and the danger they posed to true revival.”⁴⁷³ Many “church leaders . . . disavow[ed]” the work of Roberts and “oppose[d] . . . signs and wonders . . . [v]isions, voices, spiritual promptings, [and] inspired prayers.”⁴⁷⁴ They believed that it was a serious error to stress “signs rather than faith . . . psychic and bodily experiences rather than the Word of God . . . ecstasies in special meetings rather than . . . simple, quiet and consistent obedience to the Spirit of the One who is in us.”⁴⁷⁵ In rural Wales, the “response of the Baptists . . . to the revival [work of Evan Roberts] was initially very cautious. The editor of the local Baptist journal, *Y Pwritan Newydd* (‘The New Puritan’) . . . stated that he could not go along with the mode of activity in some meetings[,]”⁴⁷⁶ as various aspects of the revivalism were “sure to be working against Baptist principles.”⁴⁷⁷ Indeed, Baptist church membership “had been increasing for many years prior to the revival [led by Evan Roberts],” with “Baptist membership increas[ing] by 24,000 in 1905,” the largest rate of increase; in 1905 “Independents increased by 12,000 . . . and the Calvinistic Methodists increased by just under 16,000.” Baptist critics of Roberts affirmed that genuine revival was overcome by the revivalism of Roberts and his followers. “[T]here c[ould] be no doubt . . . [t]hat Evan Roberts did repel, that he quenched rather than inflamed the Revival flame in many districts[.] Evidence of this fact abounds, and is indisputable.”⁴⁷⁸ While the revivals in the book of Acts led to the continued multiplication of churches for many years, after the revivalism of Roberts had finished its course Independent and Calvinistic Methodist “membership began to decline in 1906,” followed by the beginning of membership decline in “1907 for the Baptists.”⁴⁷⁹ With the ascendancy of Keswick and continuationist doctrine and the revivalism of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis, “decline set in so quickly after the revival’s end”—a fact which “did not augur well for the future of Nonconformity in Wales,”⁴⁸⁰ as, indeed, a decades-long decline set in almost immediately after Roberts finished his revivalistic course.

As the work of Evan Roberts filled congregations with false doctrine, filled church membership rolls with unregenerate people, and hardened Wales to a true work of the Holy Spirit, serious spiritual declension manifested itself as soon as the strange fire

473 Pg. 257, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
474 Pg. 275, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
475 Pg. 276, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
476 Pg. 92, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
477 Pg. 261, *Voices From the Welsh Revival, 1904-1905*, Jones.
478 Pg. 49, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.
479 Pg. 529, “Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905,” Pope.
480 Pg. 529, “Demythologising the Evan Roberts Revival, 1904-1905,” Pope.

died down. Already by 1909 a very serious “decline of evangelical Christianity [was] most manifest” throughout Wales.⁴⁸¹ “All over the Principality there [was] not only a serious and general falling off in the number of adherents, but there is hardly any interest taken in fundamental theology.”⁴⁸² “Wesleyan Methodism [was] confronted with a serious decrease of membership” and the “spiritual state of the Wesleyan Church” was the matter of the “greatest apprehension.”⁴⁸³ Losses also accrued to the other “Nonconforming bodies,” for these had “unquestionably lost their old grip upon the people.”⁴⁸⁴ A “grave note of religious pessimism” came to “pervad[e] Welsh Nonconformity” as there was a “lamentable falling-off in Welsh Sunday schools, in the attendance, in the interest taken and in the registered results.”⁴⁸⁵ Roberts’ revivalism failed to produce lasting results: “[T]he Welsh Revival of 1904-5 . . . has not been followed by any marked progress of either a political or religious character. . . . There has not sprung up in its track anything of a general and permanent character. . . . Vital religion has not been made more effective[.]”⁴⁸⁶ This fact resulted in “a great change . . . in public opinion . . . and events justify the change. Ministers in general are distressed at the number of [alleged] converts who have cut themselves off from the way of His life. Their judgment is not a hasty one. People seem harder than ever—due to the effects of the Revival.”⁴⁸⁷ In sharp contrast to the revivals in the Bible, and real revivals in church history, only four years after the ministry of Evan Roberts burned out nothing positive was evident “in the sense of curbing the passions of the great masses of the people, in the purifying of their common speech and in eradicating their criminal tendencies. If a plebiscite of the magistrates, solicitors, colliery owners, and prison officials, were taken [in 1909], their *unanswerable* reply would be in the negative. A disenchanted nation remains neither stimulated in thought nor enriched in character.”⁴⁸⁸ Indeed, by 1909 historians could record:

[I]n looking back at the Welsh Revival of 1904-5 we find that its success is by no means commensurate with its proportion, with its excitement at the time, with its professed statistics of individual or collective results, or even with the money expended upon it. . . . [There was a] complete failure of the Revival to permanently regenerate churches and districts to any considerable degree. . . . [T]he Revival . . . did not produce subsequent discipline of morals, but it

⁴⁸¹ Pg. 15, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁴⁸² Pg. 15, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁴⁸³ Pg. 205, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁴⁸⁴ Pg. 206, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Many drifted into Anglican sacramentalism (pg. 206, 208, *ibid*) or simply into rationalism and infidelity.

⁴⁸⁵ Pg. 219, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁴⁸⁶ Pgs. 242, 254, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁴⁸⁷ Pgs. 241-242, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan.

⁴⁸⁸ Pgs. 254-255, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original.

was subversive of, and antagonistic to, the spirit that produces results in practical life. The religious disappointment of thousands of individuals in Wales today is such as to have made their 'last state worse than the first.' . . . The moral condition of the Welsh people . . . [i]n many ways . . . was better . . . *before* the Revival than it is today. . . . The whole attitude of the people has undergone a deplorable change, and the change is both rapid and widespread. No one conversant with the inner life of Wales can fail to observe the alarming spread of the personal and domestic disuse of the Bible. . . . There is an alarming ignorance of the contents of the Bible among the rising generation . . . [t]he Bible is becoming less and less the Book of the rank and file. The . . . preacher [engages in] less close study of the Bible. Preaching is more topical than expository. . . . [The] methods [of] . . . Evan Roberts . . . did undoubtedly repel not a few, and hardened rather than softened the hearts of some who longed for a higher life. . . . It is a fact within the knowledge of any and every man that football, the music-hall, and the public house, are the dominant interests of . . . the very thousands that thronged the various chapels during the Revival season. Sunday shows of various sorts, that were compelled to close their doors at that time, are now in the zenith of their popularity, and there is not power enough in the churches or among the ministers and clergy to check their progress. Since the Revival various socialistic organizations have invaded the valleys, and . . . thousands . . . hear the "socialistic gospel" . . . the social application of the "New Theology" [theological modernism]. If materialistic socialism, without a tinge of reverence for sacred things and sacred institutions, is either the direct or indirect result of the Revival of 1904-5, then it cannot but be a source of sorrow to God-fearing people that the Revival ever came. The reaction is on a large scale . . . and the reaction is still in progress. . . . Many—very many—of [the] . . . Free Churches . . . have been obliged to revise their roll of membership [downward], and are now lamenting over the deadly indifference that has overtaken the flock. The apathy, the levity, the decay of religious faith, the lapse in the habit of prayer, the disinclination to take part in religious work, the non-attendance of adherents, and the decline of the Sunday School, together with the prevalence of vice in its various aspects . . . have followed the Revival. The general condition of the churches is worse than it was in the days preceding the outbreak in 1904. There is a loss of appeal in the Gospel message, and an alarming disregard of sacred institutions. . . . The fall of the spiritual thermometer is very marked. . . . [I]n very many instances contributions towards foreign missions and the maintenance of the ministry have decreased . . . [so that they are] much less than they were two and four years previous to the Revival. . . . [T]he general condition of things among the churches in the Principality is worse since the Revival than before. . . . [T]here is a retrogression and a reversion to a more unsatisfactory type of religious life. . . . [The] mission . . . [of] Evan Roberts . . . did not produce a reversion to a higher type of reverence or moral life. The converse is true.⁴⁸⁹

The evils in the work of Evan Roberts, feared by many Baptists and other old-line evangelicals, who believed in the older and more Scriptural theology of revival, came to pass.

Jessie Penn-Lewis was, in her day, "Keswick's leading female speaker . . . the woman destined to make the most impression at Keswick."⁴⁹⁰ "Only those who . . . kn[ew] her longest and most closely can fully appreciate how strongly [she] influenced . . . Evangelical life and thought of her time."⁴⁹¹ Indeed, a condensation of her book *The Warfare with Satan and the Way of Victory* was even found among the volumes of the

⁴⁸⁹ Pgs. 74, 78-79, 88-89, 127, 251, 254-257, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan. Italics in original.

⁴⁹⁰ Pgs. 120, 155, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁴⁹¹ Pg. iii, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard, 2nd ed. preface by Bernard W. Matthews, 1930.

epoch-making series, *The Fundamentals*.⁴⁹² She came from a Quaker family, had significant “Quaker linkages,”⁴⁹³ and, among other events in her notably limited education, went, as she affirmed, to “a school . . . opened by a Quaker lady,” along with receiving training from a “Quaker gentleman.”⁴⁹⁴ Her husband William Penn-Lewis had a strong Quaker background as “a follower of George Fox,⁴⁹⁵ a professed Quaker and descendent of . . . William Penn,”⁴⁹⁶ so that Jessie’s married name of Penn-Lewis⁴⁹⁷ pointed back to that extremely influential early anti-Trinitarian Quaker who founded the state of Pennsylvania. Throughout their long married life, “every Sunday, [Mr. Penn-Lewis] and his wife went to . . . a Society of Friends Meeting,” except on certain occasions when they attended “an Anglican service” or, “sometimes, a lively evangelical meeting.”⁴⁹⁸ She could justify the disorder and confusion of the meetings led by Evan Roberts through an appeal to the Quaker principal of worship: “By the immediate operations of the Holy spirit, [Christ] as the Head of the church, alone selects and qualifies those who are to present His messages or engage in other service for Him; and, hence, we cannot commit any formal arrangement to any one in our regular meetings for

⁴⁹² “Thankfully, too, may be placed on record the fact that a concise summary of ‘The Warfare with Satan and the Way of Victory’ was selected as one of the papers for insertion in Vol. X of ‘The Fundamentals,’ a series of volumes re-stating the Fundamental Truths of the Christian Faith, issued free by the generosity of ‘Two Christian Laymen’ to workers throughout the world” (“The Overcomer Literature Trust Fund,” pg. 203, *The Overcomer*, December 1914; cf. Chapter 13, “Satan and His Kingdom,” Jessie Penn-Lewis, pgs. 183-199, *The Fundamentals*, vol. 4, ed. Torrey).

⁴⁹³ Pg. 274, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁴⁹⁴ Pg. 5, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard; cf. pg. 6, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

⁴⁹⁵ George Fox (1624-1691) was the “Founder of the Society of Friends, otherwise known as Quakers. . . . In 1646 he announced his reliance on the ‘Inner Light of the Living Christ.’ . . . [H]e taught that truth is to be found primarily not in Scripture or in creed but in God’s voice speaking to the soul. . . . his colleagues . . . included William Penn” (pg. 425, “Fox, George,” *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell).

⁴⁹⁶ Pg. 139, *I Saw The Welsh Revival*, David Matthews. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1951. After his marriage to Jessie, Mr. Penn-Lewis’ Quaker background still showed itself (pg. 11, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). At Mr. Penn-Lewis’ funeral, preached by F. B. Meyer, “Dr. Meyer remarked that [the] quiet garden attached to the Friends [Quaker] Meeting House was peculiarly appropriate as the last resting place of William Penn-Lewis, as he was a descendant of William Penn, one of the Pilgrim Fathers, the founder of Pennsylvania” (pg. 290, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard). Mrs. Penn-Lewis, buried by her husband in this Quaker graveyard, would also refer to what one or another “old Quaker” or “old Quakers” had said in her writings (cf. her letter from Coonoor, S. India, March 3, 1903, reprinted in “The Life of Faith” of March 25th 1903; Chapter 3, *Soul and Spirit*, by Jessie Penn-Lewis, etc.).

⁴⁹⁷ Before her marriage she was “Jessie Jones” (pg. 7, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). More details about her early life and marriage are contained in her diaries and her booklet *The Leading of the Lord*.

⁴⁹⁸ Pg. 155, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

worship.”⁴⁹⁹ Mrs. Penn-Lewis would, on various occasions, give the “message” at “the Friends’ Meeting House” up to the very end of her life.⁵⁰⁰ Both Mr. and Mrs. Penn-Lewis were buried in a Quaker graveyard, “the Friends Burial Field at Reigate,”⁵⁰¹ their funerals being held in Quaker meeting houses, thus identifying with the Quaker movement and its heresies in the choice of their final resting place.⁵⁰² Furthermore, Mrs. Penn-Lewis’ “mother was one of the first to join . . . the Good Templar Movement” in her town, and Jessie “was keenly eager to be a Templar too,” so she followed her mother as a “Templar” in the demonic cult of Freemasonry.⁵⁰³ The “very first Lodge night after [her] twelfth birthday . . . [she was] initiated into the coveted circle.” She soon became “Chief Presiding Officer of the juveniles . . . [in the Minor] Lodge,” while her husband-to-be was “Treasurer of [that same] Lodge at th[at] time.”⁵⁰⁴ She “continued as secretary of the Lodge by re-election quarter after quarter until . . . compelled to give it up”⁵⁰⁵ because of her father’s death. Her Quaker and Masonic influences were connected, as a “Quaker . . . undertook to teach [her] the secretarial work [of the Lodge].”⁵⁰⁶ However, Mrs. Penn-Lewis’ parents and she did not stick exclusively to Quaker and Freemason meetings; she had Calvinistic Methodism in her background also, since, for example, her grandfather was a minister in the “C. M. Connection,” and, what is more, was “said to be the most metaphysical preacher of his day” in that movement.⁵⁰⁷ Jessie’s devout mother consequently “had ideas that children could be brought up without the knowledge of sin.”⁵⁰⁸ Jessie also attended Anglican services. For instance, after marrying William,⁵⁰⁹ the Penn-Lewis family attended “the Church of the Annunciation . . . [where

⁴⁹⁹ “Public Worship” in the Orthodox Quaker *Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887* (<http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml>).

⁵⁰⁰ Pgs. 300-301, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁰¹ Pg. 295, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁰² Pgs. 290, 306, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

⁵⁰³ Compare “Freemasonry and the Christian,” Eddy D. Field II & Eddy D. Field III. *Master’s Seminary Journal*, 5:2 (Fall 94) 141-158; also *The Secret Teachings of the Masonic Lodge*, John Ankerberg & John Weldon (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1990).

⁵⁰⁴ Pg. 4, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard. Garrard was Mrs. Penn-Lewis’ secretary and confidant for decades, and after Penn-Lewis’ death Garrard “serve[d] as general secretary and magazine editor” of *The Overcomer* “for sixteen years” (pgs. 305ff. *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pgs. 10, 86, 156, 250, 297).

⁵⁰⁵ Pg. 6, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁰⁶ Pg. 6, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁰⁷ Pg. 1, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

⁵⁰⁸ Pg. 2, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard; cf. pg. 4, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

⁵⁰⁹ Neither Jessie nor William even professed conversion to Christ before their marriage (cf. pgs. 8-10, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard).

Mr. Penn-Lewis had been] attending [before their marriage],” an Anglican congregation where the “Vicar was an extreme High Churchman” who believed in a damnable sacramental salvation, the Papist confessional, and other “strong Anglo-Catholic views.”⁵¹⁰ During the second year of her marriage, Jessie “began to feel very ill at ease about the Lord’s Return” and she was professedly converted to Christ,⁵¹¹ although she did not say a word to anyone about this professed conversion until a year and a half later, when, having moved to the Anglican parish where Evan Hopkins was the minister, she was simply “asked if she were ‘a Christian,’ and her . . . answer ‘Yes’ was her first open confession of Christ,”⁵¹² this response allegedly proving not merely her religiosity, but

⁵¹⁰ Pgs. 6-7, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵¹¹ Pgs. 6-7, Garrard; cf. pg. 9, Jones. Describing her professed conversion, Penn-Lewis testified: “[I had] a deep inward desire to know that I was a child of God[.] . . . [T]aking . . . my (too little read) Bible from the shelf, [I] turne[d] over the leaves, and [my] eye f[ell] [upon] the words, ‘The Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all’: again a casual turn of the sacred pages, and [I read] the words, ‘He that believeth hath Eternal Life.’ . . . [I considered] whether I did believe that God had laid my sins upon the Lamb of God on the Cross: a pause of wonderment that it really said that I had Eternal Life if I simply believed God’s Word: a quick cry of ‘Lord, I do believe’—and [I] passed from death unto life.” One hopes that Mrs. Penn-Lewis was truly regenerated, although the facts that she wished to know that she “was” a child of God, befitting her Quaker background, rather than desiring to “become” one (cf. Luke 5:31-32; 19:10), that her description of her professed conversion sounds dangerously like an affirmation that the new birth is a matter of a “believe that,” a mental assent to certain facts (James 2:19), rather than a supernaturally wrought and spiritual coming to the Person of Christ in repentant faith and trusting in His death and shed blood (cf. John 6:37), and that she entirely omits any mention of repentance (cf. Luke 13:3), including repentance of the false gospels taught in Quakerism, Masonry, and Anglo-Catholicism (2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1), make the genuineness of her conversion a matter of serious doubt, especially as she continued to associate with Quakerism and other false religions that taught a false gospel (Galatians 1:8-9) the rest of her life, and she certainly was never immersed into the membership of a Bible-believing and practicing church upon profession of faith as did regenerate people in the Bible (cf. Acts 2:41-47; Mark 16:16).

⁵¹² Pg. 8, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. Any soul-winner with even a modicum of discernment knows that in a “Christian” culture like 19th century Britain the fact that someone, when asked if he is a Christian, will respond with the word “yes,” by no means proves his regeneration. A large majority of 21st century Americans would say “yes” to the same question, yet they are no more the true children of God than were the majority of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Hopkins himself professed to be converted after reading 1 John 1:9. He testified: “I saw that there was a covenant . . . and if I was among those who confessed their sins, I was in the agreement, and that He was *faithful* to the Son, and *just* to the promise made to the Son, to forgive me then and there. I saw, at once, that I had pardon” (pgs. 27-28, *Evan Henry Hopkins: A Memoir*, Alexander Smellie). One hopes that Hopkins was truly converted, although 1 John 1:9 is not about how one is born again, and justification is granted to those who come to a particular point where, as lost sinners, they come to Jesus Christ in repentant faith (Mark 1:15; John 3:16; 6:37), while there is no promise in the Bible that says that as long as one is “among those who confessed their sins” one will enter the kingdom of God. Whatever one may conclude from Evan Hopkins own testimony of conversion—one can be happy that, unlike so many Anglican priests, he at least had something he could say, and he never adopted Anglo-Catholicism—the rampant confusion within Anglicanism about the way of salvation helps to explain why Jessie Penn-Lewis could be accepted as a true believer, rather than as simply a religious but very possibly unconverted person, simply because she said “Yes” when asked if she were a Christian.

her supernatural true conversion and regeneration.⁵¹³ She soon became “a fluent and powerful” woman preacher in “open air” meetings connected with Hopkins’

⁵¹³ Perhaps Penn-Lewis’s weak view of conversion and regeneration contributed to her passing beyond the more typical Keswick division of Christians into those who are spiritual and those who are perpetually carnal into her own four-fold division, a division in which she was followed by Watchman Nee. She taught in her *Four Planes of the Spiritual Life* that “[b]elievers in Christ . . . all lived on one of four planes: the evangelistic plane, the revival or Pentecost plane, the path of the Cross plane, or the spiritual warfare plane. Each of these had a commencement, a continuation, and a consummation before you went on to the next” (pg. 224, cf. pg. 233, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). That is:

There are four planes—broadly speaking—in the spiritual life of the believer, and of the Christian worker: The first plane we may call the “evangelistic” plane; that is, the plane where the soul knows the new birth; knows that he has eternal life in Christ; where he becomes a soul winner, preaches salvation from the penalty of sin, and is used to lead others to Christ; where the entire objective is winning souls for Christ; where he is faithful in proclaiming the gospel of salvation in Christ.

Then there is the second plane, which may be called the “revival” plane; or the stage in personal experience where the believer receives the fulness of the Holy Spirit, learns to know Him and to obey Him; to rely upon Him and to look to Him to work as he co-operates with Him, and is used to lead others into the experience of the fulness of the Spirit.

Then there is the third plane, which we may call the plane of the “path of the cross,” where the believer experimentally apprehends his position in Romans 6 in fellowship with Christ’s death; is brought into “conformity” to His death (Philippians 3:10); he learns the fellowship of His sufferings, and is led to walk in the path of the Cross in every detail of practical life. Here the believer is able to interpret to others the way of the Cross, and to lead others to know Romans 6 and 2 Corinthians 4:10-12 in experience.

The fourth plane is the plane of spiritual warfare. It is really the “ascension” plane, where the believer knows his union with Christ, seated with Him “far above all principality and power”; and where, in service, he is in aggressive warfare against the powers of darkness; learns to have spiritual discernment to detect the working of the devil; and learns the authority of Christ over all the power of the enemy. (Luke 10:19)

Or to put it concisely—the first is the plane of salvation, or the new life; the second is the plane of the Spirit; the third is the plane of victory over sin; the fourth is the plane of victory over the powers of darkness. The individual believer, if he goes forward in the Christian life with God, is generally—not always—led just in this order also. First, he receives salvation; second, he receives the Holy Ghost; third he is led along the path of the Cross; fourth, he walks in the path of conflict and victory, resulting in “power” over all the power of the enemy. The individual worker, also, finds he is used in these four planes of service. First, he is used to lead others to Christ; second, he is used to lead them into the fulness of the Spirit; third, he is used to interpret to them the path of the Cross; and fourth, to discern the devices and workings of the devil, and to have power over “all the power of the enemy,” through union with Christ on the throne.

Madame Guyon truly says that in every plane of the spiritual life there is a beginning, working out, and a consummation of the life in that degree, followed by a passage into the next plane, where there is again a beginning, a working out, a consummation. . . . Further, it is true that, speaking generally, it often takes years to get through each plane! (“Four Planes of the Spiritual Life,” Watchman Nee, reprinting “an excerpt from *Life Out of Death*, a book by Jessie Penn-Lewis. It was originally published by The Overcomer Literature Trust, Parkston, Poole, Dorset, England.” Elec. acc. http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/article_pdf.php?aid=18101)

Penn-Lewis’s four-fold division of Christians into a lower class, higher class, even higher elite class, and highest and most elite class, will be convincing to those who accept the inspiration of her writings, and her reference to Madame Guyon will perhaps impress those who receive the Romanist mystic’s writings as a spiritual authority, but for those who accept the *sola Scriptura*, the total absence of Biblical evidence for Penn-Lewis’s four-fold partition of the people of God will lead them to reject her doctrine out of hand. However, while Mrs. Penn-Lewis had no support for her ideas in the Bible, she did find some in the stages in the Higher Life expounded at the Broadlands Conference (pgs. 191-193, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910).

congregation,⁵¹⁴ although because of a difficult ministry experience she “would have cracked” without the stabilizing influence of some other women.⁵¹⁵ Also, opposition because of “her unorthodox views . . . caused [her great] pain.”⁵¹⁶ Nonetheless, throughout her life she regularly preached in congregations, conventions, and settings of the most varied kinds to both men and women,⁵¹⁷ despite “strong prejudice based upon misunderstanding of Paul’s” prohibitions in 1 Corinthians 14:34-40 and 1 Timothy 2:11-15,⁵¹⁸ but in accordance with the Quaker practice of “encouraging women to be ministers.”⁵¹⁹ Generally, “the pastors [were] strongly opposed,”⁵²⁰ but women were to reject pastoral counsel, receive women preachers anyway, and preach themselves; many

Mrs. Penn-Lewis, while she had no support in Scripture for her four-fold division of Christians, did, however, find some support in the teaching of her Quaker predecessor, Hannah W. Smith, and the Broadlands Conference, where, e. g., Mrs. Smith did not speak of the Higher Life alone, but also of “the bird life . . . of sunshine and song” (pg. 196, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910). Perhaps one had the Lower Life lived by the body of non-Keswick Christians, the Higher Life lived by the elite few, and the Bird Life lived by those whose sense of Biblical teaching had completely gone to the birds.

⁵¹⁴ Pg. 10, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵¹⁵ Pg. 13, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵¹⁶ Pg. 41, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵¹⁷ E. g., *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard, pgs. 77-78, 88-96, 107-109, 130-131, 156-158, 185-187 (in Moody’s church and college, where her influence led to a “revival” where “[a]ll order was dispensed with . . . [s]ome would be praying for pardon, some were singing, and some asking for the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and others for Healing,” pg. 105, *The Trials and Triumphs of Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones), 187-188 (A. B. Simpson’s church and the CMA Nyack Institute), 194-196 (1901 Scottish Keswick convention to both men and women, where, as at many Keswick-themed conferences in other parts of her homeland and in many foreign countries, her preaching to men was “blessedly sealed by the Spirit of God,” so that “in after years there was no suggestion of a limited ministry [to women only] whenever [Penn-Lewis] was able to come to Scottish Conventions”), 199, 203, 274, 277 (“the Voice of the Spirit of God” leading her to powerfully preach a misinterpretation of John 12:24 at the Swanwick Conference she started), 286 (many “ministries revolutionized” by the doctrines she preached), 301, *ibid.* She also led meetings where men and women prayed in different languages at the same time in a confusion that clearly violates the pattern set in 1 Corinthians (cf. pg. 80, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard; pgs. 53, 57, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, where a confused meeting was said to be “a forerunner of the Welsh revival.”). Compare also, for her preaching, pgs. 41 (at Keswick), 45 (leaving her husband behind while she went on preaching tours in various countries), 49-57, 71-74 (pg. 74 records an example, not only of a mixed preaching service, but a special “men-only” service), 86, 97 (“meetings and conventions in Canada and the great northern cities of the United States.”), 103-108, 113, 138-139, 146 (preaching at the Welsh Keswick at Llandrindod and influencing Welsh holiness revival men like Seth Joshua, while “open[ing] up new truths to such key people”), 149, 153, 161-162, 196-197, 232, 235 (where the men handled the simple matters, but she, as one above them, “would step in later to comment on the more complex questions”), 240-241, 259-265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵¹⁸ Pg. 73, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵¹⁹ Pg. 431, “Friends, Society of,” *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell.

⁵²⁰ Pg. 50, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pgs. 161-162.

did,⁵²¹ being “faithful to the power of the Lord” against their “local clergyman, who said women should not speak at meetings.”⁵²² Penn-Lewis knew that Paul did not really mean to prohibit women preaching to men when he wrote: “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church,” and “Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.” Rather, Penn-Lewis knew that “Psalm lxxviii 11-12 (see R. V.) must surely have been a prophecy of these days in which we live,” proving that women in the New Testament dispensation are “to prophesy and preach”⁵²³ to men, although nothing of the sort is in view in the psalm if one adopts a grammatical-historical interpretation of the Hebrew text, the Authorized Version, or even the Revised Version to which Penn-Lewis refers.⁵²⁴ However, “God

⁵²¹ Compare “God Is Using Women: Opportunities for Women at Keswick,” chap. 8, pgs. 148-166 in *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present and Future*, by Charles Wesley Price and Ian M. Randall. Carlisle: OM, 2000.

⁵²² Pgs. 138-139, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Mrs. Penn-Lewis followed her own advice of rejecting pastoral counsel. When, in 1897, even “several Keswick leaders, including her own Vicar [Evan Hopkins], distrusted her teachings as ‘too subjectivist,’” and Hopkins warned her about “a misinterpretation and a misapplication of texts of Scripture,” rather than submitting to their objections, she “felt the Lord was calling her to publish her messages as a top priority” because she was “[i]solated more and more from former colleagues” (pg. 60, 62, *ibid.*).

⁵²³ Pg. 73, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵²⁴ Mrs. Penn-Lewis also employed other texts that do not, grammatically-historically interpreted, prove her point about women preachers, such as Joel 2 and Acts 21:9 (see pgs. 73-74, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard). In her argument for women preachers from the Spirit baptism text in Joel 2, Penn-Lewis follows the argumentation of Phoebe Palmer, the Methodist woman preacher with a Quaker background (“Keswick and the Higher Life,” <http://www.seeking4truth.com/keswick.htm>) who made that passage central to her case for women preachers, as well as popularizing the connection between the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification and Spirit baptism (in which she had the help of Asa Mahan; “Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology,” Donald W. Dayton. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1974): 60-69). Palmer’s “work quickly extended beyond Methodism into a large number of Protestant denominations, helping to fuel interest in Christian perfection, holiness and ‘the higher Christian life’ throughout much of English-speaking Protestantism” (pg. 502, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. Larsen). Her views of Spirit baptism and entire sanctification “largely defined the ‘holiness revival’ or ‘holiness movement’ that grew from her work and that of other proponents of Christian perfection, Christian holiness and the higher Christian life. . . . In England, Palmer introduced her ideas during an extended preaching tour between 1859 and 1863. Later, other American revivalists, notably Robert Pearsall Smith and his wife Hannah Whitall Smith, and Asa Mahan, followed up her visit, preaching versions of her theology throughout the British Isles. Their work led directly to the organization of the Keswick Conventions and the ongoing Keswick ‘Higher Life’ Movement among British evangelicals . . . [and] also influenced modern Pentecostal and charismatic movements. . . . [I]t is clear that her emphasis on Pentecost and the baptism with the Holy Spirit and her interpretation of the early chapters of Acts . . . laid the groundwork for much modern Pentecostal and charismatic thinking” (pgs. 502-503, *ibid.*). Naturally, Mrs. Palmer was a continuationist, as her preaching of post-conversion Spirit baptism and perfectionism led to “trances, visions, sleeps, dreams, and miracles” (pg. 66, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Synan). Interestingly, her husband was a homeopathic physician (pg. 501, *Biographical Dictionary of*

had given her the text of a ‘new translation’ of [the] Psalm.”⁵²⁵ Soon after beginning her public work, she “saw that [she] should know the Holy Spirit as a Person . . . through reading Andrew Murray’s *Spirit of Christ*,” leading her to a variety of special spiritual experiences, although she testified, “I could not understand why it made so little difference in my service . . . [i]n these respects [of serving Christ in different ways], I was just the same as before, until, some three years later,” she received a “Baptism of the Spirit for service.”⁵²⁶ She later was able to meet “Mr. Murray” and have “a long talk” with him, “the first contact of a fellowship in God which deepened into a bond in the Spirit between [their] two souls.”⁵²⁷ Penn-Lewis also discovered, after staying at Bethshan, Boardman’s faith-cure “House of Rest,”⁵²⁸ the doctrine of healing espoused by Mahan, Boardman, and Murray, learning “what it meant to take [Christ’s] life and strength for [the] body when needed for His service.”⁵²⁹ Shortly after adopting the Faith Cure doctrine, she began seeking a “Spirit baptism” of the sort “Finney and Asa Mahan”⁵³⁰ experienced, and, not able to figure out whether or not the Bible taught their doctrine,⁵³¹ set aside Scripture and all “books” of theology to simply pray until God revealed directly to her what she could not figure out by means of that Word of God that is “more sure” than even His audible voice (2 Peter 1:16-21). She then, by means of a vision and “revelation” where she saw a “hand holding up in terrible light a handful of filthy rags” and heard what was allegedly God’s voice, adopted what became an influential Keswick doctrine of crucifixion with Christ and the central aspect of her later preaching and writing, based on a misinterpretation of Romans 6, and as a result of receiving that crucifixion doctrine by revelation also received the kind of baptism that

Evangelicals, ed. Larsen), supplying another strand in the web that connects the pagan ideas of the nineteenth century Mind and Faith Cure movement to the healing theology of the twentieth century Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements.

