

ABSTRACT

Living in Bible Times: F.F. Bosworth and the Pentecostal Pursuit of the Supernatural

Christopher J. Richmann, Ph.D.

Chairperson: C. Douglas Weaver, Ph.D.

This study examines American pentecostalism using the healing evangelist F.F. Bosworth as an interpretive lens. Bosworth's formative experiences, long-running success, and influence on pentecostal culture situate him as a representative leader. Yet his resistance to majority doctrine and lack of durable denominational ties challenges traditional definitions of pentecostalism, driving to the conclusion that pentecostal identity lies in the pursuit of the supernatural inherited from the nineteenth-century holiness movement rather than in doctrinal markers or connections to the Azusa Street revival.

Bosworth's life story structures the dissertation, providing the most comprehensive biography of Bosworth to date. Experiences with Methodist revivalism, divine healing, and spirit-baptism reveal Bosworth as a typical pentecostal leader-in-the-making. Like numerous influential pentecostals, Bosworth had no significant connections to the Azusa Street revival. His early ministry and facilitation of a crucial revival in Dallas in 1912 established him as a leader in the young pentecostal movement, and his

work with the Assemblies of God placed him in the mainstream who sought organizational stability for pentecostalism.

In 1918, Bosworth publically rejected the tongues evidence doctrine, forcing his departure from the Assemblies of God. But his subsequent fame as a healing evangelist and the impact of his *Christ the Healer* (1924) demonstrate that he continued to represent and shape the supernaturalist impulse of pentecostalism. And while Bosworth's British-Israel teaching was widely disparaged by full gospel believers, this teaching was embraced by many influential early pentecostals. In his last decade, Bosworth became a major contributor to the post-World War II healing revival, shaping a new generation of independently-minded pentecostals in the same pursuit of the supernatural that had animated his entire career.

Bosworth's thought centered on the continuity of God's activity, which helps explain his positions on tongues, divine healing, and biblical prophecy. While Bosworth popularized much of the thought of E.W. Kenyon, Bosworth also came to many of the same positions independently. As a unique living link between the late-nineteenth century divine healing movement and the postwar healing revival, as a leader who valued independence, and as an evangelist who focused on healing, Bosworth embodied the ethos of popular American pentecostalism.

Living in Bible Times: F.F. Bosworth and the Pentecostal Pursuit of the Supernatural

by

Christopher J. Richmann, M.A.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Religion

W.H. Bellinger, Jr., Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

C. Douglas Weaver, Ph.D., Chairperson

William L. Pitts, Jr., Ph.D.

Barry G. Hankins, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2015

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2015 by Christopher J. Richmann

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	viii
Preface.....	ix
Chapter One: The Gospel of the Supernatural.....	1
The Holiness Movement.....	1
Supernaturalism in the Holiness Movement.....	13
Sanctification and Manifestations.....	18
Premillennialism.....	20
Divine Healing.....	26
Emergence of Pentecostalism and the Holiness Retreat.....	45
Chapter Two: A Pentecostal Leader-in-the-Making.....	55
Childhood, Conversion, and Healing.....	59
The City of God.....	70
Pentecost in Zion.....	84
From Dowieites to Pentecostals.....	92
Dowieite Pentecostalism: Pentecostal Identity and Origins.....	105
Chapter Three: Emboldened and Empowered to Preach, 1907-1913.....	110
Early Itinerancy, 1907-1910.....	113
Dallas, Texas: Bosworth the Rising Star.....	125
Stone Church Revival: Bosworth the Revered Leader.....	148
Bosworth’s Early Theology of Healing.....	152
Conclusion.....	155
Chapter Four: Organizations and Orthodoxy, 1914-1918.....	157
Formation of the of the Assemblies of God.....	159
Dallas and Beyond: Bosworth as Pastor, Evangelist, and Denominational Statesman.....	163
The Tongues Evidence Controversy.....	174
Bosworth’s Early Ambivalence.....	175
Context: Early Pentecostal Fluidity on the Tongues Evidence Teaching.....	178
Bosworth’s Critique and Pentecostal Responses.....	196
Why the Tongues Evidence Doctrine Triumphed.....	209
Conclusion.....	219
Chapter Five: The Healing Evangelist, 1919-1932.....	222
Loss and Change, 1919-1920.....	223

Mounting Success, 1921-1924.....	229
Responding to Critics and Encouraging Supporters: <i>Christ the Healer</i>	236
The Opposition.....	237
Response from the Bosworth Camp	246
The Question of R.A. Torrey	248
Impact of <i>Christ the Healer</i>	250
New Phase: Independent Evangelism, 1924-1932.....	255
Methods, Means, and Message: Bosworth as a Healing Revivalist	260
Balancing a Double Gospel	264
The Culture of Divine Healing	266
“My Physician Sent Me Here to Be Healed”	269
Non-Fundamentalist Critique of Modernism.....	273
The Full Gospel and the Problem of Categorization	276
Bosworth and Pentecostalism in the 1920s.....	276
Bosworth and the Christian and Missionary Alliance	280
Conclusion	283
Chapter Six: The Lost Years, 1933-1947	285
Meetings, Radio, and Print, 1933-1940	286
The Distant Past and the Uncertain Future: Bosworth and British-Israelism.....	289
The British-Israel History and Message	289
Bosworth’s Involvement.....	295
Pentecostalism and British-Israelism.....	304
Opposition to British-Israelism.....	313
Winding Down?, 1940-1947.....	324
Conclusion	325
Chapter Seven: The Voice of Healing Years, 1948-1958.....	326
A Fresh Anointing from the Lord, 1948-1951	327
William Branham: The Healer-Prophet.....	328
Bosworth, Branham, and the Early Voice of Healing Network	330
Houston, 1950: A Harangue and Halo.....	337
At Home and Abroad, 1951-1955.....	340
Bosworth and Branham: Reflections on a Successful Partnership	345
Bosworth’s Impact on the Postwar Healing Revival and the Word of Faith Movement.....	355
Historical Assessment of the Postwar Healing Revival.....	365
Discontinuities and Continuities	365
Tensions between Independent and Denominational Pentecostalism.....	367
The Distinctiveness of the Revival	369
Failing Health and Death	372
Conclusion	374

Chapter Eight: Theologian of the Supernatural Gospel	376
The Miracle-Worker’s Age	376
Faith: Putting God to Work	379
Why Some are Not Healed: A Theology for Failure	383
Atonement: The Purchase of Blessings for Spirit, Soul, and Body	386
The Same in Any Age: Divine Love and Divine Immutability	389
Bosworth and E.W. Kenyon	391
Categorizing Bosworth: Scholarly Paradigms of Divine Healing	395
Faithfulness and Freedom	395
Wesleyan and Finished Work	396
Healing Evangelists and Pastoral Healing Ministers	400
Gifted Healers, Facilitators, Heroes, and Victors	403
Summary	405
British-Israelism: Reflections on Historicism and the Supernatural	406
Conclusion	409
 Chapter Nine: Conclusion	 410
 Appendices	 415
A—William H. Durham and Early Pentecostalism: A Multifaceted Reassessment	 416
B—Bosworth’s Evangelistic Ministry, 1919-1932	440
 Bibliography	 445

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Comparison of selections from F.F. Bosworth and Kenneth Hagin, Jr.....	364
Table B.1: Timeline of F.F. Bosworth’s evangelistic ministry, 1919-1932	440

PREFACE

For, after all the facts and functions of religion are reduced to a second-hand character—a reported history, a contrived and reasoned dogma, a drill of observances, where no fire burns, and no glimpses into eternity are opened by visions and revelations of the Lord, or where no God appears to be found, who is high enough to support expectation in His worshippers—then, at length, even the outer people of unbelief begin to ache in the sense of vacuity, and there, not unlikely, the pain is first felt. Their religious and supernatural instincts have been so long defrauded, that it would be a kind of satisfaction to get the silence broken, if only by some vision of a ghost—anything to show or set open the world unknown...But the Church also, or Christian discipleship, after some way out of the dullness of a second-hand faith, and the dryness of a merely reasoned gospel, and many of the most longing, expectant souls, are seen waiting for some livelier, more apostolic demonstrations. They are tired, beyond bearing, of the mere school forms and defined notions; they want some kind of faith that shows God in living commerce with men, such as He vouchsafed them in the former times.

—Horace Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural* (1858)¹

In April of 1928, an “old church member” in Rochelle, Illinois, came to the family home of four deaf children, announcing that “if they had faith,” God would cure them. She told them to go to Chicago, where an independent pentecostal evangelist named F.F. Bosworth was holding services at Paul Rader’s Gospel Tabernacle, an independent full gospel church whose pastor had formerly been president of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Bosworth had already healed thousands, she claimed. The four children, whose ages spanned fifteen to twenty-three, were sent to Chicago, along with two others who were their classmates at a school for the deaf. At the service, the six came to the platform when Bosworth asked “if any sick or infirm wished to be prayed for.” All six testified to instantaneous healing, and could be heard later at a local Baptist church

¹ Horace Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural: As Together Constituting the One System of God* (London: R. D. Dickinson, 1880), 321.

repeating “over and over the simplest words as their teacher encouraged them.” “Soon they will know the whole alphabet,” brimmed their teacher Gertrude Virgin in a newspaper interview, “and will be able to talk.”² Recalling the scene thirty years later, David du Plessis, a pentecostal minister and well-known ecumenist, claimed that the school for these six children had to be closed since they no longer had any deaf students to teach.³ The scene was not completely, jubilant, however. After reading the newspaper story of the healings, an incredulous South Dakota rancher challenged Bosworth through the offices of the *Chicago Daily News* to a \$25,000 wager. The rancher was certain Bosworth could furnish no proof that the children had been cured. The family doctor for four of the children agreed that about a week after the supposed healing “the children tested just as that always have.” For his part, Bosworth responded that the rancher was “totally ignorant of what the gospel has to offer” and stuck by the healings, as did the children’s parents.⁴

F.F. Bosworth (1877-1958) was a high profile and influential leader in American pentecostalism. The pentecostalism he proffered was centered on experience of the supernatural—like the healing of six deaf children—rather than doctrinal purity or denominational loyalty. Bosworth conducted his healing ministry with full confidence that God was continually active in the world—a position that informed his understanding of spirit-baptism, divine healing, and biblical prophecy. Despite his lack of long-term affiliation with any of the classical pentecostal denominations, Bosworth was one of the

² “Six Able to Speak and Hear Through Faith and Prayer,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 6, 1928, sec. 1, 7.

³ David J. du Plessis, “A Faithful Pioneer Passes,” *World-wide Revival* 11, no.1 (April 1958): 10.

⁴ “Ranchman Offers \$25,000 Wager on Fallacy of Claim,” *Belvidere Daily Republican*, May 21, 1928.

most celebrated pentecostal figures of the 1910s and 1920s, as seen in the fact that none other than David du Plessis—“Mr. Pentecost” to the second and third generations of pentecostals worldwide—reflected with awe on Bosworth’s work and legacy. Furthermore, Bosworth’s work brought pentecostalism to the attention of the wider public: secular newspapers like the *Los Angeles Times* quoted above and the *Chicago Daily News* reported on the healing. Such attention highlighted the key themes of pentecostalism’s cultural importance: celebrated supernatural activity, controversy with an unbelieving public, and tension with the medical community. Yet except for his role in an early doctrinal controversy over speaking in tongues and his support of the new generation of healing evangelists in the 1940s and 1950s, Bosworth has generally been placed on the periphery of the American pentecostal story. As this dissertation will argue, however, the sources indicate that Bosworth is a central figure, embodying and influencing the distinctive impulses of pentecostal identity.

Identifying Bosworth as central to pentecostal history challenges the dominant interpretation of pentecostalism, which relies either on the doctrine of tongues as initial evidence of baptism of the Holy Spirit formulated by Charles Parham in 1901 or historical connections to the Azusa Street revival (1906-1909) to distinguish pentecostalism from other religious traditions. Such interpretations reinforce (intentionally or not) a denominationally-centered understanding of pentecostalism. Bosworth had no strong ties to Azusa Street and he openly disagreed with the so-called initial evidence teaching. Bosworth’s story, then, forces us to look elsewhere for the distinguishing impulse of pentecostalism, even beyond the bounds of what are known as the “classical” pentecostal denominations. As the six deaf children who gained their

hearing in 1928 knew, Bosworth's work centered on the ministry of supernatural healing. This dissertation will therefore argue secondarily that pentecostalism's driving impulse and cultural significance is found not in the doctrine of initial evidence or the legacy of Azusa Street, but in the quest for the supernatural that was inherited from the radical holiness movement of the late nineteenth century.

This study defines "supernatural" as perceptible manifestations of divine activity.⁵ In part, this means that such occurrences require no sophisticated theological interpretation, as necessitated, for instance, in recognizing suffering as God's will. A corollary to "perceptible" is "immediate"; while believers did not always insist that God's work should be instantaneous, they tended to stress the present, as opposed to future dimension of blessing. As pentecostal evangelist Aimee Semple McPherson preached repeatedly, "God's time is now."⁶ Supernatural works in this context are generally attributed to God and for the benefit of believers or the spread of their message. This definition also encompasses works of God that demonstrated God's wrath or the fulfillment of prophecy in tragedy. From Frank Bartlemann's tracts on the San Diego

⁵ This definition bears some resemblance and owes some debt to the concept of "primal spirituality" as used by Harvey Gallagher Cox, *Fire from Heaven the Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2001), 81, and to the notion of "primitivism" in Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 12. I am not arguing, however, that pentecostals necessarily tapped into some universal human spirituality or that pentecostals were more "otherworldly" than other believers, but that pentecostals were the most conspicuous pursuers of experiences that are labeled supernatural, and that this is their chief cultural and religious significance. The concept of supernaturalism used here also has some resonance with the sociological notion that sects can be identified by their "nearness of the spirit." Peter L. Berger, "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," *Social Research* 21, no. 4 (December 1, 1954): 467-85. But, as others have pointed out, Berger's categories are too vague to be a viable category of analysis.

⁶ Aimee Semple McPherson, *This Is That: Personal Experiences, Sermons and Writings of Aimee Semple McPherson, Evangelist* (Los Angeles: Bridal Call Publishing House, 1919), 416, 432, 446; Kevin T. Lowery, "A Fork in the Wesleyan Road: Phoebe Palmer and the Appropriation of Christian Perfection," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 36, no. 2 (September 1, 2001): 220.

earthquake of 1906 to Pat Robertson’s televised pontificating on the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, pentecostals have been quicker than most Christians confidently to identify God’s direct intervention, even in calamity. Furthermore, the pentecostal impulse also drives toward identification of demonic activity as a correlate to divine activity.

Supernaturalism includes foremost the spiritual gifts as listed in 2 Corinthians 12:8-11 and miracles similar to those performed by Jesus and the apostles in the New Testament. But the concept also encompasses a wider range of phenomena that is less biblically-grounded, suggesting that the subjective experience of the supernatural is more important than objective definitions. For instance, falling “under the power” (as holiness-turned-pentecostal evangelist Maria Woodworth-Etter described it) and the ability to discern illness through a vibrating left hand (as postwar healing evangelist William Branham claimed), as well as relying on God miraculously to provide finances or instantaneous words for a sermon are just as much part of pentecostal supernaturalism as prophecy or speaking in tongues. While pentecostals sought to justify their experience of the supernatural in biblical terms, such apologetics were secondary to the experience itself; a range of mystical experiences and miracles classify as supernaturalism.⁷ Broadly speaking, mystical experiences were a protest against the “formalism” of the churches, while miracles were a protest against an overly scientific approach to epistemology. But these distinctions were not always so clear to the holiness and pentecostal adherents who centered their religion on experience of the supernatural.

⁷ For an insightful history of Protestant mystical experience and its explainers and adversaries in the English-speaking world, see Ann Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999); For an intellectual history of changing attitudes toward miracles, see Robert Bruce Mullin, *Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

Supernaturalism is a contested category, and this is no less true in the study of the holiness and pentecostal movements. James Opp's thorough and perceptive study of divine healing in Canada maintains a sharp distinction between the nineteenth-century divine healing movement and the twentieth century practice of divine healing. Relying on Victorian ideals of domestic piety and the logic of atonement-centered healing, early divine healing was not considered "supernatural" or "miraculous," argues Opp. Healers and healed alike did not generally expect an instantaneous healing, and their theology inclined them to believe that healing was a natural consequence of atonement and faith, rather than a dramatic act of divine intervention. Not until John Alexander Dowie began to associate healing with apostolic gifts and later pentecostals began to blend the experience of tongues with healing did divine healing become "supernatural" in this sense.⁸

Opp's analysis is useful for understanding the shifts that occurred in divine healing, but his argument is overstated. Although atonement theology was frequently pushed to its logical end as cause-and-effect (and so was in some sense "natural" because it followed divinely prescribed laws), adherents and the public at large still considered healing to be miraculous: whether because of human failure or because God did not normally circumvent the laws of nature, God was doing something that did not normally occur. A.J. Gordon, one of the most articulate early proponents of healing in the atonement, subtitled his apologetic for divine healing "*Miracles of Cure in All Ages*"

⁸ James William Opp, *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine, and Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880-1930* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 29–30, 207–208, et passim. Other scholars have followed this analysis, see James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Holiness-Pentecostal Transition Years, 1890-1906: Theological Transpositions in the Transatlantic World* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Pub, 2013).

(emphasis mine). Opp’s argument seems to rest on the rigid logic that if healing were promised to all on the basis of the atonement and available through faith, then it is the simple outworking of divine laws and not miraculous, since a miracle by definition is a *violation* of the laws of nature. But this is to read forward into Victorian religion a particular Enlightenment definition of miracles—a definition that made “promise” and “miracle” incompatible: since God’s promise was a type of law, maintaining that God promised a miracle would be like maintaining that God established a law to violate his law. But as Robert Bruce Mullin notes, beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, the traditional Enlightenment definition had been losing ground.⁹ As a result, the relationship between law and the supernatural was ambiguous and sometimes contradictory. Gordon apparently did not see any incongruity when he, speaking of the dominical promises in Mark 16, wrote, “It is important to observe that this rich cluster of miraculous promises all hangs by a single stem, faith.”¹⁰

Divine healing was not the only late Victorian theology of healing that struggled with the categories of natural and supernatural. Mary Baker Eddy, the founder of Christian Science and proponent of the most law-centered theological exposition of healing, described her own healing: “I could not explain the *modus* of my relief. I could only assure [the homeopathic physician in attendance] that the divine Spirit had wrought

⁹ “Since the middle of the nineteenth century, theologians had been edging toward a definition of miracle that saw it as a reflection of higher law of nature rather than a violation of law.” Mullin, *Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination*, 192.

¹⁰ Adoniram Judson Gordon, *The Ministry of Healing: Miracles of Cure In All Ages* (Kessinger Publishing, LLC, 2006), 22. Gordon had a remarkably nuanced understanding of these categories of natural and supernatural: “Though we call [miracles of healing] supernatural, they are not contranatural.” *Ibid.*, 44. For a lucid explanation of how natural and supernatural “overlapped” in divine healing thought, see Jonathan Richard Baer, “Perfectly Empowered Bodies: Divine Healing in Modernizing America” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2002), 145.

a miracle—a miracle which I later found to be in perfect scientific accord with divine law.”¹¹ Divine actions like healing were supernatural because of their spectacular character, notwithstanding fine philosophical points about whether they violated natural laws. What holiness and pentecostal saints were after was just what Horace Bushnell prophetically described, a “faith that shows God in living commerce with men such as He vouchsafed them in the former times.” And the pursuit of such a faith, as Donald Dayton writes about divine healing, “emerged from the [holiness] revival of perfectionist themes,” and became “characteristic of Pentecostalism.” In framing our discussion this way, the continuity between nineteenth century and later pentecostal understandings of supernaturalism is maintained, without neglecting important shifts.¹²

The nondenominational approach to pentecostalism offered here is at odds with much of the scholarship on pentecostal history. Although early pentecostals disavowed “man-made creeds” and the formation of new denominations, practical and doctrinal concerns led many to form or join pentecostal denominations by the 1920s.¹³ As a result, pentecostal historiography has largely been framed by the history of pentecostal denominations and their leaders. These tendencies are evident in the prominent historiographical debate over the setting of pentecostalism’s birth. One camp points to

¹¹ Mary Baker G. Eddy, *Retrospection and Introspection* (Boston: Joseph Armstrong, 1892), 38–39; Gillian Gill, *Mary Baker Eddy* (Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books, 1998), 163.

¹² Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Studies in Evangelicalism, No. 5 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987), 115. The case for the continuity between radical holiness and early pentecostalism in divine healing is made by *Ibid.*, 115–142; Baer, “Perfectly Empowered Bodies,” chap. 4.

¹³ One prominent example is the Assemblies of God, which formed in 1914 partly to shore support for an interpretation of sanctification that denied the more Wesleyan-styled second blessing teaching of other pentecostals. In 1916, the Assemblies of God rejected a teaching that emphasized the unity of God, catalyzing the formation of Oneness denominations like the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World.

Charles Parham's innovative doctrine of tongues as the "Bible evidence"—later called "initial evidence"—of spirit-baptism as the *sine qua non* of pentecostal identity. The other camp points to developments stemming from the Azusa Street revival led by African American evangelist William Seymour. Both positions reinforce (intentionally or not) an interpretation of the movement that focuses on the development of denominational identity as key to understanding pentecostal history.¹⁴

A few scholars see beyond these options for defining the essence of pentecostalism, laying a foundation for the present work. In *Heaven Below*, Grant Wacker's focus on the relationship between early pentecostalism and American culture allows him largely to bypass doctrinal and denominational issues. Donald Dayton deemphasizes tongues in his explanation of pentecostalism's emergence, demonstrating its remarkable continuity with much of late-nineteenth century American evangelicalism. Aaron Friesen investigates the function of the initial evidence doctrine with refreshing historical and methodological openness, recognizing that the doctrine evolved significantly before it was crystalized in the late 1910s, and that its acceptance as a truth claim among pentecostals has been partial and qualified. Joe Creech argues that Azusa Street's importance lies more in its symbolic power than in its direct impact on

¹⁴ What one identifies as the birthplace of pentecostalism has obvious implications for pentecostal identity. For the Parham-tongues thesis, see James R. Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988). For the Azusa Street thesis, see Cecil M. Robeck, *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement* (Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2006). Another key debate centers on pentecostalism's theological roots, with some stressing the Wesleyan origins, and others emphasizing the Reformed contribution. These studies are largely attempts to understand the early denominational and creedal developments of pentecostalism. The Wesleyan influence is stressed by Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997). The Reformed roots are stressed by Edith Lydia Waldvogel, "The 'Overcoming Life': A Study in the Reformed Evangelical Origins of Pentecostalism" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1977).

institutional development. James Robinson contends that pentecostalism's chief role is as the bearer of divine healing in the twentieth century.¹⁵

The charismatic movement of the 1960s and 1970s forced a widening of traditional categories by revealing that believers outside the pentecostal denominations could adopt pentecostal beliefs and practices. Pentecostals and scholars accommodated the charismatics by labeling the original denominations “classical pentecostals” to distinguish them from these “neo-pentecostals.”¹⁶ But still left out of this discussion of pentecostal identity are earlier figures—like Bosworth—who carried on the pentecostal quest for the supernatural from outside classical pentecostal denominations.

The historiography on Bosworth is thinner and less contentious than that on pentecostal origins. Eunice Perkins's devotional *Joybringer Bosworth* was first published in 1921, with an expanded edition appearing in 1927.¹⁷ Oscar Blomgren's laudatory

¹⁵ Wacker, *Heaven Below*; Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*; Aaron T. Friesen, *Norming the Abnormal: The Development and Function of the Doctrine of Initial Evidence in Classical Pentecostalism* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013); Joe Creech, “Visions of Glory: The Place of the Azusa Street Revival in Pentecostal History,” *Church History* 65, no. 3 (September 1, 1996): 405–424; Robinson, *Divine Healing*.

¹⁶ According to Synan, these terms developed around 1970. Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*, 283. Most scholars discussing the origin of the term “classical Pentecostal” claim it was coined by Catholic charismatic scholar Kilian McDonnell, “Holy Spirit and Pentecostalism,” *Commonweal*, November 8, 1968, 198–204. In general, these writers are following Cecil M. Robeck, “McDonnell, Kilian,” in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley M. Burgess and Van der Maas (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 2002), 853. See Gary B. McGee, *Miracles, Missions, and American Pentecostalism*, American Society of Missiology Series, No. 45 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 90; Jon Bonk, *Between Past and Future: Evangelical Mission Entering the Twenty-First Century* (William Carey Library, 2003), 64, n. 19. However, a slightly earlier use of the term can be found in Edward O'Connor, “Pentecost and Catholicism,” *Ecumenist* 6, no. 5 (August 1968): 161–64. In both of these early usages, the term is not carefully defined, and refers simply to denominational pentecostals. Neither scholar shows any awareness of having coined a new term, which suggests that the phrase was in use before it appeared in these writings.

¹⁷ Eunice May Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story* (Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921); Eunice May Perkins, *Fred Francis Bosworth (the Joybringer)* (River Forest, IL: F.F. Bosworth, 1927).

Herald of Faith article series appeared in 1963-1964.¹⁸ Uncritical sketches of Bosworth continue to appear in many popular pentecostal histories.¹⁹ The first scholar to look impartially at Bosworth's historical importance was David Harrell, who identified Bosworth's link to the postwar healing evangelists—a theme elaborated by C. Douglas Weaver's study of William Branham.²⁰ Although limited in their use of primary sources on Bosworth, Jonathan Baer's dissertation and James Robinson's recent survey helpfully treat Bosworth as a major figure in the cultural revival of divine healing in the 1920s.²¹

In major studies of pentecostalism, Bosworth has received little attention. For example, Bosworth appears only briefly in Robert M. Anderson's *Vision of the Disinherited*, which analyzed early pentecostalism in terms of class anxiety, and in Grant Wacker's *Heaven Below*, which argued (contra Anderson) that early pentecostalism's strength lay in its balance of primitivism and pragmatism.²² Bosworth's struggle with Assemblies of God leadership over the initial evidence doctrine has been his spotlight in

¹⁸ Oscar Blomgren, Jr. "Man of God, Fred F. Bosworth," *Herald of Faith* (October 1963-June 1964).

¹⁹ For examples, see Roberts Liardon, *God's Generals: The Healing Evangelists* (New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 2011), 11–47; Lester Sumrall, *Pioneers of Faith* (Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1995), 37–44.

²⁰ David Edwin Harrell, *All Things Are Possible: The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975); C. Douglas Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet, William Marrion Branham: A Study of the Prophetic in American Pentecostalism* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2000).

²¹ Baer, "Perfectly Empowered Bodies," 290–294; James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Years of Expansion, 1906-1930 -- Theological Variation in the Transatlantic World* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014), 165–183.

²² Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1992), 107; Wacker, *Heaven below*, 185, 223; Walter J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972), 32, 358; David W. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 10* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 260, 273–275.

historiography, beginning with Carl Brumback's apologetic history of the Assemblies of God in 1961.²³ This episode merits Bosworth's inclusion in Vinson Synan's survey, Edith Blumhofer's history of the Assemblies of God, and Cecil Robeck's detailed article on the topic.²⁴

A few recent studies have looked at Bosworth more closely. Douglas Jacobsen treats Bosworth as a "borderland" pentecostal, and identifies "divine love" as the central theme of his thought.²⁵ Jacobsen's study is theology-centered and limited in primary sources. Roscoe Barnes analyzes Bosworth's life, charting Bosworth's career development and the factors that led to his success. Pavel Hejzlar contrasts varied approaches to healing ministry, using Bosworth as a test case.²⁶ None of these works

²³ Carl Brumback, *Suddenly ... from Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), 216–225. Other Assemblies of God denominational histories followed suit, such as William W. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1971), 124–130.

²⁴ See Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*, 164; Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 135–137; Cecil M. Robeck, "An Emerging Magisterium? The Case of the Assemblies of God," *Pneuma* 25, no. 2 (September 1, 2003): 164–215. Bosworth's role in the tongues debate is also mentioned by many of the contributors to *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, ed. Gary B. McGee (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), see 104, 109, 110, 118, 119, 124, 126, 130, 132, 187.

²⁵ Douglas G. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 287–313.

²⁶ Roscoe Barnes, "F.F. Bosworth: A Historical Analysis of the Influential Factors in His Life and Ministry" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria, 2009); Roscoe Barnes, *F.F. Bosworth: The Man Behind "Christ the Healer"* (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009); Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis Macnutt in Dialogue*, Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies, 4 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010). Hejzlar argues that Bosworth and Hagin represent a conversion-oriented healing evangelism, while Sandford and MacNutt represent a holistic healing approach based on spiritual development.

offers historical context for Bosworth's life or adequately places him in pentecostal or American religious history.²⁷

As an interpretive biographical study of F.F. Bosworth, this dissertation qualitatively analyzes the data of Bosworth's life available in the dozens of writings from his own hand and the voluminous reports of his work in the religious and secular press. This study also aims to use Bosworth as a lens through which to analyze the nature of American pentecostalism. Bosworth is appropriate for such a study because of his interactions with the major figures and institutions of pentecostalism, his remarkable success in pentecostal ministry, and his continuing impact on pentecostal identity through his writings and the work of those he influenced. As such, and for comparison and illustration, I have consulted a range of pre-pentecostal, holiness, fundamentalist, and pentecostal sources. Aside from providing the fullest biography of Bosworth to date, this dissertation makes two main contributions to the study of American religious history. First, this is the first scholarly biography of Bosworth to place him fully in his pentecostal and American religious context. Second, Bosworth's story will nuance traditional scholarly categories of pentecostalism, potentially opening up new avenues of research. In many ways, Bosworth's story is typical of classical pentecostals. Like most early pentecostals, Bosworth participated in the holiness and divine healing movements, experiencing his own healing of tuberculosis by the itinerant faith healer Mattie Perry. Like several other leaders, Bosworth was closely associated with the flamboyant healer John Alexander Dowie, who at the turn of the century established a utopian mecca of healing at Zion City, Illinois, just north of Chicago. In 1906, Bosworth experienced

²⁷ Neither do any of these studies deal with Bosworth's British-Israelism, a belief that Anglo-Saxons are the direct descendants of Israel and that biblical prophecies are fulfilled in Anglo-Saxon history.

spirit-baptism and tongues under Charles Parham, the originator of pentecostalism's distinct tongues doctrine. Bosworth affiliated on and off with the Christian and Missionary Alliance, the interdenominational holiness group that produced many important pentecostal leaders. Finally, Bosworth was a founding delegate and early presbyter of the Assemblies of God, which in 1914 became the main organizational force for pentecostalism in the Midwest and grew to become the largest pentecostal denomination in the United States.

In other ways, however, Bosworth's story is atypical. He left the Assemblies of God in 1918 over its teaching on tongues as the initial physical sign of spirit-baptism. Many criticized his "confession" doctrine—a claim that faith, particularly when spoken, can seize earthly blessings. Bosworth embraced the maligned British-Israel theory, a type of premillennial eschatology that contradicted the dispensationalism of most pentecostals. Late in his life, Bosworth assisted the controversial postwar healer William Branham.²⁸ Bosworth's similarities to other early pentecostals place him firmly in the pentecostal story. His differences with classical pentecostals challenge and complexify the traditional narrative.

Bosworth's is not the only story that challenges traditional categories. Even the key early leaders Charles Parham and William Seymour were never part of the classical pentecostal denominations. Other important early pentecostal leaders—like John G. Lake, Maria Woodworth-Etter and Carrie Judd Montgomery—worked from beyond the bounds of the pentecostal denominations, and until recently, have been largely overlooked by historians. This observation suggests that pentecostalism cannot be reduced to

²⁸ Among Branham's controversial aspects were his claim to be able to discern bodily sickness through vibrations in his left hand and his teaching that Eve's sin was sexual intercourse with the serpent.

denominational identity. By extension, one can argue that the mid-century expressions of pentecostalism that flowed beyond the denominations—such as the Latter Rain movement,²⁹ the postwar healing revival, and the charismatic movement—are not historical peculiarities, but the blossoming of the pentecostal impulse, defined as seeking the supernatural. In this light, Bosworth stands as a quintessential pentecostal especially deserving of study—for only Bosworth was a major player in both the first pentecostal revival of the early 1900s and the postwar healing revival. In a related way, Bosworth’s story challenges the leading interpretation that describes the postwar healing revival in terms of discontinuity, rather than continuity with earlier pentecostalism.³⁰

Defining pentecostalism as the pursuit of the supernatural rather than denominationally is beneficial in three ways. First, this perspective helps the researcher appreciate the continuity of the pentecostal story. Second, it provides a rationale for studying figures like Bosworth within a pentecostal context, even though they do not align neatly with the denominations. Finally, it serves as a guiding principle for understanding Bosworth’s thought and his impact on American religious history.

Bosworth’s life will provide the structure of the project. Chapter one will review the holiness movement, divine healing, premillennialism and early pentecostalism. This chapter will argue that the unifying theme of these movements was a quest for the

²⁹ The Latter Rain movement, which began in Saskatchewan in 1948, stressed the apostolic office, reception of spiritual gifts through laying on of hands, and the imminence of Christ’s return. Major pentecostal denominations denounced it, largely due to scandals surrounding personal prophetic messages.

³⁰ The postwar healing movement is often described with words like “explosion.” See, for example, Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*, 213.

supernatural. This chapter will also provide the broader historical context for Bosworth's religious development.

Chapter two will treat Bosworth's life from birth to 1906—the year of his spirit-baptism under Charles Parham's ministry. Through his interactions with holiness Methodism and divine healing, Bosworth emerges as a typical pentecostal leader-in-the-making. His experience mirrors that of other important early pentecostals—like Marie Burgess and John G. Lake—who, like Bosworth, had no substantial ties to Azusa Street. Consequently, links to Azusa Street are more limited in their historical importance than most historians acknowledge.

Chapter three will cover 1906 to 1914, showing Bosworth to be one of the most influential pentecostals in the pre-denominational phase. The 1912 revival in Dallas that Bosworth facilitated with the help of Maria Woodworth-Etter contributed to many crucial developments in early pentecostalism and importantly refocused the pentecostal movement on experience of the supernatural during a time of doctrinal controversy. This revival also raised Bosworth's stature in the movement and cast him as an expert in revivalism.

Chapter four will treat 1914 to 1918—the year Bosworth resigned from the Assemblies of God. In addition to outlining Bosworth's pastoral, evangelistic and denominational work during this period, this chapter will cover Bosworth's role in the initial evidence controversy, arguing that early pentecostals held a range of views on speaking in tongues and that many resisted the initial evidence teaching. Accordingly, tongues alone is not an adequate identifier of the pentecostal impulse, and the definitions of classical pentecostalism that are built on the initial evidence teaching are historically

suspect. Finally, I will argue that while speaking in tongues was a key component of pentecostal supernaturalism, the initial evidence doctrine reflected social, rather than spiritual concerns.

Chapter five covers 1919 to 1932—the year of Bosworth’s last widely-publicized campaign. Despite the fact that he did not belong to a pentecostal denomination, Bosworth continued to bear all the marks of pentecostal spirituality. Noting Bosworth’s role in the healing revival of the 1920s, this chapter will use Bosworth as a lens for investigating the culture of divine healing, the developing relationship between divine healing and medicine, and the role of pentecostal supernaturalism in the modernist-fundamentalist debates. A thorough investigation of the context for the appearance of Bosworth’s *Christ the Healer* (1924) sheds light on the interactions between full gospel adherents and fundamentalists.

Chapter six will cover 1933 to 1947. In Bosworth scholarship, these are essentially “lost years,” as no direct sources for Bosworth’s activities have yet been uncovered. Other scholars have referred only obliquely to this period, during which Bosworth adopted the controversial British-Israel theory. Through a recovery of three writings from Bosworth dated to this period and numerous references to his activities in a British-Israel periodical and in secular newspapers, I will argue that Bosworth remained active, though on a much smaller scale. Furthermore, an investigation of British-Israelism will reveal that although censured by other pentecostals, the doctrine is not contradictory to pentecostalism but served as a non-dispensationalist argument for scriptural authority and premillennialism.

Chapter seven will cover the last decade of Bosworth's life (1948-1958). Bosworth's work with the emerging celebrities of the postwar healing revival demonstrates his continued ability to reflect and shape the main impulses of pentecostalism. I will argue that Bosworth was a major stream through which extra-denominational, supernaturalist pentecostalism flowed into the healing revivals and the charismatic movement.

In chapter eight, I will argue that Bosworth's thought is unified by a belief in the continuity of God's activity and that this theological center helps explain Bosworth's positions on tongues, divine healing, and biblical prophecy. While identifying the theological pillars of Bosworth's doctrine of healing, I will demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of scholarly categorizations of Bosworth's healing theology. This chapter will also argue that while Bosworth popularized much of the thought of metaphysically-tinged Baptist E.W. Kenyon, Bosworth also came to many of the same positions independently. Finally, Bosworth's British-Israelism parallels his conviction that Christ heals in the present as in the past, since his belief in the continuity of God's activity led him to reject cessationism (relegating miracles to the past) and futurism (relegating fulfillment of prophecy to the future).

Identifying three themes from Bosworth's story, the conclusion will summarize the study and contend that he embodied and helped shape pentecostal identity. First, Bosworth's career provides the most direct and identifiable personal link between the late-nineteenth century holiness and healing movements and the post-World War II healing revival. Second, Bosworth's unpopular theological positions highlight the theme of independent thinking that characterizes pentecostalism. Finally, Bosworth's success

was due to his healing ministry, not his reputation as a preacher, his theological acumen, or his denominational loyalty. This suggests what the six deaf children healed by Bosworth in 1928 knew well—that pentecostalism’s driving impulse and cultural impact is centered on experience of the supernatural, with healing as its common expression.

CHAPTER ONE

The Gospel of the Supernatural

The characterizing feature, and that wherein we differ from evangelical churches of the present day, is in the belief that Pentecost can be repeated the same as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, with all the accompanying signs, manifestations, operations and gifts of the Spirit. It is this supernatural, divine element in the Movement that has attracted attention and held spellbound such a multitude of people.

—R.E. McAlister, *The Pentecostal Movement* (ca. 1916)¹

The Holiness Movement

John Wesley emphasized a decidedly this-worldly element in soteriology that he called Christian perfection. Influenced by Anglican divine William Law, Moravians in England and on the continent, and his reading of the church fathers, Wesley's stress on sanctification or godly living was not new, but his confidence that it could be fully attained in life was. His view challenged the traditional Reformation teaching on total depravity with its correlate that the Christian remains a sinner in life while also justified by faith. Wesley believed that with the grace of God, Christians could attain a state in which one no longer sinned.

Wesley insisted that perfection is not freedom from ignorance or mistake, and he carefully defined sin as “a voluntary transgression of a known law.”² According to

¹ R.E. McAlister, *The Pentecostal Movement: What It Is and What It Stands For* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.).

² John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley*, 3rd ed., complete and unabridged (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1978), VI: 2–3, 417.

Wesley, few had experienced this salvation from sin, and “some who once enjoyed full salvation have now totally lost it.”³ In other words, it was a rare gift and vigilance was required to maintain it. Wesley believed that in most cases sanctification happened at death or very near to it. But he also allowed that it may happen within years or even months after conversion.⁴ And while the cessation of sin was by definition a moment—or instant—in time, Wesley frequently spoke of the process of gradual progress as well as continuing growth after the moment of sanctification.⁵

Wesley called Christian perfection the “grand depositum” of the Methodists, their distinctive witness to the world. But by the 1830s, a few Methodists in America were beginning to worry that the characteristic teaching and experience was being lost. This was coupled with rising concerns over the wealth and worldliness of Methodist congregations, especially those in the cities. A push for a renewed emphasis on holiness came from three main sources.

Timothy Merritt began publication of *Guide to Christian Perfection* in Boston in 1839. The magazine was a product of Merritt’s desire to fulfill Wesley’s dream that “sanctifications would be as common as conversions,” but it was also a response to growing interest in Christian perfection among a scattering of New England churches

³ Ibid., 419.

⁴ Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Studies in Evangelicalism, No. 5 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987), 48.

⁵ Scholars agree that Wesley was inconsistent on a number of aspects of sanctification. Ibid. See Orville S. Walters, “Concept of Attainment in John Wesley’s Christian Perfection,” *Methodist History* 10, no. 3 (April 1, 1972): 12–29. Walters identifies 1772 as the end of Wesley’s indecision on the instantaneous nature of sanctification (22). Laurence W. Wood, concerned about when Wesley finally determined that justification and sanctification occurred at two separate points in time, puts the crucial date at 1763. “The Origin, Development, and Consistency of John Wesley’s Theology of Holiness,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 43, no. 2 (September 1, 2008): 33–55 (49).

beginning in 1837.⁶ The *Guide* quickly became the main promoter and vehicle for the early American holiness movement.