⁵²⁵ Pg. 50, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵²⁶ Pgs. 13-15, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵²⁷ Pg. 48, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. Their continuing friendship is evident from, e. g., the fact that Andrew Murray wrote a preface to the Dutch edition of her book *The Cross of Calvary and Its Message* (see pgs. 220-221, Garrard; pg. 203, *The Overcomer*, December 1914) and that she led various groups of people in studies on spiritual life based on Murray’s writings (pg. 97, *ibid.*). Those who translated Murray’s writings often translated hers as well (e. g., pg. 204, *ibid.*).

⁵²⁸ Pg. 16, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵²⁹ Pg. 17, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. She records an instance where Murray’s doctrine allegedly worked to cure a cold on pgs. 101-102, *ibid.*

⁵³⁰ Pg. 24, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵³¹ The Bible certainly does not teach the Finney/Mahan doctrine of Spirit baptism. See the appendix “Spirit Baptism: A Completed Historical Event. An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism.”

Finney and Mahan had experienced.⁵³² She further explained, in continuity with the Keswick healing doctrine stretching from Boardman through to Simpson, Murray, Nee, and many others, that she was “healed . . . when the Baptism of the Spirit came . . . in 1892 . . . when there came to me that revolution in Christian life which can only be described as a ‘Baptism of the Spirit’ . . . [and which] enabled [me], physically, to endure and to accomplish labour . . . beyond both natural and physical powers,”⁵³³ since the believer’s co-crucifixion with Christ gives him both spiritual victory over sin and Satan and physical healing. Penn-Lewis wrote:

If you have learned the inner life of victory . . . you . . . have in union with Christ . . . life and healing for soul and body. . . . [It is the weak Christian] who is not able to trust beyond the use of means for recovery[.] . . . Isaiah said, “By His stripes we are healed.” . . . I got the inside clue [when] . . . I saw this Hebrew rendering . . . “IN HIS HEALED WOUNDS THERE IS HEALING FOR US!” . . . [J]ust as we are “crucified together with Him,” and share in His victory over sin and Satan, so in a still deeper sense “crucified with Him” *when we stand in victory over sin and Satan*, the life of Jesus ministered by the Holy Spirit indwelling the spirit, can heal the bruised and broken bodies of all who thus by faith apprehend their identification and union with Him . . . as I stand in identification with His death, the VERY LIFE that healed Him, which comes to me as I am joined to Him in spirit, can heal my broken body . . . It is “identification” again, with Him in His death, and a deeper appropriation of His Risen and healing life. . . . [H]ealing . . . is all for each believer in the finished work of Calvary.⁵³⁴

Thus, bodily healing is part of the Christian’s inheritance for today and also a product of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, so that the truly spiritual Christian will reject medicine for the Faith Cure; Penn-Lewis bore her “testimony to the truth of Matt. viii. 17, and Rom. viii. 11” and “st[ood] by faith upon these Divine facts,”⁵³⁵ for “[h]ealing is part of the finished work of Calvary[,] [and] ‘In His healed wounds there is healing for us[.]’ . . . The same life-power that healed and restored His broken body can heal and quicken my broken body.”⁵³⁶ Consequently, “on the basis of Romans Six you may put in your claim for the healing of any bodily disease.”⁵³⁷ One simply “definitively drop[s] [one’s] ‘body’ at the Cross” and then becomes “quite well” as Christ’s bodily life then begins to flow

⁵³² Pgs. 18-29, *Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵³³ Pg. 183, “An Autobiographical Sketch,” *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914.

⁵³⁴ “Experimental Difficulties,” pgs. 186-187, *Overcomer*, 1911. Capitalization and italics retained from the original. It is not clear who Mrs. Penn-Lewis received her unusual “Hebrew rendering” from, for the Hebrew וַיִּהְיֶה בְּרִיחַ הַיָּם וַיִּהְיֶה הַיָּם וַיִּהְיֶה הַיָּם : לְגִי is properly rendered “with his stripes we are healed,” as in the Authorized Version, while the rendering that gave Mrs. Penn-Lewis the “inside clue” is a corruption of the passage. Note her very clear identification of the Higher Life for the spirit and the Higher Life for the body, the Keswick theology and the Faith Cure.

⁵³⁵ Pg. 264, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. However, she also affirmed that a certain kind of bodily weakness can assist one in prayer and thus may be spiritually beneficial. Perhaps she made this affirmation because she was herself in a very weak bodily state at the time of her writing.

⁵³⁶ Pgs. 278-279, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵³⁷ Pg. 134, *Overcomer*, 1914. Pg. 278, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard, records an instance of a girl healed from some unspecified affliction by adopting Penn-Lewis’ view of Romans 6.

into the person who has entered the Higher Life;⁵³⁸ healing comes by “taking the Risen Life of the Crucified Christ to quicken the mortal body,”⁵³⁹ since “diseases spr[ing] from inward soul sicknesses such as lust and anger . . . [and] deliverance and victory over the soul’s imprisoning passions was a part of Christ’s victory on the Cross.”⁵⁴⁰ Evan Roberts exercised this healing ability on himself, so that he was “bubbling over with joy and shouting about his wonderful new body that had become strong by faith,” delivered from “nine years” of sickness—delivered, that is, at least for a few hours, since “twenty four hours later he was knocked out completely with strain” and continued to be as ill as before.⁵⁴¹ Similarly, “fellow-Welshman, Stephen Jeffries, in the early stages of his ‘Faith healing’ that caused scores of conversions in South Wales . . . became a celebrated figure in London,” at least until “some of the healed people testified that they had not been healed permanently.”⁵⁴² Such a loss of the effectiveness of a Keswick healing had an explanation, however; just as the Higher Life will spiritually be lost by ceasing to maintain the decisive act of faith, so bodily healing is lost whenever one ceases to maintain faith,⁵⁴³ in radical discontinuity with the type of healing practiced by Christ and the Apostles. In further discontinuity with the truly miraculous healings recorded in the Bible, which brought about actual and perfect physical deliverance from disease, Mrs. Penn-Lewis’ “healing” at the time of her alleged Spirit baptism left her with “large cavities” in her lungs which were from thenceforth in perpetual danger of “active disease,”⁵⁴⁴ and she continued to endure terrible “ill-health and suffering”⁵⁴⁵ and “constant poor health and much pain”⁵⁴⁶ for the rest of her life as “the lung weakness” grew ever the “more manifest.”⁵⁴⁷ The poor woman suffered from “bouts of pleurisy and neurasthenia . . . weeks of asthmatic attacks and hypertension . . . weeks each year . . . plagued with chills, migraines, and bronchial attacks, which left her too exhausted to think . . . pneumonia [that left her] just a shadow of herself . . . pain and helpless weakness . . . over-straine[d] heart . . . recurrent flu . . . enforced convalescence . . .

⁵³⁸ Pgs. 149-150, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard. See also pgs. 284-285.

⁵³⁹ Pg. 271, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁴⁰ Pgs. 273, 276, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁴¹ Pgs. 248-249, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Thus, for the next number of months, he was so sick that he was “in no state to do anything,” even answer letters.

⁵⁴² Pg. 271, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁴³ Pg. 149, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

⁵⁴⁴ Pg. 65, Garrard; cf. pg. 93, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; pg. 183, “An Autobiographical Sketch,” *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

⁵⁴⁵ Pg. 17, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

⁵⁴⁶ Pg. xi, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

⁵⁴⁷ Pg. 190, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

serious hemorrhage . . . almost fatal illness . . . [and other] sicknesses for forty years.”⁵⁴⁸ Her doctor told her, “Your lungs have been weak ever since I have known you—now 30 years or more,”⁵⁴⁹ and she lived in “constant expectation of a ‘final release’ from her pain-racked body.”⁵⁵⁰ Finally she died, with work she felt she still had left to do,⁵⁵¹ although she had taught that, because of “the fifth to the eight [*sic*] of Romans,” she “expected to be enabled for full service in all the will of God until the Lord comes.”⁵⁵² She did not, however, manage to live until the Lord came, or even until all the work she thought she was supposed to do was accomplished—instead, she died just like people who did not share her revelatory insight into Romans. However, there were other explanations for her continuing and severe illnesses, and for her death, than that her Keswick doctrine of healing was erroneous; for example, when she suffered three serious attacks of pneumonia in 1926-1927, each time being “brought very near the gates of death,” and each one leaving “her weaker in body,” until, at length, she actually died in 1927 at the age of 67, her ill health was not because of a false doctrine of healing, but because, in line with the teaching at the Broadlands Conference⁵⁵³ and later Keswick meetings, by getting pneumonia she was enduring “the ‘fellowship of the sufferings of Christ . . . for His Body’s sake, the Church,’ which made it difficult for the physical frame to respond to the life which the Risen Lord was ready to give.”⁵⁵⁴ Those who are skeptical of her extra-biblical revelations and doctrines, instead of accepting such an excuse as valid, would rather greatly pity both her severe bodily sufferings and her continuing Keswick Faith-Cure delusion.

While Mrs. Penn-Lewis’ Spirit baptism produced a kind of bodily healing that fell far short of the apostolic pattern, it produced a spiritual state that far exceeded what was experienced by the Apostles, for, she wrote, “I have never had to fight a battle of

⁵⁴⁸ Pgs. 14-15, 19, 67, 79-85, 91, 93, 113, 163-164, 204-207, 213, 231, 249-250, 277, 292, 298-299, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁴⁹ Pg. 298, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁵⁰ Pg. 15, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁵¹ Pgs. 301-302, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, for instance, records her plans for “a new syllabus” for various writings, articles for the next edition of *The Overcomer*, and “advance plans the Eccleston Hall Conference” where she had chosen the “Keynote speech.”

⁵⁵² Pgs. 263-264, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

⁵⁵³ Pg. 25, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874.

⁵⁵⁴ Pgs. 297-298, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard. While Mrs. Penn-Lewis employs words that are similar to those in Colossians 1:24, her meaning is certainly very different from that of the Apostle Paul. Compare pg. 186, “Experimental Difficulties,” *The Overcomer*, 1911, for Mrs. Penn-Lewis’ doctrine of Christians “sharing His [Christ’s] suffering for souls, and for the world.”

‘surrender of will’ from that time,”⁵⁵⁵ having entered by Spirit baptism into a realm of spiritual experience higher than any promised in the Bible or experienced by men like the Apostle Paul in their lifetime (Galatians 5:17; Romans 7:14-25).⁵⁵⁶ However, while her entry into the Higher Life came to her, she affirms, directly by a revelation and mystical experience—one of the vast numbers of supernatural revelations and visions she received⁵⁵⁷—she also had the help of “Madame Guyon,” who was most “influential”⁵⁵⁸ upon Mrs. Penn-Lewis when introduced to her by “Mrs. Evan Hopkins”⁵⁵⁹ as Jessie sought Spirit baptism and Higher Life sanctification in 1888. Penn-Lewis did not compare Guyon’s writings with Scripture to see if they were trustworthy (Acts 17:11; 2 Peter 1:16-21), but adopted Guyon’s spirituality because “the Lord spoke” to her and told her that “this is the path.”⁵⁶⁰ Having discovered by revelation from the spirit world the value of Guyon’s writings, Penn-Lewis testified: “I owe a great deal to the books of Madame Guyon, and the way she showed me the path to life ‘in God’ . . . her ‘Life’ . . . [led me to] clearly s[ee] the way of the Cross . . . [and the need for] ‘*dying*’ not ‘*doing*’ [to] produce spiritual fruit.”⁵⁶¹ That is, Penn-Lewis learned from Guyon the alleged truth of Quietism, “an effortless spiritual life” that is “stripped of [even the] vestiges of self”⁵⁶² by passing beyond “effort or feeling or even faith”⁵⁶³ to mystical union with the Divine, “the Christ-life,”⁵⁶⁴ where “your own personality as a separate identity [is] merged in

⁵⁵⁵ Pg. 22, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

⁵⁵⁶ It is noteworthy that even John Wesley, while preaching Methodist perfectionism, “never claimed the experience for himself. He was a very honest man. He taught this perfectionism but he would never say that it was true of himself.” Indeed, for “many years he had great difficulty of producing any examples of it,” although at one point “he felt he could produce 30 such people; but only one of the 30 seemed to persist—the others fell away” (pg. 311, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, D. M. Lloyd-Jones). Mrs. Penn-Lewis, however, once having received her second blessing, was one of the very, very few who—in their own opinion, at least—seems to have kept it.

⁵⁵⁷ E. g., pgs. 82-90, 114, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, describe an assortment of her “ecstatic and mystical states,” visions, voices, and other phenomena from the spirit world.

⁵⁵⁸ Pg. 16, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Books such as Guyon’s *Autobiography*, *Spiritual Torrents*, and *Short Catechism* are specifically mentioned as influential (cf. pgs. 16, 22, *ibid.*).

⁵⁵⁹ Pg. 34, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

⁵⁶⁰ Pg. 34, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard; pg. 16, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁶¹ Chapter 4, *The Centrality of the Cross*, Jessie Penn-Lewis; cf. pgs. 34-35, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard.

⁵⁶² Pg. 16, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Compare the discussion in the excerpt above from “A Warning Exhortation Against Pietists, Quietists, and all Who in a Similar Manner have Deviated to a Natural and Spiritless Religion under the Guise of Spirituality,” by Wilhelmus à Brakel.

⁵⁶³ Pg. 61, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁶⁴ Pg. 63, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. It is noteworthy that “Christ-life” phraseology was in use among the metaphysical and New Thought cults of the late nineteenth century.

Him,”⁵⁶⁵ and “God is—we are not.”⁵⁶⁶ Connecting her Quietism to the teachings of the “old Quakers” and her peculiar view of the soul and spirit, Penn-Lewis taught that one must reject “creaturely activity . . . [which] is manifestly the energy of the creature being used in the service of God rather than the creature seeking in spirit to co-operate with the Holy Spirit given to him as the Gift of the Risen Son of God.”⁵⁶⁷ The Quietism learned from Guyon and the spirit world that produced her writings brought Penn-Lewis “into the stream of life at Keswick . . . in one spirit with . . . all” the ministers and spiritual teachings at the Keswick Convention of 1892,⁵⁶⁸ where speakers included the annihilationist George Grubb.⁵⁶⁹ Penn-Lewis also “prepared reprints of works by . . . Madame Guyon”⁵⁷⁰ to spread Guyon’s Roman Catholic mysticism to others.

Indeed, Jessie Penn-Lewis produced her writings under inspiration, she believed, just like Madame Guyon did, and the writers of the Bible did. Just like “Madame Guyon again and again describes how she wrote, under the hand of God, many things which it was not in her own mind and spirit to write . . . writing . . . treasures of knowledge and understanding that [she] did not know [her]self to possess . . . with incredible quickness,

For example, at Emerson College, where “New Thought metaphysics” were taught rather than “historical Christian orthodoxy,” in “praise of the faculty at his graduation in 1896, one student remarked, [“]You have taught us not only how to think but what to think. You have taught us not only how to live but what to live. You have broadened our horizons, and made of us larger and better men and women, so that we shall go out from here better equipped to live the Christ life.” (pg. 37, *A Different Gospel*, citing John M. Coffee, Jr. and Richard L. Wentworth, *A Century of Eloquence: The History of Emerson College, 1880-1890*, quoting Albert Armstrong, *Emerson College Magazine* (May, 1896), pg. 108). The terminology of the Christ-life was also employed by Mary Baker Eddy and her Christian Science cult, in testimonies that could be phrased in an identical way by advocates of the Keswick theology through the substitution of “Higher Life” or “Keswick” for “Christian Science.” For example:

Through the practice of Christian Science Jesus demonstrated the Christ-life, and every application of Christian Science has for its fruits Christ-like living, and tends to lift man above sin, sickness, and death. Is there anything the Christ-life does not satisfy, any heights or depths it cannot touch, any misery it fails to alleviate, any sin it will not destroy, any aspirations it does not fulfil? That Christian Science does supply these human needs today is the testimony of thousands of men and women. (pg. 218, “What is Truth?” by Charles D. Reyholds, in the *Christian Science Journal*, XXII:4 (July 1904). 193-256)

After all, “Christian Science so includes and enforces th[e] vital trut[h] of . . . a living of the Christ-life . . . that every Christian Scientist finds [himself] renewedly and increasingly emphasizing [it] in his thought and life.” After all, the Christ-life is key, for “it is the normal work of the Christ-life to heal us of sickness as well as sin” (pg. 474, *Christian Science Journal* XXII:8 (November 1904) 457-536)

⁵⁶⁵ Pg. 323, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁶⁶ Pg. 335, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁶⁷ Chapter 3, *Soul and Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

⁵⁶⁸ Pg. 35, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁶⁹ Pg. 35, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pg. 274, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*. Since Hannah W. Smith was a universalist, it should not be surprising that other heretics who rejected the doctrine of hell were embraced and promoted at Keswick.

⁵⁷⁰ See pg. 230, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones. Brunswick, N.J.: Bridge-Logos Publishers, 1997.

for the hand could hardly follow the Spirit,”⁵⁷¹ writing, that is, under a supernatural inspiration, Penn-Lewis commented in her “heav[ily underscor[ed] . . . two-volume edition of Madame Guyon’s ‘Autobiography’” the “similarity of experience” between the two women, in that Jessie felt that Guyon’s description of her writing by inspiration was “exactly how I have always written.”⁵⁷² The same spirit that moved Guyon to write by inspiration—which, unfortunately, was the very god of this world that worked in Hindu and other pagan mystics, and that authored Rome’s many wretched heresies, such as justification by imparted righteousness, salvation by works, transubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, image worship, and the acceptance of non-canonical Apocrypha as inspired—also moved Jessie Penn-Lewis, in accordance with the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light, to write by inspiration. Penn-Lewis’ writings were thus nothing but “determined obedience to the ‘heavenly vision,’” and, she said, “I cannot write one sentence unless I receive it from God” by “inspiration,” thus producing her “Overcomer Literature” in this manner.⁵⁷³ For example, by means of a “special vision,” she described how she had one of her books revealed to her: “[A]s I was going to bed, there suddenly flashed upon me [the book] *The Message of the Cross*⁵⁷⁴ with every chapter marked—the whole scheme, every heading, chapter and title. Next morning I arose with every bit of it printed on my mind. I went to my study—locked the door—took each passage and wrote it as rapidly as it was possible. . . . Will the devil leave me alone over this?”⁵⁷⁵ In association with this book she also narrates: “In a dream I arose and went downstairs and sat alone far away in the vision. A voice came to me from the glory . . . [t]he knowledge was unspeakable.” She wrote:

I was suddenly within the veil. . . . It seemed as if I and the Lord were one. He stood before the Father holding out His pierced hands, but it was I who stood there, too, in Him. He was saying ‘Father I have died,’ but I was saying it, too. Calvary seemed far away down on the hillside.

This was the Risen Lord with marks of the wounds, in the presence of the Father—and I was there. I saw Calvary within the veil. My whole being was melted.⁵⁷⁶

These visions built upon her supernatural encounter earlier in the year:

I suddenly began to feel pressed and burdened. My head fell on my breast with heavy breathing and for some time I groaned heavily. Then God spoke, ‘He who knew no sin was made sin on our behalf.’ I felt as if part of myself or a member of my body was corrupt and loathsome. It was part of me and tied to me by life and I could not be separated from it.

⁵⁷¹ Pg. 177, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵⁷² Pg. 177, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵⁷³ Pgs. 53-55, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵⁷⁴ The book was very influential; for example, “a professor in the Moody Bible Institute . . . said that . . . *The Message of the Cross* had helped him greatly,” and he “took steps to have [Penn-Lewis’s] books distributed in Chicago” (pgs. 97-98, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

⁵⁷⁵ Pg. 66, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁷⁶ Pg. 89, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

Thus I knew what it meant for Him who knew no sin to be made Sin, to have identified with Him and the accursed ones, corrupt with the fallen life and yet joined to Him their Redeemed. For a week I walked so strangely under ceaseless condemnation. All I did seemed wrong. My conscience void of offense seemed to become all offense without a cause. . . . The lesson was that it was all permitted of God to teach me how truly the Pure and Holy One suffered as He became SIN on our behalf.

It was a fellowship of Christ's sufferings in the one sense, that it lets one understand His agony as the sin-bearer. . . . This was the first deep knowledge of the Cross.⁵⁷⁷

Thus, the material for her books came from the spirit world, visions, dreams, voices, experiences with heavy breathing, groaning, parts of her body feeling corrupt and loathsome, and so on. Her teaching on "those deeper aspects of Romans 6 and Colossians 2"⁵⁷⁸ were "revealed" to her in such a manner—rather than from the study of the Bible, which teaches, on the contrary, that while Christ endured the punishment of the sinful world in a vicarious way, sin being imputed to Him, He nevertheless was never personally sinful. Thus, by her visions and revelations, she gained that "deep knowledge of the Cross" which contradicts what Scripture teaches about the work of Christ on the cross. Writing to F. B. Meyer, she said, "I have been given by the Divine Spirit the interpretation of the Cross to the Christian."⁵⁷⁹ She "was specially chosen . . . and equipped with deep spiritual truths in these last days for the Church, truths that no one else held,"⁵⁸⁰ since they are not in the Bible. Furthermore, the spirits that gave her revelations not only miraculously produced *The Message of the Cross*, "every bit of it," although she did not delight in writing it,⁵⁸¹ but enabled her to know the future by "reveal[ing] to her that the book would be greatly used"—and it was, in fact, "being

⁵⁷⁷ Pgs. 87-88, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Evan Roberts also experienced similar ecstatic "ordeal[s]" through which, he claimed, "he had, in a most realistic sense, been partaker of Christ's sufferings" (pg. 174, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905). Nothing in the Bible states or implies that believers endure the kind of penal agony that Christ endured on the cross. Philippians 3:10, which contains the words to which Mrs. Penn-Lewis alludes in her vision from the spirit world that led her to her discovery of her peculiar version of Higher Life theology, refers to the Apostle Paul suffering persecution at the hands of men for Christ's sake, and has absolutely nothing to do with Mrs. Penn-Lewis's doctrine. The Lord Jesus took the wrath of God against sinful mankind "by Himself" and completely satisfied God's wrath by His one offering on the cross (Hebrews 1:3; 9:27-28; John 19:30). When Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts claim to share in Christ's penal sufferings they are guilty of terrible spiritual confusion and blasphemy.

⁵⁷⁸ Pg. 201, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁷⁹ Pg. 231, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁵⁸⁰ Pg. 304, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁵⁸¹ One of her later books, *Studies in the Song of Solomon*, was her "first book written with delight" (pg. 67, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). It seems that writing inspired works was not especially enjoyable for Mrs. Penn-Lewis, at least much of the time, although her *Studies* volume was inspired as well (pg. 220, *ibid.*), so at least once in a while writing under inspiration was enjoyable. Unfortunately, the first book she delighted in writing was one "in which the *Song of Solomon* is not interpreted in the traditional manner" (pg. 220, *ibid.*), but was rather radically and grossly misinterpreted—under inspiration, of course.

studied more and more on the very eve of the Great Awakening” in the Welsh holiness revival “in 1904.”⁵⁸² Nor was *The Message of the Cross* by any means her only book inspired in this manner—her other books were “God-inspired”⁵⁸³ as well. “God’s Hand was upon me . . . and I wrote . . . all He showed me,” she claimed, “chapter[s]” of her writings coming through “vision[s]”⁵⁸⁴ and “revelations,”⁵⁸⁵ “God . . . pouring light . . . and [her] pen running without halting,”⁵⁸⁶ as she “wr[ote] what He gave me . . . even as Moses in the Mount with God.”⁵⁸⁷ Likewise, her magazine articles were inspired. Even historical reports of events “were sounding like prophetic messages,” for “she simply refused to separate her reports from her burden messages given directly by the Lord.”⁵⁸⁸ She could also, free from the constraint of careful study of the Bible because of her inspiration, write “the actual matter [of a book] in one week”⁵⁸⁹ as “there poured from her pen . . . message[s] . . . so definitely given of God . . . truly prophetic . . . words.”⁵⁹⁰ However, although she wrote every sentence and word of her writings under inspiration from the spirit world, she still needed to spend “ceaseless labour in proof correcting . . . and [other] details”⁵⁹¹ that, it seems, supernatural inspiration did not get right at first. So great were the new revelations associated with her that she told others that the “Holy Ghost [could] tak[e] hold of” them also, “according to 1 Chron. xxviii:19,” a passage which describes how David received truth under the infallible inspiration of God, and “inspire” even those who “translate” her writings into other languages; “God will take hold of your mind and your pen,” she affirms of her translator-to-be⁵⁹²—so one does not even need to learn English to read her inspired writings, but can read inspired translations of her works in foreign tongues. Nor was inspiration limited to her as a prophetess, and to those who translated her writings; inspiration was given to many who had entered into

582 Pgs. 66-67, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

583 Pg. 220, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

584 Pgs. 151-153, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

585 Pg. 172, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

586 Pg. 174, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

587 Pg. 173, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. Kenneth Hagin likewise received his books by inspiration (cf. pgs. 61ff., *A Different Gospel*, McConnell).

588 Pg. 140, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

589 Pg. 191, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; Penn-Lewis here speaks of her book “Face to Face.” Other books took a variety of periods to be received by inspiration, although they generally were produced far more quickly than volumes are that employ careful, Spirit-dependent study, painstaking exegesis, and sound hermeneutics, since Mrs. Penn-Lewis could dispense with such work, and was hardly capable of it in any case.

590 Pgs. 220-221, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

591 Pg. 153, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

592 Pg. 128, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

the highest levels of the Higher Life—all those, for example, who were to rise in the partial Rapture were the recipients of “revelation” and “inspiration” from God.⁵⁹³ Furthermore, not Mrs. Penn-Lewis’ writings alone, but sundry other books, inspired as were the books of the Bible, could be written in modern times. The process of 2 Peter 1:15-21, where “prophecy” and “scripture” came from “holy men of God . . . moved by the Holy Ghost,” was taking place in her day, she knew. Penn-Lewis described how one could write in the present day under the same kind of inspiration that was involved in the production of the Bible, both exalting modern writings to the level of Biblical inspiration and downgrading Biblical inspiration by affirming that it did not involve “dictation,” when every jot and tittle of Scripture was indeed dictated, although not mechanically, by the Holy Spirit through holy men of old. In her exaltation of modern “inspired” writings she also attacked the plenary character of Biblical inspiration, affirming that there were levels of inspiration in the Bible, some parts being from God and some parts being what the human writer simply felt like recording.⁵⁹⁴ Thus, Penn-Lewis—under inspiration herself, of course—wrote:

True writing under the hand of God [takes place today]. . . under Divine guidance . . . *moved* by the Holy Spirit (2 Peter 1:21) . . . writing under the guidance of God . . . by the movement of the Holy Spirit in the man’s spirit[.] . . . The Scriptures bear the marks of their having been written in this way. Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (2 Peter 1:21). They spake from God, but as *men* they received and uttered, or wrote the truth given in the spirit, but transmitted through the full use of their divinely enlightened faculties. Paul’s writings all show the fulfillment of the[se] . . . requirements[.] . . . In Paul, too, we see the clear discrimination possessed by a spiritual man, able to recognize what came from God in his spirit, and what was the product of his own thought. . . . Note the varying language in 1 Cor. 7:6, 8, 10, 12, 25, 40, “I say,” and “Not I but the Lord.” . . . [W]riting under the guidance of God . . . is not given by dictation[,] but] . . . “supernatural revelations” [are for] today[.]⁵⁹⁵

Thus, by means of the inspiration of her writings and their inspired translation, Jessie Penn-Lewis followed Madame Guyon and became “a teacher of the deep things of God.”⁵⁹⁶

⁵⁹³ Pg. 201, “The Spirit of Translation,” *The Overcomer* December 1914.

⁵⁹⁴ Penn-Lewis justifies her heresy on inspiration by twisting statements in 1 Corinthians 7 about what Christ said in His earthly ministry and what Paul received by inspiration but was not taught by the Lord during His earthly ministry, but was nonetheless equally the Word of God with the rest of the canon (“not I, but the Lord” vs. “I say,” cf. 1 Corinthians 7:40; 14:36-37; 2 Peter 3:16), with alleged levels of inspiration, so that Paul’s epistle is wrested into an affirmation that some of his writings came from the Lord and some were simply what he thought was nice.

⁵⁹⁵ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Italics retained from original. Some capitalization has been changed. The fact that Penn-Lewis warns that “many” claims to “supernatural revelations” and inspiration are in error does not change the fact, but only makes it all the clearer, that she thinks *some* such claims are not error—only “many,” but not “all” modern claims to write under inspiration, as the Apostle Paul did, are false.

⁵⁹⁶ Pg. 192, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

Indeed, Mrs. Penn-Lewis tied in her inspiration with her role as a woman preacher, for those “passages of the Apostle Paul’s writings” that plainly proclaimed the sinfulness of women preachers “were bound to be *in harmony with the working of the Holy Spirit*⁵⁹⁷ in the Nineteenth Century” during which she had “proved . . . in her own life” the propriety of woman preaching by her spiritual experiences and “God sp[ea]king] with mighty power through His handmaiden.” Had not the preaching, teaching, counseling, public prayer, and other acts of female leadership over men in the Welsh Revival demonstrated that the Most High accepted such disobedience to Scripture,⁵⁹⁸ just as the marvels Penn-Lewis further proclaimed: “The Lord has set a the seal of blessing on my messages at Keswick [and elsewhere],” and she knew that “the whole current of life moving through the spiritual Church is towards clear and open ground for women in the work of God,” so failing to preach would be “disobedience,”⁵⁹⁹ regardless of what the plain statements of the Bible might affirm to the contrary. As she wrote in her apologetic for women preachers, *The Magna Carta of Women*, “The Spirit of God has never been poured forth in any company in any part of the world without the ‘handmaids’⁶⁰⁰ prophesying”—at least in the types of alleged revival with which she was associated—and we “dare not quench the Spirit . . . by saying that only men were inspired by the Holy Spirit.”⁶⁰¹ Her argument from Acts 2 for woman preachers anticipated the Pentecostal

⁵⁹⁷ Emphasis in the original.

⁵⁹⁸ Pgs. 261, 264-265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Concerning the general abandonment of Biblical gender roles in the Welsh holiness revival, an abandonment that was certainly not limited to Jessie Penn-Lewis alone, note also pg. 36, *The Great Revival in Wales: Also an Account of the Great Revival in Ireland in 1859*, S. B. Shaw. Chicago, IL: S. B. Shaw, 1905. It is interesting that in “the story of all holiness movements . . . [t]he place of women is an important part,” from Phoebe Palmer, to Catherine Booth, to Hannah W. Smith, onward (pgs. 165, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall; the woman preachers at Keswick are described on pgs. 148ff.). The neglect of *sola Scriptura* for testimonials by women to their experience of sanctification contributed to the rise of women preachers as testimonial morphed into authoritative proclamation (cf. pgs. 148ff., *ibid*).

⁵⁹⁹ Pg. 197, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁰⁰ Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s appeal to Acts 2:17-21 to support her continuationism and doctrine of women preachers was standard Quaker practice:

As it is the prerogative of the Great Head of the church alone to select and call the ministers of His Gospel, so we believe that both the gift and the qualification to exercise it must be derived immediately from Him; and that, as in the primitive church, so now also, He confers spiritual gifts upon women as well as upon men, agreeably to the prophecy recited by the apostle Peter, ‘It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,’ (Acts 2:17) respecting which the apostle declares, ‘the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.’ (Acts 2:39) As the gift is freely received so it is to be freely exercised” (“Public Worship,” *Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887*. Elec. acc. <http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml>).

Compare the similar attempt to use Acts 2 by Phoebe Palmer (pg. 88, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton).