Phoebe Palmer testified to the experience of entire sanctification in 1835. Her sister, Sarah Lankford, had also experienced the second blessing earlier that year, and had quickly organized in her New York home “Tuesday Meetings for the Promotion of Holiness.” Although Lankford had the crucial organizational instinct, Palmer’s struggle to attain and her determination to articulate the experience of sanctification were essential to the formulation of holiness doctrine that stirred Americans across the country. Palmer modified Wesley’s teaching on sanctification by stressing its instantaneous nature, insisting that it should happen early in the Christian life, and systematizing the process whereby it is attained.⁷

Palmer taught that those who consecrate themselves fully to God, have faith for the blessing of sanctification, and testify to its reality were guaranteed the experience. She made her claims on the basis of a hodgepodge of biblical texts. Romans 12:1-2 taught that Christians were obligated to offer themselves as living sacrifices to God. According to Hebrews 13:10, Christ is the altar upon which this sacrifice is offered, and according to Matthew 23:19, “the altar...sanctifies the gift.” Palmer assured those

⁶ Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1996), 1–3.

⁷ Palmer’s impact on holiness theology is summarized by Charles Edward White, “The Beauty of Holiness: The Career of Phoebe Palmer,” *Fides et Historia* 19, no. 1 (February 1, 1987): 24-27. For a similar assessment of the differences between Palmer and Wesley, see John Leland Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism* (New York; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), 190. While some historians (particularly those from the Wesleyan tradition) minimize the differences between Palmer and Wesley (e.g., Charles Edwin Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936*, ATLA Monograph Series, No. 5 [Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974], 4 claims they differed only on timing of sanctification), Kevin T. Lowery argues that their divergences were broad and fundamental, “A Fork in the Wesleyan Road: Phoebe Palmer and the Appropriation of Christian Perfection,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 36, no. 2 (September 1, 2001): 187–222.

seeking sanctification that all that was needed was full personal consecration combined with absolute faith. “All that remains,” she said, “is for you to come complying with the conditions and claim it...it is already yours. If you do not now receive it, the delay will not be on the part of God, but wholly with yourself.”⁸ From Romans 10:9-10, Palmer reasoned that public testimony was necessary to maintain the sanctified state.

In Palmer’s holiness theology, the ambivalence and apprehension of Wesley were gone. As Wesley once admitted, “I have an exceeding complex idea of sanctification”⁹; Palmer could not abide the uncertainty, subtlety and nuance of Wesley’s teaching. As Methodist elder and editor of the *Christian Advocate* Nathan Bangs pointed out, Palmer’s “altar terminology” threatened to erode Wesley’s focus on the witness of the Spirit in favor of potentially self-deluding “naked faith.”¹⁰ Nevertheless, Palmer’s theology set the tone for the holiness revival as she took lead of the Tuesday meetings in 1837 (and opened the meetings to men in 1839), published a number of treatises on holiness, and evangelized for the holiness cause. Her theology of sanctification was appealing because it was marked by immediacy and bypassed the self-doubt that was known to accompany the search for the witness of the Spirit.

The third impetus of the holiness revival came from the Reformed wing of American evangelicalism. Since the 1730s, Calvinist doctrines had been undergoing permutations on American soil to reconcile them with the reality of revivalism. The trajectory set by Jonathan Edwards was extended by the New Divinity men and

⁸ Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 24.

⁹ Walters, “Concept of Attainment in John Wesley’s Christian Perfection,” 17.

¹⁰ Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 24-26.

culminated in the New Haven theology of Nathaniel Taylor. As opposed to the traditional Calvinist understanding of original sin and the bondage of the will, Taylor argued that “sin is in the sinning,” and that humans, despite being thoroughly sinful, have “power to the contrary.” Charles Finney combined the New Haven theology openness to the power of human will with an intense interest in Christian perfection.

As a pastor in New York in 1833, Finney came into contact with the ideas of the New Haven Perfectionists, a group formed around the teachings of Taylor’s student John Humphrey Noyes that would eventually settle in a utopian community in Oneida. Finney was intrigued by their teachings, but also discerned their errors, particularly their belief that sanctification could not be lost, and that sanctification was necessary to salvation. In the meantime, Finney’s colleague at Oberlin College Asa Mahan had been unsettled by a student who asked “what degree of sanctification we may expect from [Christ].”¹¹ The two formulated what would be known as Oberlin Perfectionism in *Lectures to Professing Christians* in the winter of 1836-37.

In 1838, the *Oberlin Evangelist* began publication to explain and spread the Oberlin style of Christian perfection. Although Finney and Mahan had read Wesley’s *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, the Oberlin leaders differed from Wesleyan perfectionism in the central role they gave to the intellect, human will and natural ability and their practical ethical focus on “disinterested benevolence”—emphases they inherited from New Divinity theology.¹² The Oberlin theology created much controversy in

¹¹ Asa Mahan, *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection: With Other Kindred Subjects, Illustrated and Confirmed in a Series of Discourses Designed to Throw Light on the Way of Holiness* (D.S. King, 1839), 232.

¹² Allen C. Guelzo, “Oberlin Perfectionism and Its Edwardsian Origins, 1835-1870,” in *Jonathan Edwards’s Writings: Text, Context, Interpretation*, ed. Stephen J. Stein (Bloomington: Indiana University

Calvinist circles and influenced and expanded Methodist theologies of sanctification, but as a distinguishable thread of the holiness revival, it was short lived. The importance of Oberlin perfectionism lies in its demonstration that Methodists would not have a monopoly on Christian perfection.

Thomas Upham, a Congregationalist minister and philosopher, was converted to Palmer's teachings in 1839 and combined Wesleyan sanctification with a love for Catholic mysticism, particularly Quietism. A.B. Earle, a Baptist evangelist who worked in interdenominational settings, experienced sanctification in 1859. He preferred to speak of the second blessing as the "rest of faith." William Boardman came into contact with the writings of Finney and Mahan, professed the second blessing, and entered Lane Seminary in 1843 to prepare for the Presbyterian ministry. Prizing the experience of sanctification over any theory of perfectionism, Boardman popularized holiness religion by adopting more neutral language. His *Higher Christian Life* (1858) was published at the height of a national revival, cementing a close relationship between evangelical religion and sanctification that would last the next four decades.

Beginning in New York in the fall of 1857, outpourings of spiritual fervor became common in many urban areas. The revivals themselves spread holiness in its various articulations perhaps more than any periodical or monograph could have. Sparked in part by the Palmers' evangelistic success in Canada in 1857 and by the financial panic of the same year, the revivals were noted for lay involvement. But preachers of entire

Press, 1996), 159–174. Guezlo stresses Finney's New Divinity context. As Guezlo notes, Mahan was more comfortable with Methodist theology, which eventually led to a rift in Oberlin theology and in the college itself

sanctification like Finney, Earle and the Palmers were prominent, pushing crowds not only to repentance, but to full consecration.

While entire sanctification began to permeate evangelicalism, Methodists continued to view it as their special privilege and responsibility. Some tension among Methodists over the teaching was apparent in an address to the 1852 General Conference that warned against “new theories, new expressions, and new measures” in the doctrine of sanctification.¹³ Such disagreements also played a role in the formation of the Free Methodists in 1860. After the Civil War, Methodist holiness entered a new phase with the 1867 General Camp Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness at Vineland, New Jersey. The chief organizer was John Inskip, a disciple of Palmer. Encouraged by the 10,000 attendees at the 1867 meeting, the organizers formed the National Campmeeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness (later National Holiness Association, or NHA), which by 1870 was organizing multiple camp meetings each year.

To a large degree, the work of the NHA can be described as the institutionalization of Palmer’s approach to sanctification. Many of the leaders kept close and cordial ties with the Methodist Episcopal Church (MEC), as had Palmer. But the threat of divisiveness appeared occasionally. Most often the friction was not doctrinal, but ecclesiastical. Within a few years of the 1867 camp meeting, regional associations began to appear. According to Charles Jones, as holiness spread to the South and Midwest, it became less attached to the denominations. In fact, beginning in the 1880s, some regional holiness associations began to operate as denominations, forming

¹³ Cited in Timothy Lawrence Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 128.

churches, ordaining ministers, and issuing literature.¹⁴ This is partly explained by the fact that many holiness adherents in these regions were also recent converts who had less patience than longtime Methodists for reforming the church from within.¹⁵ In a search for order and unity, General Holiness Conventions were held at Cincinnati and New York in 1877. The MEC declined to participate, indicating a growing rift.

While American Methodists were in a state of dilemma, holiness flowered in England. The Quaker Hannah Whitall Smith had been converted during the revival of 1858. Under the influence of Methodist sanctification testimonies, she came to the conviction that she had discovered a higher truth for spiritual contentment, yet laid no claim to a crisis experience. Her less-Wesleyan brand of holiness was solidified in her wildly popular *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* (1875). The Smiths began to minister in England in 1873. Along with Asa Mahan and William Boardman, they were central to the Oxford Union Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness of 1874. The holiness movement in England was denominationally broader than its American counterpart, and theologically expressed itself more along the lines of “higher life” popularized by Boardman, who spent the last decade of his life in England engaged in the ministry of divine healing. While Wesleyan holiness advocates tended to speak of sanctification in terms of the eradication of inbred sin, higher life adherents envisioned sanctification as suppression of sin and spiritual empowerment. The success of the Oxford meeting led to the most important development in the British movement: the Keswick Convention of 1875.

¹⁴ See Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 58; Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 223.

¹⁵ Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 57, 90.

Animated in large part by American higher life advocates, the Keswick movement, with its annual meeting for the “promotion of scriptural holiness,” returned the favor by stimulating a new phase of the American holiness movement. D.L. Moody, who had been central to the evangelical and higher life consensus that produced the first Keswick convention, returned to the United States in 1875 and inaugurated his own Keswick-style convention at Northfield, Massachusetts, in 1880. Moody also worked closely with the British higher life Baptist F.B. Meyer, who evangelized widely in the United States in the 1890s.

One of the most important leaders of the higher life movement was A.B. Simpson, a Presbyterian minister who experienced the second blessing upon reading Boardman’s *The Higher Christian Life* in 1873. Simpson also experienced a miraculous healing in 1881 and subsequently resigned from his New York pastorate, frustrated with his congregation’s lack of enthusiasm for ministering to the poor. An indefatigable organizer, Simpson founded two organizations in 1887, the Christian Alliance for domestic work, and the Missionary Alliance for overseas evangelism. In 1897, these organizations united to become the Christian and Missionary Alliance, which by the 1910s had become functionally a denomination.

By the 1890s, the trickles of Methodists leaving their denomination in the name of holiness became a river. Twenty-three new holiness denominations were formed during the decade.¹⁶ The rationale for this “come-outism” came in large part from the non-Methodist Daniel S. Warner, who was stripped of his ministerial license in the

¹⁶ James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Holiness-Pentecostal Transition Years, 1890-1906: Theological Transpositions in the Transatlantic World* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2013), xiii.

Winebrennarian Church of God in 1878 for his promotion of holiness. He began to see denominations as the enemy of holiness:

the Lord showed me that holiness could never prosper upon sectarian soil encumbered by human creeds and party names, and he gave me a new commission to join holiness and all truth together and build up the apostolic church of the living God. Praise His name! I will obey him.¹⁷

In 1881, Warner formed what he considered a non-sectarian congregation, and he was denied membership to the Indiana Holiness Association because that group required its members to belong to a recognized Christian organization. The Church of God Reformation Movement sparked by Warner's work went on to become one of the largest holiness denominations.

Warner "sought to apply the logic of Christian perfection...to the church question."¹⁸ His 1880 *Bible Proofs of the Second Work of Grace* expressed his wish that "the blood of Christ may reach and wash away every vestige of denominational distinction..."¹⁹ By equating denominations with sin, Warner supplied the theological justification for the holiness exodus from the denominations. In 1891, John P. Brooks wrote *The Divine Church*, considered by some scholars "the textbook" of come-outism.²⁰ Brooks was a leader in the movement of independent holiness churches arising from the Southwest Association for the Promotion of Holiness in 1883. "Holiness," Brooks wrote,

¹⁷ Cited in Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 209.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 208.

¹⁹ Steven L. Ware, *Restorationism in the Holiness Movement in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 43.

“can no more be subjugated to sectarian domination.”²¹ Like Warner, Brooks considered denominationalism not just a hindrance to holiness, but its chief enemy.

With the rationale provided by Warner and Brooks, loyalty to one’s denomination ceased to be a virtue. Animosities were heightened in 1894 when the MEC revised the *Discipline* to give local pastors more control over their territories and curtail the activities of itinerant evangelists. This was clearly aimed at holiness preachers, who thrived on a traveling ministry. Furthermore, as many holiness adherents had adopted premillennialism and divine healing, their decision to leave institutional Methodism was eased by the denominational resistance to these teachings. James Buckley became editor of the flagship Methodist periodical the *Christian Advocate* in 1880, and came out strongly against divine healing, calling it an “absurdity.”²² In 1897, the NHA banned discussion of these and other “side-track” issues.²³

While not all come-outers were as adamant as Warner and Brooks about the evils of denominationalism, radical holiness leaders of the 1890s faced no crisis of conscience about leaving their denominations if they felt they could be more productive from beyond denominational walls. Some of them worked independently; many joined or formed church bodies dedicated to the holiness message. The differences between holiness adherents and other Methodists had become blatantly clear to one writer in the *Wesleyan Christian Advocate*: “They preach a different doctrine....; they sing different songs, they patronize and circulate different literature; they have adopted radically different forms of

²¹ Cited in *Ibid.*, 51.

²² Cited in Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 185.

²³ Kenneth O. Brown, *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler: “Wholly and Forever Thine”: Early Leadership in the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness* (Hazleton, PA: Holiness Archives, 1999), 250–251. Brown here reproduces a large portion of the 1897 resolutions.

worship.”²⁴ These differences had reached a boiling point. From the perspective of the North Carolina holiness evangelist A.B. Crumpler, new groups were needed for “those who had been saved and sanctified, many of whom belonged to no church, and many of whom had been turned out of their churches for professing holiness.”²⁵ The Cincinnati Methodist minister Martin Wells Knapp formed the International Holiness Union and Prayer League in Cincinnati in 1897, and finally left the MEC in 1901, clashing with his denomination over his commitment to premillennialism and his interracial services. The Pilgrim Holiness Church traces its lineage to Knapp’s work, as does the Metropolitan Christian Association, or “Burning Bush Movement.” In 1894, California holiness preacher Phineas Bresee left the MEC to found the Church of the Nazarene. Bresee felt that Methodists were indifferent to the needs of the poor and that his work in Los Angeles was better off unencumbered by denominational prejudices. Through a series of mergers, the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene (they dropped “Pentecostal” from their name in 1919) became the largest holiness denomination in the world.

Holiness concerns were not limited to white churches; in addition to interracial ministries like those conducted by Knapp, many predominantly black churches began to gather under the holiness banner. Amanda Berry Smith, a black holiness evangelist with ties to John Inskip, published her influential autobiography in 1893. Charles E. Fuller worked with B.H. Irwin’s Midwest-based Fire-Baptized Holiness Church and eventually formed a separate black version of Irwin’s denomination. Charles Mason and Charles Jones came from a Baptist background, and became leaders in the southern black holiness

²⁴ Randall J. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 159.

²⁵ Cited in *Ibid.*, 141.

movement, consolidating their work in the emerging holiness denomination Church of God in Christ. The United Holy Church of America formed out of revival meetings of black holiness adherents in North Carolina in the mid-1880s and became one of the earliest holiness denominations to embrace the pentecostal message.²⁶

Supernaturalism in the Holiness Movement

As can be seen in the above sketch, the holiness movement was concerned about more than holiness. Especially in its more radical elements, holiness adherents embraced and became some of the chief champions of two new doctrines: premillennialism and divine healing. When combined with sanctification and the deeply-rooted commitment to conversion, this constellation of beliefs became, in A.B. Simpson's words, *The Four Fold Gospel* (1890).

The fourfold gospel was conceptually held together and made distinct in American religion by its pursuit of the supernatural. Holiness saints were not the only nineteenth-century believers concerned with supernaturalism, but other supernaturally-centered groups, like Adventists and Mormons, had by mid-century routinized and institutionalized their supernatural impulse in the establishment of a limited prophetic office.²⁷ The supernaturalism of holiness adherents was not limited to the fourfold gospel, but received its fullest explication along these *foci*. For the holiness thread, this supernaturalism was rooted in Wesley's stress on sanctification as a present possibility.

²⁶ L. Lovett, "Black Holiness Pentecostalism," in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard M. Van Der Maas (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 419–428.

²⁷ Thomas G. Alexander, "Wilford Woodruff and the Changing Nature of Mormon Religious Experience," *Church History* 45, no. 1 (March 1, 1976): 56–69. For Adventist concentration of prophecy in the person of Ellen G. White, see Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, 153–165.

Much influenced by the Enlightenment demand for empirical verification, Wesley raised experience to an unprecedented role in theology.²⁸ “Whatsoever else it imply,” he wrote, sanctification “is a present salvation. It is something attainable, yea, actually attained on earth.”²⁹ This was a divergence from Reformation thought. According to Luther’s *simul iustus et peccator*, to be justified by faith is to remain a sinner, trusting in Christ’s righteousness rather than evidences of personal righteousness:

[t]hat righteousness is not essentially in us, as the Papists reason out of Aristotle, but without us in the grace of God only and in his imputation; and that there is no essential substance of righteousness in us besides that weak faith or firstfruits of faith, whereby we have begun to apprehend Christ, and yet sin in the meantime remaineth verily in us...³⁰

Calvin balanced Luther’s hard emphasis on external righteousness by teaching also that the indwelling Christ, through the Holy Spirit, regenerates sinners so that progressively “our will is rendered conformable to God’s will.” But Calvin also insisted that “until we slough off this mortal body, there remains always in us much imperfection and infirmity, so that we always remain poor and wretched sinners in the presence of God.”³¹ For Wesley, on the other hand, a purely imputed righteousness and full sanctification deferred to death were insufficient. Rather, salvation “is not a blessing which lies on the other side of death...It is not something at a distance. It is a present thing, a blessing which through

²⁸ Guelzo, “Oberlin Perfectionism and Its Edwardsian Origins, 1835-1870,” 160.

²⁹ Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 47.

³⁰ Martin Luther, “Commentary on Galatians,” in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1962), 131–132.

³¹ Lewis William Spitz, ed., “The Geneva Confession,” in *The Protestant Reformation: Major Documents* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997), 116–117.

the free mercy of God ye are now in possession of.”³² With Wesley begins the quest for a perceptible experience of the supernatural.

In America, Wesley’s Methodists had enjoyed intense religious experience since the Chesapeake-area revivals of the 1770s that planted Methodism on the continent. Methodists joined with Presbyterians and Baptists in enjoying physical manifestations of divine activity during the interdenominational frontier camp meetings of the early 1800s. The “jerks,” trances, shouting, falling and other displays were recognized as authentic, but not necessary signs that “the power of God came down” for conversion or sanctification. By 1804, Baptists and Presbyterians largely abandoned the camp meeting format that fostered such exercises, while Methodists combined their camp meeting fervor with African spirituality to produce the shout tradition—an interactive, performative complex of spiritual exercises that placed ecstatic experiences at the center of the conversion process. As Ann Taves argues, much of the shout tradition ethos was renewed in radical holiness circles of the late nineteenth century.³³

In reaction to the perceived decline in sanctification experiences in the 1820s and 1830s, Phoebe Palmer and the early holiness movement emphasized the instantaneous and immediate nature of sanctification. That sanctification was expected to happen immediately signaled that holiness was not simply a matter of discipline and obedience. A dramatic infusion of grace became the *sine qua non* of full salvation. Along with the stress on the instantaneous nature of sanctification, the holiness movement expanded on Wesley’s teaching by more closely identifying sanctification with baptism in the Holy

³² Cited in Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 47.

³³ Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, 76–117. Quote from p. 94.

Spirit and other pentecostal language. Wesley did not stress the Holy Spirit in sanctification, but on occasion he linked the second blessing to the experience of the apostles on Pentecost.³⁴ This connection was made most explicit in early Methodism by Wesley's associate John Fletcher. In the mid-nineteenth century, this language took on a life of its own. Finney was probably the first among American holiness advocates to revive this terminology.³⁵ He was followed by many holiness adherents, both Methodist and Reformed. The fate of holiness phraseology was sealed when Palmer embraced the pentecostal model with *Promise of the Father* (1859). The title of Asa Mahan's *Baptism of the Holy Ghost* (1870) provides a pointed example of this development, as his earlier systematic work on holiness bore the didactic title *The Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (1839). By the end of the century, holiness periodicals went by the name of *Pentecostal Herald* and *Guide to Holiness and Pentecostal Life*, and holiness books ran under titles like Martin Wells Knapp's *Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies* (1898) and Charles J. Fowler's *Back to Pentecost* (1900).

The linguistic shift from "Christian perfection" to "baptism of the Holy Spirit" has been charted well by Dayton, and need not be retraced here.³⁶ But it should be stressed that the shift was almost total. Undoubtedly holiness advocates who were convinced of the doctrine of instantaneous sanctification found in the Acts 2 narrative a helpful biblical precedent, even though "[a] study of the biblical doctrine of 'perfection'

³⁴ Wood, "The Origin, Development, and Consistency of John Wesley's Theology of Holiness," 45–49.

³⁵ Timothy L. Smith, "Doctrine of the Sanctifying Spirit: Charles G. Finney's Synthesis of Wesleyan and Covenant Theology," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (March 1, 1978): 92–113, especially p. 106.

³⁶ Donald W. Dayton, "From Christian Perfection to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost,'" in *Aspects of Pentecostal-charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan (Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1975), 39–54.

does not naturally lead to the account of Pentecost, and vice versa.”³⁷ In the history of Protestant biblical interpretation, this “Pentecostal hermeneutic” marks a remarkable shift from a preference for the Pauline corpus to the Luke-Acts texts and with it a shift from didactic portions of scripture to narrative passages.³⁸

The switch to pentecostal language was more than semantics. Rather, “[t]he Pentecostal formulation had its own power that pulled in new directions.”³⁹ All these directions incorporated a heightened expectation of the supernatural. Pentecostal language secured an understanding of sanctification as “an instantaneous bestowal of divine power,” and “a more tangible event” than it had been for Wesley.⁴⁰ Connected to this, believers who read their experience through the pentecostal lens mused on what manifestations might accompany spirit-baptism, since it came with supernatural effects for the disciples. The pentecostal model also linked holiness to power in addition to Wesley’s focus on cleansing of sin and love for God. As Palmer said, “purity is power,” especially as it relates to the ministry.⁴¹ Additionally, the pentecostal paradigm sharpened eschatological hopes, first of an imminent earthly millennium, and later of an imminent

³⁷ Donald W. Dayton, “Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9 (March 1, 1974): 65. As Dayton notes elsewhere, a tension between the Wesleyan cleansing theme and the pentecostal power motif existed throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century, prompting various solutions from the mainstream holiness movement’s equating purity to power, to the radical holiness (and later pentecostal) theology of a third blessing, to the higher life/Keswick movement’s emphasis of power at the expense of purity. This tension finally helps to explain the pentecostal movement’s de-emphasis of sanctification. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 90ff.

³⁸ Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 23.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁴⁰ Lowery, “A Fork in the Wesleyan Road,” 191, 192.

⁴¹ Phoebe Palmer, *Phoebe Palmer: Selected Writings*, ed. Thomas Oden (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 264.

return of Christ. In this atmosphere of heightened expectation of the miraculous and focus on Holy Spirit power, divine healing emerged as a pillar of the holiness creed.

Sanctification and Manifestations

Palmer's "shorter way" was meant, in part, to do away with the need for manifestations or evidences of the second blessing. In this sense, her holiness doctrine was custom-fitted for more respectable urban believers.⁴² Palmer chafed under the Wesleyan doctrine of the witness of the Spirit, which she considered vague and elusive. She relied on "naked faith," and the "naked word" for assurance that the blessing had been received. But paradoxically, Palmer was not hesitant to relate the evidences of sanctification that immediately followed it. "My spirit returned consciously to its source, and rested in the embrace of God," she wrote. "I felt that I was but a drop in the ocean of infinite LOVE, and Christ was all in all."⁴³ This ambivalence explains why Palmer's method can be seen as both mystical and as a "radical doctrine of *sola scriptura*."⁴⁴ The expectation of a dramatic supernatural experience at the time of sanctification was heightened by recourse to pentecostal language, as seen in Finney's account of his spirit-baptism:

[T]he Holy Spirit descended upon me in a manner that seemed to go through me, body and soul. I could feel the impression, like a wave of electricity, going through and through me. Indeed it seemed to come in waves and waves of liquid

⁴² Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, 122, 148–153.

⁴³ Cited in Charles Edward White, "What the Holy Spirit Can and Cannot Do: The Ambiguities of Phoebe Palmer's Theology of Experience," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 20, no. 1 (March 1, 1985): 114.

⁴⁴ Elaine A. Heath, *Naked Faith: The Mystical Theology of Phoebe Palmer*, Princeton Theological Monograph Series, 108 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009). Paul Bassett, "The Theological Identity of the North American Holiness Movement," in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (Univ. of Tennessee Press, 2001), 85. Cited in Lowery, "A Fork in the Wesleyan Road," 204.

love for I could not express it in any other way. It seemed like the very breath of God. I can recollect distinctly that it seemed to fan me, like immense wings.⁴⁵

Furthermore, since spirit-baptism was “power from on high” for the apostles, the theme of power became more central as the century wore on. As Simpson wrote of sanctification as the indwelling Christ, “[i]t is the only secret of power in your life, and mine, beloved...it is true, that God will come to dwell within us, and be the power, and the purity, and the victory, and the joy of your life.”⁴⁶ Spirit-baptism resulted in supernatural power to live the faithful Christian life.

Assertions regarding the nature and evidence of this power became more specific among the most radical holiness adherents, especially among those who separated spirit-baptism from sanctification as a third work of grace. B.H. Irwin, a key rabble-rouser in the midwest holiness movement for his teaching of a “baptism of fire” that followed sanctification, wrote vividly of his spiritual experience. Irwin said he was “literally on fire,” but felt only “unutterable ecstatic bliss.”⁴⁷ While many offered testimonies of the manifestations and sensations that accompanied these works of grace, no consensus could be reached. As Charles Parham was to bemoan,

Now all Christians credit the fact that we are to be recipients of the Holy Spirit, but each have their private interpretations as to His visible manifestations; some claim shouting, leaping, jumping, and falling in trances, while other inspirations, unction and divine revelation.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Charles G. Finney, *Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney* (New York: Barnes & Co., 1876), 20.

⁴⁶ Albert Benjamin Simpson, *Days of Heaven upon Earth* (Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing Co., 1897), 143.

⁴⁷ Cited in R. G. Robins, *A. J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Modernist* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 43.

⁴⁸ Charles F. Parham, *The Sermons of Charles F. Parham*, ed. Donald W. Dayton, *The Higher Christian Life* (New York: Garland Pub., 1985), 27–28.

Parham was probably familiar with the Christian Metropolitan Association, which for a time determined jumping to be the evidence of spirit-baptism.⁴⁹ This group had been inspired in part by Martin Wells Knapp, who after being arrested in 1901 for the excessive noise level of his worship services, claimed that “Baptism of the Holy Ghost moves to vocal demonstration.”⁵⁰ For Knapp, manifestations were not optional or dispensable. He warned that “[i]t is far safer to play with lightning rods in a thunder storm than to oppose this baptism or any of its manifestations.”⁵¹

Regardless of how it was described, sanctification was understood as a supernatural experience. As A.J. Gordon complained, “With how many is regeneration merely a repairing of the old nature by culture, instead of a miraculous communication of the divine life.”⁵² The yearning to make the spiritual tangible was heightened by the desires for assurance of salvation or sanctification and the newly dominant pentecostal model that taught believers to expect manifestations. This yearning was also magnified by and evident in the newly surging doctrine of the premillennial return of Christ.

Premillennialism

In the mid-nineteenth century, premillennialism had a bad reputation. The doctrine, which teaches that Christ will return to earth physically prior to his millennial reign of peace and righteousness, was blighted by William Miller’s failed predictions of

⁴⁹ William Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progressive Era America* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 84-85.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁵¹ Martin Wells Knapp, *Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies: Or, Devices of the Devil Unmasked* (Cincinnati: Office of the Revivalist, 1898), 25.

⁵² Cited in Raymond J. Cunningham, “From Holiness to Healing: The Faith Cure in America 1872-1892,” *Church History* 43, no. 4 (December 1, 1974): 512.

Christ's return in 1844. The largest group emerging from Miller's teaching, the Seventh Day Adventists, did the teaching no favors by advocating other peculiar teachings like abstinence from pork and celebration of Sabbath on Saturday. The vast majority of Protestants adhered to a vague but generally agreed-upon doctrine of postmillennialism, which taught that Christ would return to earth following the righteous earthly millennium (whether figurative or a literal thousand years—there was no consensus) and that the advent of the millennium was partly dependent on human righteousness and achievement. The theological notion that human society was on the cusp of a period of peace and righteousness complemented the general sense of progress shared by all as well as the American crusade to civilize the West. Lyman Beecher's famous *Plea for the West* (1835) summarized the tenor of the times:

It was the opinion of Edwards, that the millenium would commence in America. When I first encountered this opinion, I thought it chimerical; but all providential developments since, and all existing signs of the times, lend corroboration to it. But if it is by the march of revolution and civil liberty, that the way of the Lord is to be prepared, where shall the central energy be found, and from what nation shall the renovating power go forth? What nation is blessed with such experimental knowledge of free institutions, with such facilities and resources of communication, obstructed by so few obstacles, as our own?⁵³

Despite the moral challenges connected to immigration, slavery, and the frontier, most Protestants in the first half of the nineteenth century felt assured that they were approaching a period of unprecedented societal righteousness.

The only serious contender to the dominant postmillennialism emerged from John N. Darby, a priest in the Church of Ireland who helped found the Plymouth Brethren. Although Darby began articulating his version of premillennialism with its historical dispensations and pretribulational rapture of the church in the early 1830s, his teachings

⁵³ Lyman Beecher, *A Plea for the West* (Cincinnati: Truman & Smith, 1835), 9–10.

did not receive significant acceptance in America until about 1875, when a group of premillennialists began yearly meetings of what came to be known as the Niagara Bible Conference.⁵⁴ At the same time, premillennialism made inroads into the Keswick movement in England. Through contacts with Keswick and the Niagara conferences, a number of high profile American ministers adopted premillennialism, including D.L. Moody and A.B. Simpson. Moody in particular was influential in the spread of the new eschatology through his Northfield conferences beginning in 1880. Many of these new premillennialists were “inconsistent dispensationalists,” embracing only parts of Darby’s grander system.⁵⁵ But like Darby they all combined the message of the soon return of Christ with an aversion to eschatological date-setting.

Before the Civil War, holiness advocates of all stripes endorsed the postmillennial vision. Henry Cowles was Oberlin’s most avid millenarian. Based on “some deep pervading action in the social and moral atmosphere,” he declared that “THE MILLENNIUM IS AT HAND.”⁵⁶ In its broad outlines, the postmillennial creed fit well with the Arminian soteriology of the holiness movement. Both teachings emphasized the need for human cooperation with God and magnified the potential of human activity. Cowles urged believers that the millennium was “waiting only for our cooperation to be

⁵⁴ Ernest Robert Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 132–161. The most complete and recent treatment of premillennialism in America is Timothy P. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

⁵⁵ Bernie A. Van De Walle, *The Heart of the Gospel: A. B. Simpson, the Fourfold Gospel, and Late Nineteenth-Century Evangelical Theology*, Princeton Theological Monograph Series, 106 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009), 191.

⁵⁶ Cited in Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 156, 157.

ushered in with all its light and love.”⁵⁷ Given this resonance, the holiness embrace of premillennialism by the end of the century requires some explanation.

Dayton argues that the triumphant postmillennialism of Oberlin and other holiness advocates simply raised hopes too high.⁵⁸ With the expectation of millennium reaching a fever pitch in theologians like Cowles, the social and moral disappointments of the 1850s and 1860s were especially devastating. The victory of the Union did not bring the millennium it seemed to promise. The middle decades of the nineteenth century saw a dramatic increase in immigration that would continue until it was forcibly stopped with the National Origins Act of 1924. Especially toward the end of the century, much of this immigration was from Catholic and Lutheran areas in Europe that did not share America’s puritan moralism. What Lyman Beecher thought of as a challenge to which America could rise quickly became a cause for despair as 6.5 million immigrants came to America between 1840 and 1870. Cities grew apace with immigration. In 1830, just 8.8 percent of the U.S. population lived in cities; by 1900, nearly four in ten Americans was a city dweller.⁵⁹ As all Christians knew, vice thrived in cities, and the rise of urban centers in America brought in its train renewed campaigns against typical urban sins, like alcohol and prostitution. Furthermore, the nation seemed much less stable financially, with major financial panics in 1873 and 1893 and a well-publicized railroad strike in 1877.

⁵⁷ Cited in *Ibid.*, 157.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 158.

⁵⁹ Michael R. Haines, “Selected Population Characteristics – Median Age, Sex Ratio, Annual Growth Rate, and Number, by Race, Urban Residence, and Nativity: 1790–2000, Table Aa22-35,” in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Earliest Times to the Present: Millennial Edition*, ed. Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, et al. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/ISBN-9780511132971.Aa1-10910.1017/ISBN-9780511132971.Aa1-109>.

Coupled with these social factors was the intellectual challenge posed by biblical higher criticism. As Ernest Sandeen pointed out, the premillennial approach to scripture found reinforcement in the Princeton doctrine of biblical inerrancy.⁶⁰ At the end of the century, the Princeton teaching was the strongest defense against the erosion of biblical authority implicit in liberal theology. Believers were eager for support to uphold scriptural veracity, and premillennialism claimed a space in these concerns. Biblical inerrancy was inseparable from supernaturalism: for Princeton-style fundamentalists, it meant affirming the miracles of scripture; for holiness premillennialists, it meant affirming present-day miracles. The premillennial script also called for end-time apostasy, which premillennialists found in the modernist threat.

The postmillennial optimism of Beecher and Cowles seemed misplaced by the end of the century. From the dismantling of the evangelical consensus to the rise of biblical criticism, history no longer seemed to confirm the postmillennial philosophy. But the millennial impulse was too deeply imbedded to be discarded as social conditions changed. As Dayton writes, “The only way to sustain the hope of the millennium was to radically rearrange the chronology along the lines of premillennialism.”⁶¹ And this is what thousands of believers—both holiness and non-holiness—did in the last years of the nineteenth century. This suggests that the millennial fervor of the antebellum era was driven by supernaturalism, rather than a specific theological or biblical commitment.

⁶⁰ Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism*. Sandeen missed the importance of holiness (and later pentecostal) adherence to premillennialism (177), a problem partly rectified by George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 72–101.

⁶¹ Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 158.

Both postmillennialists and premillennialists were focused on testifying to evidence of God's intervention in the world; they only disagreed on the order of its details.

A more specific reason for holiness acceptance of premillennialism was its power to make sense of holiness adherents' experience. As more and more holiness folk—especially in the South—encountered hostility from their denominations, they turned to an apocalyptic eschatology that confirmed their elect status while condemning their adversaries. The fact of being shunned by their denominations seemed confirmation of the end times. Holiness adherents never tired of quoting Jesus' words in John 2:2: "They will put you out of the synagogues." Such resistance only pushed holiness folk further into pentecostal language and imagery, which in turn intensified their apocalypticism. Since the denominations had abused their authority, true power rested only in those who had the fullness of the Holy Spirit, and the biblical scene of Pentecost affirmed a close connection between the work of the Holy Spirit and the eschaton. As the key doctrine of holiness seemed to be rejected by the church on earth, holiness people could no longer affirm the postmillennial vision of the progress of righteousness.⁶²

Premillennialism also complemented the holiness conviction that sanctification was a restoration of apostolic Christianity. As Stephen Ware argues, the restorationist ethos led many to the conclusion that the rediscovery of apostolic teaching begun with Luther had reached its zenith in the holiness movement; the only thing left was Christ's return. In support of this belief, holiness folk developed the "evening light" doctrine, which claimed on the basis of Zechariah 14:6-7 that the restoration of lost doctrines

⁶² Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 136–185. Quote on p. 170.

directly preceded the end of time.⁶³ Early pentecostals embraced a related doctrine of “latter rain,” which argued from Peter’s Pentecost sermon and Palestinian rainfall that a special spiritual outpouring would occur just before Christ’s return.⁶⁴

Divine Healing

Almost without exception, those who embraced divine healing had already adopted some form of holiness teaching. Divine healing appealed to late-nineteenth century Christians for many reasons. To some degree, the doctrine of divine healing was an extension of the logic of sanctification. As Randall Stephens puts it, holiness adherents came to the conclusion that “[t]he body . . . was perfectible much like the soul.”⁶⁵ In other words, the supernaturalist drive for evidence of present divine activity was at work in both teachings. The move to divine healing was surprisingly simple for radical holiness leaders like Charles Parham, who “realized the mighty power of God in sanctifying the body from disease as He had from inbred sin.”⁶⁶ Leaders like R. Kelso Carter increased expectations of supernaturalism by arguing that healing was “in the atonement.” This teaching was also polemical; as liberal theology denied the supernaturalism of the biblical and the present world, it threatened to disenchant the earthly realm and make the

⁶³ Ware, *Restorationism in the Holiness Movement in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*, 101.

⁶⁴ D. Wesley Myland, *The Latter Rain Covenant and Pentecostal Power* (Springfield, MO: Temple Press, 1910).

⁶⁵ Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, 175.

⁶⁶ Parham, *The Sermons of Charles F. Parham*, 16.

atonement more “subjective.” As Raymond Cunningham suggests, divine healing may have been an effort by proto-fundamentalists to bolster the doctrine of the atonement.⁶⁷ Divine healing was also for some holiness folk the logical conclusion of their premillennialism. If a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit was to presage Christ’s return, then all sorts of miraculous occurrences like healing could be expected. And if the book of Acts described the sanctification experience—and by extension, the ideal church—then Christians could expect a full range of supernatural experiences. For some, divine healing was also a practical necessity of the last days—God needed fit laborers for the end-time harvest. As A.B. Simpson put it, “The blessed gospel of physical healing in the name of Jesus will prove an invaluable handmaid to the cause of missions.”⁶⁸

Social factors also contributed to the rise of divine healing. The steady erosion of Calvinism left believers open to the possibility that affliction may not be providential and that miraculous intervention could be God’s will for all times.⁶⁹ The advance of science kindled a reaction from some who felt that miracles were the perfect antidote to an overreliance on rationalism. “It may be,” wrote Smith Platt, an early and prolific Methodist holiness advocate,

now that the modern era of science has begun to shape the thoughts of men by only scientific methods, that a special occasion has arisen for a fresh display of signs and wonders to keep the church and the world alive and open to the realities of God’s immediate visitation.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Cunningham, “From Holiness to Healing,” 512.

⁶⁸ Cited in Heather D. Curtis, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 78–79.

⁶⁹ In reaction to the abuses of Catholicism, reformers like John Calvin had argued that miracles were needed in early Christianity to help establish the truth of the gospel. But since there was no new gospel to be established, miracles were no longer needed. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008), xxiv.

⁷⁰ Cited in Cunningham, “From Holiness to Healing,” 512.

In the rapidly-changing intellectual climate of post-bellum America, old questions—like the human role in divine matters and the place of the miraculous—could receive new answers.

Often not appreciated in discussions of divine healing is the state of professional medicine in the late nineteenth century. Most leaders of the divine healing movement did not categorically condemn medical intervention like healer John Alexander Dowie, who lumped “Doctors, Drugs, and Devils” together as foes of Christ.⁷¹ But proponents of divine healing all considered divine healing the “better way.”⁷² The position of orthodox medicine was by no means secure in the late nineteenth century. Medical thought in the early republic was dominated by the heroic approach advocated by revolutionary-era physician Benjamin Rush (1746-1813). Rush believed that an excess of nervous energy, or “capillary tension,” was at the heart of all disease; cure came in the form of tension-release through purgation: bleeding, lancing, induced sweating, salivating or vomiting. These therapeutics often employed dangerous levels of toxins such as calomel and arsenic. Countless patients complained of permanent scarring and the loss of teeth due to these treatments. This approach had the advantage of producing visible effects on patients’ bodies, confirming the “results” of treatment. Practitioners of heroic medicine also believed that the dramatic effects of their treatments stimulated the body’s inner healing power. Clearly, the treatment was often worse than the ailment, but in the

⁷¹ John Alexander Dowie, *Doctors, Drugs and Devils; or, The Foes of Christ the Healer. A Sermon Delivered in The Auditorium, Chicago, March 29, 1896* (Chicago: Zion Publishing House, 1897).