⁶⁰¹ Pg. 265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

position exactly.⁶⁰² Thus, “[w]omen could be entrusted with prophetic and teaching ministries of the highest kind.”⁶⁰³ If, by “a special vision . . . [her] sermon[s] [were] inspired,”⁶⁰⁴ and she was “God’s special messenger” who properly “asserted her special status as a messenger of God,”⁶⁰⁵ who would dare to question her preaching? She warned: “you will fear lest you touch His revealings to me in the least degree . . . given by Him directly to me.”⁶⁰⁶ When Jehovah spoke directly from heaven on Mount Sinai, or speaks in His Word the Bible, men must fear and tremble before Him: “Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the LORD hath spoken” (Isaiah 1:2). But now hearken—Jessie Penn-Lewis has spoken. Who dares not fear? Indeed, she wrote that she received by revelation her special doctrine of the Cross and sanctification at the time “it pleased God to reveal His Son I me that I might preach Him.”⁶⁰⁷ After consulting with others who saw visions, and feeling “a strange prompting to sing and preach,” Penn-Lewis “was no longer reluctant to share her [own] visions with others,” and shortly thereafter “began her public preaching” in earnest, receiving supernatural ability to “speak to men’s meetings and fe[el] not a twinge of nerves.”⁶⁰⁸ Naturally, a “woman who is called to preach is likewise called to an understanding of the Word which will agree with that inward voice”⁶⁰⁹—Quaker Inner Light and direct revelations must be used to interpret the Bible, which, therefore, must not be the sole and sufficient authority for faith and practice, despite 2 Timothy 3:16-17. For that matter, “there were times when she” did not “compose an address” but simply “appeal[ed] to the Holy Spirit to give her a message” to preach, or supernatural influences “told her to throw away her notes” or to simply “arise, nothing doubting, and speak,” bestowing upon her supernatural “power . . . and liberty” apart from study of the Scriptures; while sometimes a “minister was not pleased” by this preaching without study, “it matters not.”⁶¹⁰ Her writings and messages thus reflected

⁶⁰² E. g., see the argument for women preachers from Acts 2:17-18; 21:9 on pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:12 (Los Angeles, January 1908), reprinted on pg. 50, *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.

⁶⁰³ Pg. 265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, cf. pgs. 259-265.

⁶⁰⁴ Pg. 66, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁰⁵ Pgs. 99, 109, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁰⁶ Pg. 100, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Penn-Lewis’s arguments for women preachers were largely dependent upon the work of Katharine Bushnell, whose invalid arguments were reproduced—under inspiration, of course—by Mrs. Penn-Lewis (cf. pgs. 161-163, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall).

⁶⁰⁷ Pg. 25, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁰⁸ Pgs. 38-39, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁰⁹ Pgs. 268-269, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard.

⁶¹⁰ Pgs. 19, 28-29, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

her “personal experience”⁶¹¹ and were “confirmed by numbers of letters in [her] possession, as well as by the witness of God to many another soul,” rather than by careful attention to sound principles of Biblical exegesis; she had “no desire to dogmatise or systematize,”⁶¹² and, for that reason, pressed upon Christian workers as a dogma not to be questioned: “Do not dogmatize over anything.”⁶¹³ She “return[ed]” theological “books” when sent to her with “nothing to say about them” because she was “not concerned about ‘systems,’ . . . hav[ing] no time for” them,⁶¹⁴ preferring what she could learn by mystical experiences, visions, and revelations.

Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s disregard for systematic theology was evident in her confusion and false doctrine about who God Himself even was. As at the Broadlands Conferences preaching that “Jesus Christ is . . . the Holy Spirit”⁶¹⁵ was acceptable, so Mrs. Penn-Lewis could make modalistic affirmations about God as a single “Person manifested as Father, Son, or Holy Spirit.”⁶¹⁶ She could deny the omnipresence of God the Father and God the Son, claiming that they were not on earth, and deny the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit by affirming that He was on earth, but not in heaven:

God the Father, as a Person, is in the highest heaven. His *presence* is manifested in men as the “*Spirit of the Father.*” Christ the Son is in heaven as a Person, His *presence* in men is by His Spirit. The Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of the Father, and of the Son, is on earth in the Church. . . . The Person of God [which, it seems, is again only modalistic and solitary, not Trinitarian] is in heaven, but the *presence* is manifested on earth, in and with believers; through and by the Holy Spirit; in, and to the human spirit, as the organ of the Holy Spirit for the manifested presence of God.⁶¹⁷

Scripture teaches that all three Persons of the Trinity are within the believer (John 14:23), not the Holy Spirit only (which is necessary, in any case, since the Divine essence is undivided), so that while the Spirit certainly is in the Christian (Romans 8:9), Christ is in the believer also: “Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own

⁶¹¹ Pg. 61, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶¹² Pg. 56, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard.

⁶¹³ Pg. 226, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Jones notes that she, at times, “answered [doctrinal questions] in a very dogmatic fashion” (pg. 227, *ibid.*).

⁶¹⁴ Pgs. 67-68, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard.

⁶¹⁵ Pg. 170, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910.

⁶¹⁶ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

⁶¹⁷ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. It is not affirmed that Mrs. Penn-Lewis was indeed a modalist, rather than a Trinitarian; she could speak of the “three Persons of the Trinity” within almost the same breath as referring to God as a single “Person.” Rather, the affirmation is that she did not know what she was talking about in her Trinitarian affirmations, as evidenced in her failure to recognize or employ the Biblical (cf. Hebrews 1:3) and classical Trinitarian distinction between God as one in essence or nature and three in Person. Nor is it affirmed that Mrs. Penn-Lewis, if pressed, would necessarily boldly, fixedly, and stubbornly deny the omnipresence of the Father, Son, and Spirit; rather, her blasphemy on this subject is likely simply a product of her great, willful, and culpable ignorance of theology.

selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?” (2 Corinthians 13:5; Galatians 2:20). However, Penn-Lewis wrote: “The thought with many is that the *Person* of Christ is in them, but in truth, Christ as a *Person* is in no man,”⁶¹⁸ an affirmation which, happily, is false, as then all would be reprobates. Nevertheless, she knew that it was necessary to adopt all this confusion and false doctrine on the Trinity and the Divine attributes in order to “understand the counterfeiting methods of evil spirits”⁶¹⁹—confusion about and blasphemy against the Triune God would certainly be of great help in resisting evil spirits, at least to those who think it is well to reject theology for mindless mysticism. Thus, while Penn-Lewis did not have time for theology, she had plenty of time to pour over the writings of Madame Guyon, be “influenced by . . . mystical treatises . . . by Fenelon,”⁶²⁰ and read other mystics and heretics,⁶²¹ so that “[s]ome of her language . . . sounded like the mystic cults.”⁶²² “It is the mind, not the heart, that is the trouble,” she wrote; “experience may easily be of God and yet the mind” can get in the way. “Christians . . . know too much[,] [and therefore are] sinking . . . further away from the true life in God.”⁶²³ Thus, her preaching and writing “c[ame] from, and appeal to, the heart rather than the intellect.”⁶²⁴ God “could not use me for writing,” Penn-Lewis wrote, when her “natural mental activities [were] aroused.”⁶²⁵ Thus, rather than carefully examining the context of passages of the Bible and recognizing the fact that a genuine work of God employs a “sound mind” (2 Timothy 1:7), one could instead know one had the correct interpretation of Scripture by emptying one’s mind and having “the Holy Ghost commen[d] the message to every man’s conscience” through direct revelation.⁶²⁶ Penn-Lewis’ writings therefore do “not contain

618 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

619 Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

620 Pg. 61, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

621 E. g., Hannah Whitall Smith (pg. 169, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

622 Pg. 197, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; the statement is by “Dr. Pierson, who had worked well with her during the conventions in Wales.”

623 Pg. 336, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

624 Pgs. 190-191, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard.

625 Pg. 149, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard.

626 Rejecting the Biblical fact that in genuine spirituality, worship, and Christian service the mind is always active (2 Timothy 1:7), not empty, is also a feature of Pentecostalism: “When singing or speaking in tongues, your mind does not take any part of it” (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* II:12 (Los Angeles, May 1908), reprinted on pg. 54, *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; cf. pg. 12, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert M. Anderson), even as in demon possession in pagan religions the “pneuma banishes the human . . . mind . . . and acts or speaks” (pgs. 20-21, *ibid*). Pentecostalism receives no support for its dangerous error that the mind is inactive from 1 Corinthians 14:14, which, when it specifies that the understanding is “unfruitful” or ἄκαρπος, “does not

‘mental’ matter, *i. e.*, matter which is merely the product of the mind, even a *spiritual mind*,⁶²⁷ but material gained by “fresh and living experience” that showed what the true meaning of the Bible was.⁶²⁸ It is, then, not unexpected that those who use their minds—as the Spirit that inspired the Scriptures commands (Isaiah 1:18; Romans 12:1; 2 Timothy 1:7)—come to reject both her claims of inspiration and the theology of sanctification she allegedly received by inspiration. To recognize the inspiration of the writings of a woman who plainly contradicts Scripture, exalts ignorance of theology, promulgates a doctrine of healing that does not actually heal, believes she has deep knowledge of the Cross because parts of her body begin to feel loathsome, and predicted the end of the world in 1914, one must truly set aside his mind.

Nonetheless, Mrs. Penn Lewis preached worldwide in Quaker, Anglican, Lutheran, Salvation Army, Y. W. C. A., China Inland Mission, and many other settings⁶²⁹ to audiences that readily adopted the theology of sanctification and healing she had received from the spirit world by inspiration. She “joined the staff of the women’s meetings . . . [at] Keswick . . . by the invitation of the Trustees” in 1899,⁶³⁰ having already “been present at the Convention . . . [y]ear after year”⁶³¹ before this time, and continued her “service in the Women’s Meetings at Keswick . . . [until] 1909.”⁶³² She preached “[a]t Keswick also, for many years, [at] open meetings . . . addressed on the Sundays preceding and concluding Convention week,”⁶³³ for she was as “an influential figure in the Keswick Convention,”⁶³⁴ being asked to deliver Bible Readings to mixed gender audiences at Keswick.⁶³⁵ Many people came to Keswick specifically to hear her preach.⁶³⁶ After 1909 “she still continued one of the Trustees of the Convention,” simply

mean that the mind did not function, but rather that the product of the mind did not bear fruit and did not edify” (*The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the New Testament*, Rodgers & Rodgers, on 1 Corinthians 14:14).

⁶²⁷ Emphasis in the original.

⁶²⁸ Pgs. 252-253, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard; pg. 174, *The Overcomer*, December, 1914.

⁶²⁹ cf. pgs. 131, 144-145, 156, 245, etc., *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary Garrard.

⁶³⁰ Pg. 184, “An Autobiographical Sketch,” *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914; pg. 199, *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. Harford.

⁶³¹ Pg. 178, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶³² Pg. 185, “An Autobiographical Sketch,” *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914.

⁶³³ Pg. 244, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶³⁴ Pg. 525, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope.

⁶³⁵ Pg. 155, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁶³⁶ Pg. 157, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

“retir[ing] from the leadership of the Women’s Meetings and from the heavy organizing work”⁶³⁷ to focus on her message of warfare with Satan and the coming end of the world. She remained closely associated with Keswick until her death; shortly before her passing she was found “at Keswick in July 1927 . . . [and] travelled to Llandrindod Wells [the Welsh Keswick] on July 29th, as one of the speakers of the Convention.”⁶³⁸ She was also “a standing member . . . [of] the Council of Reference” for the Welsh “Llandrindod Keswick Convention”⁶³⁹ that she helped to found,⁶⁴⁰ and it “was Jessie’s special task to introduce [Keswick-type] conventions to North Wales.”⁶⁴¹ Indeed, she was the initiator of the process through which the Llandrindod Wells Convention began.⁶⁴² She also “helped organize . . . many new Keswick-type local conventions.”⁶⁴³ She did, however, give up some of her responsibilities in 1909⁶⁴⁴ to focus on that “message of the Cross” she had received by direct revelation accompanied with feelings of corruption in her body parts, a message which needed to be “proclaimed anew” to prepare “the Church . . . for translation at the Lord’s appearing,”⁶⁴⁵ and to that end her booklet “The Word of the Cross” was printed in the millions of copies and translated into “no less than one hundred languages and dialects”⁶⁴⁶ as a result of a vision⁶⁴⁷ of “someone coming in shining armor covered with precious stones[,] and this being was filled with God”—Dr. Rudeshill, the printer of her works himself,⁶⁴⁸ although not long afterwards he “lost all his enthusiasm for her work.”⁶⁴⁹ At times a new book she had received by revelation would be “by far the most popular book at Keswick th[at] year.”⁶⁵⁰ Her works filled “Japan, China, . . . India[,] . . . Jamaica, Mexico . . . other Caribbean centers . . . Canada . . . the Australian States . . . Singapore . . . [and] Kenya . . . [were translated into] German, French . . .

⁶³⁷ Pg. 238, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶³⁸ Pg. 299, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶³⁹ Pg. 147, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁴⁰ Pgs. 121-122, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.

⁶⁴¹ Pg. 152, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁴² Pg. 168, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁶⁴³ Pg. 163, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁴⁴ When, in 1911, she received an inspired “telegram . . . from Evan Roberts saying, ‘Withdraw at once,’” she gave up responsibilities at the Welsh Keswick as well (pg. 147, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

⁶⁴⁵ Pg. 210, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶⁴⁶ Pg. 217, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶⁴⁷ Pg. 213, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶⁴⁸ Pg. 109, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁴⁹ Pg. 140, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁵⁰ Pg. 180, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

Swedish, Russian, and other Baltic languages . . . also into Yiddish . . . Italian . . . Hungarian, and other languages,” and influenced Christendom in many other nations. In short, her “message was reaching the whole world,” as distribution of her works was taken over by the “Christian Literature Crusade,” prominent publisher for Christian and Missionary Alliance literature.⁶⁵¹ In America, “the name of Jessie Penn-Lewis had become a household word and . . . her books were in great demand.”⁶⁵² Her doctrines spread so widely that they have “permeated the teaching of the Church of God, even in circles where her name is scarcely known.”⁶⁵³

Penn-Lewis’ theology “of the Cross was the Lord’s preparation of a group of His servants who should carry the message to Wales,”⁶⁵⁴ just as her influence as a “founder of the ‘Welsh Keswick’ at Llandrindod Wells”⁶⁵⁵ and her influence in the continued development of the Welsh Keswick, the Llandrindod Wells Convention, which began in 1903,⁶⁵⁶ and her preaching at its meetings from the first, were central developments in the rise of the Methodist and Anglican aspects, especially, of the holiness revival⁶⁵⁷ of 1904 in Wales, a movement of which she also served as chronicler⁶⁵⁸ and doctrinal guide.⁶⁵⁹ She “was . . . a special correspondent to several of the men most deeply involved in the

⁶⁵¹ Pgs. 308-313, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pg. 178, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁶⁵² Pg. 104, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁵³ Pg. 197, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶⁵⁴ Pg. 199, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶⁵⁵ Pg. 525, “Demythologizing the Evan Roberts Revival,” Pope. Thus, Calvinistic Methodists were already by February 1904 spreading Penn-Lewis’s beliefs and Keswick theology in Wales as a precursor of the holiness revival there (pg. 517, *ibid*).

⁶⁵⁶ Pgs. 145-146, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Compare the discussion of the connection between the beginning of the Welsh Keswick conference at Llandrindod Wells and the Welsh holiness revival under Evan Roberts on pgs. 44-45, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, Robert Anderson.

⁶⁵⁷ However, the holiness revival movement weakened denominational distinctives and ecclesiastical separation so that people “from all denominations drew together” (pg. 129, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). Indeed, Roberts and Penn-Lewis affirmed in *War on the Saints* that a mark of “counterfeit” revival is “a spirit of separation” over “non-essentials” (pg. 143, *ibid.*); contrast Matthew 5:18-19; Luke 16:10. Nothing that the King of heaven commands is non-essential.

⁶⁵⁸ Her reporting sought to be “factual, but . . . also selective” (pg. 128, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

⁶⁵⁹ Pg. 221-226, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard. For example, her doctrine of women preachers was advanced because of the Revival; “women were now taking a principal part . . . just as she had foreseen” (pg. 120, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). She influenced not only the most prominent preacher, Evan Roberts, but also led other ministers of the holiness Revival, from Seth Joshua to R. B. Jones; she had led the latter, for example, “into a new understanding of how to obtain victory over all defeatedness through the Cross. Using the very same proof-texts that she had shown him, he had preached with new authority . . . about renewed revival . . . and never looked back again.” (cf. pgs. 120ff., *ibid.*)

Revival. . . . Few were more intimate with the workings of revival, few were in such constant touch with the chief instruments and their prayer partners, and few were so well-known abroad that their reports of miraculous events would be believed and responded to.”⁶⁶⁰ She, herself Welsh,⁶⁶¹ “founded Keswick in Wales, and was the inspiration behind many other conventions.”⁶⁶² As the Keswick theology contributed to the work of the Welsh holiness revival under Evan Roberts, the holiness revival, in its turn, strongly influenced those worldwide who accepted the Keswick theology: “Keswick leaders helped to bring Keswick emphases to Wales and there was a determination to introduce the Welsh Revival to a wider audience.”⁶⁶³ It is not surprising, in light of her claims to miraculous gifts, supernatural visitations, and inspiration, that she put the Welsh Revival on a level with the religious excitement that birthed the Pentecostal movement in Los Angeles, California, from which the entire Pentecostal and charismatic movements have originated, since she believed, as did Evan Roberts,⁶⁶⁴ that people in their day were experiencing the “gifts of prophesy, tongues, healings, and other spiritual experiences, connected with the work of the Holy Ghost.”⁶⁶⁵ Just as the “heavens [were] opened” in a powerful “working of the Holy Spirit . . . [in] Revival . . . in Wales,” a like heavenly stream was at work in “the Pentecostal Movement in Los Angeles.”⁶⁶⁶ She found acceptable the teaching, coming from “Los Angeles, California . . . [of] many [Pentecostal] Azusa Street leaders and of the Pacific Apostolic Faith Movement” that set

⁶⁶⁰ Pgs. 119-120, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁶¹ Pg. 155, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁶⁶² Pgs. xi, 94-95, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Her preaching and influence also contributed to holiness revival movements in other lands; for example, after she preached in Egypt in 1904, there was revival “blessing among both Coptic and Methodist congregations” (pg. 132, *ibid.*), despite the fact that the Copts believed in a false sacramental gospel akin to that of Roman Catholicism and never repented of their accursed heresies.

⁶⁶³ Pg. 169, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall.

⁶⁶⁴ Roberts believed in the continuation of “tongues and prophesyings and visions,” but only for those who had wisdom and experience as Christians (pg. 173, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.). Others would be deceived by Satan and be wild fanatics. Nonetheless, Roberts was very far from calling wild fanatics all those who were shouting “shabbalaboba, shawannabogo, sinwanafaco,” and so on, and thinking that such gibberish was the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit.

⁶⁶⁵ Pg. 53, *War On The Saints*, Full Text, Unabridged ed., by Jessie Penn-Lewis & Evan Roberts. New York, NY: Thomas E. Lowe, 1974. Roberts & Penn-Lewis warned that Satan was counterfeiting these gifts as well.

⁶⁶⁶ Pg. 38, *The Overcomer*, II:3 (March 1910). She did think that there were elements of dangerous pseudo-spirituality, a stream from beneath, as it were, in both the Welsh holiness revival and in the tongues movement (e. g., in addition to pg. 38, also pgs. 9-10, *Overcomer*, 1910), but any mainline Pentecostal would issue the same sort of warnings, as even those at the heart of the Azusa Street meetings did. The problem was by no means the tongues themselves or the continuationism.

forth teachings on sanctification and miraculous gifts “[l]ike the Overcomer Testimony founded by Jessie Penn-Lewis”⁶⁶⁷ and Evan Roberts.⁶⁶⁸ Those “Americans who had visited each revival center in Wales, especially places where Evan Roberts could be seen,” returned home, and soon “new signs and wonders had begun in the United States,” as “the Spirit had come in power upon Los Angeles” and other places.⁶⁶⁹ Not only did people come from the Welsh holiness revival to America to raise up and support Pentecostalism, but the literature of the supernatural work in Wales through Evan Roberts circulated widely at Azusa Street⁶⁷⁰ and other roots of the Pentecostal movement as the worldwide influence of the Keswick continuationism so zealously promoted by Mrs. Penn-Lewis prepared the way for the rise of worldwide Pentecostalism. As the revivalism in Wales spread into India, “Pandita Ramabai, a high-caste widow . . . heard the news of the Welsh revival.”⁶⁷¹ Ramabai, an avid supporter of women preachers like Mrs. Penn-Lewis,⁶⁷² had spoken at Keswick in 1898 after learning the Keswick theology of receiving the Spirit from a missionary,⁶⁷³ and not long after the rise of the Welsh holiness revival “Pandita Ramabai’s witnessing and praising bands . . . adopted tongues.”⁶⁷⁴ By 1906 they both warmly welcomed Pentecostal leaders⁶⁷⁵ and were

⁶⁶⁷ Pg. 179, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁶⁸ “Jessie and Evan . . . jointly found[ed] and staff[ed] *The Overcomer* . . . [and] signed documents naming them as co-sponsors of” the magazine. “The two founders contributed about seventy five percent of the contents” for the first few years (pgs. 211, 213, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

⁶⁶⁹ Pg. 170, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁷⁰ See, e. g., pg. 29, *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements*, David D. Bundy. Wilmore, KY: B. L. Fisher Library, Asbury Theological Seminary, 1975.

⁶⁷¹ Pg. 193, “The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day,” Frederick G. Henke. *The American Journal of Theology*, 13:2 (April 1909) 193-206.

⁶⁷² Pg. 161, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Amy Carmichael, who “had lived . . . as the widowed [Quaker Keswick founder] Robert Wilson’s adopted daughter since the age of twenty-two” (pg. 89, *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*, Polluck.) and the faith cure healing evangelist who turned Pentecostal Carey Judd Montgomery, among others, similarly believed in women preachers (cf. pgs. 125-127, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton; however, Mrs. Montgomery could not heal herself, nor her husband, pg. 132; cf. pgs. 51-52, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee).

⁶⁷³ Pg. 154, *Transforming Keswick: The Keswick Convention, Past, Present, and Future*, Price & Randall. Ramabai came to associate herself with the Christian and Missionary Alliance and other Keswick continuationist groups (pg. 154, *ibid*).

⁶⁷⁴ Pgs. 27-28, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee. Tongues had spread like wildfire by 1907; note the extensive coverage of the tongues movement under her ministry on pg. 4, *The Apostolic Faith* I:10 (Los Angeles, September 1907); pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* I:12 (January 1908); pg. 1, *The Apostolic Faith* II:12 (May 1908), reprinted on pgs. 44, 49, 53, *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; cf. also pg. 7, *The Pentecostal Evangel: The Official Organ of the Assemblies of God*, 442-443, April 29, 1922.

contributing to the spread of tongues internationally.⁶⁷⁶ “Jessie . . . commended the leaders of [her] group,”⁶⁷⁷ although “[c]onfusion reigned” there as people, “with shoulders and bodies twitching and jerking” experienced “extreme agony” as they “had been speaking in tongues,” while others experienced, based on a gross and blatant misinterpretation of Luke 12:49, a “baptism of fire” that involved a “flood of fire poured on [one’s] head, and . . . burning inside [that was] rather hard to bear.”⁶⁷⁸ Furthermore, “Vicar Alexander Boddy . . . had stood with Evan Roberts in revival meetings and been thrilled by the evidences of the Holy Spirit’s work in their midst,” and “by the following year . . . he heard with joy about [the] Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles, California, and other places . . . sought the same blessing and found himself worshipping the Lord in ‘new tongues.’”⁶⁷⁹ Penn-Lewis’s “old frien[d] . . . Mrs. Groves . . . [was a] missionary who had joined in the [Pentecostal] Latter Rain experience,” and Jessie Penn-Lewis wrote to her that when one “reach[es] the very roots of faith down in the Cross, and from there ascend[s] into a life of purity and worship . . . ‘Tongues’ c[an] be one

⁶⁷⁵ Pg. 147, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan; pgs. 28-29, 47, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee.

⁶⁷⁶ E. g., Donald Gee records how Ramabai’s propagation of tongues contributed to many in the United States adopting the practice and to the formation of the Methodist Pentecostal Church in Chile (pgs. 57-58, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Gee).

⁶⁷⁷ Pg. 183, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁷⁸ Pgs. 193-194, “The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day,” Frederick G. Henke. *The American Journal of Theology*. Bartleman provides a further description of the work of the spirit world, accompanied with tongues, that Jessie Penn-Lewis commended:

The girls in India so wonderfully wrought upon and baptized with the Spirit (in Ramabai’s mission), began by terrifically beating themselves[.] . . . They jumped up and down . . . for hours without fatigue[.] . . . They cried out with the burning that came into and upon them. Some fell as they saw a great light pass before them[.] . . . About twenty girls went into a trance at one time and became unconscious of this world for hours; some for three or four days. During that time they sang, prayed, clapped their hands, rolled about, or sat still. . . . The Spirit was poured out upon one of the seeking girls in the night. Her companion sleeping next to her awoke [and] s[aw] fire envelope her[.] . . . Many of these girls were invested with a strange, beautiful and supernatural fire. . . . At Kara Camp pictures appeared on the walls to a company of small girls in prayer, supernaturally depicting the life of Christ. The figures moved in the pictures and were in colors. Each view would last from two to ten minutes and then the light would gradually fade away, to reappear in a few moments with a new scene. These appeared for twelve hours . . . [as] [i]n Wales colored lights were often seen, like balls of fire, during the revival there. (pgs. 35-36, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-day Pentecost*, by Frank Bartleman. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1980)

While trances, beating of oneself, and the rest, when evaluated by the Bible, were far more in line with what took place in connection with demon possession than with the work of the Holy Spirit, Jessie Penn-Lewis nonetheless commended Ramabai’s work—for it was of the same character as the work that took place in Wales through Evan Roberts and which was encouraged by Mrs. Penn-Lewis herself. The “Pentecostal . . . revival was rocked in the cradle of little Wales. It was ‘brought up’ in India, following; becoming full grown in Los Angeles” (pg. 19, *ibid*).

⁶⁷⁹ Pg. 183, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; pg. 6, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Donald Gee. Note the reception and commendation by American Pentecostal and Azusa Street leader Frank Bartleman on pg. 148, *Azusa Street: The Roots of Modern-Day Pentecost*, Frank Bartleman, ed. Synan.

expression.”⁶⁸⁰ She printed “a long tribute to the [Lutheran] pastors who met at the Barmen Conference” in 1907 and stated: “We acknowledge that God might give all the gifts of the Spirit in our own day. The church should allow herself to be ready.”⁶⁸¹ Mrs. Penn-Lewis was thus “[f]ar from denying the gift of tongues,” but “asked only that those who had no gifts would exercise patience, and that those who had received the gift would stay humble,”⁶⁸² and, therefore, “was criticized by strict evangelicals as one who took too soft a line.”⁶⁸³ Her writings on Pentecostalism were “not written in a spirit of opposition or adverse criticism,”⁶⁸⁴ for, as a Quaker, she agreed with the fundamental continuationism of Pentecostalism. Indeed, Charles Parham, that key founder of the modern “tongues” movement, recognized the affinity of his fanaticism with that of Quakerism by affirming that extra-Biblical “Divine inspiration is the basic principle of Quakerism,” as it was central to his own theology, leading him to believe that the “Holy Spirit” by “inspiration” spoke through him in the various “language[s] of the world.”⁶⁸⁵ It is, therefore, not in the least surprising that Mrs. Penn-Lewis believed that “the best qualities of the Pentecostal movement could be accepted,”⁶⁸⁶ although she criticized certain of its more extreme aberrations.⁶⁸⁷ Her teachings also contained the seeds of a variety of Word of Faith heresies.⁶⁸⁸

⁶⁸⁰ Pgs. 192-193, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁸¹ Pgs. 194, 175, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Compare the background in Germany that led this conference at Barmen in *Perfectionism*, vol. 1, Chapters 6-7, B. B. Warfield.

⁶⁸² Pg. 142, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁸³ Pg. 169, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁸⁴ Pg. 227, *Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁶⁸⁵ Pg. 67, *The Everlasting Gospel*, Charles F. Parham.

⁶⁸⁶ Pg. xv, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁸⁷ For example, Penn-Lewis was happy that the followers of “Lady Pandita Ramabai” in India “had adopted tongues but forbidden rollings, groanings, and other body movements” (pg. 142, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones). Thus, a “careful study of all her correspondence in 1907-1908 would silence those who have misrepresented Jessie Penn-Lewis as an uncompromising enemy of all forms of Pentecostalism” (pg. 143, cf. pgs. 177-194, *ibid.*). Nor is one surprised that a “full set” of her works has been compiled and is stored at the “Assembly of God College, Mattersey . . . England” (Pg. 317, *ibid.*).

⁶⁸⁸ For example, she anticipated the Word of Faith heresies that speaking words create reality in a manner comparable to the way in which God created the world *ex nihilo* by His speech, and that God Himself lives by faith. Commenting on Mark 11:22-24, and assuming that the text of the Authorized Version is mistranslated in Mark 11:22 and the correct rendering should be “have the faith of God,” she wrote:

The words . . . “Have faith in God,” are really . . . “*Have the faith of God*.” . . . The “faith of God” is this, that when *He* speaks the word the thing is *done*. God said, “Let there be light,” and there was light. The words you speak are of the greatest importance in the prayer life. In this spiritual sphere, what *you say* creates. . . . “The faith of God” is the faith which God had when He said: “Let there be light.” God does not doubt that it will be as He has said. . . . Remember that your *words* are of importance in the spiritual realm. “They overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony.” [Revelation 12:11,

Not only did Penn-Lewis see the Welsh holiness revival as a phenomenon similar to the Pentecostal revival, but the movement in Wales led her also to the composition of *The War On The Saints*⁶⁸⁹ with Evan Roberts. This book, which was part of the preparation for the end of the world in 1914, was intended “[o]nly [for] those who have experienced the baptism of the Holy Spirit,” as all others would not be able to “understand and benefit”⁶⁹⁰—Christians who simply searched the Scriptures and therefore rejected the doctrine of a post-conversion Spirit baptism certainly would find no value in the book, as it was not based on grammatical-historical interpretation of the Bible, but upon “inquiries and testings . . . evidence . . . of counterfeit signs, visions, exercises, and manifestations . . . [and] testimonies.”⁶⁹¹ Indeed, “Evan Roberts disclosed later that [the book] had included his spiritual autobiography because he had long since realized that he too had been deceived and harassed by Satan,” although by the time *War on the Saints* was written, he had now obtained “power to understand and discern,”⁶⁹² so one did not need to fear that the book itself was a product of Satanic deception—after all, the book had cosmic dispensational significance in preparing for the end of the world in 1914, so no deception could possibly be involved. Roberts called “*War on the Saints* . . . my unnamed biography.”⁶⁹³ *War on the Saints* stated that believers, even those who have received the second blessing of the baptism of the Spirit, “devoted believers . . . honest and earnest believers . . . who have been baptized with the Holy Ghost . . . who sigh and cry over the powerlessness of the true Church of Christ, and who grieve that her witness is ineffective . . . can be deceived, and even possessed by deceiving spirits.”⁶⁹⁴ Deception

which, it seems, is also supposed to support the idea that words create reality.] . . . Apply this to everything in your life, and it will make you beware of your words” (pgs. 56-58, *The Spiritual Warfare*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Italics in original.)

The heresy that God lives by faith found its way from Penn-Lewis, through Keswick and Higher Life leaders such as A. B. Simpson, who misinterpreted Mark 11:22-24 likewise to teach that God lived by faith (pg. 40, “Does God Act by Faith?” A. B. Simpson. *The Alliance Weekly* 59:3, July 19, 1924), into the Pentecostal and Word of Faith movements; see, e. g., pg. 98, *In His Presence*, E. W. Kenyon. Kenneth Hagin stated: “God ha[s] faith. . . . Evidently God had faith in His [own] faith, because He spoke the words of faith and they came to pass” (“Having Faith in Your Faith,” Kenneth E. Hagin. Tulsa, OK: Faith Library, 1980, 4-5, cited pg. 346, *Charismatic Chaos*, John MacArthur).