⁷² James William Opp, *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine, and Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880-1930* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2005), 51.

absence of more effective options, heroic methods continued through most of the nineteenth century.⁷³

Samuel Thomson (1769-1843) offered a different philosophy of disease and treatment. As a counterpoint to Rush's focus on an excess of nervous energy, Thomson posited lack of heat as the taproot of sickness. For twenty dollars, Thomson's followers could purchase his plan in his *New Guide to Health* (1822). Thomsonians treated their patients by restoring vital heat to the body, either through hot baths or through a carefully prescribed diet (herbal, which was associated with heat, rather than mineral) clearing the body for proper heat-producing digestion. Thomson's methods were only slightly gentler than Rush's: Thomsonianism prescribed *Lobelia inflata* (known colloquially as "Indian tobacco" or "puke weed") to induce vomiting. Despite the fee he charged for his method and his insistence on secrecy, Thomson reflected the Jacksonian democratic ideal by stressing the accessibility of medicine to all. "Let mystery be stripped of all pretence, [a]nd practice be combined with common sense," was his slogan.⁷⁴ This appeal to common sense was long an obstacle for regular medicine, and was only overcome when the balance of scientific discovery gained for physicians recognition of "legitimate complexity."⁷⁵ Thomson's approach—especially the use of botanics—was absorbed into the later eclectic movement, which collected wisdom from many schools while criticizing heroic methods.

⁷³ Curtis, *Faith in the Great Physician*, 28–31.

⁷⁴ Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 51–52. Quote on p. 52.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 140–144.

Another major alternative was homeopathy, a coined term meaning “similar to the disease.” Born in the thought of German Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843), popular homeopathy was centered on two philosophical positions: (1) like cures like; a treatment that causes symptoms in a healthy patient has the power to cure those same symptoms in a sick patient; and (2) the law of infinitesimals; the smaller the dose, the more potent it is, because the process of dilution awakened the spiritual potency of a drug. Homeopaths believed that the illness created by their diluted drugs displaced the original disease, yet, because it was a small dose, the body’s vital force was able to overcome it. Patients welcomed homeopaths because their small doses produced far fewer negative results than regular physicians’ methods. Patients also appreciated the fact that homeopaths believed that each patient should be treated on an individual basis and that proper diagnosis can be made only after paying careful attention to the patient’s full history, symptoms, and personality. While they sharply critiqued the scientifically-minded regulars, homeopaths were fond of conducting experiments to prove their approach, which gained them esteem in the eyes of the public.⁷⁶ Despite disagreements between different schools of unorthodox medicine (including others not mentioned, like hydropathy and osteopathy), irregular physicians had this in common: their worldviews crossed easily back and forth between physic and metaphysic, and in treating their patients, they did not seek to attack disease so much as strengthen or free the innate power of healing.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ “Because homeopathy was simultaneously philosophical and experimental, it seemed to many people to be more rather than less scientific than orthodox medicine.” *Ibid.*, 97.

⁷⁷ Catherine L. Albanese, “Physic and Metaphysic in 19th-century America: Medical Sectarians and Religious Healing,” *Church History* 55, no. 4 (December 1, 1986): 489–502; James C. Whorton, *Nature Cures: The History of Alternative Medicine in America* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), xii, *et passim*.

Regular physicians struggled to distinguish themselves in the midst of these competing philosophies. Homeopaths referred derisively to regulars as “allopaths,” or those who treat with substances that in a healthy patient produce symptoms different from the disease. Tracing its impulse from Paris medicine of the revolutionary era, these doctors made advances in anatomy and physiology, as seen in Samuel Gross’s *A System of Surgery* (1859). But until the end of the nineteenth century, regulars offered few therapeutic alternatives to heroic medicine or Thomsonianism; they were known primarily for their fondness for heavy drugging. Regulars unanimously denounced “exclusive” or irregular systems. Regulars knew from experience that “conceptual inconsistency and confusion ran through the therapeutic world of nature religion.”⁷⁸ Through most of the nineteenth century, regular medicine was hampered politically and scientifically by its lack of regulation. No thorough or regularly-enforced standard for medical education or licensing existed. Students could claim an M.D. with as little as two terms of study (sometimes amounting to only eight months total) without high school or college requirements. Medical schools were proprietary and unregulated, and any school that raised requirements risked an exodus of students to the nearest school with laxer standards. The American Medical Association (AMA) was formed in 1847 partly as a response to this situation, but as Paul Starr points out, its function until the early twentieth century was more polemical than scientific.⁷⁹

The embryonic state of medical knowledge among regulars left them vulnerable to critique from irregulars. To understand why so many would turn to unscientific

⁷⁸ Albanese, “Physic and Metaphysic in 19th-century America,” 490.

⁷⁹ Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*, 90ff.

methods of healing (whether unorthodox physicians, mind-cure, or divine healing) is to note how underdeveloped medical science was in the late nineteenth century. Without understanding the causes of many diseases, doctors developed a knee-jerk response of prescribing unrelated drugs. Their penchant for indiscriminant drugging is described in a mid-century ditty:

Whate'er the patient may complain
Of head, or heart or nerve, or brain
Of Fever high, or parts that swell—
The remedy is calomel⁸⁰

To satisfy patients, doctors offered drugs, even if they had no medical rationale for doing so.

Not only were regulars' drug therapies undiscerning and dangerous, their understanding of pathology was severely limited. Germ theory was just coming to public attention in the 1860s and 1870s with the work Louis Pasteur and Robert Koch. Tuberculosis, the ailment of many who sought divine healing, was identified as one such germ disease, but remained untreatable throughout the nineteenth century. The most immediate application of the new theory was Joseph Lister's antiseptics, which made surgery safer, but also had the unfortunate side effect of increasing the number of unnecessary surgeries, as doctors were overeager to work with the new technology.⁸¹ Scientific advances raised patients' expectations, but also sharpened the despair of those who were not cured.

⁸⁰ Cited in Whorton, *Nature Cures*, 1.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 156.

Another indicator of the precarious state of late-nineteenth century medicine was the development of functional disease theories.⁸² Distinguished from organic diseases, functional diseases were those ailments that did not evince organ or tissue damage, but whose symptoms were real. Functional disease theory represents both advances in understanding the role of the mind in health and the diagnostic limitations of late-nineteenth century medicine. The most notorious functional disease of the period was neurasthenia. Confronted by a web of symptoms including headache, fatigue, anxiety, partial paralysis and depression, doctors, following in the footsteps of Charles Beard, began pronouncing the vague diagnosis. A range of treatments from rest cure to electrotherapy was prescribed for this “Americanitis,” which early on was thought to be related to the disorienting experience of rapid urbanization. Women were particularly prone, and more than one female neurasthenic was healed by a female divine healer.⁸³ Female invalids often complained of spinal agitations and extreme sensitivity to light, sound and touch. Such conditions, known as “hyperesthesia,” were often related to neurasthenia.⁸⁴

Throughout the nineteenth century, irregular healers constituted roughly twenty percent of practicing physicians.⁸⁵ The simple fact of serious competition from unorthodox practitioners indicates the precarious state of Victorian era medicine. Regular

⁸² Michael R. Trimble, “Functional Diseases,” *British Medical Journal (Clinical Research Edition)* 285, no. 6357 (December 18, 1982): 1768–1770.

⁸³ Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 136–146.

⁸⁴ Such were the symptoms the divine healer Carrie Judd Montgomery suffered before her supernatural healing. Jennifer A. Miskov, *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery, 1858-1946* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2012), 15–22.

⁸⁵ Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*, 99.

physicians won an important victory in the Supreme Court decision *Dent vs. West Virginia* (1888), which essentially ruled that doctors had to have degrees from reputable schools, as defined by the AMA. With the establishment of The John Hopkins University medical school in 1893, a national standard for rigorous and science-based medical education was set, although more than twenty years would pass before this standard would become a nation-wide reality. A similarly prophetic victory was won in the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act, which along with muckraking journalism of the Progressive era, took aim at so-called patent medicines. Historians often refer to the high profile report by Abraham Flexner in 1910 as the watershed in modern medicine. Funded by the Carnegie Foundation, Flexner visited every medical school in the nation critiquing the facilities and quality of training. John Alexander Dowie, the divine healer who instigated a riot in Chicago with his attacks on the medical profession, probably would have agreed with Flexner's assessment of Chicago's medical education as "the plague spot of the country."⁸⁶ Rather than denouncing medicine as a whole like Dowie, Flexner sought to improve it: he pressured medical schools to lower enrollment, enact stricter standards, and follow a research-based approach.⁸⁷

The regular physicians' growth of authority rested partly in its willingness to cooperate with moderate homeopaths and eclectics. As a consequence, these alternative medicines became less philosophically-driven. And as they did, a new, purely philosophical approach rose to fill the void. Christian Science emerged as a distinct

⁸⁶ Abraham Flexner, *Medical Education in the United States and Canada: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910), 216.

⁸⁷ For an overview of the rise of regular medicine see Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*, 79–144.

religious and healing alternative in 1875 with the publication of Mary Baker Eddy's *Science and Health*. Until 1866, Eddy had been a devoted follower and promoter of the mind-cure doctor Phineas Quimby. A New England inventor and devotee of mesmerism, Quimby came to believe that healing comes through the positive alignment of spirit and body. In 1862, Quimby began treating Eddy, who suffered from chronic digestive and spinal problems. Quimby died in 1866, and whether intentionally or not, Eddy quickly took steps to fill the vacuum. Eddy suffered a fall on ice weeks after Quimby's death. She had to be carried home on a sled, but in three days she was walking again, claiming to have received further insight into healing through her study of the scriptures.

Eddy institutionalized her philosophy with the formation of the Church of Christ, Scientist, in 1879. Her fame grew quickly as testimonies of healing under her care multiplied, carried by her *Christian Science Journal*. She became the object of wide fascination, generating lengthy investigations from Mark Twain and the future novelist Willa Cather. Eddy claimed to have taught four thousand students between 1881 and 1889 at her Massachusetts Metaphysical College—an institution that was, tellingly, chartered by the state for medical instruction.⁸⁸

Eddy's approach to healing owed a debt to Quimby, but as the fallen master left little written record of his teaching, the extent of the debt is a matter of debate.⁸⁹ Regardless, Eddy's system distinguished itself by being formed in a thoroughly Christian worldview and by totally denying the reality of the material. Health lay in the realization that disease—as a material manifestation—was an illusion. Christian Scientists counseled

⁸⁸ Mary Baker Eddy, *Science and Health: With Key to the Scriptures* (Boston: A. V. Stewart, 1906), xi–xii.

⁸⁹ Gillian Gill, *Mary Baker Eddy* (Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books, 1998), 122–168.

sufferers to deny the reality of their symptoms as well as the underlying sickness. Similar versions of this “counterfactual confession” appeared in later New Thought doctrine and divine healing.

Eddy’s teachings pushed supernaturalism to the extreme, so that the natural was swallowed up in the supernatural. She claimed to teach the “Principle, before which sin and disease lose their reality.” As a “principle,” her approach to healing was “scientific” and she claimed that “these mighty works are not supernatural, but supremely natural.”⁹⁰ Here it can be seen that naturalism and supernaturalism are ends of a circular spectrum: supernaturalism becomes most important to those who are most concerned about the problems of the natural world; and those who argue most for supernaturalism wish to raise it to the level of scientific predictability associated with nature.⁹¹ Nevertheless, for the average adherent, what was important was not the philosophy, but the results. As Willa Cather put it:

Copies [of the *Christian Science Journal*] found their way to remote villages in Missouri and Arkansas, to lonely places in Nebraska and Colorado, where people had much time for reflection, little excitement, and a great need to believe in miracles.⁹²

⁹⁰ Both quotes from Eddy, *Science and Health*, xi.

⁹¹ Finney was dealing with similar issues on the relation between the natural and the supernatural when he defined religious revivals as not miraculous but “the purely philosophical result of the right use of constituted means.” Although Finney was more beholden to the Enlightenment definition of miracles than Eddy or many later divine healing advocates, he clearly expressed a similar concern for reconciling spiritual experience with rational categories of causation. Charles Grandison Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (New York : F.H. Revell, 1868), 12.

⁹² Willa Cather, *The Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy and the History of Christian Science* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 313.

A further outgrowth of Quimby's and Eddy's teachings was New Thought, which taught the unity of humanity and divinity, the ultimate reality of thought over substance, and the human power to create, like God, through thought.⁹³

Divine healing emerged in this milieu of science, scientific incompetence, pseudoscience, and metaphysical rejection of the material. Proponents of supernatural healing noted the disagreement between and infighting among physicians as a sign of its ultimate impotence. As Daniel Bryant, an overseer in Dowie's organization and one-time cooperator with pentecostals in Zion City, argued as late as 1907,

It is inexplicable that anything with so unbroken a history of change as the so-called Science of Medicine could live a day in a civilization characterized by the commonest intelligence. Look at the practice of medicine today. It is split up into scores of factions, each asserting itself to be right and the others wrong...After nineteen centuries of study and research, as a result of which the world blazes with the light of scientific research along many lines, the so-called Science of Medicine is in the greatest confusion, and continues to be one of the greatest humbugs on the earth today. The Bible teaches that God is the Healer of His people. Nothing else can succeed.⁹⁴

Those who took God as their healer had often exhausted the expertise of physicians. Jennie Paddock of Chicago was healed in 1890 of a tumor that darkened one side of her body and was "so enlarged she could not fasten her dresses by about six inches." She had sought treatment at numerous hospitals and had seen many specialists, but no one would operate on her. One doctor had only exacerbated her suffering through an "electric treatment." Her case was declared hopeless and her last doctor told her she was near death. Paddock's friend brought a request for prayer to John Alexander Dowie, who

⁹³ Kate Bowler, *Blessed: A History of the American Prosperity Gospel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 13–14. New Thought will be addressed in detail in later chapters in connection with E.W. Kenyon and Bosworth's relation to the prosperity gospel.

⁹⁴ Daniel Bryant, "Baptism of Holy Spirit," *Zion City Independent*, December 13, 1907, 1. Zion Historical Society.

prayed for her at a mass gathering at nearby Western Springs. The next morning, Paddock declared she was healed, and within a few days was “doing a hard days [sic] work.” Paddock’s hard-won preference for divine healing was seamlessly passed on to the next generation when her daughter fell ill and wanted a doctor. Paddock assured her daughter that “God cured mamma, and He will cure you.” After a simple prayer and laying on of hands, Paddock’s daughter was healed.⁹⁵

Paddock’s healer John Alexander Dowie stood in a line of earlier pioneers of faith healing. Before a discernable movement had begun, a number of scattered ministries from 1830 to 1860 focused on divine healing. Edward Irving endorsed healing as well as other spiritual gifts in his London ministry beginning in 1831. Due to his early death and the fact that Irving himself did not receive the leadership gifts of prophecy or tongues, Irving’s legacy was more a derision for other evangelicals than an inspiration for future faith healers.⁹⁶ On the continent, the German Johann Christoph Blumhardt developed a theology and ministry of healing after a lengthy pastoral struggle with a demon-possessed girl in his parish at Möttlingen. After the girl’s recovery in 1843, Blumhardt established the internationally-known healing facilities at Bad Boll. Dorothea Trudel of Männerdorf, Switzerland, healed four of her co-workers in 1840 with her prayers, and by the mid-1850s, she operated a series of healing homes.⁹⁷ Trudel’s work in particular fired the imaginations of later faith healers in the English-speaking world.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ “A Miracle of Healing,” *Leaves of Healing* 1, nos. 9, 10, 11 (1891): 220–222.

⁹⁶ James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Formative Years, 1830-1890: Theological Roots in the Transatlantic World* (Pickwick Publications, 2011), chap. 1.

⁹⁷ Healing homes were the dominant form of divine healing practice until about 1900. The environment of healing homes was thoroughly domestic and sacred, as participants stayed sometimes many weeks or months in devotional pursuit of healing. The main purpose of the domestic setting was insulation from the unbelieving world, providing time and encouragement for the believer to build up faith for

Ethan O. Allen (grandson of the Revolutionary War hero) was probably the first American to devote himself to a ministry of divine healing. He was healed of a liver ailment in 1846 and afterwards began a healing ministry, but did not commit his thoughts and experiences to paper until he published *Faith Healing* in 1881. Allen's work was that of an itinerant, and he never institutionalized his ministry through a base or a periodical. Of more lasting importance was Sarah Anne Freeman Mix (known as Mrs. Edward Mix), who was healed by Allen of tuberculosis in 1877. Mix's ministry was short (she died in 1884), but her fame grew quickly, aided by her periodical *Victory Through Faith* and her role in the healing of one of the most famous early divine healers, Carrie Judd (1858-1946).

After a painful fall on an icy sidewalk in 1876 (not unlike Mary Baker Eddy's experience), Judd's health devolved quickly. Doctors despaired of treating her chronic pain, and Judd resolved herself to a life of sanctified suffering. As Judd's mother counseled her, "Your mission may be to lie here and suffer and be an example of patience to others, as you have been."⁹⁹ Her mother's words reflected the widespread notion, based in Calvinist theology, that suffering was to be interpreted as God's sovereign will, and that submission was the appropriate faithful response to suffering. This did not stop Judd from reaching out to Mrs. Edward Mix in 1879, however. Mix replied to Judd, telling her that she would pray for Judd at an appointed time according to James 5,

healing. Healing homes corresponded well to the Victorian notion that home (rather than hospital) was the site of both sickness and convalescence—that health was a personal rather than clinical matter; they also provided opportunities for women to serve in high profile positions of leadership under the cover of domesticity. See Curtis, *Faith in the Great Physician*, chap. 5.

⁹⁸ For Blumhardt and Trudel, see Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2011, chap. 2.

⁹⁹ Cited in Miskov, *Life on Wings*, 17.

encouraging the invalid to “claim that promise,” and assuring her that “[i]t makes no difference how you feel, but get right out of bed and begin to walk by faith.”¹⁰⁰ This counsel for counterfactual confession reveals the surface similarity between divine healing and Christian Science. Mix’s advice also shows how the divine healing movement had imbibed the logic of Palmer’s “shorter way” to sanctification and applied it to physical restoration—the seeker did not wait for confirmation in the form of immediate evidence but rather “stood on the promise,” trusting that the blessing would follow. But like Palmer, divine healing advocates gave a mixed message on the role of experience; more than one sufferer described the “warm wave” or other tangible experience that accompanied or anticipated the moment of restoration.¹⁰¹

Gradually, Judd regained her strength and health, and she set out to spread the blessing and the message of divine healing to others. She embarked on a fifty-year ministry, moving from the holiness movement to pentecostalism without breaking stride. Judd’s *The Prayer of Faith* (1880) was probably the first theological treatment of divine healing published in America. As this title suggests, early practitioners of divine healing grounded their beliefs in the straightforward words of James 5:14-15:

Are any among you sick? They should call for the elders of the church and have them pray over them, anointing them with oil in the name of the Lord. The prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will raise them up; and anyone who has committed sins will be forgiven.

Judd’s writing brought her to the attention of others in the holiness and growing divine healing movement. One contact was Charles Cullis (1833-1892), a homeopathic

¹⁰⁰ Cited in Nancy Hardesty, *Faith Cure: Divine Healing in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003), 8.

¹⁰¹ Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 58.

physician and Episcopal layman who after a visit to Trudel's Männerdorf (now run by Samuel Zeller) in 1873 incorporated faith healing into his practice. Cullis was a major shaper of the healing movement through his healing homes, his promotion of healing and holiness literature through his Willard Tract Society and his own publications such as *Faith Cures* (1879), and his connections to other healing and holiness leaders. Inspired by his time in Männerdorf, Cullis republished the anonymous *Dorothea Trudel: The Prayer of Faith*. Cullis also republished Boardman's *The Higher Christian Life*, and Boardman honored his colleague in *Faith Work Under Dr. Cullis* in 1874.

A.B. Simpson was healed of chronic heart problems at a camp meeting in 1881 led by Cullis at Old Orchard, Maine. Simpson's greatest contribution, as has already been noted, was his synthesis of the themes of justification, sanctification, healing, and premillennialism bubbling to the surface of the holiness movement. He also was one of the first to place divine healing on a more comprehensive theological basis:

[R]edemption finds its center in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, and there we must look for the fundamental principle of Divine healing, which rests on the atoning Sacrifice. This necessarily follows from the first principle we have stated [that the causes of disease and suffering are traced to the Fall]. If sickness be the result of the Fall, it must be included in the atonement of Christ, which reaches 'as far as the curse is found.'¹⁰²

This "healing in the atonement" forms one third of what James Robinson calls the "radical triad" of the healing movement. While many early adherents of divine healing, such as Methodist Daniel Steele, argued that faith for healing was only given to some in special circumstances, during the 1880s, leaders like Simpson argued that it was secured

¹⁰² Albert B. Simpson, *The Gospel of Healing* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications, 1915), 34.

for all by Christ's sacrifice.¹⁰³ Another element of the radical stance was the belief that faith obligates God to heal, which was implicit in the stress on James 5 among the earliest leaders of the movement. The third component was the rejection (or at least implicit denigration) of medicine.¹⁰⁴ As evident from the brief history of the development of nineteenth century medicine above, this attitude toward medicine was not nearly as radical in 1890 as it would be today. Many were suspicious of medicine due to its ineffectiveness, internecine squabbles, and its appeal to scientific knowledge not available to all, which seemed to represent an undemocratic system.

The healing movement reached its transatlantic apex in 1885 at the International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness in London, led by Simpson and Boardman. At that time, the little-known holiness and healing minister John Alexander Dowie wrote to the conference from Australia, regretting his inability to attend. He mused that the healing movement was an indication that "primitive lines of spiritual power" were being restored, specifically in the "perpetuity of the gifts of Healing by the Holy Spirit."¹⁰⁵ It was clear from this early date that Dowie had a different approach to healing than his colleagues.

Dowie rose to fame and scorn at the turn of the century for his healing ministry in Chicago and nearby Zion City, Illinois. In his denunciation of medicine, his understanding of healing as an apostolic gift, and in his identification of Satan as the

¹⁰³ Jonathan Richard Baer, "Perfectly Empowered Bodies: Divine Healing in Modernizing America" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2002), 162–163.

¹⁰⁴ Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 2–3.

¹⁰⁵ William Edwin Boardman, *Record of the International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness Held at the Agricultural Hall, London ... 1885* (London: J. Snow & Co., 1885), 171; Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 55–56.

cause of sickness, Dowie moved beyond other faith healers. As Robinson argues, Dowie's ministry marks a turning point in the divine healing movement. Earlier leaders—like Cullis, Simpson, and Boardman—practiced healing in intimate settings, oriented healing around holiness and perpetual dependence on God, deemphasized their personal role, and attributed healing to faith and the atonement. In contrast, later healers, following in Dowie's train, healed in mass meetings, functionally separated holiness from healing, emphasized their own role, and sometimes attributed healing to the spiritual gifts.¹⁰⁶ The distinction can be drawn too starkly, though, for earlier healers like Maria Woodworth-Etter (who, like Carrie Judd, took her ministry into the pentecostal movement) and Daniel S. Warner evinced some of these radical tendencies before Dowie came to wide public notice. Still, Dowie can be seen as a crossroads in divine healing for at least two reasons. First, Dowie had a phenomenal impact on early pentecostalism. Dozens of first generation pentecostals had spent time at Zion City, including F.F. Bosworth, who arrived there in 1902.¹⁰⁷ Second, Dowie attracted opposition even from other moderate supporters of divine healing. Dowie's divisive nature revealed that the movement was not monolithic and that many, when confronted with the options of softening their beliefs or being identified as radicals, would happily choose the latter.

The teachings of spirit-baptism, premillennialism and divine healing were mutually reinforcing, but they presented no syllogism. Believers could easily accept some points without accepting all. This was in fact the party line of moderate holiness adherents associated with the Methodist Episcopal Church and the National Holiness

¹⁰⁶ Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 83, 169.

¹⁰⁷ Dowie's impact on Bosworth and early pentecostalism will be investigated in the next chapter.

Association, who felt that premillennialism and divine healing distracted believers from the central concern of sanctification. But the elements of the fourfold gospel complemented one another and spoke to common concerns. The higher life evangelist and educator R.A. Torrey, who increasingly distanced himself from divine healing after the turn of the century, nonetheless addressed a conference of premillennialists in 1914 arguing that “The Lord’s Second Coming [is] a Motive for Personal Holiness.”¹⁰⁸ More radical leaders like Martin Wells Knapp said much the same thing: “[He] [w]ho constantly expects the coming of the Bridegroom will see that no stains be found on bridal robes, and that slumbering souls be awakened and prepared.”¹⁰⁹ And as we have seen, the turn to pentecostal language to describe sanctification turned holiness adherents’ minds also to Peter’s eschatological urgency in Acts 2. Furthermore, the logic of sanctification (attainable by faith, instantaneous, visible to the senses) was easily applied to emerging theologies of divine healing.

A.B. Simpson’s fourfold gospel made sense to radical holiness adherents because it appealed to their longings for the supernatural. Sanctification (often marked with manifestations of divine power), premillennialism, and divine healing all taught at heart that God was active on earth in unequivocal ways. Developments in theological orientation as well as social forces impelled believers to accept and promote this radical supernaturalism.

¹⁰⁸ Cited in Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism*, 226.

¹⁰⁹ Knapp, *Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies*, 137.

Emergence of Pentecostalism and the Holiness Retreat

The ardent embrace of the fourfold gospel among the radical holiness constituency was short-lived, owing mostly to a division in the ranks that was permanent by the 1910s. A significant number of holiness adherents who came to be known as pentecostals embraced a new expression of supernaturalism that claimed speaking in tongues as the evidence of spirit-baptism. This teaching was first introduced by Charles Parham in 1901 in his work with Bible students in Topeka, Kansas, and garnered wide attention in 1906 as the teaching became the focal point of the Azusa Street revival in Los Angeles. Those who rejected this teaching at first cautiously critiqued, and then dramatically denounced pentecostals.¹¹⁰ In their effort to distance themselves from the “tongues movement,” non-pentecostal holiness believers also distanced themselves from other elements of extreme supernaturalism that pentecostals embraced. The removal of “pentecostal” from many holiness denominational names and publications indicated not only that these groups did not want to be confused with the new tongues movement, but that they were willing to sacrifice to a remarkable degree the supernaturalism that pentecostal language and imagery had brought into the holiness movement.¹¹¹

Aside from speaking in tongues, the most obvious reaction against supernaturalism among non-pentecostal holiness adherents was in divine healing. The practice and doctrine of divine healing had already been challenged in various strands of the holiness movement before pentecostalism emerged, and some argue that the

¹¹⁰ Grant Wacker, “Travail of a Broken Family: Radical Evangelical Responses to the Emergence of Pentecostalism in America, 1906-16,” in *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism*, ed. Edith L. Blumhofer, Russell P. Spittler, and Grant Wacker (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 23–49.

¹¹¹ Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 173.

controversy over divine healing in the late nineteenth century was already sketching the boundaries of religious alignments that would become permanent with the advent of pentecostalism.¹¹² This trend began with the denominations from which the holiness movement had sprung, and continued on in the holiness associations. Mainstream opposition was exemplified in James M. Buckley, who helped align the MEC against faith healing through his editorship of the *Christian Advocate*.¹¹³ In 1897, the NHA forbade discussion of the “side-track” issues of divine healing and premillennialism.

Moderate supporters of divine healing also turned against the doctrine. The Salvation Army maintained in its *Order and Regulations* (1891): “That God should heal the sick after this fashion is in perfect harmony with the views and experience of The Salvation Army from the beginning.”¹¹⁴ While the Army did not promote healing in the atonement, it did not condemn those who did, and left such matters to individual conscience. As the Army consolidated its work in the 1890s, and William Booth faced the sad fact of his wife’s breast cancer, tolerance eroded. A final break came in 1902, when William Booth’s eldest daughter, Kate, and son-in-law, Arthur Booth-Clibborn, left the Salvation Army. Arthur had become enamored of Dowie’s teachings when Dowie had preached in London in 1901. Not surprisingly, Arthur, like F.F. Bosworth, joined the new pentecostal movement in 1906 when Charles Parham came to Zion City to spread his new message. The departure of the Booth-Clibborns scarred William Booth, who responded by railing against faith healing as “false, misleading, and ruinous...dangerous

¹¹² “...the earliest sign of this new departure was not speaking in tongues but ‘healing by faith.’” Cunningham, “From Holiness to Healing,” 499.

¹¹³ Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 185–186.

¹¹⁴ Salvation Army, *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers of the Salvation Army* (London: Headquarters of the Salvation Army, 1891), 52; Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 85.

and productive of evil.” William Booth no longer allowed faith healing to be taught in his organization.¹¹⁵

Some holiness leaders who earlier embraced divine healing came to temper their views. Concerned with the extreme views of radical healers like Dowie, A.B. Simpson began in the 1890s to downplay the teaching in his periodicals and conventions. In 1896, he asserted that the doctrine was important but “very subordinate.”¹¹⁶ In 1884, R. Kelso Carter’s *The Atonement for Sin and Sickness* was one of the strongest theological arguments for divine healing. But when his health began to decline and he failed to receive healing under Cullis, Dowie, or Simpson, he drastically reevaluated his theology, as seen in his “*Faith Healing*” *Reviewed After Twenty Years* (1897).¹¹⁷ R.A. Torrey, Dwight Moody’s colleague in Chicago, also backpedaled on his initial support for divine healing. Torrey had sought Dowie’s prayers for his daughter in 1898, around the same time that Moody and Dowie (also still in Chicago at the time) were sparring over the teaching. Torrey was shamed into denying support for Dowie’s extreme teachings as a face-saving measure for Moody.¹¹⁸ By the 1920s, Torrey had become an outspoken critic of divine healing practices, especially as practiced by pentecostals. Radical supporters of divine healing, like holiness evangelist and organizer Seth Rees, saw the writing on the

¹¹⁵ Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 82–89. William Booth quote on p. 88.

¹¹⁶ Baer, “Perfectly Empowered Bodies,” 95–96.

¹¹⁷ Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 253; Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 189, 194–195.

¹¹⁸ Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 78–80.

wall: “[H]oliness preachers and camps which oppose Divine healing are losing their fire and juice,” decried Rees.¹¹⁹

But even among its radical supporters, divine healing suffered a decline around the turn of the century. Martin Wells Knapp, whose Cincinnati-based International Holiness Union and Prayer League was a central force in radical holiness, took a stand for divine healing. But Knapp also showed caution: “that Jesus ‘bore our infirmities and carried our sickness’ will be known in its fullness only when clad in resurrection robes at His appearing, though scintillations of it reach us here...” Neither did Knapp take Dowie’s hard line on medical means.¹²⁰ Knapp’s work spawned a number of groups.¹²¹ The Pilgrim Holiness Church has been called the “Wesleyan/Holiness expression of Simpson’s ‘Four-fold Gospel.’”¹²² This group remained more committed than other holiness groups to supernaturalism, but they too allowed for deviance from the hard line on divine healing, insisting that they will not “pass judgment upon those who use other providential means for the restoration of health.”¹²³ One of the most radical proponents of divine healing, Daniel S. Warner’s Church of God reformation movement, abandoned its strict commitment to the doctrine in the mid-1920s.¹²⁴ As a result of complex

¹¹⁹ Cited in Baer, “Perfectly Empowered Bodies,” 187.

¹²⁰ Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013, 205; Knapp, *Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies*, 127–128.

¹²¹ The Metropolitan Christian Association, known more colloquially as the Burning Bush movement after its muckraking periodical, carried all the elements of the fourfold gospel into the twentieth century, but had a very small appeal due to their rejection of personal possessions. Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers*.

¹²² Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 264.

¹²³ *Manual of the Pilgrim Holiness Church: Containing Form of Government and Ritual for Churches; Also Location of Ministers. Etcetera...* (Easton, MD: Easton Publishing Company, 1922), 19.

¹²⁴ Michael S. Stephens, “‘Who Healeth All Thy Diseases’: Health, Healing, and Holiness in the Church of God Reformation Movement, 1880-1925” (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 2004).

negotiations over doctrine, the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene adopted an intentionally vague statement on divine healing in its 1908 *Manual*:

We believe in the Bible doctrine of physical healing, and urge our people to seek to offer the prayer of faith for the healing of the sick. Providential means and agencies are not to be refused when necessary.¹²⁵

In remaining silent on the doctrine of healing in the atonement and the certainty of healing, and in authorizing medical means, the Nazarenes took a moderate stance on divine healing.

To a lesser degree, premillennialism was also softened by many holiness groups. It has already been noted that the NHA stifled preaching on premillennialism in 1897. The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene attempted an inclusive stance, saying “we do not regard the numerous theories that gather around this Bible Doctrine as essential to salvation, and so we concede full liberty of belief among the members...”¹²⁶ Nevertheless, their constituency leaned toward premillennialism by the 1920s.¹²⁷ Daniel S. Warner’s Church of God reformation movement adopted a type of amillennialism.¹²⁸

While they held tightly to the doctrine of entire sanctification, the experience of sanctification was also toned down in many of these holiness groups. J.G. Morrison of the Church of the Nazarene argued that while Nazarenes sought a real cleansing from sin,

¹²⁵ Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene General Assembly et al., *Manual of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, [1908]* (Los Angeles: Nazarene Publishing Company, 1908), 35.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹²⁷ Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, 263; Timothy Lawrence Smith, *Called Unto Holiness; the Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years* (Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Pub. House, 1962), 316–317. Smith argues that holiness affinity for fundamentalism and the “shock of the war” led to the increase in premillennialism.

¹²⁸ Ware, *Restorationism in the Holiness Movement in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*, 67–75.

they had no need for “boisterous praying, great bodily exercise,” or “vociferous and constant shouting” and urged adherents to distance themselves from those who taught that manifestations like visions, dreams, or speaking in tongues authenticated the experience.¹²⁹ The Pilgrim Holiness Church likewise repudiated “any teaching...that holds to any particular manifestation, as by the Gift of Tongues, so-called, as proof of this Baptism.”¹³⁰ A.B. Simpson’s Christian and Missionary Alliance gradually underwent a “modification of original objectives” with regard to supernaturalism as well, due in part to its increasing attacks on pentecostalism.¹³¹

Some holiness believers began to reconcile spiritual experience with developing scientific—specifically psychological—notions of the self in what Heather Curtis has called “a sane gospel.” Already in the late 1880s, a rift was beginning to appear between higher life and more radical holiness adherents concerning the nature of authentic, healthy spiritual experiences. This rift may also have paralleled geographical and class distinctions between the two groups. The urban higher life leaders like A.B. Simpson and Carrie Judd, eager to disassociate themselves from Spiritualism and Christian Science that were especially strong in the Northeast, argued that true spiritual experience never compromises volition or mental faculties. On the other hand, more radical leaders like the midwestern Maria B. Woodworth encouraged ecstatic experiences. For radical holiness believers like Woodworth and for later pentecostals, Simpson’s plea that “God does not ask us to give up our sanity” sounded like a betrayal of the original holiness call for

¹²⁹ Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, 316.

¹³⁰ *Manual of the Pilgrim Holiness Church*, 17.

¹³¹ Ernest Gerald Wilson, “The Christian and Missionary Alliance: Developments and Modifications of Its Original Objectives” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1984).

complete consecration. Simpson and his higher life colleagues felt that an appeal to the subliminal mind and temperament could make sense of spiritual experience while maintaining personal volition and judgment. While the use of psychological categories to describe supernatural activity might seem to bolster supernaturalism, it was more often a polemic against ecstatic or involuntary spiritual experiences. Furthermore, psychological categories tended to pull the specific theological meaning out of religious experience. As William James was happy to point out, all religions were gateways to true supernaturalism. Interpreting spiritual experience through psychological categories could also undercut the supernatural impulse, as it anchored the validity of supernaturalism to recent scientific theory rather than on the self-evident power of the divine. And as the subliminal conscious theories of James and F.W.H. Meyers receded behind Freudian and Jungian developmental approaches, this early alliance between supernaturalism and psychology was of little lasting benefit to the supernaturalist cause.¹³²

In the early twentieth century, while holiness and higher life groups were equivocating on divine healing, producing vague statements on eschatology, denouncing manifestations associated with spirit-baptism, and yielding spiritual experience to the judgment of science, the new pentecostal churches clung to their supernaturalist inheritance.¹³³ Still, holiness and higher life groups did not completely abandon

¹³² Heather D. Curtis, "A Sane Gospel: Radical Evangelicals, Psychology, and Pentecostal Revival in the Early Twentieth Century," *Religion and American Culture* 21, no. 2 (June 1, 2011): 195–226, Simpson quote on p. 204; Robert Bruce Mullin, *Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 184–185.

¹³³ The story of holiness retreat from supernaturalism could also be explored as a function of the improved socio-economic status of its adherents by the third decade of the twentieth century, as well as its development from sect to church. The literature on the holiness movement in relation to these sociological factors is mainly speculative, providing nothing comparable to Anderson's well-researched thesis on early pentecostalism in *Vision of the Disinherited*. See Wacker, "Travail of a Broken Family," 30; Melvin E.

supernaturalism. Many held on to one element, like sanctification for the new holiness denominations. Premillennialism also had a remarkable career in the growing fundamentalist movement. A few groups—like the Christian and Missionary Alliance—continued officially to endorse the fourfold gospel. But these stances became increasingly problematic for groups that wanted to disassociate from pentecostalism.

Pentecostal beliefs and practices were not simply a carbon copy of earlier holiness trends. For a variety of reasons, divine healing and the experience of spirit baptism looked different in pentecostal hands.¹³⁴ Pentecostal supernaturalism also had limits. If practices were too easily confused with counterfeits and had no clear biblical justification, they could be judged as “fanaticism.”¹³⁵ But by the 1910s, supernaturalism could be considered, in the words of R.E. McAlister’ quoted at the opening of this chapter, “the characterizing feature” of pentecostalism. McAlister’s three-page tract did not even specifically mention tongues. Up-and-coming Canadian pentecostal minister A.H. Argue insisted in 1921 that pentecostals focus on “essential things,” which meant preaching Christ as “the One who heals the sick, as the One who baptizes with the Holy Ghost as at Pentecost, as the One who is coming again very soon.”¹³⁶ Pentecostal superstar Aimee Semple McPherson explicitly made the “foursquare gospel” the

Dieter, “The Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal Movements: Commonalities, Confrontation, and Dialogue,” *Pneuma* 12, no. 1 (March 1, 1990): 11; Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 142.

¹³⁴ Opp, *The Lord for the Body*; Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 2013.

¹³⁵ This was the case with “writing in unknown languages,” which had been encouraged in the early months of the Azusa Street revival. But when a local Spiritualist began performing this feat for crowds, the pentecostals backed away from the practice, claiming “we do not read anything in the Word” about it. Cecil M. Robeck, *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement* (Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2006), 111–114; *Apostolic Faith (Los Angeles)* 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 2.

¹³⁶ Cited in Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 140.

doctrinal foundation of her work in 1922.¹³⁷ The only change from Simpson's fourfold gospel was the restatement of sanctification as spirit-baptism. Pentecostal spirit-baptism was attested by the supernatural sign of tongues, and also frequently accompanied by intense physical sensations. In William Durham's experience, "my body was worked in sections, a section at a time."¹³⁸ Commitment to divine healing found expression in pentecostal doctrinal statements, the healing ministries of McPherson, John G. Lake, and F.F. Bosworth, and in the 1920 controversy in the International Pentecostal Holiness Church. Against the backdrop of the devastating postwar flu epidemic, the majority affirmed a radical stance, insisting that faith in the Great Physician precludes trust in doctors. The hard line against medicine would not always be the litmus test for pentecostals, but at this early stage in pentecostalism and with other holiness groups relaxing their standards, pentecostals felt the need to assert their loyalty to divine healing in this way.¹³⁹

With the new pentecostal movement emphasizing all the traditional holiness elements of supernaturalism, and non-pentecostal holiness denominations vacillating, pentecostalism emerged as the favored son of the nineteenth-century gospel of the supernatural. Speaking in tongues added a point of doctrinal and social cohesion and validation, providing a convenient rallying point for these supernaturally-inclined believers who felt beset by the culture around them. But the core impulse remained the simple quest for perceptible divine action, and those who were nurtured in holiness

¹³⁷ Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *Aimee Semple McPherson: Everybody's Sister*, Library of Religious Biography (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 191.

¹³⁸ "Personal Testimony of Pastor Durham," *Pentecostal Testimony* (March 1909): 7.

¹³⁹ Joseph W. Williams, *Spirit Cure: A History of Pentecostal Healing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 37.

supernaturalism and continued to promote it after the turn of the century, like F.F. Bosworth, became the key leaders of the early pentecostal movement.

CHAPTER TWO

A Pentecostal Leader-in-the-Making

...I did rise and say these few words, but in a quiet voice, “Praise God, praise God, I believe Pentecost is for me tonight” and sat down...I was definitely conscious of two things—the very near presence of the Devil on one hand and the dear Lord Jesus standing very close by.