⁶⁸⁹ Note that the seventh and subsequent editions of *War on the Saints* commend the articles and subsequent book by John A. MacMillan, *The Authority of the Believer*; see the analysis of MacMillan below.

⁶⁹⁰ Pg. 228, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, citing the preface to reprinted editions of *War on the Saints*.

⁶⁹¹ Pg. 228, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁶⁹² Pg. 229, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones; cf. pgs. 180-183.

⁶⁹³ Pg. 102, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁶⁹⁴ Compare William Boardman’s earlier warning that entry into the Higher Life can lead one into fanaticism, an affirmation he proved, not with Scripture, but with the testimony of a lady who consecrated herself and then became a Shaker (pgs. 144-149, *The Higher Christian Life*, Boardman).

is usually associated with possession: “Christians are as open to possession by evil spirits as other men, and become possessed . . . in most cases, unwittingly . . . apart from the cause of willful sin.”⁶⁹⁵ However, sometimes believers, without any known sin, and without even being deceived, may be possessed; through “unknown . . . sin . . . even by a believer, an evil spirit may take possession of the mind, or body, without there being any experience of deception.”⁶⁹⁶ Demons can not only possess ordinary believers without known sin, and who are not deceived, but even the most spiritual believers can be possessed. Indeed, “the most spiritual believers, baptized with the Holy Spirit, and most fitted to be used of God in Revival service, may become deceived and possessed by demons in their outer being through accepting the counterfeits of Satan.”⁶⁹⁷ In fact, *War on the Saints* teaches:

[S]ouls who are (a) not disobedient to light, or (b) living in any known sin, but the contrary . . . become possessed by evil spirits, through deception over absolute surrender to God (as they supposed), and whole-hearted reckless abandonment to ‘supernatural power’ which they believed was of God, but through ignorance, were not able to discern as counterfeits by demons of the Spirit of God. . . . Evidence of believers wholly consecrated to God in spirit, soul and body, in will and fact, becoming possessed in mind and body by demons, is now available, having all the symptoms and manifestations . . . described in the Gospels. Multitudes of believers are possessed in various degrees[.]

Vast multitudes of believers were possessed, Mrs. Penn-Lewis knew, and possessed, not in some lesser sense, but to the fullest extent and in every way that people were indwelt and controlled by Satan and his demons recorded in Scripture:

Evidences are now available, proving that . . . possession in its fullest degree, has taken place in believers . . . such cases having all the symptoms and manifestations described in the gospel records. The demon answering questions in his own voice, and speaking words of blasphemy against God through the person . . . the demon, or demons, in the body, using the tongue, and throwing the body about at their will.⁶⁹⁸

⁶⁹⁵ Chapter 4, *War on the Saints*.

⁶⁹⁶ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*.

⁶⁹⁷ Pg. 283, *War On the Saints*, Roberts & Penn-Lewis. Roberts & Penn-Lewis follow Robert P. Smith in this affirmation. Smith explained: “You may have special temptations of Satan after this time of [Spirit] baptism at Oxford. . . . Never forget that the highest elevations of experience involve the most fearful dangers” (pgs. 257, 259, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874). Of course, since Robert’s Baptism involved the “thrill” and “intense emotion” (pg. 259, *ibid*) of his erotic bridal Baptism doctrine, it was not surprising that the Baptism and Higher Life he proclaimed led to fearful dangers and special temptations by Satan.

⁶⁹⁸ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*. Some apologists for *War On the Saints* have affirmed that the book employs its own peculiar definition of demon “possession” that does not really mean “possession” in the manner recorded in the Bible, but something lesser, such as mere demonic influence, so that it allegedly does not affirm that believers can be possessed in the full sense of the term. However, such a view is entirely false, as the plain declarations by Mrs. Penn-Lewis above make clear. While *War on the Saints* affirms that there are degrees of demon possession—another doctrine that, according to the Bible, at least, is false—when Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis taught that believers can be “possessed,” as possessed as the worst case of possession recorded in Scripture, their words were not an accidental slip of the pen. Then again, since Penn-Lewis wrote under inspiration, her word choice obviously could not be an accident.

Mrs. Penn-Lewis knew that the teaching that believers could be possessed to the uttermost extent by demons was extremely important, for: “IF THEY [demons] GET INSIDE THEY WILL MAKE HIM [the Christian or other possessed person] DO WHAT THEY WILL.”⁶⁹⁹ Unfortunately, nobody could know if he had sinned enough to allow demon possession to occur,⁷⁰⁰ so demons could be possessing and controlling Christians without their being the slightest bit aware of the situation. It was all the more necessary, then, to study *War on the Saints* to find out what to do in what could seem to be the almost inevitable onset of demon possession as one came under Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s influence.

In fact, as Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s teachings spread, it was “becoming more and more prominent . . . [for] CHRISTIAN[S] TO BE POSSESSED BY EVIL SPIRITS,”⁷⁰¹ but this was certainly not because her teachings were themselves demonic. No, the recognition that the most spiritual believers, those who have drunk the deepest of the Higher Life Mrs. Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts were propagating, those who have risen to the level of perfection so that they do not have any known sin, may nevertheless be demon possessed, makes it clear how absolutely essential *War on the Saints* truly is—for with the Bible alone, nobody would be able to know such things as these, now brought to light under inspiration by Roberts and Penn-Lewis in preparation for the end of the world. Indeed, Scripture would indicate that believers cannot be demon possessed (1 John 4:4), so it is essential to read *War on the Saints* to discover, from “experience” and “evidences” and “fact” outside of the Bible, that the literal interpretation of God’s holy Word must be rejected⁷⁰² on this subject:

⁶⁹⁹ Pg. 205, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones, citing *The Overcomer*. Capitalization in original.

⁷⁰⁰ “The needed degree of ground given to an evil spirit in order to possess, cannot be clearly defined” (Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*).

⁷⁰¹ “Believe Not Every Spirit,” pg. 71, *Overcomer* 1912. Capitalization in original. Compare Robert P. Smith’s warning that those who enter the Higher Life should “expect revelations of the world of darkness” (pg. 43, *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874*. Chicago: Revell, 1874).

⁷⁰² Mrs. Penn-Lewis, answering the question, “How are we to know when the Lord speaks to us in a word of Scripture,” does not speak about interpreting the Bible literally, grammatically, and historically, but states instead: “It depends *where* the text comes from. Can you detect what comes from the Holy Spirit in your spirit, and what from your own mind? You may walk after the ‘soul’—that is after your mind—and not ‘after the spirit.’ Satan has access to your mind, and he knows texts . . . [say,] [‘]what is of God [in the text] I take, and what is of the devil I refuse, now may God prove which is which!’ Constantly do that, and you will . . . live after the Spirit . . . learn[ing] in experience . . . without even knowing whether it is God or Satan in specific matters” (pg. 186, “Experimental Difficulties,” *The Overcomer*, 1911). One is to reject the use of one’s mind in interpreting the Bible in favor of mysticism, teaches Mrs. Penn-Lewis. Naturally, careful exegesis and the literal interpretation of Scripture will pass away with such a methodology.

The fact of the demon possession of Christians destroys the theory that only . . . persons deep in sin, can be “possessed” by evil spirits. This unexamined, unproved theory . . . serves the devil well[.] . . . But the veil is being stripped off the eyes of the children of God by the hard path of experience; and the knowledge is dawning upon the awakened section of the Church that a believer . . . can . . . be possessed.⁷⁰³

Indeed, the “facts” Penn-Lewis speaks of made it so clear that Christians could be possessed that texts to the contrary—such as 1 John 4:4 & 5:18—are not only not exegeted anywhere in the course of the hundreds of pages of *War on the Saints*, but they are not even cited. What need is there of exegesis when one has experience? An exegetical and theological argument against believers being demon possessed, such as the following, could surely be simply rejected out of hand:

Christians cannot be possessed . . . [*daimonidzomai*]. This is true for the following four reasons.

1.) The believer has new life in Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, if Spirit indwelling means anything, it should mean that Christians cannot be victimized, indwelt, and/or possessed by demons. John seems to conclusively say this when speaking of false teachers in the lineage of the Antichrist who bring a “spirit” of false doctrine. He asserts, “You [believers] are from God . . . and have overcome them; because greater is He who is in you than he who is in the world” (1 John 4:4). Likewise, believers are God’s temple. Thus, God promises that He “will dwell in them and walk among them; and . . . will be their God, and they shall be [His] people” (2 Cor 6:16). In short, while Satan and his minions unceasingly attempt to assail believers, it is unthinkable that they could come in and possess, control, or victimize the saints with the apparent benign acquiescence of the indwelling God.

2.) The believer also has the guarding protection and preservation of the Son of God. As John says, “We know that no one who is born of God sins [i.e., habitually sins; present tense]; but He who was born of God keeps him, and the evil one does not touch him” (1 John 5:18). Of course, no Christian can live without sin or without being attacked from Satan. Still, the believer here is promised that he will not be overcome by the devil and his forces. John’s verb for “touch” is *hupto*, which denotes *to take hold of*,⁷⁰⁴ not a mere superficial encounter but rather a *fastening on*⁷⁰⁵ or *overpowering* encounter. What John means is that Satan cannot *finally* overtake and possess the believer. Further, the believer is described as one “born of God,” a state of continuing eternal life (perfect passive of *gennao*); as such, he cannot practice sin (present tense of *hamartano*). The reason for this is the keeping power of another who has also been born of God in a similar, though infinitely greater, sense.

3.) Satan has been defeated through the cross work of Jesus Christ.⁷⁰⁶ This guarantees that a believer is forever freed from Satanic control and victimization. Jesus Himself, in view of His coming death, pronounced this defeat, saying, “Now judgment is upon this world; now the ruler of this world will be cast out” (John 12:31). Paul similarly speaks of Christ’s “disarm[ing] the rulers and authorities . . . [and] ma[king] public display of them, having triumphed over them through” the cross (Col 2:15). Christ, by His infinite atonement for sin forever broke the hold of evil angels⁷⁰⁷ on those who have been forgiven. In another place, Christ’s death is said to have

⁷⁰³ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*. Naturally, no Scripture is given to support Penn-Lewis’s assertions.

⁷⁰⁴ BDAG, s.v. “*hupto*,” p. 130.

⁷⁰⁵ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1966), p. 538.

⁷⁰⁶ *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, s.v. “Demon,” by A. Scott Moreau, p. 165.

⁷⁰⁷ So F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), pp. 110–11.

rendered the devil “powerless” (Heb 2:14). Further, the believer’s union with Christ . . . assures him that the merit and validity of the Savior’s infinite and eternal cross work is forever efficacious against any hostile takeover attempt by Satan or any of His angels. The believer’s position of being in Christ, of being already judicially-seated in the heavenly places with Christ (Eph 2:6), makes Satan’s attempts to successfully dominate him futile.

4.) Demon possession requires complicity. Strong observes that “the power of evil spirits over men is not independent of the human will. This power cannot be exercised without at least the original consent of the human will.”⁷⁰⁸ For instance, when Satan desired to afflict Peter, it was within Peter’s power to pray for help in resisting the temptation (Luke 22:31, 40). Similarly, the expelled and wandering unclean spirit in Mark is said to be “seeking rest,” perhaps implying that he is looking for someone hospitable to his homeless plight (Matt 12:43). As such, the complicity would approximate an active availability for or exposure to demonic takeover. And, a true, Spirit-indwelt believer could not participate in such drastic accessibility. Granted, a Christian may be harassed by Satan and demons due to moral failure or willful sinning, but this sort of harassment is not coterminous with demonization.⁷⁰⁹

While Scriptural exegesis and legitimate conclusions from literally interpreted Scripture—that is, God’s own self-testimony—could be rejected out of hand, what the demons themselves had testified was important. In fact, the demons had themselves taught that believers could be possessed, and that they could be cast out by the sign gift of exorcism and by the binding of Satan and his compatriots—that is, these affirmations were, in truth, the doctrines of demons (1 Timothy 4:1)—so, clearly, it was a good idea not to listen to the Word of God, but set it aside and take heed, instead, to such seducing spirits and use what devils said through people who were possessed to figure out the truth.⁷¹⁰ While Scripture teaches that the sign gift of exorcism has ceased and believers

⁷⁰⁸ *Systematic Theology*, pp. 457–58.

⁷⁰⁹ Pgs. 395-398, *A Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity, Volume 1: Prolegomena and the Doctrines of Scripture, God, and Angels*, Rolland McCune.

⁷¹⁰ Thus, to prove that Christians can be demon possessed, and that demons can be cast out by the techniques of *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis cites the following:

The Case of a Christian Lady . . . In the Spring of this year (1912) [this servant of God] who was possessed, came here, and the spirits possessing her spoke through her in voices utterly unlike her own. They would utter through her the most awful blasphemies against God, and against our Lord Jesus Christ, and would prophecy [*sic*] concerning the Church[.] . . . When the frenzy comes upon her, she is fearfully shaken, dashes about the room, made to howl like a dog, and her hands clenched, her face drawn with horrible contortions, etc., etc. . . . in the interval [between fits she] is the MOST LOVELY SPIRITED CHRISTIAN WOMAN. . . . This sister is not one who has not got faith. She is well grounded in the same faith, and has the same light as we have; but we have here to do with a demon[.] . . . It would also be an error if one were to think that PRAYER AND COMMANDING had not been of any use, for in these last three weeks God has done great and glorious things . . . [although] [t]he demon is still there, it is true[.] . . . [making] a desperate and plaintive howling . . . that lasts all the time we pray. . . . *Later*. . . For about a fortnight now the demon has been silent. For eight days he did not speak a single word, only he cried out twice: “THE AUTHORITY CASTS ME OUT!” The only thing he does is howling and gnashing of teeth. Some days ago we prayed for about one-and-a-half hours. In this way it goes on now for ten or fourteen days—there is only this terrible crying . . . There is not any blasphemy, nor cursing God, no more asserting threatenings, and all the sayings that he would not depart, that it would not suit him—all this has ceased. Instead of the dreadful ravings and outbursts of rage, there is now the desperate howling, often a dreadful screaming . . . the sister is almost free from his tormenting her . . . The demon must have received a terrible blow from God . . . [i]t was so last evening; when we prayed, the desperate cry began at once, and I felt once more the impulse to command the demon in the Name of the Lord Jesus to depart. He then gave a great start, he trembled, howled, stretched out both hands as if imploring mercy, and begging us not to do that, but *he was not allowed to utter a single*

are not to command, talk to, or in any way dialogue with demons,⁷¹¹ Jessie Penn-Lewis knew better. The fact that believers could be possessed was validated by people who had the sign gift of “discerning of spirits” in modern times,⁷¹² as the sign gifts, whether exorcism, or “discerning of spirits . . . the gifts of healing . . . the working of miracles . . . tongues,” and the rest (1 Corinthians 12:9-10), did not pass away in the first century, but, in accordance with Penn-Lewis’s Quaker and Keswick continuationism, are for modern times also; through post-conversion Spirit baptism “the Holy Spirit. . . . is able to distribute to each the gifts of the Spirit, for effective witness to the Risen Head, ‘dividing to each one severally even as He will.’ (See 1 Cor. 12:4-11).”⁷¹³ Furthermore, post-conversion Spirit baptism, with its distribution of miraculous gifts, is the essence of revival. In revival, as the gifts are distributed, not only can believers who are spiritual, not living in any known sin, and not disobedient to any light, be demon possessed, but revival, Spirit baptism, and the contemporary distribution of the gifts of 1 Corinthians 12 actually leads to demon possession. Few who are revived are not also deceived by Satan at that time, with vast numbers of the most spiritual believers becoming possessed and vast numbers of less spiritual believers simply being deceived, for revival is the hour of Satan’s power, and Satan’s most effective harvest time:

We have seen that the period in the believer’s life wherein he receives the Baptism of the Holy Spirit is the special time of danger from the evil supernatural world, and the Baptism of the Spirit is THE ESSENCE OF REVIVAL. Revival dawn, is, therefore, the great moment for deceiving

word. But there followed strong reaction and vomiting, and this was repeated as often as I spoke the command in the Name of the Lord Jesus to depart. Of course we have to go on praying just as earnestly, but as God has done such great things, and if we go on praying, also the last blow will be given. The demon will have to depart. . . . [T]he demon’s acknowledgment of the power and authority granted to those who commanded him, and the other spirits to depart, is striking. The spirit in possession said: “Oh, this authority, this authority which they have now recognized, is an awful thing for hell!” Pleading for mercy at another time the evil spirit said, “Do leave off your commanding. For three weeks I have suffered unbearable torments because of it. Do not tell anybody that we had to yield to the authority Oh, these prayers of believers . . . they always pray, they are no longer afraid” (“Demon Possession Among Christians,” in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Capitalization and italics in original).

While Mrs. Penn-Lewis believes that such a story is evidence that her doctrine is true, it is obvious to those who are regenerate and apply the *sola Scriptura* that the whole story stinks of the pit and that the devils were in charge of the whole situation. When Christ and the Apostles used the genuine gift of exorcism, devils did not take weeks or months to be expelled—they were cast out immediately. What kind of evidence for Christianity would it be if Christ or an Apostle told a devil to leave somebody, and the devil said no, refused to leave for weeks and months, led the alleged Christian who was possessed to howl and cry, scream, be tormented, and vomit, for hours and hours, for days and weeks, while “authoritative” commands to leave were offered over and over and over again? The devils want people to think that they are able to resist the Almighty power of God so that they can say no to Him, just as they want people to think that they can possess Christians. The astonishing spiritual blindness involved in believing a demon is telling the truth when it validates a doctrine of warfare prayer is itself an evidence of Satanic delusion.

⁷¹¹ See the convincing argument on pgs. 398-400, *A Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity, Volume 1: Prolegomena and the Doctrines of Scripture, God, and Angels*, Rolland McCune.

⁷¹² Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*.

⁷¹³ Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*.

spirits to find entrance into the believer by deception through counterfeits, resulting sometimes in . . . possession[.] . . . Few go through the crisis without deception by the enemy in more or less degree[.] . . . If the believer does become deceived by evil spirits at the time that he is baptized with the Spirit . . . he begins through deception to descend into a pit which ultimately means depth of darkness, bondage and misery. . . . Those who do not discover the deceptions sink into deeper deception, and become practically useless to God and to the Church. Revival is the hour and power of God, *and of the devil*[.] . . . [T]he devil [is] . . . DOING HIS WORK, FROM THE DAWN OF REVIVAL. . . . Revival . . . is his greatest harvest time. He is netting his victims, mixing his workings with the workings of God, and beguiling the saints more effectively than he was ever able to do with his temptations to sin. Satan was never more active among the sons of God. . . . To put it in bluntest language, the Revival hour is the occasion for evil spirits to obtain ‘possession’ of spiritual believers[.] . . . Believers who are not so abandoned to the Spirit escape the acute ‘possession,’ but . . . are equally open to deception[.]⁷¹⁴

Consequently, the “revival . . . in Wales . . . [was] followed [by] . . . evil spirit possession . . . under the guise of the Holy Spirit,”⁷¹⁵ so that the “Awakening in Wales” led, by 1906, to “what may be called the ‘hour and power of darkness’ upon the Church of Christ.”⁷¹⁶ The “outpouring of the Spirit of God in Wales” was followed by an “outbreak of demons upon the spiritual Church” in the country.⁷¹⁷ Indeed, “since the Revival in Wales . . . almost without exception, in every land where revival [that is, revivalism of the sort experienced in Wales under Evan Roberts and promoted by Mrs. Penn-Lewis] has broken forth, within a very brief period of time the counterfeit stream has mingled with the true . . . [in] the Church of God.”⁷¹⁸ The rampant spread of demon possession and devilish counterfeits of true spirituality was not, however, evidence that something was terribly wrong with the theology and practice of Evan Roberts, Mrs. Penn-Lewis, and their followers in the Welsh holiness revival, nor did the fact that nothing like a horrific domination by Satan and his demons take place in connection with true revival in the book of Acts seem a cause for concern. The fact that those who adopt and practice the theories of consecration, revival, and Spirit baptism of Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts, and advance the farthest in the Higher Life, are especially in danger of demon possession is simply a corollary of truth about Christian sanctification⁷¹⁹ received by Mrs. Penn-Lewis and Mr. Roberts through visions, voices and inspiration, and can therefore be

⁷¹⁴ Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*. Capitalization in original.

⁷¹⁵ Pgs. 44-45, 55, *War On The Saints*.

⁷¹⁶ Pg. 233, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Garrard.

⁷¹⁷ Pg. 184, “An Autobiographical Sketch,” *The Overcomer* magazine, ed. Jessie Penn-Lewis, December 1914.

⁷¹⁸ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

⁷¹⁹ Hannah Whitall Smith affirmed something similar: “[T]he nearer we seek to approach our God, and the more we try to please Him, the greater our [spiritual] dangers! . . . [I]t is . . . very perplexing” (pg. 36, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of “H. W. S.”*, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to Mrs. Anna Shipley, August 8, 1876). Hannah Smith’s perplexity is solved if the Higher Life theology she shared with Mrs. Penn-Lewis is actually a pagan mysticism, not Christian spirituality. An increase of demon possession and other profound spiritual dangers is then easily understood.

trusted, although few things sound, to the ear of one who has not experienced the power of the spirits that have influenced Penn-Lewis and Roberts, more unbiblical and dangerous.

However, since “PURE Revival . . . has to do with the spirit, not the intellect,”⁷²⁰ the fact that one’s intellect cries out that *War on the Saints* is filled with unscriptural and irrational nonsense is not important. Rather, one can have hope, because “[t]he Church of Christ will reach its high water mark when it is able to deal with demon possession; when it knows how to ‘bind the strong man’ by prayer; ‘command’ the spirits of evil in the name of Christ, and deliver men from their power,”⁷²¹ by practicing what *War on the Saints* teaches, including both a doctrine of “binding the strong man,” Satan, by a type of warfare prayer that is not found in the Bible,⁷²² and a false doctrine of how to deal with demon possession, all of which were passed on to John A. MacMillan, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, Pentecostalism, and the Word of Faith movement.⁷²³ Indeed, the

⁷²⁰ Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*.

⁷²¹ Pg. 43, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. 9th ed.; New York, NY: Thomas Lowe, 1912, 1963.

⁷²² Thus, Evan Roberts recorded—in all capitals, to boot—that he was confronted with the following question:

I AM ASKED WHERE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT IS IT IMPLIED THAT WE CAN PRAY AGAINST (a) ENVIRONMENT, (b) EVIL SPIRITS, (c) SATAN, (d) THE FOE, (e) SPIRITUAL WICKEDNESS, (f) FORCES OF DARKNESS? IS THE POSITION A SCRIPTURAL ONE, AND SPIRITUALLY CORRECT TO TRUTH AND FACT?

To this question Roberts replied:

Praying “against” the powers of darkness is Scriptural, and in accord with truth, and attested facts of Christian experience. It can be clearly seen in Scripture and in the history of the Christian church, that . . . God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the destruction of sin and Satan. . . . A questioner . . . [who] is not “spiritual” . . . cannot understand, or interpret in a spiritual sense, the language used by the Apostle in connection with the warfare with the forces of darkness. Let any questioner take to God the whole matter, and ask for a leading into all truth concerning it; then he will be shown the true meaning of the words, not from intellectual reasoning, but from Divine enlightenment, and the experiences of life” (“The Scriptural Basis For ‘Warfare’ Against The Powers Of Darkness,” by Evan Roberts, in *War on the Saints*).

Roberts never provides a single example, out of hundreds of prayers that are recorded in the Bible, of even one example of his warfare prayer concept, nor of people binding Satan by prayer, much less does he prove his idolatrous concept that God allegedly is powerless to destroy Satan without people binding the devil first. Only if the literal interpretation of the Bible is rejected, the sufficiency of Scripture concerning prayer is set aside, and God’s Word is twisted and interpreted in light of “the experiences of life,” while “intellectual reasoning” is rejected for a “spiritual sense” that is derived from “attested facts of Christian experience” instead of the grammar and context of passages does Roberts get any evidence for his warfare prayer doctrine from the infallible revelation of God.

⁷²³ “[T]he concept [of binding Satan] was taught, not only in early Alliance circles through Simpson and MacMillan, but also . . . [by] teachers such as Andrew Murray, Jessie Penn-Lewis and Watchman Nee. . . . Chinese spiritual leader Watchman Nee, whose father-in-law was an Alliance pastor and who was influenced by Penn-Lewis, Murray and Simpson, also taught authoritative prayer and the power of binding and loosing in 1934” (“A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement,” Paul King, *Alliance Academic Review*, ed. Elio Cuccaro. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1996). Thus, MacMillan wrote: “[In] [p]rayer . . . God’s believing people . . . bind the . . . principalities and powers, the world-rulers of this darkness, the hosts of wicked spirits in the heavenlies . . . [and] hold back . . . the working of the power of the air,” and thus “procure . . . peace on earth” and an end to many wars, among other things (*Alliance Review*, October 7, 1939, 626-627). MacMillan allegorized Psalm 149:8 to prove his affirmations.

deity set forth by Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis is helpless and unable to defeat sin and Satan without people binding the devil.⁷²⁴ Binding Satan and evil spirits was even necessary to allow Jesus Christ to return and catch up His saints (or at least those saints who had passed beyond justification, and the second blessing of the Higher Life, and the third blessing of the Warfare with Satan Life, into the Highest Life, the Throne Life “far above” Satan⁷²⁵); the Lord was helpless until the Higher Life practitioners had bound all the evil spirits so that the Rapture could take place,⁷²⁶ and even then He could only catch away those believers who had achieved the Throne Life and Translation Faith and consented to Him taking them—the rest God would have to leave behind: “We must first get what may be called the ‘translation’ spirit. . . . We *have to put our wills for this*. God must get the consent of our wills for everything that He does. . . . Just as you give your consent to your spirit being ‘far above,’ so you must say, ‘Lord I consent to translation.’”⁷²⁷ Happily, the evil spirits had all been bound in 1913,⁷²⁸ brought down to a

Similarly, Watchman Nee taught: “Matthew 18:18, 19 deals with prayer. . . . It is a binding, not an asking God to bind. [In] commanding prayer . . . [we] bind all the evil spirits and demons; and bind Satan and all his activities. We may rule as kings over all things” (pgs. 72-77, *God’s Plan and the Overcomers*, Watchman Nee).

⁷²⁴ “God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the destruction of sin and Satan. . . . God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the overthrow of sin and Satan, just as God needed the co-operation of Israel in His dealing with the Canaanites. Christ said, ‘First bind the strong man.’ This implies and involves praying against the strong man. How does the binding take place, and what is it that binds but PRAYER?” (“The Scriptural Basis For ‘Warfare’ Against The Powers Of Darkness,” by Evan Roberts, in *War on the Saints*.)

⁷²⁵ “[A]dvance in conquest brings the believer nearer and nearer until he breaks through the plane of war into the place ‘FAR ABOVE PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS.’ It is *there* that you will not be ‘troubled.’ For there is an experimental advance in spirit to the plane ‘far above,’ and THIS IS THE PREPARATION OF THE CHURCH FOR THE MASTER’S COMING . . . [these] souls . . . ‘far above all principality and power’ . . . [are] prepared for translation at the time of the end. . . . [T]he spirit must first learn to ascend. We must first get what may be called the ‘translation’ spirit. . . . God must get the consent of our wills for everything that He does. . . . Just as you give your consent to your spirit being ‘far above,’ so you must say, ‘Lord I consent to translation’” (pgs. 179-181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913, reprinting a sermon preached by Mrs. Penn-Lewis at the “Leicester Conference for Workers, Nov. 13, 1913.” Capitalization and italics retained from the original.)

⁷²⁶ Evan Roberts, talking to a reporter about how he and other Christians had bound Satan and all the evil spirits by 1913, using the techniques in *War on the Saints*, Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s *Warfare with Satan*, etc., so that the Rapture could now take place, as prophesied in the Translation Message, stated:

Had not this warfare [with Satan] been carried out, then when our Lord came these hosts of evil angels would make war. The translated [would] rise into the air, and the dead [would] arise, and all would be involved in warfare. But God means that the warfare with the evil hosts shall finish before Christ comes[.] . . . [When the] translation takes place, the spirit hosts of evil shall be bound up . . . if they were not bound before the translation they would also interfere with that. (pgs. 187-188, *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

⁷²⁷ Pgs. 179-181, *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Italics in original. The helplessness of her god before the human will was very important, and required italicization, for Mrs. Penn-Lewis.

⁷²⁸ “It dawned on me that if the hosts of evil are to be put into the abyss there will come a moment when the warfare will cease[.] . . . I prayed that the whole warfare . . . [with] the hosts of evil . . . should stop. . . . I can see now that there has been sufficient prayer to bring about that incarceration . . . the actual incarceration of the foe, [the end of] this warfare [which] would fulfill the DISPENSATIONAL

great extent by the almost omnipotent prayers of Evan Roberts,⁷²⁹ and people were learning through *The Overcomer* magazine that, as they had exercised a distinct act of faith for justification, another distinct act of faith for sanctification, a third distinct act of faith for bodily healing, a fourth distinct act of faith for the Throne Life of overcoming Satan, so now they could exercise a fifth distinct act faith to bring Christ back, allowing the Redeemer to catch them up—therefore, Christ could and would return in 1914. Penn-Lewis recounts how the Higher Life practitioner is to bind Satan:

In Matthew 12:29 the Lord said, “*First bind the strong man,*” and then “*spoil his goods.*” . . . The Church must learn this “binding” power of prayer for it is written, “*Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven*” (Mat. 18:18). And what can this “binding” mean except restraining the working of the enemy by appealing to the conquering power of Him who was “*manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil*”? . . . Christians . . . [should] [take] Christ at His word, and aloud, with united hearts and voices . . . “bind” the adversary.⁷³⁰

While, since her articles and books were received by inspiration, Penn-Lewis might appeal to her own authority as a prophetess and her experience as one who knew of the deep things of Satan to validate her doctrine of “binding the strong man,” she certainly could not appeal to anything in the Bible to support it, as neither Matthew 12:29, nor Matthew 18:18, nor any other text of Scripture supports her contention.⁷³¹ In Matthew 12, Christ proved that He as the Messiah (v. 23) and the Son of God, by the Spirit of God was casting out devils that had possessed men, thus validating that He was stronger than Satan, the “strong man,” and all his fallen angels (v. 29), because He could “enter . . . [Satan’s] house” or kingdom and free those Satan had kept captive, “spoil his house,” by casting out demons. While it is perfectly appropriate for believers to pray that Satan and

PURPOSES of God . . . the translation is at hand” (pg. 186, “Be Ye Ready,” Evan Roberts. *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

⁷²⁹ “October 19th [1913] . . . was the wonderful night when years of dispensational warfare-burden on this man of God . . . Mr. Roberts . . . rolled away, as a piece of work accomplished in the unseen realm. . . . The Lord is coming to TRANSLATE His saints. . . . [First] the ‘War’ book was published . . . [t]hen on Oct. 19th came a great burst of prayer against death . . . [b]efore long what relief came to my mind! . . . Not death, but TRANSLATION; not dissolution, but a change! . . . The light had come . . . for the saints at the close of this dispensation . . . TRANSLATION” (pg. 183, “The Translation Message of Evan Roberts,” *The Overcomer*, December 1913. Capitalization retained from the original.).

⁷³⁰ Pg. 374, “How to Pray for Missionaries,” Jessie Penn-Lewis, *The Alliance Weekly*, 72:24, June 12, 1937, 373-375, & 72:26, June 26, 1937, 406-407. Italics in original. While Scripture does not bear out Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s contentions, she affirms that a meeting of atheists was broken up by binding Satan in this fashion, one of “many . . . proofs” from experience for her Satanic binding and loosing doctrine. By binding Satan, Mrs. Penn-Lewis affirms, the many “thousands of God’s people” who are possessed by demons like those of Mark 9:17-18 can be delivered (pg. 374, *ibid*). In her article, she ties her doctrine of binding Satan into the throne-power teaching developed at more length by John MacMillan.