—Bernice C. Lee, “A Holy Jubilee”¹

When Fred Francis Bosworth rehearsed his life story for an audience gathered at the Toronto Christian and Missionary Alliance Tabernacle in 1923, a number of details were conspicuously lacking.² Two of the most important figures in Bosworth’s early professional and spiritual development—John Alexander Dowie and Charles Parham—went unnamed as Bosworth recalled his tale of divine providence. Dowie’s utopian community Zion City, Illinois, became a haven for participants in the divine healing movement at the turn of the century, including Bosworth, who lived there, served as a deacon, and worked under Dowie’s employ for a number of years. Charles Parham, who had visited Dowie’s work in Chicago in 1900, came to Zion City in the fall of 1906 and introduced to Bosworth and a host of other Dowieites the doctrine of baptism with the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues. Dowie made Bosworth a spiritual leader;

¹ Bernice C. Lee, “A Holy Jubilee,” *Bread of Life* 5, no. 11 (November 1956): 9.

² F.F. Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story: The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth, as Told by Himself in the Alliance Tabernacle, Toronto* (Toronto: Alliance Book Room, n.d.). Although undated, this Toronto address was most likely delivered in 1923. Bosworth held meetings in Toronto in the spring of 1921 and the first week of May 1922, but the “Alliance Tabernacle” in which he delivered this account was not opened until May 14, 1922. See Lindsay Reynolds, *Rebirth: The Redevelopment of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada* (Willowdale, Ontario: Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada, 1992), 67–69. The 1923 date is corroborated by the fact that the earliest advertisement I have found for this publication is in *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 34 (October 20, 1923): 552.

Parham made him a pentecostal. Yet neither received even passing mention in his brief life account.

Other historians have noted that spiritual autobiography is a selective and meaning-making endeavor laden with theological and personal agendas. As D. Bruce Hindmarsh explains, “At one level, autobiography simply promises to retrace the history of a life, but at a deeper level it is always apologetic of the individual.”³ This can be seen frequently in holiness and pentecostal autobiography. For instance, the notorious holiness-turned-pentecostal healing evangelist Maria Woodworth-Etter conspicuously left out of her lengthy personal story her part in the failed prophecies of a deadly tidal wave to hit the California Bay Area in April of 1890.⁴ As Edith Blumhofer observes about Aimee Semple McPherson’s numerous autobiographical writings:

Sister [Aimee] wrote with hortatory intent that determined content. She used her autobiographies to explain herself in terms of her message, embellished them with justification of who she was and what she did, and glibly ignored vast areas of her life...Her writings are less a record of her life than an interpretation, an intentional and selective presentation of the parts of her experience that she chose to disclose because such disclosure suited her purpose.⁵

No early pentecostal sought first to tell a complete account of accurate historical facts; the main concern was always spiritual truth revealed through personal experience. Like other pentecostal leaders, Bosworth delivered his life story on many occasions.⁶ Through

³ D. Bruce Hindmarsh, *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 5.

⁴ Wayne E. Warner, *The Woman Evangelist: The Life and Times of Charismatic Evangelist Maria B. Woodworth-Etter*, Studies in Evangelicalism No. 8 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1986), 99.

⁵ Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *Aimee Semple McPherson: Everybody’s Sister*, Library of Religious Biography (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 396–397.

⁶ *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 40 (January 1, 1921): 1; C.C. Fitch, “Bosworth Campaign in Toledo,” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 34 (November 5, 1921): 538. Aimee Semple McPherson not only wrote and delivered orally her autobiographical account, but performed it—with costumes and props—yearly on her

retellings as a person ages, the spiritual autobiography may shift and grow, and emphases may change. The highly subjective nature of spiritual autobiography is helpful to keep in mind when weighing Bosworth's own retelling of his life, as well as the biography composed by his early admirer Eunice Perkins, who probably used an earlier draft of Bosworth's autobiography as a main source.⁷ This subjectivity, while frustrating to the historian on a quest for hard facts, is immensely helpful for understanding the deeper historical truths of motivation and the construction of meaning within communities.

Bosworth had good reason in the early 1920s to leave Dowie and Parham out of his account. Neither leader, each who showed so much promise in the early years of the century, claimed many disciples by the end of the first decade. In September 1905, Dowie had suffered a debilitating stroke and increasingly came under suspicion of sexual misconduct and misappropriation of funds. His progressively grandiose claims about himself—first as Messenger of the Covenant, then Elijah the Restorer, then First Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ—began to create tensions and further alienate him from others in the holiness and divine healing movement. Dowie's death in 1907 simply capped his steady decline in authority. And Parham, although beginning from a position of strength in the early 1900s as he propagated his view of spirit-baptism, quickly fell from grace in the pentecostal movement he helped create. He began to lose control when he decided not to go immediately to Azusa Street when his student William Seymour began reporting a new Pentecost at this outpost of Parham's Apostolic Faith network. When Parham finally

birthday as "From Milkpail to Pulpit" for her Los Angeles congregation. Blumhofer, *Aimee Semple McPherson*, 372–373.

⁷ Similarities in phraseology between Bosworth's autobiography and Perkin's work abound. Compare, for instance, Bosworth, *Bosworth's Life Story*, 2–3; and Eunice May Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story* (Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921), 21.

did come to Los Angeles at the end of 1906, he lambasted the worship and preaching he encountered, making many more enemies than friends. By mid-1907 he was also effectively disowned by his supporters in the Midwest and South after the national press aired allegations of sexual misconduct and connected Parham's ministry to the manslaughter of an invalid woman being exorcised by pentecostals. Of particular concern to Bosworth, Parham was the originator of the initial evidence teaching, which by 1918 Bosworth viewed as an unscriptural innovation. Bosworth, being effectively disowned by pentecostal denominations who embraced this teaching and finding his support in broader evangelical circles, gained nothing by advertising his earlier connections to Parham.

Bosworth's own self-conscious editing notwithstanding, no discussion of his life is complete without attention to Dowie and Parham. In part, this chapter will attempt to do what Bosworth avoided, that is, place Bosworth firmly in the stream of the radical holiness and early pentecostal movements developed by Dowie, Parham and others who carried into the new century the radical holiness quest for the supernatural. Like Bernice Lee, who witnessed Bosworth's pentecostal baptism and experienced her own eleven days later at Dowie's Zion City, these believers were conspicuous for their penchant for sensing both God and the devil at work in the world. Coming to spiritual maturity in this milieu, Bosworth emerges as the typical pentecostal leader-in-the-making, but one who, like others who are often marginalized in pentecostal history, had no lasting connection to the classical pentecostal denominations and no significant ties to the famed Azusa Street revival.

Childhood, Conversion, and Healing

Fred Francis Bosworth, the second son of Burton and Amelia Bosworth, was born on January 17, 1877, on a farm near what would be Utica, Nebraska.⁸ He was an adventurous yet sensitive youngster, showing an early interest in turning a profit and in entertaining through music—not the stuff of childhood piety. Through a series of transactions, he was able to obtain a cornet, an instrument that had impressed him when earlier he attended a Civil War reunion with his father. Bosworth carefully taught himself how to play the instrument during down time while working in his father’s feed store. His passion for music would prove to be a decisive factor in his later development as a religious leader. Despite the fact that his parents were “devout Methodists,” Bosworth never indicated that his family had any decisive spiritual influence on him. Instead, his spiritual journey—as he saw it—began when at age seventeen he joined his friend Miss Maude Greene at a meeting at the First Methodist church in Omaha. In order to please his friend, he was compelled to come forward when a call for salvation was offered. Once there, however, he was impressed that he must make a definite decision, one that would have an eternal impact. At the altar, he said “yes” to God in typical Methodist and revivalist fashion.

While he never evinced doubts about the authenticity of his conversion, and in fact experienced an initial surge of joy, Bosworth later bemoaned that he remained adrift for a number years following this experience. This problem, he felt, could have been resolved by the baptism with the Holy Spirit. Along with many early pentecostals,

⁸ Unless otherwise noted, biographical information on Bosworth’s life before 1902 comes from Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 19–38; Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story*. This booklet was republished with slight variations as F.F. Bosworth, “From Farm to Pulpit,” *Bread of Life* 29, no. 6 (June 1980): 5–6, 8, 11.

Bosworth felt that spirit-baptism could remedy a myriad of problems converted Christians experienced—lack of power over sin, ineffectiveness in ministry, vocational indecision, and assurance of salvation, among other issues.⁹ By his own admission, Bosworth was without direction and motivation after his conversion, evidenced by the quick succession of jobs he held. Bosworth’s late teenager years provide ample evidence of what historian Robert M. Anderson has called the “job-hopping tendency” that typified the transitory economic experience of the early pentecostal leaders’ industrializing and urbanizing lower-middle class.¹⁰ In the 1890s, Bosworth worked in turn as an engineer in a windmill factory, a grocery clerk, a cook, a butcher, a railroad worker, a cross-cut saw operator, and a house painter. His contemporary biographer interpreted Bosworth’s adolescent aimlessness in words reminiscent of St. Augustine’s memorable prayer:

A soul in whom God lives will be restless and wholly unsatisfied until it has found—after trying one thing, then another, as such a soul is likely to do—the very center of God’s will for that soul.¹¹

Bosworth’s family had moved to University Place, a suburb of Lincoln, sometime in the early 1890s. Around this time, Bosworth had developed a lung ailment that he attributed to exposure to the cold winter air after leaving an overheated room where he was helping with an operation on a neighbor boy who had been accidentally shot.

Bosworth’s lungs continued to bother him despite taking “lung builder and food tonic.”

⁹ An excellent example of early pentecostals’ view of spirit-baptism as a panacea is seen in the testimony of Antoinette Moomau: “To sum it up, the baptism of the Spirit means to me what I never dreamed it could this side of Heaven: victory, glory in my soul, perfect peace, rest, liberty, nearness to Christ, deadness to this old world, and power in witnessing.” Antoinette Moomau, “China Missionary Receives Pentecost,” *Apostolic Faith*, (Los Angeles), 1, no. 11 (January 1908): 3. Cited in Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010), 153.

¹⁰ Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1992), 107.

¹¹ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 38.

A University Place physician determined his condition was incurable. Bosworth then moved briefly to Prophetstown, Illinois, to stay with extended family, hoping to rest. He was bedridden for several weeks before deciding to make a trip to the newly-incorporated city of Fitzgerald, Georgia, where his parents had moved.¹² The trip was particularly painful. He later recalled that he “coughed violently all the way and the jarring of the train was like knives piercing my lungs.”¹³ Bosworth expected this to be his last chance to see his family before he died. While his health improved some in the Georgia air, Bosworth continued to suffer a painful cough.

In Fitzgerald, Bosworth’s life took many turns for the better. He met with new professional success, operating a barber shop and later becoming assistant post master and campaigning successfully for city clerk. His music interests blossomed, as he took charge of the Empire State Band. And although an earlier love interest had broken their engagement, in Fitzgerald, Bosworth met Estella—like him, a Nebraska transplant—whom he married in late 1900. This series of improvements began with the most important event in Bosworth’s early life: the healing of his lung problems under the ministry of holiness evangelist Mattie Perry sometime between 1896 and 1898.¹⁴

¹² Fitzgerald was incorporated in 1896 as a haven for Union veterans. Roscoe Barnes, “Why F.F. Bosworth and His Family Moved to Fitzgerald, Ga.,” accessed November 6, 2013, http://www.academia.edu/2281739/Why_F._F._Bosworth_and_His_Family_Moved_to_Fitzgerald_Ga.

¹³ F.F. Bosworth, “Discerning the Lord’s Body,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 4.

¹⁴ Pavel Hejzlar dates Bosworth’s healing to 1900. Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis Macnutt in Dialogue*, Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies, 4 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 19. Roscoe Barnes puts the healing around 1899. Roscoe Barnes, *F.F. Bosworth: The Man Behind “Christ the Healer”* (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 77. Bosworth nowhere gives the exact date of his healing, but based on various strands of evidence, I surmise his healing to be earlier, sometime between 1896 and 1898. Bosworth stated that *after his healing* he worked as a barber for an unspecified time, two years as assistant post master, and two more as city clerk—a position he lost in December 1900. Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story*, 6; Roscoe Barnes, “F.F. Bosworth: A Historical Analysis of the Influential Factors in His Life and Ministry” (Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria, 2009), 236. In his *Life Story* published in

Mattie Perry (1868-1957) of South Carolina was the daughter of a travelling Methodist evangelist who, as she put it, “trusted God for healing.”¹⁵ Perry was converted at age twelve.¹⁶ In 1884 Perry witnessed the deaths of a sister and a brother, after which she began to sense a call to the mission field. Perry was sanctified in July 1887 when she, in the language of Phoebe Palmer, “consecrated” herself.¹⁷ And like Palmer, while she claimed the blessing by faith, she testified to an immediate experience of reassurance. “He most graciously heard my cry,” she gloried, “cleansed my heart, and flooded my soul with His Spirit. I knew that the work was done.”¹⁸ Her sanctification theology evinced the Wesleyan cleansing theme as well as the newer pentecostal imagery. “[W]e can’t live [a pure, virtuous life],” she declared, “until we are cleansed, and filled with the Holy Spirit.” Months later, she was testifying publically to her experience and counseling seekers at Twelve Mile Campground in Pickens, South Carolina.¹⁹

Perry continued her ad hoc ministry at Williamston Female College, in Williamston, South Carolina, where she organized prayer meetings. While at Williamston, Perry’s lifelong health problems first surfaced. She felt she was a “physical wreck” and had recurring eye problems, heart and lungs diseases, and neuralgia. Like

1923 (see note 2), Bosworth stated that he would have been dead “twenty-five years now” had he not been healed. This would place his healing in 1898 at the latest, but it is possible that Bosworth’s figure of “twenty-five years” was absent-mindedly borrowed from an earlier telling of the story, which would date the healing earlier as well. Finally, placing Bosworth’s healing between 1896 and 1898 also better corresponds with Mattie Perry’s itinerancy, as she began a more settled ministry in 1898 when she founded Elhanan Institute.

¹⁵ Mattie E. Perry, *Christ and Answered Prayer* (Nashville: Benson Printing Company, 1939), 22.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 37.

most others who later testified to divine healing, she complained of growing worse under the treatment of physicians and of being discouraged “by some that the day of miracles was past.” But she could not square this Calvinist heritage with her simple reading of Hebrews 13:8: “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever.” At one point her illness forced her to leave school for a year, during which she claimed to be miraculously healed through the prayers of one “who taught divine healing.”²⁰

With her health renewed, Perry returned to school, finishing her studies in June 1892. Around this time, she began independent city mission work in Spartanburg, “praying with the unsaved and endeavoring to point them to the Lamb of God” as well as distributing tracts, leading children’s services and teaching a temperance class.²¹ In 1893 she applied to the Methodist Church for official commission in city mission work. She was discouraged when all they would offer her was work as a sales agent of *Way of Faith*, an influential southern holiness periodical that would later be a chief promoter of pentecostalism to southern holiness circles. But without any assigned territory, she lamented, “I could do very little.” Another setback occurred in 1894 when she applied to the Methodist Episcopal Church Board of Missions to work in China. She was denied and was advised to commit herself to informal domestic work.²²

Soon after these rejections, Perry was tapped to work interdenominational tent meetings in connection with her *Way of Faith* work. While she averred that she was “not fighting church institutions,” she believed that independent work brought more glory to

²⁰ Ibid., 40–42, 69.

²¹ Ibid., 46–47.

²² Ibid., 53.

God. Perry was so intent on letting God alone be glorified in her work that she claimed she had no natural ability. Even when her pastor tried to find some talent to nurture in her for her mission work, he admitted he found none. In her tent work, Perry worked alongside evangelists J.A. Williams and H.H. Merritt, her brother Sam, and later her father and her sister Lillie as organist. Eventually her brother Jim joined them as well, and tent evangelism was truly a family business. Their work was centered on the Carolinas and Georgia, but Perry claimed to have traveled to twelve states.²³ After attending a Christian and Missionary Alliance convention in New York in 1895, Perry began training at the Alliance's New York Missionary Institute, the precursor of Nyack College.²⁴ She left the Missionary Institute in May 1896, serving as the superintendent for the Alliance (which at this time was fully nondenominational) for a number of southern states in conjunction with her tent evangelism.²⁵

Early in her tent work, Perry felt convicted that she had not testified publically to her divine healing. As with holiness believers in Palmer's line, adherents of divine healing frequently believed that testifying to one's healing was a condition of keeping it.²⁶ After a study of the scriptures on the topic, Perry began to devote one service in each revival to healing. "Sinners wanted a perfect Savior," she beamed, "one who can save to

²³ Ibid., 55–57.

²⁴ Ibid., A.B. Simpson's introduction, 42–43.

²⁵ Ibid., 145.

²⁶ On the importance of testifying in Palmer's theology, see Charles Edward White, *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist, and Humanitarian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press, 1986), 139–140; Harold E. Raser, *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought*, *Studies in Women and Religion*, v. 22 (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1987), 175–177.

the uttermost, both body and soul.”²⁷ She soon began to see results, praying successfully for the healing of an Atlanta woman who had broken her leg and hip. In South Carolina, another sufferer, a teenage “poor crippled negro boy” told Perry that he had been sent to her by a local physician. As was the case for most who practiced faith healing, Perry believed that healing should not come before conversion, and so she advised him in salvation before she would pray for his healing. The boy claimed salvation and healing the same night under Perry’s ministrations. In Fitzgerald, Georgia, where Perry prayed for Bosworth’s healing, a woman was healed of chronic scrofula, a type of tuberculosis that affected the lymph nodes and often resulted in drainage from the neck. In all cases, Perry emphasized the instantaneous nature of divine healing. In North Carolina, a woman suffering from dropsy asked for prayer. Perry asked her a series of questions culminating in: “If [God] is willing and able to heal you [as you have confessed], when does He want to heal you?” The woman gave the only acceptable response: “Now.” She was healed “the moment her faith took it,” according to Perry.²⁸

Perry’s evangelistic work also incorporated a missionary impulse. After attending the Christian and Missionary Alliance convention in New York at which A.B. Simpson raised \$14,000 for missions, the Perrys committed to supporting a missionary and began receiving offerings for missions in their meetings.²⁹ Perry also felt strongly that all races should hear the gospel, and at most meetings blacks joined the congregation in a

²⁷ Perry, *Christ and Answered Prayer*, 59.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 72–76.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 96.

designated section. At each revival, Perry recalled, one service was devoted to blacks, who led in singing, praying, and shouting. Perry herself often oversaw these services.³⁰

Perry is remembered most for her Elhanan Bible and Training School, which was constructed from an unfinished hotel in Marion, North Carolina. The school opened in 1898 with six teachers and nineteen students. In 1901, she added an orphanage. At its height, the school served 150 at a time, and Perry claimed to have had 1,200 students pass through before fire crippled the institution in 1926 and it was closed the following year.³¹ For Perry, evangelism worked hand in hand with social service. She aimed to “bless suffering humanity, rob hell of her victims, make earth better, and heaven richer and sweeter.”³² Perry believed that salvation was linked to cleanliness, and her temperance work was closely tied to evangelism.³³ Her theology of healing flowed from this recognition that “the whole man is included in redemption.”³⁴

Through much of the first two decades of the twentieth century, Perry had severe health problems, confined often to a wheelchair. But Perry resumed in itinerant ministry in the 1920s and 30s. In fact, she assisted in Bosworth’s Pittsburg campaign in 1920.³⁵ She also held meetings at Bosworth’s Dallas church in March of 1921.³⁶ In 1928 and 1929 she undertook a year-long trip to the Holy Lands. Inspired by the sacred geography,

³⁰ Ibid., 56–58.

³¹ Ibid., 158.

³² Ibid., 123.

³³ Ibid., 50–51, 60, 165.

³⁴ Ibid., 228.

³⁵ Ibid., 229.

³⁶ Ibid., 237.

she began producing Bible harmonies to use as correspondence courses, and in this connection, Perry joined the faculty of God's Bible School in Cincinnati in 1937, which had been founded by holiness legend Martin Wells Knapp.³⁷

Like many holiness evangelists, and like Bosworth, Perry had a complex relationship to the emerging pentecostal movement. Perry's brother Samuel, who had assisted at Elhanan, received his spirit-baptism in August of 1907 and became an influential early pentecostal. By the end of 1907, Samuel had led pentecostal meetings in Marion in conjunction with Elhanan Institute.³⁸ In 1909 he joined with the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) and continued to spread Pentecost throughout the South. Mattie probably received her pentecostal baptism at the 1907 meetings, and she accompanied Samuel on his pioneer pentecostal mission to Cuba in 1910.³⁹ Mattie nowhere detailed her understanding of pentecostal baptism, and never mentioned speaking in tongues. In 1923, Samuel joined the Assemblies of God ministerial roster and became a general presbyter with the denomination in 1925. In 1928, Mattie joined Samuel on the Assemblies of God roster and continued in good standing through November 1931.⁴⁰

³⁷ Ibid., 266.