⁷³¹ Taking out of context another verse, Evan Roberts wrote: “The power of Revelation 12:10 should be received by faith” (pg. 213, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones), but it is very difficult to see how a verse about Satan having great power on earth during the Tribulation period when he is cast permanently out of heaven has the slightest relevance to Keswick advocates or Pentecostals attempting to bind Satan in the church age.

his devils would be hindered in their attempts to stop the work of God, Matthew 12 is specifically about Christ casting out demons and so validating His Messianic claims, not about the work of God going forward in a general sense, or an alleged “‘binding’ power of prayer.” None of the hundreds of prayers in Scripture mention believers binding Satan to advance the work of God in some general sense, nor, for that matter, is there the least hint that any Christian in the Bible thought that he was to bind Satan in prayer or in any other way at all. In fact, Scripture is very clear that when the Millennial kingdom begins “an angel [will] come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he [will lay] hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and b[i]nd him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled” (Revelation 20:1-3; cf. Revelation 9:14).⁷³² Satan is not bound now (1 Peter 5:8; Job 2:2), and when he will be bound in the Millennium, a powerful angel, not a Christian, will bind him, and cast Satan into the bottomless pit. A Christian, who is far weaker than Satan, should also consider if it is wise to seek to bind that mighty angel when the devil is far more powerful than any fallen man—especially since he will not have the blessing of the Spirit in his endeavor, since God has never stated that men are to bind the devil in the dispensation of grace. The Lord Jesus, by contrast, both with His inherent power as God and the power of the omnipotent Spirit working in Him without measure as the Messiah and God-Man, has every right and ability to bind Satan according to His will. Furthermore, unless a Christian is praying for the coming of the Millennial kingdom when he prays for Satan to be bound, he is asking for something that is not going to happen, and if a Christian claims, or a group of Christians claim, that they can bind Satan, they are actually opening themselves up for Satanic delusion—at least if one goes only by the Bible, rather than by the inspired writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis. The fact that Christians cannot bind Satan explains why, although countless Pentecostals, Word of Faith advocates, and practitioners of Keswick

⁷³² Mrs. Penn-Lewis allegorizes Revelation 20 as follows: “There is a systematic warfare of prayer possible against the kingdom of darkness, which would mean co-operation with the Spirit of God in the liberation of the Church, and hasten the ultimate binding of the great serpent, and casting him down to the pit. (Rev. 20:1). A material ‘chain’ could not bind a supernatural being, and it may be that ‘the great strong angel’ typifies the mystical ‘Christ’; consisting of the Head and members—the ‘Man-Child’ caught up to the Throne—when the members will have been liberated from the power of the enemy, and then commissioned to lay hold of the Deceiver to cast him into the abyss, and shut him up for the thousand years” (Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*). Anyone who finds such an allegory convincing in the least is not likely to be concerned about literal interpretation or the actual meaning of Revelation 20, nor will he be especially worried that no passage in Revelation actually mentions “the great strong angel,” or that the only passage in the book that mentions a “strong angel” specifically contrasts this angel with the Lord Jesus (Revelation 5:1-6).

continuationism claim, all over the world, to bind Satan all the time, so that every minute of the day someone somewhere in the world is praying that Satan would be bound, Satan remains the god of this world (2 Corinthians 4:4) and is as unbound and active as ever. The radical change that will take place in the world when Satan actually is bound—and stays bound—in the Millennial kingdom (Revelation 20:1-3) stands in the sharpest contrast with the total absence of any such change when Pentecostals follow Jessie Penn-Lewis and claim to bind Satan, since he somehow is loosed from their “binding” and as active as ever the second after they make their prayer, and even while, deluded by his lies, they are praying it.

Likewise, neither Matthew 18:15-20 nor Matthew 16:18-19 have anything to do with Christians binding Satan.⁷³³ The “binding” and “loosing” of Matthew 16:19; 18:18 refer to making decisions about what is right and wrong, about the regulation of right behavior and teaching, comparable to Jewish use of the terms “binding” and “loosing” to declare what was permissible or impermissible (cf. Matthew 23:4, 13; Luke 11:52).⁷³⁴

⁷³³ It is true that the verb δέω, “to bind,” appears in both Matthew 12:29 and Matthew 18:18. However, this fact does not prove that the same idea is in view in both passages any more than the fact that Herod has John the Baptist bound (δέω) in Matthew 14:3 or a donkey is bound (δέω) to keep it from wandering away in Matthew 21:2 proves that the latter two texts refer somehow to demons being cast out and to the binding of Satan.

⁷³⁴ Commenting on Matthew 16:19, “And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,” John Gill wrote:

This . . . [refers to] doctrines, or declarations of what is lawful and unlawful, free, or prohibited to be received, or practiced; in which sense the words, אָסַר וְרָחַק, “bound and loosed,” are used in the Talmudic writings, times without number, for that which is forbidden and declared to be unlawful, and for that which is free of use, and pronounced to be so: in multitudes of places we read of one Rabbi אָרַס, “binding,” and of another רָחַק, “loosing”; thousands, and ten thousands of instances of this kind might be produced; a whole volume of extracts on this head might be compiled.

Similarly, the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (H. R. Balz & G. Schneider, vol. 2, on λύω) notes:

Binding and loosing are spoken of in Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 as a figurative designation for authoritative ecclesiastical action. Here one may assume the presence of Jewish rabbinic usage [cf. *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch I-IV* (1922-28), H. Strack & P. Billerbeck, I, 738–42; IV, 304–21]. 'Asar and hitir in Hebrew and "sar and s'ra' in Aramaic are used, in regard to discipline, for the imposition and repeal of the synagogue ban and, in regard to the teaching office, for binding interpretation of the law—“forbid and permit.”

Commenting on Matthew 16:19, Luz & Koester (*Matthew: A Commentary. Hermeneia*) write:

). The primary meaning is “forbidding” and “permitting” with a halakic decision of the rabbis, that is, the interpretation of the law. Less frequently, but documented in contemporary sources, a judge’s activity is meant. Then “to bind” and “to loose” correspond to “to put in fetters” or “to acquit.” . . . In later rabbinic terminology there is a source for “to impose the ban” or “to rescind” it . . . Furthermore, it is the rabbinic conviction that God or the heavenly court recognizes the halakic decisions and the judgments of rabbinical courts. Thus not only the concepts “binding/loosing” but the entire saying is rooted in Jewish thought. [Matthew 16:19] is presumably thinking of teaching, while in 18:18 the thought is of judging, without the two meanings being mutually exclusive.

Peter, as one of the Apostles, possessing Divine authority as represented by the metaphor of the “keys” (Matthew 16:19; cf. Isaiah 22:22⁷³⁵), declared, based on the coming of Christ, the abolition of Old Testament ceremonies such as circumcision, dietary laws, and festival days for the Gentiles (Acts 15:10, 19) and the end of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles in the church age (Acts 10:28; 11:2-3, 18), “binding” believers to New Testament worship and lifestyle and “loosing” them from Old Testament worship and lifestyle.⁷³⁶ Interpreting Matthew 16:19 in light of its Jewish background in this manner has been standard practice for centuries, while Mrs. Penn Lewis’s view that the verse refers to binding Satan by prayer does not appear to have existed before her lifetime.⁷³⁷

The concept of sitting in Moses’ seat (Matthew 23:2), as the following verses demonstrate, likewise refers to authoritative teaching (cf. Matthew 5:1-2ff.; 13:1-2; 24:3; 26:55), properly from the only true and ultimate authority for the believer, the Word of God.

⁷³⁵ It is noteworthy that in Isaiah 22:22, while the connection is not necessarily the most clear and direct, the verbs “open” and “shut,” פָּתַח and שָׁטַח, can be used for “loosing” and “binding.” Thus, פָּתַח can bear the sense of “loosen” (cf. in the Piel Genesis 24:32; Isaiah 20:2; 58:6; in the Qal, which is found in Isaiah 22:22, note Deuteronomy 20:11; Judges 3:25; 19:27; Isaiah 14:17; 26:2; 45:1; Nehemiah 13:19; etc., and the nature of the Piel as resultative in relation to the Qal), and the Hebrew פָּתַח is translated with λύω in the LXX in Genesis 42:27; Job 39:5; Psalm 101:21 (102:21); Isaiah 5:27; 14:17; 57:6; Jeremiah 47:4 (50:4). For שָׁטַח, compare Judges 3:23; 9:51; Isaiah 24:22; 45:1; 60:11, and the use of אָחַד for this verb in the Targum and Peshitta of Isaiah 22:22. Compare in the Mishna: “And further did R. Eliezer say, ‘They unloose a vow by reference to what happens unexpectedly [a new fact].’ And sages prohibit. . . . R. Eliezer permits [declares the vow to be unbound]. And sages prohibit [declare the vow to remain binding].” (*Nedarim* 9:2: אָמַר ר’ אֱלִיעֶזֶר שׁוֹתֵחִין בְּנוֹלָד וְנִחְכְּמֵי אוֹסְרִין . . . ר’ אֱלִיעֶזֶר מַתִּיר וְנִחְכְּמֵי אוֹסְרִין: (עוֹד).

Note also that “*Sipre* to Deuteronomy 32:25 applies Isaiah 22:22 to rabbinic permission and prohibition of specific actions” (*The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Nolland, in the *New International Greek Testament Commentary*, on Matthew 16:18-19.)

Unsurprisingly, Isaiah 22:22 has as little to do with binding Satan as Matthew 16:19; 18:18.

⁷³⁶

R. T. France notes:

Taking up the imagery of Isaiah 22:20–22, Jesus declares Peter to be the steward (the chief administrative officer) in the kingdom of heaven, who will hold the keys, so that, like Eliakim, the new steward (cf. Isa 22:15) in the kingdom of David, “he will open, and no one shall shut; he will shut and no one shall open.” The steward is not the owner. He has both authority (over the rest of the household) and responsibility (to his master to administer the affairs of the house properly). The keys are those of the storehouses, to enable him to make appropriate provision for the household, not those of the outer gate, to control admission. . . . [as in] the role of the steward in [Matthew] 24:45; also Luke 16:1–8. . . . The metaphor of “tying up” and “untying” speaks also of administrative authority. The terms are used in rabbinic literature for declaring what is and is not permitted. When the same commission is given to the whole disciple group in [Matthew] 18:18 it will be specifically in the context of dealing with sin within their community. . . . Such authority to declare what is and is not permissible will of course have personal consequences for the person judged to have sinned, but it is the prior judgment in principle which is the focus of the “tying” metaphor, and there, as here, the objects of both verbs will be expressed in the neuter, not the masculine; it is things, issues, which are being tied or untied, not people as such. The historical role of Peter in Acts well illustrates the metaphor, as it was to him that the responsibility fell of declaring that Gentiles might be accepted as members of the new *ekklēsia* (10:1–11:18), though of course the exercise of his disciplinary authority could also have dire personal consequences for those who stepped over the mark (Acts 5:1–11; cf. 8:20–24). (*The Gospel of Matthew: The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, R. T. France, on Matthew 16:19).

⁷³⁷

Thus, a work such as *A History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19 from 1781 to 1965*, Joseph A. Burgess (Ph. D. Diss., University of Basel; Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, MI: 1976) notes the recognition of the Jewish background to the binding and loosing metaphor as signifying authoritative teaching in

Similarly, Matthew 18:18 indicates that every one of Christ's true churches⁷³⁸ has Divine authority to preach and teach God-given truth about doctrine and lifestyle, and consequently the ability to excommunicate members of the congregation (Matthew 18:15-17) who refuse to believe and practice the God-given truths of the Word that the church binds and looses (Matthew 18:18) by its preaching and discipline. The church has authority to declare God's will and pronounce the actions of its wayward member as sin. Furthermore, Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 refer to teachings, issues, or actions, not to personal beings—not humans, and certainly not fallen angels—being bound or loosed; the passages refer to “whatsoever” is bound or loosed, not “whosoever” is bound or loosed (cf. also Matthew 5:19).⁷³⁹ If one were to insist, despite the “whatsoever,” that persons were in view, those being “loosed” by the church in Matthew 18 would be members of the assembly who had been “bound” by joining the congregation, so unless fallen angels or Satan himself had been immersed upon profession of faith into the membership of a New Testament church, nothing about binding Satan is contained in

sources from Buxtorf (1639) and before, to Lightfoot (1655), to vast numbers of more modern writers (pgs. 62-64, cf. 77-78). This view became “standard practice for Protestant exegetes” in at least very large portions of the time period Burgess focuses upon (pg. 92). In contrast, not a sentence of Burgess' dissertation breathes even a hint of the existence of Mrs. Penn-Lewis's position before her lifetime (cf. pg. 105).

⁷³⁸ Note that close connection of the two references in Matthew to the ἐκκλησία and to binding and loosing (Matthew 16:18-19; 18:17-18).

⁷³⁹ That is, in Matthew 16:19, ὁ ἐὰν δήσῃς . . . ὁ ἐὰν λύσῃς employs the neuter pronoun ὁ, rather than the masculine form, and Matthew 18:18 likewise employs the neuter ὅσα, not the masculine, in ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε . . . ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε. Contrast Josephus, *Wars of the Jews* 1:111 (1:5:2:111), where the masculine pronoun οὗς is employed when persons are in view: τούτοις περισσὸν δὴ τι προσεῖχεν ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρα σεσοβημένη περὶ τὸ θεῖον οἱ δὲ τὴν ἀπλότητα τῆς ἀνθρώπου κατὰ μικρὸν ὑπιόντες ἤδη καὶ διοικηταὶ τῶν ὅλων ἐγίνοντο διώκειν τε καὶ κατάγειν οὗς ἐθέλοιεν λύειν τε καὶ δεσμεῖν καθόλου δὲ αἱ μὲν ἀπολαύσεις τῶν βασιλείων ἐκείνων ἦσαν τὰ δ' ἀναλώματα καὶ αἱ δυσχέρειαι τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρας. “Now, Alexandra hearkened to them to an extraordinary degree, as being herself a woman of great piety towards God. But these Pharisees artfully insinuated themselves into her favor by little and little, and became themselves the real administrators of the public affairs; they banished and reduced whom they pleased; they bound and loosed [men] at their pleasure; and, to say all at once, they had the enjoyment of the royal authority, whilst the expenses and the difficulties of it belonged to Alexandra.”

In Matthew 5:19, ὃς ἐὰν οὖν λύσῃ μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὃς δ' ἂν ποιῆσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, note the connection between “breaking” or “loosing” and “teaching,” which in the context (v. 20-48) is contrasted with the improper use of teaching authority by the Pharisees.

Philo speaks of the binding and loosing of things and thus employs neuter forms in *On the Eternity of the World* 13; the material creation has the potential for nonexistence, it is argued: “Now everything which has been bound together is capable of being dissolved, but it is the part of an evil ruler to dissolve that which has been well combined and arranged, and which is in good condition.” τὸ μὲν οὖν δὴ δεθὲν πᾶν λυτόν, τὸ γε μὴν καλῶς ἀρμοσθὲν καὶ ἔχον εὖ λύειν ἐθέλειν κακοῦ.

Note further that in Matthew 18:18 the pronoun ὅσα is plural; the church, by its preaching and teaching, binds and looses numbers of doctrines; contrast the singular “brother” mentioned in 18:15-17. Were Satan the being in view in 18:18, the plural pronoun would be unexpected.

Matthew 18. No modern advocate of Keswick or Pentecostal theology is the Apostle Peter, so Matthew 16:19 does not help advance Jessie Penn-Lewis' position. Nor does the binding and loosing take place in Matthew 18:18 through prayer; rather, the congregation receives Divine guidance in prayer (Matthew 18:19)⁷⁴⁰ so that its preaching and discipline, its binding and loosing, are in accordance with the will of Christ, who is God present in their midst (Matthew 18:20; 1:23), and in accordance with the preceding and directing antecedent will⁷⁴¹ of the Father in heaven. Binding and loosing is practiced

⁷⁴⁰ Note the continuation of the “two or three” idea of Matthew 18:16 in the “two” of Matthew 18:19. Even the smallest true church has the promises of Matthew 18:15-20 and is bound to practice the passage's teachings.

⁷⁴¹ This fact is verified by both the future perfect passive periphrastics in Matthew 16:19; 18:18 and the context. Mantey writes:

“I will give to you the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, but whatever you bind (δήσῃς, an aor. subj.) on earth *shall have been bound* (ἔσται δεδεμένον) in heaven, and whatever you loose (λύσῃς) on earth *shall have been loosed* (ἔσται λελυμένον) in heaven.” Or in other words, Christ was informing his disciples that he was elevating them to the same rank and privileges that the scribes enjoyed, but at the same time he warns them not to perpetuate the abuses of the scribes, who taught things contrary to the Scriptures. Like scribes, they were to be interpreters of God's will to men, but in this capacity they are cautioned not to exceed their authority. Man is to ratify and obey God's decrees. This passage does not teach that God concurs in men's conclusions; but rather it teaches that those who live in accordance with Christ's directions will decide to do just what God has already decided should be done. (pg. 246, “The Mistranslation of the Perfect Tense in John 20:23, Mt 16:19, and Mt 18:18, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58:3 (September 1939) 243-249; cf. contra Mantey, ‘The Meaning of John 20.23, Matthew 16.19, and Matthew 18.18,’ Henry Cadbury, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939), 251–54; contra Cadbury and favorable to Mantey, *The Greek Perfect Tense in Relation to John 20:23, Matthew 16:19 and 18:18*, William Dayton. Th. D. Dissertation, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1945)

In accordance with the Greek, the Latin Vulgate translates: “Et tibi dabo claves regni cælorum. Et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in cælis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in cælis. . . . Amen dico vobis, quæcumque alligaveritis super terram, erunt ligata et in cælo: et quæcumque solveritis super terram, erunt soluta et in cælo” (Matthew 16:19; 18:18). “The Latin Vulgate also translates as ‘Will have been bound,’ ‘will have been loosed,’ exactly corresponding to the Greek. It is the Church on earth carrying out heaven's decisions, communicated by the Spirit, and not heaven ratifying the Church's decisions” (Comment on Matthew 16:19, *Matthew, The Anchor Bible*, W. F. Albright & C. S. Mann. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971). Compare pg. 80, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, William Chamberlain (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1979); “Binding and Loosing,” *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, gen. ed. Chad Brand, C. Draper, A. England.

Comparable future perfect passive periphrastics in the LXX are found in Genesis 30:33: πᾶν ὃ ἐὰν μὴ ᾗ ῥαντὸν καὶ διάλευκον ἐν ταῖς αἰξίν . . . κεκλεμμένον ἔσται παρ' ἐμοί, “Every one that is not speckled or spotted among the goats . . . if found with me *will have been stolen* by me,” and Genesis 43:9 (LXX; also Genesis 44:32): ἐὰν μὴ ἀγάγω αὐτὸν πρὸς σὲ καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου ἡμαρτηκῶς [perfect active] ἔσομαι πρὸς σὲ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας; the sinful negligence took place before the time of the failure to present Benjamin before Jacob, with resultant durative blameworthiness. The LXX overall is generally supportive of Mantey—see the perfect passive periphrastics in: Genesis 30:33; 41:36; Exodus 12:6; 28:7; Deuteronomy 28:33; Judges 13:5; 1 Samuel 25:29; 2 Samuel 7:16; 1 Chronicles 17:14; 2 Chronicles 7:15; Nehemiah 5:13; Tobit 13:14; Sirach 10:1; 42:8; Nahum 3:11; Zephaniah 2:4; Isaiah 9:18; 11:5; 17:9; 27:10; 33:12; Jeremiah 14:16; 43:30; 51:14; Ezekiel 24:17; 29:12; 30:7; 44:2; 46:1; 48:12; Daniel 2:20, 41 (var.), 42. Extrabiblical examples include: “I feel that if I clear myself before you *I shall have cleared* (*apolelogemenos esesthai*) myself through you before the rest of the Greeks’ (Lucian, *Philaris*, I, 1). ‘Now if you do this, you *will have bestowed* (*ese katatetheimenos*) a great favor upon me’ (Papyri BGU 596,13). ‘And if you send them away scot-free, much security *will have been voted* (*epsephismenoi esesthe*) to them to do whatever they wish’ (Lysias, XXII, 19). . . . Other future perfects occur in Lysias XII, 100; Papyri Par. 14, 50:8.24” (pg. 135, “Evidence That the Perfect Tense in

by a true church in conjunction with and as a result of prayer, but not by means of prayer. Furthermore, the verb tenses for “shall be bound” and “shall be loosed” indicate that the binding and loosing constitutes a continuing condition.⁷⁴² The doctrine taught by the Apostles and promulgated by true churches is permanently binding on the people of God, who have also been permanently loosed from Old Testament ceremonial regulations.⁷⁴³ However, it seems that those who abuse Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 to support their doctrine of binding Satan—the large majority of whom are not members of Biblical Baptist churches, and thus people to whom Matthew 18:18, and 16:19 so much the more, do not apply in any case⁷⁴⁴—fail to keep him bound for very long at all,⁷⁴⁵ although no

John 20:23, Matthew 16:19 Is Mistranslated,” Julius R. Mantey. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 16 (1973), 129–38). In the New Testament, Luke 12:52; Hebrews 2:13 are the only other future perfect periphrastics, and Hebrews 2:13 is active; Luke 12:52 is the only future perfect passive periphrastic other than Matthew 16:19 & 18:18. Compare the future passive periphrastics in related generally contemporaneous corpora, in which the sense of future periphrasis argued for by Mantey finds support, although not universally so; thus, see in the apostolic patristics 1 Clement 10:3; 58:2; Barnabas 11:3, 6; Shepherd 51:9; 55:4; compare, in Justin Martyr, *Trypho* 60, 81, 123; in Josephus, *Antiquities* 13:70; also *Protoevangelium of James* 12:1; *Enoch* 3:8; 98:6; *Sibylline Oracles* 1:286; *Testament of Levi* 4:6; *Letter of Aristeas* 40; *Ordinances of Levi* 58, 61, 64.

⁷⁴² The examination of the future perfect periphrastics in the preceding footnote validate that the continuing state notion of the Greek perfect remains present in future periphrasis; indeed, one would expect the periphrastic construction to emphasize the state. It is noteworthy that even (incorrect) critics of Mantey’s (correct) “shall have been” translation do not dispute that an abiding state is brought about by the action of the future perfect periphrastic; thus, Cadbury writes: “In the two passages of Matthew [16:19; 18:18] the future perfects seem to imply a permanent condition . . . I would suggest for Matthew’s future perfects an expression ‘shall be once for all’ (pgs. 252-253, ‘The Meaning of John 20:23, Matthew 16:19, and Matthew 18:18,’ Henry Cadbury, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939), 251–54), and Stanley Porter, while advocating his erroneous atemporal view of Greek tense (cf. pgs. 504-512, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace), nonetheless translates Matthew 16:19 as “whatever you might bind upon the earth shall be in a state of boundness in heaven; and whatever you might loose upon the earth shall be in a state of loosedness in heaven” since he affirms the sense is “shall be in a state of being bound or having boundness” (pgs. 155, 160, “Vague Verbs, Periphrastics, and Matt 16:19,” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* (Córdoba, Spain) 1 (1988), 155–73). Indeed, every future perfect in the New Testament retains the idea of a continuing resultant state (Matthew 16:19 (ἔσται δεδεμένον . . . ἔσται λελυμένον); 18:18 (ἔσται δεδεμένα . . . ἔσται λελυμένα); Luke 12:52 (ἔσονται . . . διαμεμερισμένοι); 19:40 (κεκράζονται); Hebrews 2:13 (ἔσομαι πεποιθώς); 8:11 (εἰδήσουσίν).

⁷⁴³ One who wished to argue that binding and loosing pertain specifically and directly to the joining of and excommunication from a congregation in Matthew 18 (they indirectly do so, since when the congregation, on the basis of Scripture, declares the actions of a member “sin,” it is then to act upon that teaching authority and remove the sinning individual from membership), also are consistent with the abiding state involved in the verb tenses; one does not need to add a person to a membership roll (cf. Acts 1:15; 2:41, 47) or remove a disobedient church member over and over again; once is enough.

⁷⁴⁴ The authority to bind and loose, entrusted to Peter as representative of the Apostles as members of the church in Matthew 16:19, is perpetuated through the congregation of saints, as verified by Matthew 18:18. Parachurch institutions and all religious denominations that exist outside of the succession of Bible-believing and practicing Baptist churches that has existed from the first century until the present day have no authority to bind and loose, to teach the Bible (cf. Matthew 28:18-20), or even to exist.

⁷⁴⁵ Thus, in the book *Binding and Loosing: How to Exercise Authority over the Dark Powers*, by K. Neill Foster and Paul L. King, Mr. Foster had “believed in the principles of binding and loosing for many years and had published some material on the subject[,] [that is, a book entitled *Warfare Weapons*.] . . . We

other congregation or individual is likely to be praying for Satan to be loosed, since prayers to loose Satan appear to be vastly fewer in number than those to bind him. Scripture affirms that Satan will not be bound until the Millennial kingdom, and the texts Penn-Lewis employs to support her doctrine of Christians binding Satan are ripped out of context. Therefore, since the Bible gives no support to her view, her conclusions are only as sure as her claim to extra-Biblical inspiration. Only to the extent that the prophetic powers she and Evan Roberts possessed were validated by their prediction of the end of the world in 1914, to that extent, at best, can one rely on their advice for how to battle devils and bind Satan in *War on the Saints*.

Indeed, one need not fear that since *War on the Saints* records Evan Roberts' own spiritual autobiography, while likewise affirming, in descriptions that speak of Roberts' own experience, that even the most spiritual believers can be demon possessed, that Evan himself had been demon possessed—on his own admission—during the time of his preaching in the Welsh holiness revival. Nor need one fear when Jessie Penn-Lewis preached that “her chronic suffering” was a result of “possessions” and “the hold of the dark powers,” as she experientially “knew and proved,” for she had been delivered from such possession over “15 years” before the time of the production of *War on the Saints*.⁷⁴⁶ No, even if the authors of the book, both of whom had highly questionable testimonies of personal conversion, indicated that they had themselves been demon possessed,⁷⁴⁷ *War on the Saints* was excellent and wholesome material—and more. In fact, Penn-Lewis taught, “the only ones who will be able to stand as the influence of the Deceiver ensnares and engulfs the whole of the inhabitants of the earth”⁷⁴⁸ in the final days before the end of the world in 1914 will be those who accept the teaching of *War on the Saints* and the Satanic warfare doctrines set forth in the *Overcomer* magazine, so *War*

liked how it worked[,] [although] I no doubt would, [at this time], have admitted that my views could have been part of a private interpretation” (pgs. 2-4), until at length he finally came to conclude that the Bible actually taught what he already knew, without Biblical proof, “worked,” had practiced “for many years,” and had written a book about, without being able to defend it exegetically. The authors are sure that their doctrine “works,” although their book has an entire chapter called “When It Doesn’t Happen,” trying to explain what is going on when “[b]inding is a farce, loosing a dream,” and it “simply doesn’t work . . . simply does not take place” (pg. 209, see 209-216, *ibid.*), although Matthew 18:15-20 guarantees the binding or loosing with no exceptions whatsoever. The doctrine taught by the Apostles and by Biblical churches is always binding, with no exceptions, no “farces,” no instances where the truths of the New Testament are only a “dream,” and no instances when the promises of God fail to take place.

⁷⁴⁶ Pg. 238, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁷⁴⁷ Compare the preaching at the Broadlands Conference: “What is needed in a witness [is] . . . *personal knowledge*. . . . Can you say . . . [‘]I know He casts out devils, for He has cast out devils from me.[’?]” (pg. 215, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910. Italics in original.).

⁷⁴⁸ Pg. 278, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

on the Saints was the most necessary book on earth, as the Bible, by necessary consequence, was not sufficient on its own to protect people from the influence of the Deceiver. On the other hand, the “measure of hostility shown to [*War on the Saints*] by readers will be the measure of the deception by evil spirits into which he or she has fallen,” affirmed the “champions of the book.”⁷⁴⁹ The Bible alone was insufficient to deal with demons—instead of the Bible, one needed to learn things from familiar intercourse with the demons. However, Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis could “testify” that they had “no superficial experience” of the “deep things of Satan,” but could “fathom” those depths because they had themselves mined them through their “deep, varied, and awful experiences of the invisible powers of darkness . . . [h]ad we escaped the wiles, we could have written from conjecture and imagination about the arch-fiend, but then it would have been in the vital points essentially wide of the mark.”⁷⁵⁰ Since they had been deceived by the devil and had experienced the very darkest of the deep things of Satan, their writings were to be trusted in the way the teaching of those who had never been deceived by Satan and experienced his deep things—such as the sinless Author of the Bible, who had never been deceived by Satan, Jesus the Christ—could not. The reason that the teachings found in *War on the Saints* were “practically unknown, and unprepared for in the literature of the Church,” was not because the book was saturated with false doctrine, demonic apostasy, and fanaticism, but because the truths of the book could only be revealed after the “seven years [of] . . . dispensational warfare . . . [with] demons” that followed the 1904 Welsh holiness revival in “the Time of the End” shortly before the return of Christ in 1914.⁷⁵¹ “*Dispensationally* the Book was in sequence to the Revival of 1904, and *dispensationally* it antedated the Translation Message given in October 1913, just one year after its issue.”⁷⁵² Besides, the doctrines of *War on the Saints* led people such as the head of the Y. W. C. A. in Finland to experience supernatural healing,⁷⁵³ and victories over evil spirits took place by means of positive

⁷⁴⁹ Pg. 181, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones. Interestingly, while Penn-Lewis never, at least in public, wavered on the book’s contents, “[o]nly a year after the manual appeared, Evan Roberts told some friends that it had been a failed weapon which had confused . . . the Lord’s people” (pg. 182, *ibid*), so it appears that only Jessie Penn-Lewis herself, but not her co-author, continued to be free from deception by evil spirits.

⁷⁵⁰ Pg. 180, “An Accomplished Ministration,” *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

⁷⁵¹ Pg. 191, “*War on the Saints: A Brief Review of its Dispensational Significance*,” *The Overcomer*, December 1914.

⁷⁵² Pg. 191, “*War on the Saints: A Brief Review of its Dispensational Significance*,” *The Overcomer*, December 1914. Italics in original. Mrs. Penn-Lewis capitalizes the “B” of “Book” in the quotation, not for the Bible, but for *War on the Saints*—this latter is “the Book” in the quotation, a practice Penn-Lewis continues in the article cited above.

⁷⁵³ Pgs. 244-245, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

confessions that anticipated those of the Word-Faith movement,⁷⁵⁴ which was also anticipated in the book's affirmation that prayer is more of a "manipulative ac[t]" than simply a "cooperative ac[t]" with God.⁷⁵⁵ For, while the Bible taught that sign gifts such as exorcism were miraculous powers possessed by Christ and given to the Apostles as one of the "signs of an apostle" (2 Corinthians 12:12) and as a confirmation of the Word proclaimed by them,⁷⁵⁶ as is evident from the fact that the generality of believers in Scripture never even claimed to have the ability to cast out demons at will, *War on the Saints* taught that every "believer" who has entered into the Higher Life has "power to wield [Christ's] Name, and in His name to have authority to cast out demons."⁷⁵⁷ Today "demons are cast out immediately after the simple prayer of faith by the Christians. . . .

⁷⁵⁴ Pg. 265, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. Thus, *War on the Saints* has repeated affirmations such as:

The believer should . . . declare his attitude . . . [t]he last word spoken, alters, ratifies, or nullifies previous ones . . . it is helpful for the believer to assert his decision . . . the declaration is having effect in the unseen world[.] . . . It is essential that believers should understand the value of the act of refusal [of evil spirits], and the expression of it. . . . The believer in conflict may say with effect: "I refuse all the authority of evil spirits over me: their right to me: their claims upon me: their power in me: their influence in or upon me["] . . . a strong, primary weapon of victory i[s] declaring deliberately The believer must now insist on EXPRESSING HIMSELF IN VOICE" (Chapters 9, 10, *War on the Saints*, capitalization in original).

What Word of Faith idolater could want more? Penn-Lewis was not the only Higher Life antecedent to the Word-Faith doctrine of positive confession. "[H]oliness leaders such as Simpson, Andrew Murray . . . and Hannah Whitall Smith all . . . advocate[d] positive confession" ("A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement," Paul King, *Alliance Academic Review*, ed. Elio Cuccaro. (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1996). Murray wrote: "It is needful also to testify to the faith one has. . . . You must, before you are conscious of any change, be able to say with faith, 'On the authority of God's Word I have the assurance that He hears me and that I shall be healed.'" (pgs. 46, 48, *Divine Healing: A Series of Addresses*. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing, 1900). The believer is to "speak out [his] desires in the name of Christ" (pg. 54, *The Prayer-Life: The Inner Chamber and the Deepest Secret of Pentecost*. London: Morgan & Scott, 1914). Indeed, even an unconverted person comes to faith from unbelief by means of positive confession; Murray wrote: by "speak[ing] out . . . you will insensibly come to . . . confidence that He is also yours" (pg. 36, *Why Do You Not Believe? Words of Instruction and Encouragement for All Who Are Seeking the Lord*. Chicago, IL: Fleming H. Revell, 1894). Hannah Whitall Smith wrote: "Put your will, then, over on the believing side. Say, 'Lord, I will believe, I do believe,' and continue to say it" (Chapter 6, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*). Again she wrote: "Those three little words, repeated over and over, — 'Jesus saves me, Jesus saves me,' — will put to flight the greatest army of doubts that ever assaulted any soul. I have tried it times without number, and have never known it to fail. . . . I beg[in] to say, over and over, 'The Lord does love me. He is my present and my perfect Saviour; Jesus saves me, Jesus saves me now!' The victory [is] complete. . . . Confess it to yourself. Confess it to your God. Confess it to your friends" (Chapter 14, 5, *ibid*). A. B. Simpson wrote: "Faith will die without confession" (pg. 35, *Seeing the Invisible: The Art of Spiritual Perception*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1994).

Paul King ("A. B. Simpson and the Modern Faith Movement," *Alliance Academic Review*) also affirmed that William Boardman was also an antecedent to positive confession, referring to two texts on pgs. 261, 263 of *The Higher Christian Life* (New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1984) in which one "spoke out the faith," but an examination of these references fails to prove Boardman was truly an advocate of something like positive confession.

⁷⁵⁵ Pg. 206, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

⁷⁵⁶ Compare Mark 16:17, 20.

⁷⁵⁷ Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

men [are] delivered from demon-possession after one prayer,” in the same way, allegedly, that demons were miraculously cast out in the first century, although, unlike when the Biblical gift of exorcism was truly and properly exercised, sometimes modern exorcists are unable to cast devils out.⁷⁵⁸ Similarly, today supernatural “[v]isions may have their source in . . . God . . . Divine ‘Visions’ [are] given . . . [d]reams can come from . . . God . . . [w]riting in its source may be from . . . God[.] . . . There is a true seeing and hearing . . . of supernatural things . . . of supernatural words . . . [and] of the revelations of God,”⁷⁵⁹ so cessationism is certainly false, and believers who adopt Keswick and Pentecostal continuationism can receive revelatory dreams and visions, and can produce inspired writings in this present age. By means of the truths of *War on the Saints*, “what happened when Christ was on earth, will happen again when the casting out of evil spirits will become a recognized part of all Christian and ministerial activity.”⁷⁶⁰ *War on the Saints* will lead men to practice exorcism and then lead to the restoration of all the first century sign gifts—it will destroy the cessationism believed and practiced by Christians and churches because of literal exegesis of the Bible and the acceptance of its sole authority for faith and practice. The spread of such Quaker, Pentecostal, and Word of Faith notions is certainly a great benefit to at least one side in the war between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. Besides, Evan Roberts himself wrote: “Satan came to me but he was driven to flight,”⁷⁶¹ so Roberts had tested the doctrine in *War on the Saints* in his own personal experiences with Satan—the book, and the teachings of Roberts and Penn-Lewis in general, were “precisely true according to experience.”⁷⁶² Surely such apparent victories over evil spirits and powerful answers to prayer were not themselves part of a deeper Satanic deception, but validated the teaching of Roberts and Penn-Lewis on Satanic warfare and the book *War on the Saints*. Certainly in modern times demons would not pretend to be cast out or actually leave human victims in order to advance a deeper deception by validating unbiblical Keswick continuationism, although in Christ’s day devils worked in exactly this sort of way by allowing the sons of

⁷⁵⁸ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Immediately after stating that the practice of first century exorcism was taking place, Penn-Lewis mentions that sometimes people would be possessed for “weeks, months, years” without the allegedly miraculous gifts actually working.

⁷⁵⁹ Chapter 5 & “The True Workings Of God, And Counterfeits Of Satan,” *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

⁷⁶⁰ Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

⁷⁶¹ Pg. 113, *An Instrument of Revival*, Jones.

⁷⁶² Pg. 180, *The Overcomer*, December 1914. This status of being “precisely true according to experience” was more exact, admittedly, than the conformity of their teachings to Scripture. They claimed that their demonology was “correct” only “in principle according to the Scriptures”—which it was not—but it was “precisely true,” not just true “in principle,” according to experience.

the Pharisees to cast them out (Luke 11:19) in order to validate anti-Christ Pharisaic doctrine as true. No, although God's Word records exactly such deception, today this Biblical warning should be set aside or ignored, just as it was by Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis. Besides, neither Evan Roberts nor Jessie Penn-Lewis thought they were demon possessed while writing the book, although they confessed that they had been possessed earlier—at least while writing the book under inspiration they testified that they were possessed no longer. Although they also taught that one could be possessed and not know it, one clearly had nothing to fear. Furthermore, while literal exegesis of the Bible would indicate that true Christians could not be possessed, since *War on the Saints* could simply ignore texts that support such a truth (what need to allegorize Scripture when it can be ignored?) and affirm the contrary, and as nobody could possibly think that Mrs. Penn-Lewis was herself unconverted, her experiences being demon possessed were surely salutary, as being filled with demons also leads one to be filled, not with spiritual blindness and darkness, but with spiritual discernment. While Roberts and Penn-Lewis record in their book many curious statements which are totally impossible to prove from Scripture, happily, they could still appeal to the fact that they were themselves recipients and oracles of revelation from the spirit world that supplemented the Bible and brought them to different conclusions than they would have made had they followed Scripture alone. Thus, *War on the Saints* affirms that the “Bible throws much light upon the Satanic powers, which cannot fail to be discerned by all who search the Scriptures with open minds, but these will not obtain as much knowledge of the subject from the sacred record, as will those who have understanding *by experience*”; one is to gain “through experience . . . a personal witness to the . . . Scripture . . . testimony concerning the existence of supernatural beings, and their works, and the way they deceive, and mislead the children of men.”⁷⁶³ That is, the Bible is perhaps not to be entirely discounted, but its testimony is not able to give as much knowledge as one can obtain by personal interaction with and experiential fellowship with misleading demons. Experience must supplement searching the Scripture with an open mind, and grammatical-historical interpretation of the Word of God must give way to experience-oriented interpretation. Rejecting the total sufficiency of the Bible alone, and the literal interpretation of Scripture, to favor experience instead, will not open one up to Satanic deception, but will help one to successfully fight the devil, Penn-Lewis informs her readers. In fact, perhaps experience is really to entirely replace Scripture in knowing how

⁷⁶³ Chapter 1, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Italics in original; Penn-Lewis wished to emphasize the importance of gaining knowledge of the ways of the devil “by experience,” not by Scripture alone, grammatically-historically interpreted.

to deal with demons: “Believers will be taught the truth about themselves only by experience, therefore God permits experience . . . God has permitted Satan to sift His people.”⁷⁶⁴ Believers will not be taught by the Bible alone about how to deal with demons—no, they will be taught by experience alone. Out with *sola Scriptura*, and in with *sola experientia*. In any case, whether the Bible is to be set aside or simply supplemented by experience, as both Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis knew experientially, a “purified ‘theology’ . . . and a true demonology” certainly came not from the study of Scripture alone,⁷⁶⁵ but by being demon possessed and then becoming free from demon possession by means of the unscriptural techniques described in *War on the Saints*. “[T]he believer understands the systematic workings of the forces of Satan . . . [t]hrough aggressive warfare against the foe . . . [t]hrough the knowledge gained by reading the symptoms of deception and possession in his own case, he is now able to read them in others, and see their need of deliverance, and finds himself compelled to pray for them, and work toward that goal.” Through experiencing “the methodical, planned and systematic attacks of the forces of the enemy” one discovers truth: “By these attacks, the knowledge of the active operations of the lying spirits” comes to light.⁷⁶⁶ Not grammatical-historical exegesis of a sufficient Scripture (2 Timothy 3:16-17), but being possessed, being systematically attacked by Satan, and having experiences with demons that make one think he is free from their power through utilizing the techniques of *War on the Saints* are the way to true theology and demonology. The teachings of *War on the Saints* are themselves a product of such personal interactions with demons by people who have been demon possessed, and as such, they are necessary additions to the Bible, for accepting doctrine from people who have been self-professedly demon possessed, and received teachings from their personal interactions with demons, is not the height of folly, but obviously the smart way to go.

After all, with the Bible alone, one could never discover such truths as those that *War on the Saints* describes as follows:

[E]vil spirits . . . bury themselves in the very structure of the human frame, some acting directly upon the organs or appetites of the body, others upon the mind or intellect, sensibilities, emotions and affections, and others more immediately upon the spirit. In the body they specially locate

⁷⁶⁴ Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*.

⁷⁶⁵ The incredible lack of careful Bible study is painfully manifest throughout the book, not only from its extreme sloppiness in handling God’s holy Word with the text and its exegetical fallacies in general, but from what appears to be a lack of even a careful examination of the Biblical passages that speak of angels and demons. Such simple facts as that the Bible never speaks of a plurality, but only of one archangel, Michael, who is “the archangel” (1 Thessalonians 4:16; Jude 9), have been overlooked by Mrs. Penn-Lewis, who repeatedly speaks of a plurality of archangels (cf. Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*). Perhaps she simply received information that contradicted the Bible from the spirit world as she wrote by inspiration.

⁷⁶⁶ Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*.

themselves in the spinal column, nervous system, and deepest nerve centers, through which they control the whole being; from the ganglionic nerve center located in the bowels, the emotional sensibilities, and all organs affected by them, to the cerebral nerve center in the head; the eyes, ears, neck, jaws, tongue, muscles of the face, the delicate nerve tissues of the brain. . . . Demons . . . are of various types, greater in diversity than human beings, and these demons always seek to possess a person congenial to them in some characteristic. The Bible tells us . . . of despotic demons, theological demons, screeching and yelling demons. There are demons that act more particularly on the body, or some organ or appetite of the body. There are others that act more directly upon the intellect, or the sensibilities, and emotions, and affections. There are others of *a higher order that act directly on man's spiritual nature*, upon the conscience, or the spiritual perceptions. . . . Demons . . . seek out those whose make-up and temperament is most congenial to themselves and then seek to fasten themselves on to some part of the body, or brain, or some appetite, or some faculty of the mind, either the reason, or imagination, or perception; and when they get access, they bury themselves into the very structure of the person[.]⁷⁶⁷

Furthermore, with only the Bible, one would never know that “evil spirits want the body, and . . . so persistently work to gain access and possession . . . [b]ecause in it they find ‘rest’ (Matt. 12:43), and seem to find some relief for themselves,”⁷⁶⁸ for Matthew 12:43 actually states that unclean spirits seek rest, and find none, so one would need the inspired writings of Mrs. Penn-Lewis to know that, when they possess men, unclean spirits seek rest, and find some, the allegedly true, allegorical meaning of the text of Matthew, although one with no support whatever from the literal interpretation of the passage.⁷⁶⁹ Nor would one be able to discover the fact that there are degrees of demon possession,⁷⁷⁰ so that demons can possess one’s left arm, or right ear canal, or facial muscles, or nerves,⁷⁷¹ or divide up portions of one’s soul, or mind, or sensibilities, and

⁷⁶⁷ Pgs. 162-163, *War On The Saints*, & “How Demons Attack Advanced Believers.” Italics in original.

⁷⁶⁸ Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*.

⁷⁶⁹ While Matthew 12:43 certainly does speak of spirits that are not currently possessing any individual, the fact that devils that are not possessing sinners have no rest does not mean that those who are possessing the lost do find rest, any more than the fact that there is no true spiritual rest to wicked men who are on the earth proves that wicked men in hell do find spiritual rest. As devils are perpetually underneath the righteous judgments of God, they never have rest in any situation.

⁷⁷⁰ Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s pervasive terminology of “ground” given to demons is also absent from the Bible, although perhaps some of what she means by this concept may actually be expressed using other terms in the Bible. However, by rejecting Biblical terminology and demonology for her own terminology, the spirits that inspired Mrs. Penn-Lewis to write *War on the Saints* can influence the saints away from Biblical truth about resisting the devil to unscriptural concepts by using Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s nonbiblical terms to transition from Biblically present to Biblically absent ideas through her imprecise language.

⁷⁷¹ What do the evil spirits do when they locate themselves in the various portions of the body and possess them? Perhaps their work when living in the ear canal may be illustrative: “[E]vil spirits may take hold of the nerves of the ear, so that the person cannot hear what he should, yet is permitted to be alert enough in bearing[,] all [in order] that he should not hear” (Chapter 5, *War on the Saints*). Let all hear the great truths supplementing the Bible in *War on the Saints*—at least if demons are not possessing one’s ears and making one hard of hearing—in which case one had better read the book instead of listening to it read or expounded—although the “eyes” are also “liable to possession” (Chapter 5, *ibid*), so it may not be possible to see the book and read it, either—in which case one had better just cry out for help—unless one’s “tongue” has become subject “to possession,” along with the eyes and ears, in which case learning braille to read the book may be the only option—although since all “other parts of the body” of the

possess some portion of them, or any other portion of the person whatever—an affirmation fundamental to the entire system of *War on the Saints*—from the Bible alone, as there is not a shred of evidence for it in the Word. The Bible never teaches that a “buzzing in the ears” is caused by an “evil spirit locating in the nerves of the ear,” or that “shortsightedness” so that “things look misty and blurred” should lead a man to fear that “evil spirits control the physical eyes,” or that “talkativeness” could well be because [e]vil spirits may ‘possess’ [people] . . . only in the organs of speech.”⁷⁷² Much less would anyone ever conclude simply from the Bible that one needs to know what portion of the body, or soul, and so on, is possessed before exorcism is possible, but *War on the Saints* revealed what is truly necessary to escape from possession: “When the believer is fighting free from possession, he . . . must know the place of the spirit, the soul, and the body, in the conflict, *e.g.*, if evil spirits have a hold on the muscles of the bodily frame there must be effort, and *use of the muscles* to dislodge them, and so in every other part of the being.”⁷⁷³ None of the texts in the Bible that employ the verbs for demon possession or exorcism indicate that either possession or exorcism has degrees,⁷⁷⁴ nor is there the slightest evidence that one must find out that demons are, say, in one’s muscles and then wiggle those muscles to dislodge the demons. Nor does the Bible indicate that manifestations of sin by believers are sometimes caused by demons, so that when a believer acts or thinks sinfully he may not really have sinned, because the devil made him do it. However, in *War on the Saints* Mrs. Penn-Lewis not only discovered that the devil

Christian may be possessed, even the hands may be unable read the book in braille, if they also have been possessed. In that case it may be best to simply think about what to do—unless the Christian’s brain has been possessed.

⁷⁷² Chapter 7, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

⁷⁷³ Chapter 8, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Italics in original.

⁷⁷⁴ Note the δαιμονίζομαι texts (Matthew 4:24; 8:16, 28, 33; 9:32; 12:22; 15:22; Mark 1:32; 5:15–16, 18; Luke 8:36; John 10:21; cf. the texts with ἀκάθαρτος and πνεῦμα) and the texts with the verb “cast out” (ἐκβάλλω) relevant for demon possession (Matthew 7:22; 8:16, 31; 9:32–34; 10:8; 12:22, 24, 26–28; 17:18–19; Mark 1:32, 34, 39; 3:15, 22–23; 6:13; 7:26; 9:38; 16:9, 17; Luke 9:49; 11:14–15, 18–20; 13:32). In every case, neither the possession nor the deliverance from possession was a matter of degree. While an unconverted person could have a greater or lesser number of demons within him, in no case was there a statement or even an implication that only certain portions of a person were possessed, or that when demons were cast out they were not actually cast out from all of the person, but only from certain parts of him. Indeed, in not a single one of the seventy-six instances where the verb *cast out* appears in the New Testament can demons or anything else be cast out and yet still be present within whatever they were cast out of in some lesser degree (Matthew 7:4–5, 22; 8:12, 16, 31; 9:25, 33–34, 38–10:1; 10:8; 12:20, 24, 26–28, 35; 13:52; 15:17; 17:19; 21:12, 39; 22:13; 25:30; Mark 1:12, 34, 39, 43; 3:15, 22–23; 5:40; 6:13; 7:26; 9:18, 28, 38, 47; 11:15; 12:8; 16:9, 17; Luke 4:29; 6:22, 42; 8:54; 9:40, 49; 10:2, 35; 11:14–15, 18–20; 13:28, 32; 19:45; 20:12, 15; John 2:15; 6:37; 9:34–35; 10:4; 12:31; Acts 7:58; 9:40; 13:50; 16:37; 27:38; Gal 4:30; James 2:25; 3 John 1:10; Revelation 11:2). If *sola Scriptura* is true, and Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s writings are not inspired and an authority to set alongside of or above the Bible, then her doctrine of degrees of demon possession is another one of the Satanic lies, errors, and heresies that saturate her writings.

can make believers act sinfully—after all, there are “unclean demons . . . demons . . . of drunkenness, of gluttony, of idleness,”⁷⁷⁵ and so on—but that believers should not confess their sins when the devil makes them sin. If Christians confess the sins that the devil allegedly did through them, they will become demon possessed. A believer who only had 1 John 1:9, Luke 11:4, and related passages would simply confess all his sins and trust that God had cleansed him from all unrighteousness, and with the Bible alone he would never know that drunkenness, idleness, overeating, and so on, could actually be sins from demons rather than sins from himself—but *War on the Saints* shows that, after engaging in various sins, one should first be neutral towards them, not ashamed of them, and then one needs to find out what percentage among sins committed were actually the responsibility of the devil, and be careful to avoid confessing those sins, for even one mistake in confessing a sin that the devil really did through the believer opens the believer up to demon possession.⁷⁷⁶ Furthermore, while the Bible teaches that the true God is sovereign, self-sufficient, and does not need anything (Acts 17:25), the deity of *War on the Saints* needs prayer or it is unable to do what it wants to,⁷⁷⁷ and it is unable to overthrow and destroy sin and Satan without people helping out by binding the devil and utilizing the techniques in Roberts’ and Penn-Lewis’ work,⁷⁷⁸ affirmations that call to

⁷⁷⁵ “How Demons Attack Advanced Believers,” in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Compare the Pentecostal idea of disease-causing demons: “A demon might be in the flesh as in the case of a cancer” (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:11 (Los Angeles, October-January 1908), reprinted on pg. 46, *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).

⁷⁷⁶ “Evil spirits can also counterfeit sin, by causing some apparent manifestation of the evil nature in the life, and matured believers should know whether such a manifestation really is sin from the old nature, or a manifestation from evil spirits. The purpose in the latter case is to get the believer to take what comes from them, as from himself, for whatever is accepted from evil spirits gives them entry and power. When a believer knows the Cross and his position of death to sin, and in will and practice rejects unflinchingly all known sin, and a ‘manifestation’ of ‘sin’ takes place, he should at once take a position of neutrality to it, until he knows the source, for if he calls it sin from himself when it is not, he believes a lie as much as in any other way; and if he ‘confesses’ as a sin what did not come from himself, he brings the power of the enemy upon him, to drive him into the sin which he has ‘confessed’ as his own. Many believers are thus held down . . . but . . . would find liberty if they attributed [their sins] to their right cause[,] [namely, the devil]. There is no danger of ‘minimizing sin’ in the recognition of these facts” (Chapter 6, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis).

⁷⁷⁷ Compare the inability and weakness of Finney’s deity, passed down through the Oberlin theology into the Higher Life movement: “But if God can not prevent sin, will He not be unhappy? No; He is entirely satisfied to do the best He can, and accept the results” (pg. 222, *Sermons on Gospel Themes*, Charles Grandison Finney. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1876).

⁷⁷⁸ “Prayer fulfills some law which enables God to work, and makes it possible for Him to accomplish His purposes. If such a law does not exist, and God has no need of the prayers of His children, then asking is a waste of time” (Chapter 11, *War on the Saints*). “God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the destruction of sin and Satan. . . . God needs the co-operation of His church to carry out the overthrow of sin and Satan, just as God needed the co-operation of Israel in His dealing with the Canaanites. Christ said, ‘First bind the strong man.’ This implies and involves praying against the strong

mind both Word of Faith doctrine and the myths about how the Greek gods became hungry if enough people did not offer them sacrifices. Indeed, the deity of Mrs. Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts is even helpless to initiate the second coming of Christ until people bind Satan and his demons and so clear the air—only then can the Rapture, the partial Rapture of the Overcomers, take place.⁷⁷⁹ However, the deity of *War on the Saints* is not the only being that has needs that only people can meet—demons can also need people to get a drink. “[F]acts gathered from experience [are] sufficient to prove that certain varieties of demons live on the juices in human blood.”⁷⁸⁰ How necessary *War on the Saints* truly must be—filled to the brim, as it is, with affirmations about demons and their wiles that are entirely absent from Scripture! While critics⁷⁸¹ would affirm that the Satanic warfare doctrines in *War on the Saints* and *The Overcomer* are themselves occasions for awful spiritual delusion, and for evil spirits to gain power over people, those who recognize the inspiration of the writings of Roberts and Penn-Lewis need not trouble themselves about the bizarre, unscriptural, and idolatrous features that burst forth on page after page of their writings, nor about the great grief and quenching of the Holy Spirit that their unscriptural nonsense produces in a Christian soul, but can rest in confidence in their prophets in these last hours before the parousia in 1914.

Jessie Penn-Lewis and Evan Roberts taught, by revelation from the spirit world, and in the company of Keswick founder Hannah W. Smith,⁷⁸² that power over Satanic

man. How does the binding take place, and what is it that binds but PRAYER?” (“The Scriptural Basis for ‘Warfare’ Against the Powers of Darkness,” by Evan Roberts, in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis). Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s and Evan Roberts’s affirmations here are among the more loathsome of the regular Pelagianizing affirmations that fill their book.

⁷⁷⁹ “It dawned on me that if the hosts of evil are to be put into the abyss there will come a moment when the warfare will cease[.] . . . I prayed that the whole warfare . . . [with] the hosts of evil . . . should stop. . . . I can see now that there has been sufficient prayer to bring about that incarceration . . . the actual incarceration of the foe, [the end of] this warfare [which] would fulfill the DISPENSATIONAL PURPOSES of God . . . the translation is at hand. . . . Had not this warfare [with Satan] been carried out, then when our Lord came these hosts of evil angels would make war. The translated rise into the air, and the dead arise, and all would be involved in warfare. But God means that the warfare with the evil hosts shall finish before Christ comes . . . [when the] translation takes place, the spirit hosts of evil shall be bound up . . . if they were not bound before the translation they would also interfere with that.” (pgs. 186-188, “Be Ye Ready,” Evan Roberts. *The Overcomer*, December 1913).

⁷⁸⁰ “How Demons Attack Advanced Believers,” in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

⁷⁸¹ E. g., *The Red Letters*, Miles J. Stanford.

⁷⁸² E. g., Mrs. Smith evidenced her appreciation of the Throne Life in her description of her friend Frances Willard, who, after influence from the Higher Life movement, gained a tremendous sympathy with Hannah’s universalism, as well as ecumenicalism, spiritualism, feminism, and socialism (see, e. g., pgs. 155ff., *Frances Willard: A Biography*, by Ruth Bordin. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1986): “It is lovely having Frances Willard in one’s house. . . . She realizes more than anyone I ever knew one’s idea of being ‘seated in Heavenly places,’ without, however, the slightest trait . . . of dogmatic assertion. . . . She believes that God . . . is working out for the whole human race a glorious destiny when

forces takes place when a believer claims a position in heavenly places, basing this conclusion on, among other texts, Ephesians 1-2, although these chapters never command believers to claim anything. The foundation was in this manner laid for the throne-life and spiritual warfare doctrines nourished and developed from within a Keswick context⁷⁸³ by John MacMillan, the Christian and Missionary Alliance in general,⁷⁸⁴ and the charismatic and Word-Faith movements. In 1897 Mrs. Penn-Lewis was preaching to the China Inland Mission about the “throne-life victory with Christ in God” possessed by that subcategory of believers who had entered the Overcoming Life, what her Quaker ancestors had called the Hidden Life. The elite believer who has entered into this “place of victory ‘far above’ all the principalities and powers . . . sits with Christ in His place of victory” with “Satan and all his hosts under his [the believer’s] feet,” able to exercise “authority over the nations.” Such believers experience Christ’s “throne life of victory,” and, now “encased in Christ, and wielding His authority . . . can command all the hosts of hell” and make them obey.⁷⁸⁵ Ephesians 1-2 are said to teach that “the Holy Spirit . . . will certainly impart to us the life of the Risen Lord. He will lift us in real experience into our place in Him, seated with Him in the heavens far above all principalities and powers . . . far above the powers of darkness.”⁷⁸⁶ Mrs. Penn-Lewis used her authority as a believer to effect, for example, “the dislodging of the hosts of darkness from the atmosphere” over Russia, an action that was key for “the Holy Spirit . . . to work unhindered”⁷⁸⁷ in that place. Her revelatory gift was important in the discovery of the Throne-Life and its power over evil spirits, as neither the Lord Jesus nor the Apostles

all sin shall be done away, and every sinner shall be . . . made one with Him” (pg. 122, *A Religious Rebel: The Letters of H. W. S.*, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith. Letter to her friends, October 17, 1893).

⁷⁸³ E. g., A. T. Pierson preached at Keswick in 1905, “when all hearts were warmed and subdued by the mighty happenings of Wales,” the throne-power doctrine: “[W]e are . . . taught . . . [in] the Epistle to the Ephesians . . . the grandest revelation of the power of a child of God. . . . Why, you sway the scepter that God sways” (pg. 457, *Keswick’s Authentic Voice*, ed. Stevenson, reproducing “The Inbreathed Spirit,” A. T. Pierson, pgs. 453-460). In the spirit of the work of Evan Roberts, a rector present at Pierson’s sermon noted: “the Holy Spirit fell. The speaker was kept from completing his address by the sobs and cries[.]” (pg. 528, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, ed. T. Larsen).

⁷⁸⁴ Thus, for example, A. B. Simpson also taught on this theme of throne life; cf. *Christ in the Bible Commentary* (1992), 5:413-414. Mrs. Penn-Lewis, after her American preaching tour which had included the CMA “Nyack Institute in Nyack, New York,” subsequently “for many years . . . kept in close touch with . . . Nyack” (pg. 105, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.).

⁷⁸⁵ Pgs. 90-93, *The Warfare with Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis; the book “is based on a series of addresses given by Mrs. Penn-Lewis in 1897, at a day of waiting on God at the C. I. M. Hall, London” (preface, *ibid*). Compare Penn-Lewis’s 1906 work *Throne Life of Victory*. Evan Roberts also preached about Throne Life under Jessie Penn-Lewis’s influence (cf. pgs. 160-161, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones).

⁷⁸⁶ Pg. 74, *The Warfare With Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

⁷⁸⁷ Pgs. 147-148, *Mrs. Penn-Lewis: A Memoir*, Mary N. Garrard.

ever gave Christians an example of removing demons from the atmosphere over a country or taught that such a removal was key for the Spirit's unhindered work. Penn-Lewis taught that the believer can use his authority to influence world events, such as the first world war, and even change the "day of the rapture and perhaps the day of final judgment." The believer's authority can change "all . . . a teaching in Mary Baker Eddy's Christian Science magazine, *Active Service*, sounded very [much] like this."⁷⁸⁸ Furthermore, based on a misinterpretation of Luke 10:19 also picked up by MacMillan, Simpson,⁷⁸⁹ and Pentecostalism, Penn-Lewis wrote: "The soul hidden with Christ in God has authority over all the power of the enemy . . . he has power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and power to deliver and loose others from the bonds of the evil one."⁷⁹⁰

Mrs. Penn-Lewis taught further doctrines that differed greatly from those in the Bible. She denied central aspects of progressive sanctification,⁷⁹¹ propagated the strange ideas that "the spirit . . . is severed or 'disentangled' . . . cut away . . . from the embrace of the soul" in sanctification,⁷⁹² and taught that only the human spirit is regenerated, doctrines she passed on to Watchman Nee. Indeed, "[m]any of her teachings are echoed in the works of Watchman Nee, who acknowledged his many debts to Jessie Penn-Lewis."⁷⁹³ She also taught bizarre notions obviously absent from Scripture, possibly derived in part from her many books on psychology,⁷⁹⁴ and illustrated by her concept of

⁷⁸⁸ Pgs. 282-283, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones. B. P. Jones, however, in his very positive biography of Mrs. Penn-Lewis, affirms that it is simply "curious" that Mary Baker Eddy's teaching was "very like" that of Mrs. Penn-Lewis while affirming that the two really were different.

⁷⁸⁹ For example, Simpson, in his *Christ in the Bible Commentary*, 4:163, argues that Luke 10:19 is a promise valid for all Christians throughout the age of grace, although the verse is, when interpreted in context, only given to the "seventy"; furthermore, Simpson affirms that since that Christ has all authority over the creation, He gives that authority to every believer, so that animals, Satan, men, and so on, are subject to the believer.

Foster and King (pgs. 139-140, *Binding and Loosing*) argue that Andrew Murray also employed the sorts of binding and loosing powers taught in Pentecostalism because, as recorded on pgs. 41-42 of *Andrew Murray*, William Linder, Jr. (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 1996), Murray had certain dogs snap at him but not bite him. The conclusion that a person has exercised Pentecostal powers to bind and loose Satan because dogs snapped at him but did not bite him is not a little weak, but the argument is representative of Foster and King's overexuberance, at times, to find support for Pentecostal and Word of Faith ideas in earlier writers.

⁷⁹⁰ Pg. 77, *The Warfare With Satan*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Compare Chapters 2, 11, *War On The Saints*, Penn-Lewis.

⁷⁹¹ "There is no *gradual* deliverance from sin, no gradual process of death to sin or deliverance from the world, or the flesh." Chapter 4, Jessie Penn-Lewis, *The Centrality of the Cross*. Elec. acc. <http://www.worldinvisible.com/library/jessiepenn-lewis/8791/8791tc.htm>; also pub. Fort Washington, Pa.: Christian Literature Crusade, 1996.

⁷⁹² Chapter 5, *The Centrality of the Cross*, Penn-Lewis.

⁷⁹³ Pg. 225, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Brynmor Pierce Jones.

⁷⁹⁴ Pg. 224, *The Trials and Triumphs of Mrs. Jessie Penn-Lewis*, Jones.

“soul-force,”⁷⁹⁵ a concept, rooted in the Broadlands Conferences,⁷⁹⁶ that she passed on to John A. MacMillan,⁷⁹⁷ Watchman Nee, and others. Penn-Lewis wrote:

[M]an . . . [can] generate ‘soul-force’ [by] . . . so bring[ing] his body under the control of his own soul, that he can project his soul and spirit, and, while living on this earth, act as if he were a disembodied spirit. . . . The man who attains to this power is called an ‘adept’ and . . . can consciously see the minds of others.⁷⁹⁸ He can act by his ‘soul-force’ on external spirits. . . . He can subdue ferocious wild beasts and send his soul to a distance, and he can exhibit to his distant friends his spiritual body in the likeness of that of the flesh. . . . Soul-force . . . [is] latent in the human frame. . . . psychic power [is] latent in the human frame.⁷⁹⁹

While Penn-Lewis denied that such a “force” should be cultivated, affirming rather that it was evil, she nonetheless believed that her extra-scriptural “force,” which is that of the *chi* of Eastern paganism and the New Age, is “very real . . . even when a man becomes regenerate.”⁸⁰⁰ It appears to be connected to nerves in the pit of the stomach, according to Penn-Lewis, for these nerves are the instrumentality for the performance of miracles. “[R]evelations and prophecies, speaking and singing with tongues, healing and miracles” come from the force through the “lower nerve-centers (the ganglionic system, or the ‘vegetative’ nerves, as they are called), which have their chief seat in the region round the pit of the stomach[.] . . . These nerves . . . display abilities which our ordinary organs of sense do not possess, and] they receive impressions from a realm usually closed to us,

⁷⁹⁵ Penn-Lewis was likely also influenced in her soul-force ideas by gap theorist G. A. Pember, who believed that one “can act by his soul-force on external spirits. He can accelerate the growth of plants and quench fire; and, like Daniel, subdue ferocious wild beasts. He can send his soul to a distance, and there not only read the thoughts of others, but speak to and touch these distant objects, and not only so, but he can exhibit to his distant friends his spiritual body in the exact likeness of that of the flesh” (pg. 252, *Earth’s Earliest Ages*, Pember). Pember joined Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis in advocating a partial Rapture, teaching that “those who are believers in Christ and, therefore, a part of His redeemed . . . but have not yet been sufficiently cleansed and sanctified . . . and are thus not ready to pass into the heavenly Tabernacle . . . may be as Elisha witnessing the departure of Elijah: or as the disciples on the mount of Olives when they beheld the cloud receiving their Master out of their sight, but were not yet prepared to follow Him” (pg. 195, *ibid*), Elijah and the Lord Jesus, in their resurrection and ascension, allegedly acting as types of a partial Rapture.

⁷⁹⁶ E. g., those who congregate at Broadlands testify that they “know the fact” that “spirit acts on spirit,” one human spirit directly on another person’s spirit (pgs. 258-259, *The Life that is Life Indeed: Reminiscences of the Broadlands Conferences*, Edna V. Jackson. London: James Nisbet & Co, 1910), a concept obviously related to the soul-force idea that souls can act upon each other, although the spirit-force idea of Broadlands is viewed positively, while the soul-force concept is considered, at least by Mrs. Penn-Lewis and those influenced by her, as negative.

⁷⁹⁷ “[E]very man is endowed with a certain amount of telepathic power . . . and . . . a few have weird powers of clairvoyance[.] . . . [There are] occult powers of the soul of man . . . the occult powers are quite separate and distinct from those manifestations of demoniacal power” (pg. 719, “The Soul Powers,” John A. MacMillan, *Alliance Weekly*, 70:45, November 9, 1935).

⁷⁹⁸ Penn-Lewis here contradicts 1 Kings 8:39.

⁷⁹⁹ *Soul & Spirit*, Penn-Lewis, Chapters 6, 8-9.

⁸⁰⁰ Chapter 8, *Soul & Spirit*, Penn-Lewis.

such as clairvoyance, presentiments, prophecy, speaking with tongues, etc.”⁸⁰¹ As already noted, Penn-Lewis affirmed that only the spirit of man is regenerated.⁸⁰² Thus, the “converted man [is] one who has had his spirit regenerated . . . his renewed spirit [is] indwelt by the Spirit of God. . . . The believer . . . has been quickened in spirit, is born of the Spirit and the Spirit of God dwells in his spirit.”⁸⁰³ She connected her doctrine that only the spirit is regenerated with her doctrine that believers can be possessed by demons:

[W]hen the spirit of the man has been quickened into life and he has been delivered from the power of sin, the soulish life and elements in the physical body are open to evil powers. . . . [T]he soulish life [is used by] . . . evil spirits . . . to accomplish their plans[.] . . . This working of the enemy through the mind of a believer, when the heart and spirit may be true to God, is a most serious fact in the Church of God today[.] . . . In the physical body, the adversary can work upon the nervous system and use the animal magnetism which is inherent in every human frame, as well as many other elements open to the powers of evil, in addition to ‘the works of the flesh’ and what is generally called sin. These elements are in the very ‘makeup’ of the human vessel and . . . give . . . ground . . . to the spirits of evil to attack, or gain admittance to mind or body. . . . For full elucidation of this aspect of truth, see *War on the Saints*, a textbook on the work of deceiving spirits among the children of God.⁸⁰⁴

As the quotation above demonstrates, Penn-Lewis assumed⁸⁰⁵ the reality of “animal magnetism,” a Satanic concept developed by “Franz Anton Mesmer (1734–1815)” with clear “historical ties to pagan worship and folklore . . . pagan and occultic rituals . . . [and] old cultic practices and superstitions.” Mesmer, whose ideas undergirded the Faith and Mind Cure doctrines that were precursors of Pentecostalism,⁸⁰⁶ was rightly “accused .

⁸⁰¹ “Light on ‘Abnormal’ Experiences,” in *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis. Penn-Lewis also affirmed, contrary to modern science, that these nerves in the stomach pit “set in action . . . the organs of speech,” for somnambulists, such as those exalted by Mr. and Mrs. Mount-Temple (pgs. 39-40, *Memorials [of William Francis Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple]*, Georgina Cowper-Temple. London: Printed for private circulation, 1890), affirmed that such was so, even if scientists did not.

⁸⁰² Similarly, both E. W. Kenyon and Phineas Quimby taught that “the human spirit was ‘the real man’ and that knowledge that comes through the spiritual senses ‘independently of the brain’ is greater than that which comes through the physical senses” (pgs. 103-104, *A Different Gospel*, McConnell), setting the stage for the Word of Faith concept of “revelation knowledge,” which is very similar to the doctrine of Penn-Lewis and Watchman Nee.

⁸⁰³ *Soul and Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Chapters 2-3, elec. acc.

⁸⁰⁴ *Soul & Spirit*, Penn-Lewis, Chapter 3, elec. acc.

⁸⁰⁵ Compare the affirmation of Hannah W. Smith: “I have found by experience, and I am convinced from philosophy, that . . . subtle unseen spiritual forces . . . emanate from our spirits,” and that these forces “are far more important than the outward tangible influence that we exert consciously” (Letter to Daughter, November 3, 1884, reproduced in the entry for December 21 of *The Christian’s Secret of a Holy Life*, Hannah W. Smith, ed. Dieter).

⁸⁰⁶ Discussing Pentecostal founder Charles Parham, Robert Anderson notes:

Healing was widely taught and practiced among Holiness people as well as among the Quimby-Christian Science-New Thought constellation of sects and the Spiritualists. Parham was most strongly influenced on this subject by John Alexander Dowie and A. B. Simpson. . . . Notions similar to those of speaking in tongues and ‘Redemption of the Body’ were common among the Spiritualists. Parham indirectly acknowledged his debt to these contemporaneous religious movements, and even recognized the affinity between his own doctrines and theirs, especially those of Christian Science and Spiritualism.” (pg. 87, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*; cf. pgs. 217-218 on the similarities of spiritualism and Pentecostalism)

. . . of being a magician and charlatan,” but his ideas led to later demonic and cultic errors, as well as modern psychotherapy, as “the term magnetism . . . [was] dropped . . . and . . . hypnosis . . . introduced . . . [becoming key to the development of] the New Thought movement (a religious, metaphysical healing cult) . . . [the] Christian Science [cult of] Mary Baker Eddy . . . [and] Freud’s . . . creat[ion] [of] a new field of therapy, psychoanalysis, which soon became the new rage.”⁸⁰⁷ David MacLeod noted:

The now discredited Franz Anton Mesmer (1734–1815) was a French physician who has been called the father of psychotherapy, the discoverer of hypnosis, and the progenitor of clairvoyance, telepathy, and communication with the beyond. . . . He claimed that a magnetic force emanated from his hands that enabled him to direct the actions and thoughts of his subjects. The effects upon his patients included: convulsions, involuntary movements of the limbs, rapid blinking and crossing of eyes, and piercing cries, tears, hiccups and uncontrollable laughter. He performed healings using an indwelling force he called . . . animal magnetism[.]⁸⁰⁸

The recognition of animal magnetism was widespread in the early Higher Life and Keswick movement, as, for example, it was employed by many mediums whom the Mount-Temples knew and learned from at Broadlands, their home and center for Higher Life agitation and promotion.⁸⁰⁹ David Cloud wrote:

Mesmer . . . an astrologer and occultist, proposed a healing technique through hypnosis and the flow of “animal magnetism” from the practitioner to the patient. He held the occultic view that there are thousands of channels in our bodies through which an invisible life force flows and that illness is caused by blockages. The practitioner of animal magnetism could allegedly cure sicknesses by overcoming the obstacles and restoring the flow. The term “to mesmerize” is based on Mesmer’s hypnotic practices, and the field of modern hypnotism stemmed from his techniques. Mesmerization or hypnosis produced two occultic movements in the 19th century. One of these was the New Thought or Mind Science movement. Phineas Quimby (1802-66), a student of Mesmer, called his ‘mind healing’ theories the Science of Health and had a deep influence on Mary Baker Eddy, the founder of Christian Science. The other occultic movement produced by hypnotism was spiritism. Another Mesmer student, Andrew Jackson Davis, published a book in 1847 which he said was dictated to him by spirits while he was in a mesmeric trance. The

Thus, Parham stated: “[W]e heard and studied the . . . claims of Medical, Mental, and Christian Sciences, hypnotism . . . the power of spiritualism . . . the possession of mediums, [and] speaking under the control of evil spirits.” Having studied these Satanic works, Parham claimed that the powers that he exercised were comparable to those of these demonic manifestations, only that “God has the real of which these sorceries are the counterfeit” (pg. 26, *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness*, Charles Parham; cf. pg. 79). That is, the marvels Parham, and his associates, claimed to perform were not of a fundamentally different character than those in the spiritualism he studied and those performed by evil spirits. His supernatural tongues, for example, were like those of demon-possessed people, only, he claimed, from a better source. Unlike the miracles in the Bible, which were in a different and vastly superior category to the modern marvels of spiritualists, Christian Science cultists, and Mind Cure devotees, Parham’s marvels were comparable.

⁸⁰⁷ Pgs. 594-597, “Hypnosis,” Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling (2nd ed.), D. G. Benner & P. C. Hill.

⁸⁰⁸ Pg. 90, *Counterfeit Revival* [Hank Hanegraaff, *Counterfeit Revival* (Dallas: Word, 1997)]: *A Review Article*, David J. MacLeod. *Emmaus Journal* 7:1 (Sum 98) 71-100.

⁸⁰⁹ E. g., pg. 12, *Ruskin, Lady Mount-Temple and the Spiritualists: An Episode in Broadlands History*. Van Akin Burd. London: Brentham Press, 1982.

Encyclopedia of Psychic Science says, “The conquest by spiritualism soon began and the leading Mesmerists were absorbed into the rank of the spiritualists.”⁸¹⁰

Penn-Lewis’s acceptance of the reality of the myth of animal magnetism (even though she does not endorse it as good, but recognizes it as evil⁸¹¹) is another false doctrine promulgated by her.

Jessie Penn-Lewis’s attempt to prove that only the spirit is regenerated from verses that actually connect the new birth and the spirit consists of one sentence, containing one allusion to uncited Scripture: “It is the spirit that is regenerated—‘a new spirit will I give you.’”⁸¹² Perhaps the fact that the actual references with the words “a new spirit” also mention “a new heart,” and thus newness in the entirety of man’s inner being, including the soul, explain her slackness in giving actual verse references (Ezekiel 11:19; 18:31; 36:26); nor does she explain why her argument from her uncited Old Testament is not the elementary and obvious logical fallacy of concluding that *only* the spirit, not the soul or the entire man, is made new because of a text that refers to a new spirit but never states or hints at her conclusion concerning the soul and body; nor does she try to explain texts such as 2 Corinthians 5:17 which prove that in the believer “all things are become new” (2 Corinthians 5:17)—such verses are simply ignored, as perhaps the force that moved her to write by inspiration did not inspire her to offer an explanation of why she was contradicting plain passages of the Bible. While she did not have the Bible, at least she had Andrew Murray on her side,⁸¹³ in any case, it was necessary that only the spirit be regenerated, for without this doctrine central ideas in her spiritual warfare theories are obliterated,⁸¹⁴ and the experiences she wrote so profusely about would need to bow before the higher authority of the infallible and all-sufficient Word of God.

Penn-Lewis was influenced to her concept of soul-force, as well as her date-setting about the end of the world, from an obscure and odd theological writer named

⁸¹⁰ “Hypnosis and Health Care,” David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, October 1, 2008, an excerpt from *The New Age Tower of Babel*, by David Cloud. Elec. acc. *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*.

⁸¹¹ Cf. *Soul & Spirit*, Chapter 8.

⁸¹² Chapter 9, *Soul & Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis. Watchman Nee follows Penn-Lewis’ argument that Ezekiel 36:26 is proof that only the human spirit is regenerated (pgs. 42-43, *The Latent Power of the Soul*, Nee), and E. W. Kenyon and the Word of Faith movement after him does likewise (e. g., pg. 74, *The Hidden Man*, E. W. Kenyon), with both Nee, Kenyon, the Church of the Recovery, and the Word of Faith movement deriving the doctrine of deification from the alleged regeneration of the human spirit alone—another doctrine of Jessie Penn-Lewis, who herself also affirmed that believers become “one nature, and one life and position with the Son of God” (Chapter 12, *War on the Saints*, Penn-Lewis).

⁸¹³ E. g., pgs. 332-338, *The Spirit of Christ*, Murray.

⁸¹⁴ E. g., her doctrine that believers can be demon-possessed, as expounded in *War on the Saints*, relies heavily upon her false view of regeneration only affecting the spirit.

Mrs. E. McHardie. Penn-Lewis wrote: “There is no writer who appears to have given such full information on the dispensational aspect of . . . ‘soul-force’ . . . as the late Mrs. McHardie [in] her valuable books.”⁸¹⁵ However, Mrs. McHardie richly deserves her obscurity. Reviews of her works, such as *The Midnight Cry: An Inquiry into the Evidence of the Near Approach of the Second Advent*, have described her writing:

[Mrs. McHardie wrote] much . . . that is strained, fantastic, and absurd [to set forth] special signs that the end draweth nigh. . . . [S]he constructs a table of way-marks which leads up to the conclusion that three years hence [after 1883, thus, in 1886] ‘the times of the Gentiles’ will end, while seven years after the personal Anti-christ will be revealed and destroyed.’ . . . [She discusses] the significance of the Great Pyramid . . . [for] the great Pyramid of Egypt . . . is accepted as a witness to Jehovah, and is held to enshrine evidence of when ‘the appointed times’ will befall. . . . [She interprets] [t]he vision of Ezekiel . . . [as teaching that the] cherubim are . . . counterfeits of the seraphim—really representing the evil powers, the unclean spirits in the children of disobedience. . . . [T]he wheels . . . [and the rest of the vision of Ezekiel 1, 10 prophesy of the] [‘]electric batteries [of the nineteenth century] . . . [and give] a symbolic representation of the forces of heaven and the batteries of hell.’ . . . At great length this idea is supported by the vagaries connected with modern spiritualism, which is assigned a very prominent place in connection with the phenomena that betoken ‘the coming of the end.’ . . . [By] the closing . . . of the book . . . [o]ne almost begins to lose patience . . . when she proceeds to cull from obscure journals . . . accounts of remarkable sights in heaven and earth, in the sun, the moon, and the stars, which she insists upon regarding as signs and portents. Nobody will attach any weight to this portion of the treatise; and the general verdict upon it as a whole will be that . . . by a slight extension and exaggeration of its method, [one] might succeed in proving, after a fashion as satisfactory as it attains, positions very unlike those which it advances.⁸¹⁶

It is unfortunate that Penn-Lewis wasted her time studying works by Mrs. McHardie, Guyon, and Hannah W. Smith, instead of studying the Bible and the works of those who carefully and accurately expounded and explained Scripture.

Furthermore, Penn-Lewis’s extreme lack of discernment about Satan and his ways is clear in that she reproduced in print and accepted as truth what “the great plot of Satan, the Master Strategist,” really was, not by exegesis of Scripture alone, but by means of what “was made known by a medium under the direction of the evil spirits controlling her,”⁸¹⁷ as though evil spirits would not lie about Satan’s strategies through a medium to get Penn-Lewis to print and distribute in Christendom the ideas of the devil. Nevertheless, it is appropriate that Mrs. Penn-Lewis published what were confessedly the affirmations of evil spirits, as so much of her writings were, though unconfessedly, the product of such beings.

⁸¹⁵ Chapter 8, *Soul & Spirit*, Jessie Penn-Lewis.

⁸¹⁶ Pgs. 250-251, *The Literary World: Choice Readings from the Best new Books, and Critical Reviews*. #703, vol. 28, new series. London: April 20, 1883, reviewing *The Midnight Cry: An Inquiry into the Evidence of the Near Approach of the Second Advent*, by E. McHardie. (London: S. W. Partridge & Co, n. d). Then again, since Mrs. Penn-Lewis joined Mrs. McHardie in writing much that is “strained, fantastic, and absurd,” Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s high esteem of Mrs. McHardie’s works is not especially surprising.

⁸¹⁷ Chapter 8, *Soul & Spirit*.

The writings of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis have very large doses of heresy, Satanic influence, false prophecy, fanaticism, and plain foolishness. They should be avoided and warned against. Nonetheless, they were very influential in the unfolding trajectory of Keswick theology into Pentecostalism and the Word-Faith movement.

Applications from the Lives and Teachings of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis

Beware of Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis. They are two dangerous and very influential false teachers and exponents of grievous Keswick, continuationistic, and demonological errors. Their works should be avoided and their influence in the preaching, writing, and theologizing of others should be detected, warned about, and rejected. Their strong imprint upon the Keswick theology, and upon the Pentecostalism that arose from it, blackens these movements and provides all the more evidence that they are corruptions of Biblical Christianity. They plainly stated that they had endured demon possession, and claimed that being possessed was key to the content of their writings on demonology. Will you follow and learn from those possessed by demons? Or will you reject the doctrines of demons and cleave to the Bible, the perfect and sufficient revelation of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?

Beware of revisionist history. All historians are fallible, and even their most accurate histories have no authority for Biblical faith and practice—the Bible alone is sufficient to make “the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Timothy 3:16-17). How much the less should historical errors influence the faith and practice of God’s people? But, unfortunately, writers who are more interested in hagiography than truth exercise a great influence over the saints, leading the Lord’s sheep to look up to and pattern themselves after wolves and devourers rather than fleeing from them. Following the writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis and patterning church practice after the person and methods of Evan Roberts will destroy sound Baptist churches and expose individual believers to extremely dangerous demonic deceptions, yet vast numbers of Christians have been exposed to this pair and spiritually weakened by them because of a mythical revision of events in Wales in 1904-1905. Recognize the truth—Evan Roberts and Jessie Penn-Lewis were powerful instruments in the hands of Satan to destroy a true work of revival in Wales, bring to an end many years of growth among the true churches of that land, inaugurate decades of decay and desolation, and hatch the fanaticism and demonism that fills the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Word of Faith movements and has contributed to the spiritual destruction of innumerable souls worldwide. Do not allow true revival to be corrupted to false revivalism in your own life and congregation because

of the influence of these two demon-possessed fanatics. Do not perpetuate the revisionist history that makes them into great servants of God and the center of a true work of revival in Wales, and if you have perpetuated this lie in the past, immediately repent of it and then confess your error to those you have misled. It is high time that the truth about the real revival in Wales, and the Keswick continuationism and fanaticism of Evan Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis that so widely infiltrated and destroyed it, replace the distortions of reality that find their place in the hearts of too many of the precious people of God. If you love and long for true revival, be discerning, cleave to the Spirit-breathed Word with all your heart and soul, and reject and reprove the theology, praxis, and historical revisionism surrounding peddlers of Satanic revivalism like Evan Roberts, Jessie Penn-Lewis, and other Keswick and Pentecostal continuationists and fanatics.

One can glean numerous spiritual lessons from the negative examples of Mr. Roberts and Mrs. Penn-Lewis. They illustrate what spiritual dangers and destruction Keswick continuationism can lead to, and how important it is to reject it with all of its demonic delusions for a Scriptural cessationism. Evan Roberts also illustrates the danger of confusing true conversion and God-wrought regeneration with mere experiences of the supernatural (cf. Matthew 7:21-23). An unconverted Judas performed miracles (Matthew 10:4-8), an unconverted high priest Caiaphas prophesied (John 11:49-52; 18:14), nine unconverted lepers were miraculously healed by Christ (Luke 17:11-19), idolatrous Egyptian magicians performed miracles (Exodus 7:11, 22), an unconverted sorcerer named Simon did marvels and convinced many that he was the great power of God (Acts 8:9-10), unconverted men had supernatural dreams (Genesis 31:24; 41:7), and Evan Roberts experienced many visions, dreams, voices, and other marvels, but had no clear testimony of conversion and died with barely a glimmer of Christian piety. And if many genuinely supernatural occurrences—even those that are truly from God, not from Satan—are less than true conversion and regeneration, how much less than the new birth is simply having an emotionally charged experience—and how far, far less than the new birth is standing up or coming to the front of a church building? Such soul-damning acceptance of substitutes for regeneration filled the work of Evan Roberts in the Welsh holiness revival, causing immeasurable spiritual harm. Christians and spiritual leaders must learn from this disaster the extreme importance of clearly and without confusion preaching the gospel, recognizing true conversion, and cleaving to Biblical methods of evangelism rather than adopting methodology that, although it may appear effective in the short term, actually contributes to the everlasting damnation of eternal souls by confusing the nature and fruits of real salvation. Scripture is sufficient for both the doctrine and practice of evangelism. Your church should be preaching regularly in public

places and seeking to reach large groups of people at once, while also preaching Christ house to house to systematically reach everyone in your community (Acts 5:42). You should be preaching the good news of Christ's substitutionary death, His burial, and His resurrection, and salvation through repentant faith in Him. You should not be employing worldly promotion and marketing techniques or seeking to draw people to your church services with sensationalism. While providing people with spiritual counsel immediately after preaching is Biblically justifiable (Acts 2:37-38), including, for example, in an "inquiry room," the elements of worship in the Lord's church do not include the modern invitation system invented by Charles Finney. Furthermore, while Roman Catholic and liturgical Protestant religious organizations have altars at the front of their meeting places, true churches have no such altars, and so "altar calls" should be dispensed with. There is absolutely nothing sacred about the front of a church building, and there is no reason to conclude that because someone walks to the front of a church building, or is led to repeat the words of a "sinner's prayer" after walking to the front of a church building, that he has been born again of the Holy Spirit of God. The replacement of true conversion with decisionism was central to bringing the time of Baptist church growth in Wales to an end as a result of the methods employed in the holiness revival under Evan Roberts, and its consequences have been inconceivably disastrous world-wide whenever they have been adopted. Nonetheless, there is hope—a rejection of unbiblical and nonbiblical doctrines and practices in evangelism, a recognition of the foundational importance of the Regulative Principle of worship, a wholehearted repentance for neglecting Biblical doctrine and praxis, and a return to Biblical and Spirit-empowered evangelism and preaching, both outside of and within the context of the instituted worship of the church, could be, in the hands of the sovereign God, the instrumentality for glorious and widespread true revival.

Furthermore, learn from Evan Roberts's destruction of true revival the fallacy of his practice of only preaching on God's love. Reject this practice of Roberts, and instead preach boldly, pointedly, and with uncompromising conviction on specific sins, on hell with its fire and brimstone, on the wrath of God, and on the absolute necessity of the propitiatory work of Christ and the new birth to escape everlasting torment, as well as on God's glorious love. If you truly love unconverted sinners, you will follow the practice of Christ and His Apostles in preaching the law and judgment as well as grace and love. It will not be easy to do so—if you preach so, you will need a true love for and trust in God, and a real love for the unconverted. Preaching that pricks and cuts men to the heart may, instead of seeing three thousand true conversions as did Peter (Acts 2), lead men to become so angry with you that they gnash on you with their teeth and seek to kill you, as

they did Stephen (Acts 7), and as they sought to do to the Prophet of prophets and the perfect Pattern for all preachers, the Lord of love, Jesus Christ (Luke 4:29).

Consider also that marvels are no substitute for Spirit-empowered preaching of the entire Word. The visions and ecstasy of the Welsh holiness revival did not produce revival, but destroyed it. It certainly is possible that searching preaching is used by the Holy Ghost to bring people under such tremendous conviction of sin that powerful emotional responses follow. However, the preacher must never aim only for emotional response, nor must such responses be allowed to overturn the apostolic command that all things be done “decently and in order” (1 Corinthians 14:40). Furthermore, someone who is truly filled with the Spirit will not see visions, pretend to the gift of prophecy, or adopt other continuationist errors. Rather, he will manifest the fruit of the Spirit in a Christ-like life and in great progress in that true Christian sanctification that is impossible without the supernatural efficacy of the Spirit of God.

Consider also the great importance of following Scripture alone in successfully resisting the devil and causing him to flee. Literal exegesis of the Bible will teach you all you need to know to overcome the wicked one, and its teachings are not to be changed in the least degree because of someone’s testimony to victory over Satan or experiences fighting demons. Your sufficient offensive weapon in your spiritual armor is the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God (Ephesians 6:10-18); no uninspired book is necessary for successful wrestling with Satanic principalities and powers. With a grasp of God’s Word, apart from any uninspired book on demonology, you can say with first century Christians, “we are not ignorant of [Satan’s] devices” (2 Corinthians 2:11). Indeed, you should recognize that a frightful proportion of modern literature on demonology is not an exposition of Biblical teaching on withstanding demons, but has actually come from the devils themselves through extra-Biblical revelations or experiences where devils deluded people into thinking that they were gaining the victory over the powers of darkness while they were, in truth, falling to the cunning trickery of the devil. Lucifer and his fallen angels are too smart, and too powerful, for you to figure out on your own how to fight them and win. Only in the strength and with the guidance of Jehovah, wearing the whole armor He has provided His saints, can you successfully withstand demonic wiles. The battle-plan for victory is plainly set forth in the pages of His infallible Word—nowhere else.

Since Scripture is sufficient for successful Christian resistance of Satan, accept the truths of Biblical demonology. Find the passages that speak of Satan or of demons in a concordance and study them in their context so that you can know how to successfully resist the wicked one. Spend your time studying God’s Word on how to deal with devils,

rather than wasting your time and filling your mind with error by reading continuationist and experience-based demonology. The Scripture will lead you to truths such as the following. You should examine yourself to be sure you are in the faith (2 Corinthians 13:5), for if you have not been converted, you are still in Satan's kingdom, not God's, and are under the power of the devil, not under the protective power of Jesus Christ (Ephesians 2:1-9). You must submit to God and resist the devil, and he will flee from you (James 4:7). Be sober and vigilant in your resistance, and resist in faith (1 Peter 5:8-9), for through faith and God's enabling grace, not through your own self-dependent might, you will defeat his temptations (Ephesians 6:16). Use the Word in your resistance (Matthew 4; Ephesians 6:17). Pray regularly for deliverance from temptation and the tempter (Matthew 6:13); watch and pray constantly (Ephesians 6:18), guard yourself (1 John 5:18), and fill yourself up with the evil of sin, the love of Christ, and the mercies of God to you, so that temptations lose their power (2 Corinthians 5:14; Genesis 39:9). Serve God in an assembly that both faithfully practices church discipline and lovingly restores disciplined members who repent (1 Corinthians 5; 2 Corinthians 2). Rejoice that Jesus Christ, your High Priest, effectually prays that you will be kept from evil and the evil one (John 17:15). Do not give an occasion, scope, or place for the devil to be active and tempt you by nursing sinful anger or other sins (Ephesians 4:26-27). Be honest and obey the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:3). If you are married, regularly render to your spouse due physical benevolence (1 Corinthians 7:3-5). Forgive (2 Corinthians 4:10-11). Take to yourself righteousness and truth, fill yourself up with the knowledge of an assured salvation, and be devoted to proclaiming the gospel (Ephesians 6:10-18). Walk closely with God. Oh for greater fellowship with Him! And consider how spiritually refreshing, straight-forward, practical, and easily understood are Biblical instructions for dealing with demons. What a blessed contrast they form with the strange, obscure, and spiritually oppressive practices contended for in *War on the Saints!* Rejoice that by practicing what God has revealed about resisting the devil, you will be successful, for the Lord has not revealed the truth to His beloved people in vain.

Since Scripture is sufficient for Christian resistance to Satan, do not adopt unbiblical ideas of the sort that fill books such as *War on the Saints* and the many later handbooks on demonology that rely on extra-biblical ideas and revelations, and flee in horror from all misinterpretations of Scripture. Do not try to bind Satan, and do not pray that Satan will be bound in this age. He will not be bound until the Millennium. If you pray that an entire country or region of the world will be freed from Satanic influence because of an alleged binding, you are self-deceived, for it is not God's will that wicked people who reject the gospel and hate Him will be free from demonic control—Satan's

rule over them is a righteous judgment from He who is truly Sovereign over all nations. Only at the point of the new birth are any truly delivered from the power of darkness, for then, and only then, are they transferred into the kingdom of God's dear Son (Colossians 1:13); indeed, Scripture is so far from indicating that an entire country or region of unconverted people can be free from Satan's control that it records an inspired prayer, which is to be sung by the people of God (Ephesians 5:19) and which indicates the will of God, that Satan be at the right hand of the wicked (Psalm 109:6). Do not rail on or rebuke the devil—if even Michael the Archangel did not (Jude 9), why should you? Do not seek for a post-conversion Spirit baptism that will give you special powers against the forces of darkness—Spirit baptism was a completed historical event that took place in the first century and is not going to happen again in the church age. Do not think that the devil has the ability to make you sin—your flesh is sufficient for that, and all your sins are your own fault, not the devil's. If you are a child of God, reject the idea that the devil has the ability to inject thoughts into your head—the Bible only indicates that demons have such abilities with the unregenerate. We cannot know exactly what powers demons can exert externally upon saints, by God's permission—and we do not need to know, because Scripture does not declare it—but we can surmise that if parents of ordinary intelligence can become very familiar with their children and know them very well without direct access to their minds, extremely intelligent fallen angels can watch and know with a high degree of accuracy what mortal men are thinking without direct access to their minds. Nevertheless, they do not have the knowledge and the ability to exert internal power upon the people of God that is possessed by the Almighty and all-knowing Father of the children of God. Throw away books by continuationists that corrupt the teaching of the Bible on demonology by examining the subject based on experience-based hermeneutics or that in any other way deny *sola Scriptura* in practice. Do not adopt any ideas about Satan or the occult from any sources other than the Bible. Satan appears like an angel of light, not like a red creature with horns and a red forked tail, and witches do not fly around on brooms. For that matter, no angels in Scripture look like cute, baby-faced creatures—they all looked like men. The only possible exception is certain demonic creatures that have the faces of men and the hair of women (Revelation 9:7-8). Nor do angels have a pair of wings coming out of their back; only the cherubim and seraphim have wings. Do not seek for signs and wonders after the fashion of an evil and adulterous generation (Matthew 12:39). Do not practice charismatic “warfare prayer” or “territorial mapping.” Do not follow Jessie Penn-Lewis and Pentecostalism in attempting to use “throne power” to defeat Satan in prayer, but follow Jesus Christ and pray the way He told you to pray (Matthew 6:9-13). If, out of the many hundreds of

prayers recorded in Scripture, not even one example of the sort of prayer you wish to engage in can be found, your type of prayer cannot possibly be key to spiritual victory, to defeating Satan, or to any other Christian goal whatsoever. The devil has sowed vast amounts of confusion concerning his character and workings, and the only way you can be free from the lies he has filled the world with, and filled largely unregenerate Christendom with, is by careful study of and submission to the sole authority of the Word of God. You cannot successfully resist the devil without the power of God, but you will not have His power if you are employing your own devices rather than the means and methods of successful spiritual wrestling He has revealed.

Do not pretend that you have the sign gift of exorcism. Do not go around trying to cast out demons as if you were an Apostle. God did not record any procedure for normal Christians to practice exorcism in the New Testament epistles because the Lord's people and churches were not to practice this sign gift. If an unconverted person appears to be possessed, you should pray and fast (Matthew 17:21), and preach the gospel to him so that he can be regenerated and freed from the control of the devil (Ephesians 2:1-4). Reject the idea that a regenerate person can be possessed—the temple of the Holy Spirit cannot be the dwelling place of devils, so the saints of God cannot be demon possessed, although they must certainly resist the devil and his temptations, looking to Christ in faith. Trying to do what the Lord Jesus did in validating His Messiahship by exorcising demons will lead you to give place to the devil in a terrible way. You should have no communication with demons whatsoever—only the Almighty and omniscient God (Job 1:8; Mark 5:9), or the head of the host of good angels, Michael the Archangel (Jude 9), is ever recorded as speaking to or conversing with Satan or devils in Scripture—no godly man is ever recorded as doing so. If not even the Apostles, who had the sign gift of exorcism, conversed with demons, how much the less should you? Indeed, even the Lord Jesus only spoke to demons in Scripture on very rare occasions and for very special purposes—the large majority of the time He “suffered not the devils to speak” (Mark 1:34), using His Divine power to force them to be silent and stop speaking (Mark 1:25; 3:11-12; Luke 4:35, 41). Recognize that the conversations with demons Keswick continuationists, Pentecostals, and other modern miracle-mongers engage in during their exorcism sessions and reproduce in their periodicals and books are nothing other than disobedience to Scripture and awful occasions to be both personally deceived by fallen angels and to spread demonic lies under the guise of Christian truth through the printed page. The demons are smarter than you are. Every time you converse with them you will lose, for God has told you, “I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils” (1 Corinthians 10:20).

Beware of, avoid, and warn against “deliverance” ministries and modern exorcists. The techniques of Jessie Penn-Lewis, Evan Roberts, and Pentecostalism to deal with demons flourish in environments where the gospel is corrupted, as it was in the Quakerism of Mrs. Penn-Lewis, the Anglicanism of the Keswick Convention, and in other continuationist paedobaptist groups. When many professing Christians are unconverted and are consequently liable to being possessed by demons, and continuationism is adopted, exorcism ministries have room to flourish, while when people are truly converted, have the special protection Christ gives to the church He purchased with His own blood, and in fellowship with Him and His faithful people, they will be able to discern and reject the unbiblical heresies that permeate modern continuationistic demonology. What is more, people who are demon possessed, and then are “delivered” through unbiblical techniques by false teachers, as the sons of the Pharisees cast out demons (Luke 11:19), are in extreme danger of falling into even greater spiritual darkness, in accordance with the goals of the demons themselves. Such persons, even if the demons have decided to leave their bodies for a time to convince them to follow the religious delusions advocated by their wonder-working exorcist, will still be eternally damned unless they are born again—yet the supernatural wonder that they themselves have experienced is a tremendous roadblock to their coming to the knowledge of the truth and being truly converted. Truly, Satan has laid his deceit very deep, and the unraveling of his wiles and deliverance from his power is a work far above the strength of mere mortal men. Nevertheless, the believer has no grounds for despair; with the God of Jacob as his refuge, victory over the forces of hell is indubitably obtainable: “With men *it is* impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible” (Mark 10:27).

Rejoice in true worship in the house of God—the holy angels rejoice in it (1 Corinthians 11:10). Recognize the glorious promise that the gates of hell cannot prevail against the church (Matthew 16:18). Christ exercises a special care over the members of His assemblies and over His congregations, protecting them from enemies as a man cares for and protects his bride. The church is Christ’s holy temple, but being removed from His house is being delivered to Satan (1 Corinthians 5:4-5). Special protection from the powers of the wicked one is therefore found in the assemblies of the saints that Christ started in the first century, and which have existed to this present time under many names, but are now found among historic Baptist churches. Godly worship and praise brings the special presence of Jehovah (cf. 2 Chronicles 5:13-14), and godly music makes evil spirits depart (1 Samuel 16:23). Let such worship, and such music, be found in your church and in your home. God’s saints should sing His inspired psalms, and uninspired

hymns should be patterned after the Biblical content found in the psalter, as they regularly were in the age of hymnists from Faucett to Doddridge to Toplady. They should hold fast to the Regulative Principle of worship as the sole solid defense against the introduction of humanly or demonically designed corruptions in worship. On the other hand, false religious organizations are Satan's hunting-ground (Revelation 18:2). God is not the source of all religious experience. The worship of all pagan and non-Christian religions is the realm of the devil (1 Corinthians 10:20). The gatherings of the church of Rome are filled with demons, demons that work through the idols, demons that work supernaturally to bring the unregenerate into ever greater darkness as bread is allegedly transubstantiated over altars that have occult relics of "saints" in them, demons that rejoice in their extrabiblical festival days, demons that are attracted to their unholy and Spirit-quenching liturgy, and all sorts of other demons. Assemblies of Protestant religious organizations that preach a corrupt gospel are likewise places where demons and demonic influence abounds. When charismatics turn off their minds and engage in ecstatic religious phenomena, they are often having a genuinely supernatural experience, but one that shares its source with that of the ecstatic worship of demonized idolaters in first century Corinth (1 Corinthians 12:2).⁸¹⁸ When neo-evangelicals bring rock music or

⁸¹⁸ Commenting on the cessation of miraculous gifts, the fact that the Biblical sign gift of tongues was an ability to speak in real, known, earthly languages, and on the contrast between mindless and out-of-control pagan and demonic ecstasy and the use of the mind and in-control state involved in Biblical prophecy, the patristic writer Chrysostom noted:

This whole place [1 Corinthians 12-14 and its discussion of the sign gifts] is very obscure: but the obscurity is produced by our ignorance of the facts referred to and by their cessation, being such as then used to occur but now no longer take place. . . . [F]or the present let us state what things were occurring then. . . . [People] spake with tongues and not with tongues only, but many also prophesied, and some also performed many other wonderful works. . . . And one straightway spake in the Persian, another in the Roman, another in the Indian, another in some other such tongue: and this made manifest to them that were without that it is the Spirit in the very person speaking. Wherefore also he so calls it, saying, "But to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given to profit withal;" (v. 7) calling the gifts "a manifestation of the Spirit." For as the Apostles themselves had received this sign first, so also the faithful went on receiving it, I mean, the gift of tongues; yet not this only but also many others: inasmuch as many used even to raise the dead and to cast out devils and to perform many other such wonders: and they had gifts too, some less, and some more. But more abundant than all was the gift of tongues among them: and this became to them a cause of division; not from its own nature but from the perverseness of them that had received it: in that on the one hand the possessors of the greater gifts were lifted up against them that had the lesser: and these again were grieved, and envied the owners of the greater. . . . And this was not the only thing to disturb them, but there were also in the place many soothsayers, inasmuch as the city was more than usually addicted to Grecian customs, and this with the rest was tending to offence and disturbance among them. This is the reason why he begins by first stating the difference between soothsaying and prophecy. For this cause also they received discerning of spirits, so as to discern and know which is he that speaketh by a pure spirit, and which by an impure.

For because it was not possible to supply the evidence of the things uttered from within themselves at the moment; (for prophecy supplies the proof of its own truth not at the time when it is spoken, but at the time of the event;) and it was not easy to distinguish the true prophet from the pretender; (for the devil himself, accursed as he is, had entered into them that prophesied, [See 1 Kings 22:23.] bringing in false prophets, as if forsooth they also could foretell things to come;) and further, men were easily deceived, because the things spoken could not for the present be brought to trial, ere yet the events had come to pass concerning which the prophecy was; (for it was the end that proved the false prophet and the true:)—in order that the hearers might not be deceived before the end, he gives them a sign which even before the event

served to indicate the one and the other. And hence taking his order and beginning, he thus goes on also to the discourse concerning the gifts and corrects the contentiousness that arose from hence likewise. For the present however he begins the discourse concerning the soothsayers, thus saying,

[2.] “Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant;” calling the signs “spiritual,” because they are the works of the Spirit alone, human effort contributing nothing to the working such wonders. And intending to discourse concerning them, first, as I said, he lays down the difference between soothsaying and prophecy, thus saying,

“Ye know that when ye were Gentiles, ye were led away [ἀπαγόμενοι, properly “dragged to prison or execution.”] unto those dumb idols, howsoever ye might be led.” Now what he means is this: “In the idol-temples,” saith he, “if any were at any time possessed by an unclean spirit and began to divine, even as one dragged away, so was he drawn by that spirit in chains: knowing nothing of the things which he utters. For this is peculiar to the soothsayer, to be beside himself, to be under compulsion, to be pushed, to be dragged, to be haled as a madman. But the prophet not so, but with sober mind and composed temper and knowing what he is saying, he uttereth all things. Therefore even before the event do thou from this distinguish the soothsayer and the prophet. And consider how he frees his discourse of all suspicion; calling themselves to witness who had made trial of the matter. As if he had said, “that I lie not nor rashly traduce the religion of the Gentiles, feigning like an enemy, do ye yourselves bear me witness: knowing as ye do, when ye were Gentiles, how ye were pulled and dragged away then.”

But if any should say that these too are suspected as believers, come, even from them that are without will I make this manifest to you. Hear, for example, Plato saying thus: (*Apol. Soc.* c. 7.) “Even as they who deliver oracles and the soothsayers say many and excellent things, but know nothing of what they utter.” Hear again another, a poet, giving the same intimation. For whereas by certain mystical rites and witchcrafts a certain person had imprisoned a demon in a man, and the man divined, and in his divination was thrown down and torn, and was unable to endure the violence of the demon, but was on the point of perishing in that convulsion; he saith to the persons who were practicing such mystical arts [These verses are taken from an old Oracle, quoted among others by Porphyry in a Treatise *of the Philosophy of Oracles*, and from him again by Theodoret, on *the Remedies for Gentile Errors*, Disp. x. t. iv. p. 957.],

*Loose me, I pray you:
The mighty God no longer mortal flesh
Can hold.*

And again,

*Unbind my wreaths, and bathe my feet in drops
From the pure stream; erase these mystic lines,*

And let me go. [Porphyry’s note on this verse, as quoted by Hales from Eusebius (*Evang. Præp.* v.) in Savile’s *Chrysostom*, viii. pt. ii. p. 278, is as follows: “You see, he bids them erase the lines that he may depart: as though these detained him, and not only these, but the other things too about their apparel: because they wore certain portraits of the deities who were invoked.”]

For these and such like things, (for one might mention many more,) point out to us both of these facts which follow; the compulsion which holds down the demons and makes them slaves; and the violence to which they submit who have once given themselves up to them, so as to swerve even from their natural reason. And the Pythoness too [See *Strabo*, ix. 5.]: (for I am compelled now to bring forward and expose another disgraceful custom of theirs, which it were well to pass by, because it is unseemly for us to mention such things; but that you may more clearly know their shame it is necessary to mention it, that hence at least ye may come to know the madness and exceeding mockery of those that make use of the soothsayers:) this same Pythoness then is said, being a female, to sit at times upon the tripod of Apollo astride, and thus the evil spirit ascending from beneath and entering the lower part of her body, fills the woman with madness, and she with disheveled hair begins to play the bacchanal and to foam at the mouth, and thus being in a frenzy to utter the words of her madness. I know that you are ashamed and blush when you hear these things: but they glory both in the disgrace and in the madness which I have described. These then and all such things Paul was bringing forward when he said, “Ye know that when ye were Gentiles, ye were led away unto those dumb idols, howsoever ye might be led.”

And because he was discoursing with those who knew well, he states not all things with exact care, not wishing to be troublesome to them, but having reminded them only and brought all into their recollection, he soon quits the point, hastening to the subject before him.

But what is, “unto those dumb idols?” These soothsayers used to be led and dragged unto them.

But if they be themselves dumb, how did they give responses to others? And wherefore did the demon lead them to the images? As men taken in war, and in chains, and rendering at the same time his deceit plausible. Thus, to keep men from the notion that it was just a dumb stone, they were earnest to rivet the people to the idols that their own style and title might be inscribed upon them. But our rites are not such. He

the rock beat into their assemblies, they are bringing in music that attracts demons, rather than leading them to leave.⁸¹⁹ Do you, then, wish to avoid the presence of devils? Unite yourself to and worship faithfully in a historic Baptist church that cleaves to and contends for Biblical worship, including an uncompromised stand for traditional, classical-styled music that follows Biblical principles. Such a church can assault the gates of hell in the strength of Jesus Christ. Flee all other religious organizations—unholy angels, rather than holy ones, gather in them.

Remember that the church is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Timothy 3:15)—the church, the local, visible, Baptist congregation, is the place of God’s special presence, His special protection from Satan and his kingdom, and His promises of perpetuity and blessing until the return of Jesus Christ (Matthew 16:18). No promises of Christ’s special presence or protection are made to the mythical universal, invisible church, Para church institutions, human denominations, or inter-denominational movements such as evangelicalism. Do you claim to be a fundamentalist? If, by this term, you mean that you seek to militantly defend all the truths of the Christian faith, and militantly stand against and separate from all error, well and good—you will then, if your confession is true, be a servant of Christ in a historic Baptist church. Do you think that such a line is too strict, for “historic fundamentalism” was a parachurch movement that only recognized a handful of “fundamentals” that were worthy of separation? If that is truly

did not however state ours, I mean the prophesyings. For it was well known to them all, and prophecy was exercised among them, as was meet for their condition, with understanding and with entire freedom. Therefore, you see, they had power either to speak or to refrain from speaking. For they were not bound by necessity, but were honored with a privilege. For this cause Jonah fled; (Jonah. 1:3) for this cause Ezekiel delayed; (Ezek. 3:15) for this cause Jeremiah excused himself. (Jer. 1:6) And God thrusts them not on by compulsion, but advising, exhorting, threatening; not darkening their mind; for to cause distraction and madness and great darkness, is the proper work of a demon: but it is God’s work to illuminate and with consideration to teach things needful. . . . This then is the first difference between a soothsayer and a prophet[.] (John Chrysostom, *Homily 29*, on 1 Corinthians 12:1-2, pgs. 168-170 in *Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the First Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* John Chrysostom, trans. H. K. Cornish, J. Medley & T. B. Chambers, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series, Volume XII: Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, ed. Philip Schaff. Reproducing this quotation is by no means an endorsement of Chrysostom’s doctrine of baptismal regeneration or his other errors.)

⁸¹⁹ This fact is recognized by the rock performers themselves; e. g.: “Rock ‘n’ Roll . . . is . . . demonic. . . . A lot of the beats in music today are taken from voodoo, from the voodoo drums. If you study music in rhythms, like I have, you’ll see that is true . . . I believe that kind of music is driving people from Christ. It is contagious” (Little Richard). “[T]he sudden mingling of so many different tribes produced new variations [of music] like candomble, santeria, and vodun [demonic religion] . . . and out of this severing came jazz, the blues, the backbeat, rhythm and blues, and rock and roll—some of the most powerful rhythms on the planet. . . . It is hard to pinpoint the exact moment when I awoke to the fact that my tradition—rock and roll—did have a spirit side, that there was a branch of the family that had maintained the ancient connection between the drum and the gods [demons]” (Mickey Hart, drummer for *The Grateful Dead*). See “The Character of Rock and Roll Music,” “Is There a Connection Between Rock Music and Voodoo or African Paganism?” and related articles on music in the *Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library*, ed. David Cloud. London, Ontario: Bethel Baptist Church/Way of Life Literature, 2003.

“historic fundamentalism,” then you should reject such fundamentalism for the God-honoring true separatism only possible within a Biblical Baptist church that is unaffiliated with denominationalism, associationism, and all other humanly devised denominational structures. However, you should also consider that there never was a unified “historic fundamentalism.” *The Fundamentals*, for example, printed an essay by George Sayles Bishop, who believed in the dictation of the *autographa* and its perfect preservation—including the perfect preservation of not the Hebrew consonants alone, but also the vowels that were originally given by inspiration—in the *Textus Receptus*.⁸²⁰ Yet *The Fundamentals* also reprinted articles by Edwin J. Orr, who “was unconcerned to defend a literal interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis, and [who] took the view that an insistence on biblical inerrancy was actually ‘suicidal.’”⁸²¹ So who represents “historic fundamentalism”—Bishop or Orr? Does “historic fundamentalism” defend an inerrant *autographa*, an inerrant *autographa* that is perfectly preserved in the Received Texts of Scripture, or errant autographs and apographs? Indeed, while cessationists are amply represented in early fundamentalism, the writings of Jessie Penn-Lewis appear also in *The Fundamentals*⁸²²—so does “historic fundamentalism” follow Scriptural cessationism and the sole authority of Scripture, or Mrs. Penn-Lewis’s fanaticism, radical demonology, Quakerism, date-setting for Christ’s return, and allegedly “inspired” extra-Biblical writings—one of which is condensed in *The Fundamentals*? A unified “historic fundamentalism” is a chimera, and even if it had existed, it would possess no independent authority—the Christian’s sole authority is the Bible alone, and the Bible teaches that every religious organization on earth in this dispensation, if it wants to have the special presence of Jesus Christ, must be under the authority of one of His churches.

⁸²⁰ See the “Inspiration of the Hebrew Letters and Vowel Points,” pgs. 43-59 of *The Doctrines of Grace and Kindred Themes*, George Sayles Bishop (New York, NY: Gospel Publishing House, 1919; note as well his “Relative Value of the Old Testament” (pgs. 88-100) and “The Testimony of Scripture To Itself,” pgs. 19-42). The KJV-only, Landmark Baptist periodical *The Plains Baptist Challenger*, a ministry of Tabernacle Baptist Church of Lubbock, TX, on pgs. 3-8 of its July 1991 edition, reprinted George Sayles Bishop’s defense, based on Matthew 5:18, of the coequality of the vowel points and the consonants. Bishop was a contributor to the epoch-making volumes *The Fundamentals* (“The Testimony of the Scriptures to Themselves,” pgs. 80-97, vol. 2, *The Fundamentals*, eds. R. A. Torrey, A. C. Dixon, etc., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1970, reprint of the original 1917 ed. of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles), writing: “We take the ground that on the original parchment . . . every sentence, word, line, mark, point, pen-stroke, jot, tittle was put there by God” (pg. 92, *The Fundamentals*, vol. 2.).

⁸²¹ Pg. 492, *Biographical Dictionary of Evangelicals*, “Orr, James,” ed. Timothy Larsen, referencing Orr’s *Revelation and Inspiration* [1910], p. 198. See, e. g., “The Holy Scriptures and Modern Negations,” “The Early Narratives of Genesis” (Chapters 5 & 11 *The Fundamentals*, ed. Torrey, vol. 1; Orr wrote other articles also).

⁸²² Pgs. 183-199, Chapter 13, “Satan and his Kingdom,” *The Fundamentals*, ed. Torrey, vol. 4. Her chapter is condensed from *The Warfare with Satan and the Way of Victory*.

Fundamentalist parachurch institutions are not churches. Do you value the Lord's church in the way that One does who bought her with His blood (Ephesians 5:25)?⁸²³ If you do

823

Ephesians 5, and the rest of the book of Ephesians and the New Testament, refers to the church as a local, visible institution, not something universal and invisible. For example, consider Ephesians 5:23: “the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body” (ὅτι ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος). In this verse, “the husband,” “the wife,” and “the church” are generic nouns. There is no universal husband or universal, invisible wife, and there is no universal, invisible church specified either. Each husband is the head of his own wife, and Christ is the head of each church (cf. pgs. 253-254, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace). Ephesians 5:23, and related texts such as Colossians 1:18, do not teach the doctrine of a universal, invisible church. They simply state that Christ is the head of the church generically, that is, of every particular local, visible church. Each particular church is identified as the body of Christ in Ephesians 5 (cf. 1 Corinthians 12:27, where the particular church at Corinth is called the body of Christ). The body metaphor emphasizes that each member of the assembly, as a different and important body part, needs to minister to the other members of his particular congregation in accordance with his God-given gifting, while each church has Christ as her head. “The husband is the head of the wife” hardly means that all the husbands in the world are one universal, invisible husband who is the head of one universal, invisible wife. “Where *is* the wise? where *is* the scribe? where *is* the disputer of this world?” (1 Corinthians 1:20, ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεὺς; ποῦ συζητητὴς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου;) hardly means that all the wise men in the world are one universal, invisible wise man, nor that there is one universal, invisible scribe or disputer. No more does “Christ is the head of the church” affirm that Christ is the head of a universal, invisible church; the text teaches that Christ is the head of each particular church, just as the particular husband is the head of his particular wife.

A comparison of Ephesians 5:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:3 is instructive:

Ephesians 5:23: ὅτι ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. For **the husband is the head of the wife**, even as **Christ is the head of the church**: and he is the saviour of the body,

1Corinthians 11:3: θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι, ὅτι **παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικός, ὁ ἀνὴρ** κεφαλὴ δὲ Χριστοῦ, ὁ Θεός. But I would have you know, that **the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man**; and the head of Christ *is* God.

The singular nouns “the husband” “the wife” “the woman” “the man” imply nothing about a universal, invisible husband, wife, woman, or man. Absolutely nothing affirms the existence of a universal church in the phrase “Christ is the head of the church.” The Lord Jesus is the head of every particular local, visible congregation.

Compare also the evidence in the LXX:

καὶ ἔγραψεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς βιβλίον δεῦτερον λέγων εἰ ἐμοὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ὑμεῖς εἰσακούετε λάβετε **τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνδρῶν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν** καὶ ἐνέγκατε πρὸς με ὡς ἡ ὥρα αὐριον εἰς Ἰεζραὲλ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἦσαν ἐβδομήκοντα ἄνδρες οὗτοι ἄδρῳ τῆς πόλεως ἐξέτρεπον αὐτούς And Ju wrote them a second letter, saying, If ye *are* for me, and hearken to my voice, **take the heads [Gk. singular, “head”] of the men your master’s sons**, and bring *them* to me at this time to-morrow in Jezrael. Now the sons of the king were seventy men; these great men of the city brought them up. (2 Kings 10:6; Brenton’s LXX translation—also below).

Nothing at all is implied about anything universal or invisible with the singular. Each son had his own particular head (until he lost it!). “The head of the sons” is teaches nothing other than that each son had his own head. So “Christ is the head of the church” teaches that Christ is the head of each particular church. Compare 2 Kings 10: 8, where the plural is used:

καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν λέγων ἦνεγκαν **τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ βασιλέως** καὶ εἶπεν θέτε αὐτὰς βουνοὺς δύο παρὰ τὴν θύραν τῆς πύλης εἰς πρωί. And a messenger came and told *him*, saying, They have brought **the heads of the king’s sons**. And he said, Lay them *in* two heaps by the door of the gate until the morning.

Note also Psalm 139:10, LXX (Eng. 140:9):

ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ κυκλώματος αὐτῶν κόπος τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν καλύψει αὐτούς. *As for the head of them that compass me*, the mischief of their lips shall cover them.

Both the Greek translated “them that compass” and “the head” contain singular nouns, just as in “Christ is the head of the church.” Each particular head of each particular enemy surrounding David would be judged.

Lamentations 2:15, LXX:

ἐκρότησαν ἐπὶ σὲ χεῖρας πάντες οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ὁδὸν **ἐσύρισαν καὶ ἐκίνησαν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν** ἐπὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Ιερουσαλημ ἢ αὐτὴ ἢ πόλις ἦν ἐροῦσιν στέφανος δόξης εὐφροσύνη πάσης τῆς γῆς. All that go by the way have clapped their hands at thee; **they have hissed and shaken their head** at the daughter of Jerusalem. Is this the city, they say, the crown of joy of all the earth?

Note that the plurality, the “all” shake the singular “head.” There was no universal, invisible head or universal, invisible person opposing Jerusalem. Each person shook his own particular head at Jerusalem.

Ezekiel 1:22, LXX:

καὶ ὁμοίωμα ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῖς τῶν ζῶων ὡσεὶ στερέωμα ὡς ὄρασις κρυστάλλου ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐπάνωθεν. And **the likeness over the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

“The head of the living creatures” meant that each particular living creature had its own particular head.

Ezekiel 10:1, LXX:

καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς τῶν χερουβιν ὡς λίθος σαφείρου ὁμοίωμα θρόνου ἐπ’ αὐτῶν. And the likeness over **the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

“The head of the living creatures,” again, means each living creature had its own particular head.

This usage of the generic noun also finds clear support in extra-biblical literature. Consider the following examples:

Καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα τοῦ θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ἦκει πρὸς Βάλακον δεξαμένου δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκπρεπῶς ἠξίου προαχθεὶς ἐπὶ τι τῶν ὄρων σκέψασθαι πῶς τὸ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἔχοι στρατόπεδον Βάλακος δ’ αὐτὸς ἀφικνεῖται τὸν μάντιν σὺν βασιλικῇ θεραπείᾳ φιλοτίμως ἀγόμενος εἰς ὄρος ὅπερ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν ἔκειτο τοῦ στρατοπέδου σταδίου ἀπέχον ἐξήκοντα. When God had given him this charge, he came to Balak; and when the king had entertained him in a magnificent manner, he desired him to go to one of the mountains to take a view of the state of the camp of the Hebrews. Balak himself also came to the mountain, and brought the prophet along with him, with a royal attendance. **This mountain lay over their heads** [Gk. singular], and was distant sixty furlongs from the camp (Josephus, *Antiquities* 4:112 (4.6.4.112))

The singular mountain was over each person, each of whom had his own particular head.

καὶ τῶν μὲν δύο τὴν κεφαλὴν χωροῦσαν μέχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τοῦ δὲ χειραγωγουμένου ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ὑπερβαίνουσιν τοὺς οὐρανοὺς. [A]nd **the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the two reaching to heaven**, but that of him who was led by them by the hand overpassing the heavens. (*Gospel of Peter* 10:40)

Each particular individual here had his own particular head.

ὡσπερ οὖν κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον τοῦ ζῴου καὶ ἀνωτάτω μέρος ἐστί, For as **the head is the principle and uppermost part of the animal**, (Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 1:71)

Each singular animal had its own singular head. There was no universal head of a universal, invisible animal.

θαυμάσια μὲν οὖν ταῦτα: θαυμασιώτατον δὲ καὶ τὸ τέλος τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὃ καθάπερ ἐν τῷ ζῴῳ κεφαλὴ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐστίν. These things, therefore, are wonderful; and most wonderful of all is the end of his sacred writings, which is to the whole book of the law what **the head is to an animal**. (Philo, *On The Life of Moses* 2:290)

not, but are following some movement, whether evangelical, fundamental, or by any other name, your organization does not possess the promises Christ makes to His church alone. Beware lest Christ say to you, and to your organization, “cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?” (Luke 13:7).

Furthermore, beware other settings that are naturally the haunts of Satan. If Paul warns about the places where idol worship takes place as the haunt of devils and a setting to avoid (1 Corinthians 10:14, 20), places that are haunts of devils today should be avoided also. Since idols are attractive to demons, do not bring any idols into your house, whether as symbols of foreign “culture,” or mementos of past tourism, or for any other reason. If you have such objects in your house, whether of an openly pagan god or an allegedly Christian semi-deity such as the allegedly perpetual Virgin Mary, destroy such idols immediately. Destroy other demonic objects, such as Ouija boards, and abhor the symbols of idolatry, whether crucifixes or Christmas trees. Avoid the places where the medium and the psychic ply their trade. Do not seek to contact the dead. Do not let the practitioners of demonic and New Age alternative “medicine” deceive you, whether

Likewise here, each animal had its own head.

ταῦτα δ' ἀλληγορεῖται τροπικῶς ἐξενεχθέντα· καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ζῳῷ κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ ἄριστον, οὐρὰ δ' ὕστατον καὶ φαυλότατον, οὐ μέρος συνεκπληροῦν τὸν τῶν μελῶν ἀριθμὸν, ἀλλὰ σόβησις τῶν ἐπιποταμένων, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κεφαλὴν μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ἔσεσθαι φησι τὸν σπουδαῖον εἴτε ἄνδρα εἴτε λαόν, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἅπαντας οἷον μέρη σώματος ψυχούμενα ταῖς ἐν κεφαλῇ καὶ ὑπεράνω δυνάμεσιν. But all these statements are uttered in a metaphorical form, and contain an allegorical meaning. For **as in an animal the head is the first and best part, and the tail the last and worst part, or rather no part at all, inasmuch as it does not complete the number of the limbs, being only a broom to sweep away what flies against it; so in the same manner what is said here is that the virtuous man shall be the head of the human race whether he be a single man or a whole people.** And that all others, being as it were parts of the body, are only vivified by the powers existing in the head and superior portions of the body. (Philo, *On Rewards and Punishments* 125)

This very interesting reference by Philo shows that, as in a single animal there is a single head, so “the virtuous man,” a generic noun, not one particular man named X, is “the head of the human race,” and this is whether he “be a single man or the whole people.” The others are as “parts of the body,” are only “vivified” because of “the head” that is “the virtuous man.” The parallel to Christ as the head of the church is very clear. Nobody would think of saying that there is literally one universal, invisible virtuous man, nor that there is one universal, invisible body of people, since Philo’s point is that whether one speaks of a single man, or a group of any size, in both situations the [generic] virtuous man is the [generic] head.

Ephesians 5:23 is the capstone of the very small number of New Testament texts that advocates of a universal church believe provide support for their doctrine. However, the verse teaches nothing of the kind. It simply affirms that Christ is the head of every particular church, just as each particular husband is the head of his particular wife. There are no verses in the Bible where the noun *ekklesia*, church/assembly/congregation, refers to all believers as an already existing group.

Advocates of the universal, invisible church must find one or more indisputably clear references where *ekklesia* does not specify a particular congregation and is not employed as a generic noun, or they cannot affirm that their doctrine is Biblical. Since they are the ones who are affirming that *ekklesia* assumes a sense it does not have in any pre-Christian literature, they bear the burden of proof in demonstrating that their doctrine is clearly in the New Testament. The attempt fails in Ephesians 5:23, and in every other text in the Scripture—consequently the New Testament does not teach the existence of a universal, invisible church.

through the occult water of homeopathy, the traditional chiropractic of D. D. Palmer, or some other form of pagan energy medicine. Expect the modernist theological seminary, as a place of blasphemy against Jehovah, to be infested with demons. Assume that demons will delight themselves and congregate in the movie theater as its wide screens vomit forth violence, filthiness, occultism, and all kinds of ungodliness, just as they would at the rock concert or the bar. What concord is there between Christ and Belial?

Maintain a Biblical balance in recognizing the power of Satan. First, while recognizing the real power of the devil and the unquestionable spiritual danger he poses to you, do not deify him or treat him as if he were God—do not displease and dishonor the only God by treating his creature and angel, Lucifer, as if he truly were like the Most High. Satan is not omnipotent, omniscient, or omnipresent. His power is not equal to that of God—indeed, it is infinitely inferior to that of El Shaddai. While a very powerful creature, he is nonetheless a defeated and doomed foe. Remember that he is so. Second, do not react against the fanaticism of works such as *War on the Saints* by turning to a rationalism that denies or denigrates the reality of the demonic. Doubtless many pagan marvels are simple impostures with as much reality to them as the body of Mary Baker Eddy's Mind Cures or the fake healings of a Word of Faith wonder-peddler. However, in our Bibles we can hold infallible evidence in our hands that, although they cannot equal the miraculous power of the Almighty (Exodus 8:18-19; 9:11; Daniel 2:27-28), demons can perform real miracles (Revelation 16:14). Neither fear the devil as if he were God—reserve that reverential awe for your Creator and Redeemer alone—nor diminish the power of that roaring lion, who ferociously roams about seeking whom he may devour, as if he were a de-fanged and de-clawed pussycat.