³⁸ "Good Tidings from Marion, N.C.," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 1, no. 4 (December 15, 1907): 1. See also "Report of Meeting: Newton, N.C., July 18, 1910," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 3, no. 67 (August 1, 1910): 4.

³⁹ Perry, *Christ and Answered Prayer*, 65.

⁴⁰ In 1919, Samuel had been pushed out of the Church of God over disagreements with the denomination's exclusivity and approach to giving. For Samuel's and Mattie's affiliation with the AG, see *Constitution and By-Laws of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...Minutes 1929 with List of Ministers and Missionaries* (Springfield, MO: General Council of the Assemblies of God, 1929), 116; *Official List of Ministers and Missionaries of the General Council Assemblies of God, Revised November 1, 1930* (Springfield, MO: General Council Assemblies of God, 1930), 28. A handwritten note in the 1930 roster states that Mattie Perry's ordination lapsed November 18, 1931. Sam rejoined the Church of God in 1934 only to leave again in 1940 to seek a wider independent ministry.

Although Perry's exact commitment to pentecostal theology is difficult to ascertain, she clearly shared the pentecostal supernaturalistic worldview. While at school in New York, she testified constantly to miraculous answers to prayer. The money for her trip was provided when she did not even have enough to mail a letter to the school. "In one day in answer to prayer," she beamed, "a hat, money, fruit and tracts were given me by my loving heavenly Father." Perry saw God's supernatural benevolence everywhere she looked. The smallest incidents in life took on epic spiritual meaning, and even the unexpected gift of fifty cents was a cause to rejoice that "faith takes hold of promises."⁴¹ Yet Perry's interpretation of life events was more nuanced than later healing advocates would often have it. She did not believe that healing was always God's will, and she recognized that suffering was often given by God as a test.⁴² Even after her healing, she taught that God might allow suffering. After she was "proved" through her suffering, Perry testified to renewed health at the time of her pentecostal spirit-baptism.⁴³ After she was healed again in 1919, she embarked on an evangelistic trip in the West.⁴⁴ As reporters recognized, "the big attraction was divine healing" in many of Perry's meetings.⁴⁵

For Bosworth, the most important development in Perry's life was her dedication to faith healing in the mid-1890s. While attending Perry's service in Fitzgerald, Georgia,

⁴¹ Perry, *Christ and Answered Prayer*, 44.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 68.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁴⁴ Mattie E. Perry, "A Call to Prayer," *Latter Rain Evangel* 12, no. 5 (February 1920): 8–9; Perry, *Christ and Answered Prayer*, 204.

⁴⁵ Perry, *Christ and Answered Prayer*, 239.

Bosworth “coughed painfully” and “went to the front to be prayed for.” As Perkins explains it,

Miss Perry told him how lovingly ready God was to make him well, in the name of Jesus, and laying her hands on him she prayed that he might be healed. From that self-same hour Fred began to mend, until, ere many days, his lung trouble was entirely a thing of the past.⁴⁶

As Bosworth himself told it to the audience gathered at the Toronto Alliance Tabernacle, “Miss Perry told me that I did not need to die, that it was God’s will to heal me. Then she prayed for me and I was healed.”⁴⁷

The aimlessness that plagued Bosworth after his conversion seemed to be dispelled by his healing. Now he had, according to Perkins, both the ambition and physical ability to work.⁴⁸ After a short stint as owner of a barber shop, Bosworth was encouraged to serve as Fitzgerald’s assistant post master—a job that gave him his first experience in public life. He leveraged this experience into a successful bid for City Clerk. He served in this capacity until his support for Prohibition hobbled his reelection campaign in 1900. But his political—and presumably fiscal—experience fitted him well for subsequent jobs in Fitzgerald as a bookkeeper and bank teller. All the while, Bosworth had been developing his musical talents as leader for two local bands that merged under his directing. Bosworth’s personal life was also enriched when in 1900 he married Estella, who would be his companion in life and ministry until her death in 1919.

⁴⁶ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 28.

⁴⁷ Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story*, 6.

⁴⁸ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 31.

The City of God

While Bosworth was basking in the after-effects of his divine healing, he was also growing frustrated with the ungodly associations into which he was led by his musical interests. Luckily, he discovered these two concerns could be merged when in Fitzgerald he came across an issue of *Leaves of Healing*, the weekly periodical published by John Alexander Dowie from Zion City, Illinois. Dowie had dedicated Zion City on the shores of Lake Michigan in 1900, opened its gates to residents in 1901, and formally incorporated the city in March of 1902. That same year, Bosworth and his family moved to the Midwestern utopia. Thoroughly bearing the stamp of its enigmatic leader, Zion City was an exhaustively supernaturalist experiment, founded on the pillars of “primitive order and primitive power.”⁴⁹

John Alexander Dowie (1847-1907) was born in Scotland, grew up in Australia, and returned to Scotland for his university education.⁵⁰ He began his ministry with the Congregational Church in 1872 in the Sydney area. In 1876, Dowie’s ministry expanded to include divine healing when, in the course of a plague that had him conducting some forty funerals, he prayed for a woman who quickly recovered. He left the Congregationalist ministry in 1878 and established his Free Christian Church in

⁴⁹ Philip L. Cook, *Zion City, Illinois: Twentieth-Century Utopia* (Syracuse University Press, 1996), 172.

⁵⁰ Unless otherwise noted, this outline of Dowie’s ministry is based on Grant Wacker, “Marching to Zion: Religion in a Modern Utopian Community,” *Church History* 54, no. 4 (December 1, 1985): 496–511; and Grant Wacker, Chris R. Armstrong, and Jay S.F. Blossom, “John Alexander Dowie: Harbinger of Pentecostal Power,” in *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders*, ed. Grant Wacker and James R. Goff (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2002), 3–19. More detail can be found in Rolvix Harlan, “John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1906); and Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*. A sympathetic, but sober and straightforward account of Dowie’s life can be found in Gordon Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie, Whose Trials, Tragedies, and Triumphs Are the Most Fascinating Object Lesson of Christian History* (Shreveport, LA: Voice of Healing Publishing Co., 1951).

Melbourne in 1883. Shortly after this, he also organized the Divine Healing Association, and began making a name for himself by denouncing liquor. Inspired by a vision, Dowie took his ministry to the United States in 1888, establishing a base in San Francisco and itinerating along the West Coast. He moved into the Midwest in 1890, launching evangelistic campaigns from his base in the Chicago area. His fame exploded when during the Chicago World's Fair 1893 he set up a wood hut tabernacle across from the Wild West Show of Buffalo Bill Cody, and even healed Cody's relative Sadie Cody.⁵¹

Always welcoming a good controversy, Dowie began to run afoul of medical law in 1895, and he claimed he was arrested almost 100 times and spent \$20,000 in legal defense. These legal altercations gave him a national platform from which he would preach the gospel, denounce sin, denominations, and medicine, and make declarations about his own unique role as God's end-time servant. This year marks a turning point in Dowie's ministry: angered by the criticism he was receiving from other churches as well as the press and the medical profession, he created the Christian Catholic Church and essentially became a denomination unto himself. Until this time he had encouraged those to whom he ministered to remain in their own congregations. From this point forward, he viewed his own organization as the only true church, although remnants of Zion could be found in other denominations. He declared without remorse that his mission was to "smash every other church in existence."⁵² This Dowie did through a combination of belligerence and bombast, condemning other churches and making outrageous claims for

⁵¹ For the Sadie Cody healing, see Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 12.

⁵² Harlan, "John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion," 1.

his own authority. An early scholar of the Christian Catholic Church called this Dowie's "vice of the superlative."⁵³

Dowie envisioned Zion City to be a place where his "full gospel" of salvation, healing, and holy living could thrive. Although committed to constitutional procedure, Dowie ran Zion City as a theocracy—a label he proudly claimed. "It is not the rule of the people, but the rule of God that will bring peace and blessing," declared Dowie at the inauguration of his Theocratic Party in the spring of 1902. "Authority and Power come from above, not from beneath."⁵⁴ From June 1901, acceptance of Dowie as Elijah was required for residence in Zion City.⁵⁵

The population of Zion City during its utopian era probably topped around 7,500, bringing residents from across the nation and the globe (they claimed thirty-seven nationalities) to the approximately ten square miles that hugged Lake Michigan's shoreline between Milwaukee and Chicago—or "Beer and Babel," as Dowie referred to the cities. Dowie's success owed to a combination of secular acumen, political aggressiveness and spiritual earnestness. Zion City was politically progressive and morally conservative—the necessary ingredients for every Progressive era cocktail of reform. Residents were prohibited from smoking, dancing, drinking, gambling, swearing and even spitting. As Philip Cook puts it, Dowie's followers yearned for "a community where it would be easy to do right and hard to do wrong."⁵⁶ Like Mattie Perry, Dowie

⁵³ Ibid., 59.

⁵⁴ Cited in Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 104–105.

⁵⁵ Wacker, Armstrong, and Blossom, "John Alexander Dowie: Harbinger of Pentecostal Power," 8. For the "restoration vow," see Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 145–146.

⁵⁶ Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, x.

taught a correspondence between cleanliness and salvation: “Instead of [cleanliness] being ‘next to godliness,’” instructed a Zion publication, “Zion believes that it is godliness.”⁵⁷

A nearly self-contained economy created a small boom for the community in its early years, and many residents were drawn to the community for financial security during one of the bleakest times for the American working class. A profit-sharing system persuaded residents that Zion’s slogan was true: “Where God Rules Man Prospers.” With a lace factory as the economic backbone, Zion City was a society complete in itself. Bank, building society, publishing company, general store, hotel, daily newspaper, and manufacturing of candy, furniture, and soap rounded out the economy of the community. Homes for orphans, wayward women, and the elderly attested to its commitment to benevolence. A school system provided education for all ages through college. Zionites enjoyed a vibrant recreational and social life, with a soda fountain, ice cream parlor, and an athletic association. The newspaper of nearby Waukegan quipped, however, that in Zion baseball, “players will not be permitted to steal bases.”⁵⁸ And of course, religion was at the center of life, just as the 5,200-seat Shiloh Tabernacle sat at the center of the city. The property lease was the regulatory principle of the community. Residents did not own their property, but leased it for 1,100 years. This signaled the community’s belief that Christ would return within a hundred years to establish the millennium. The lease also signaled residents’ complete submission to Dowie’s leadership, since leases could be revoked for serious infractions of Zion policy.

⁵⁷ Cited in *Ibid.*, 122.

⁵⁸ “How ’Tis Done in Zion,” *Waukegan Daily Sun*, April 9, 1903, 2.

Dowie's vision was grand and ever-expanding. This ambition was the key of his success and the thread of Zion's unraveling. In the fall of 1903, Dowie led a group of three thousand Zionites on a crusade to New York City. The visitation was an object of fascination for the press, as it was covered daily in the *New York Times* and received national attention. From October 18 to November 1, Dowie held meetings at Madison Square Garden, mostly to mediocre results: only eighty baptisms and one hundred twenty-five new members resulted from the New York crusade.⁵⁹ Crowds in New York frequently left after a few minutes into the services, and Dowie caused intrigue with his public revelation in New York that John Murray Dowie was not his father.⁶⁰ Still, Dowie declared the trip a success because his workers had canvassed one million homes with Zion's full gospel and he was confident that "what God would do would be seen in due time."⁶¹ But heavenly jewels do not pay the rent. The New York work cost at least \$250,000 and coincided with financial difficulties in general. Dowie tried to raise funds by applying pressure on Zionites to give to the church and invest in the community, offering interest guarantees that were irresponsible if not criminal. Beginning in November 1903, Zion workers were paid in scrip.⁶² Dowie's extended absence during a world tour in 1904 exacerbated issues of finances and confidence, as did his increasing

⁵⁹ Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 146–150.

⁶⁰ "Parentage of Dowie," *Dallas Morning News*, October 27, 1903. One may speculate that with Dowie's unexpected disavowal of his father in 1903 and his refusal to use his surname following his elevation as First Apostle, he may have been cultivating a "fatherless" persona, laying the groundwork for a future claim to be the reincarnation of the Messiah. As Harlan—even without reference to these incidents—suggested, this would have been the next logical step. Harlan, "John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion," 38–39.

⁶¹ "New York Visitation of Elijah the Restorer and Zion Restoration Host," *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 5 (November 21, 1903): 146.

⁶² Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 154–158.

obsession with pouring scarce resources into a new Zion establishment in Mexico. In January of 1905, the deaths of Dowie's personal attendant Carl Stern and Abigail Speicher, wife of Overseer J.G. Speicher, cast a pale over the community that viewed life and health as signs of divine pleasure. To make matters worse, Zion's General Financial Manager and his secretary—both deacons in the church—resigned around the same time.⁶³

Through these difficulties, Dowie was usually able to restore confidence and retain commitment from Zionites through his charisma. It did not hurt that his return from his world tour in June of 1904 seemed to trigger much-needed rain during a summer drought. By and large, his followers believed their leader—by this time recognized as First Apostle—had the stamp of God upon all his work. But neither Dowie nor Zion could recover when the Apostle suffered a stroke in September of 1905 and again in December. The Apostle decided to recuperate in Jamaica. Initially Dowie left Zion in the hands of a newly-appointed triumvirate, but later decided to bring in Wilber Glenn Voliva, the Overseer of the Australian branch, who arrived in February of 1906. Although Voliva was chosen for his proven zeal and loyalty to Dowie, he quickly became Dowie's chief adversary. In April, while Dowie was in Mexico, Voliva and overseers ousted Dowie from leadership. Voliva and others garnered public support through a smear campaign against Dowie that made accusations of financial mismanagement and sexual misconduct. Rumors began to fly that Dowie was planning to introduce polygamy to the community. A legal battle ensued, and in September Voliva was elected as leader

⁶³ Ibid., 177–179.

of a hobbled City of God. Dowie died the next year deserted by all but a small loyal following who would sit at the Prophet's bedside to listen to his weekly sermons.

How much Bosworth knew of the battles over leadership in 1906 is not known. As a deacon and leader of the much-lauded Zion City Band, Bosworth could not have been ignorant of the high level disputes. With more than a decade of distance from the tumultuous months in Zion in mid-1906, Bosworth's biographer exonerated Bosworth for his participation in the failed utopia:

There are sane, spiritual, trusted men of God, in this country today, who will agree with the writer that when 'Mr. Dowie' first came to the public notice he was a true Christian man, most certainly used of God.⁶⁴

This half-excuse was the normal defense of those who came from Zion. As early as 1906, in the midst of Voliva's upheaval, Harlan noted that those who left Zion or repudiated Dowie disagreed with his leadership style, his morals, or his misguided claims about his own spiritual role, but never disavowed his ability to heal.⁶⁵ In other words, Dowie's followers would not disown their own experience of the supernatural at his hands. While Bosworth was not healed by Dowie, the entire enterprise of Zion was built upon Dowie's divine authority, the most visible validation of which was his ability to heal.

Arriving sometime in 1902, Bosworth was baptized on August 10 at Shiloh Tabernacle by J.G. Spiecher, who would also later join the pentecostal movement. In submitting to baptism, Bosworth joined more than thirteen thousand believers who had been baptized under the auspices of the Christian Catholic Church since the opening of Chicago's Central Zion Tabernacle in 1897. Bosworth's baptism coincided with the

⁶⁴ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 35.

⁶⁵ Harlan, "John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion," 79.

departure of the city's legal counsel, Samuel Packard, and rumors that Packard's exit foretold of deeper unrest. Preceding the baptismal service, however, Zion's leaders one-by-one publically affirmed their loyalty to Dowie.⁶⁶ In this atmosphere, Bosworth made his commitment to Dowie's religion public in baptism. How long Bosworth had been in Zion City at that point is unknown, but by the time of his baptism, he considered the Illinois utopia his home.⁶⁷ Bosworth may have been baptized earlier at the time of his conversion or some other time, but Dowie's particular understanding of baptism required believers to be rebaptized. Dowie argued that the biblical pattern for baptism was triune immersion, and all other forms were "useless." Dowie went so far as to say that "all who believe in single immersion are lost forever."⁶⁸ As Bosworth submitted to Dowie's teaching in baptism, he also most likely assented to Dowie's claim to be Elijah. Bosworth, along with thirty-four others, was ordained a deacon in Zion at the third Feast of Tabernacles on July 21, 1903, and certainly he made the required pledge as an officer in the city.⁶⁹

Bosworth's dedication to Zion City and its gospel was not simply the decision of an individual. Bosworth's entire immediate family joined him in Dowie's City of God. Bosworth's wife Estella was baptized in Lake Michigan on August 23, 1902, by Zion elder T.E. Cairns, and Bosworth's father, who found employment in Zion at the hospice,

⁶⁶ "Deacons Laud Dowie," *Waukegan Daily Sun*, August 11, 1902, 2; "Why They Are in Zion," *Zion Banner*, August 12, 1902, 197.

⁶⁷ "Obeying God in Baptism," *Leaves of Healing* 11, no. 17 (August 16, 1902): 576.

⁶⁸ "Dowie Rails at Churches," *Waukegan Daily Sun*, July 21, 1902, 2.

⁶⁹ "Closing Service of the Feast," *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 18 (August 22, 1903): 576; "Close of Third Feast," *Zion Banner*, July 24, 1903, 155; "Some Figures of the Feast," *Zion Banner*, July 24, 1903, 158, indicates that two elders, four evangelists, and fifty-two deaconess were also ordained on this occasion.

followed in baptism on October 22, 1902.⁷⁰ Bosworth's mother arrived in Zion in April of 1903 and was baptized that September. His children Vivian and Vernon were consecrated in 1904.⁷¹ At some point, Bosworth's brother Burton Bell (B.B.) also joined the family in Zion. Burton worked for many years in the Zion City post office.

Turn-of-the-century Americans like the Bosworths were attracted to Zion City for a number of reasons. As Grant Wacker, Chris Armstrong, and Jay Blossom argue, divine healing, financial prosperity, protection from worldliness, a progressive political policy, and Dowie's publicity skills all contributed to the Prophet's success and the remarkable growth of Zion City.⁷² By the time the Bosworths came to Zion City, at least two thousand residents already called it home. Bosworth's early biographer claims that Bosworth was attracted to the city as a place where his musical talents could flourish in a wholesome environment. This is credible, but has the scent of a retroactive explanation as well.⁷³ Bosworth had no guarantee when he decided to move to Zion City that he would be able to become involved in the musical program, and when he first moved there, he took work as bookkeeper at the Fresh Food Supply. Economic reasons may have played

⁷⁰ "Obeying God in Baptism," *Leaves of Healing* 11, no. 19 (August 30, 1902): 644; "Obeying God in Baptism," *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 2 (November 1, 1902): 60. For B.F. Bosworth's employment, see "Personal Mention," *Zion Banner*, April 28, 1903, 370.

⁷¹ Vivian's name was sometimes spelled Vivien. For Amelia Bosworth's arrival in Zion City, see "Personal Mention," *Zion Banner*, April 28, 1903, 370. For her baptism, see "Obeying God in Baptism," *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 23 (September 26, 1903): 742. For the consecrations of Vivian and Vernon, see "Obeying God in Baptism," *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 15 (July 30, 1904): 490, 491. For a time, the Bosworths resided at 2810 Elisha Avenue, which, according to Philip Cook, was the higher-priced section of town. Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 66. This financial security may be corroborated by Perkins, who claims that Dowie paid Bosworth "a pleasing salary" for his work with the band. Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 36.

⁷² Wacker, Armstrong, and Blossom, "John Alexander Dowie: Harbinger of Pentecostal Power," 10–15.

⁷³ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 36. As Perkins admits, this may have been only a "subconscious" motivation.

as much a role, since Bosworth's parents also came to the city. Another possibility is that Bosworth's lung problems continued to bother him, and he looked for healing in the community.⁷⁴

Regardless of what brought him to Zion, Bosworth soon found his place and began playing cornet with the band on Sunday morning services while working for the Fresh Food Supply. He quickly rose in the ranks. By February 1903, Bosworth was the leader of the Zion City brass band, making his large-scale debut at the Seventh Anniversary of the Christian Catholic Church before an audience of four thousand at Shiloh Tabernacle.⁷⁵ On March 1, the position became full-time with a salary, allowing Bosworth to leave his work at the Zion City Credit Department.⁷⁶ The band leader position entailed selecting music, writing arrangements, conducting the band, and training amateur musicians in private lessons. The Zion City community was thrilled with Bosworth's musical and leadership talents, calling him a "born musician," and a "director of unusual ability."⁷⁷ "From the Sunny South we have our brother, Deacon Bosworth, from Fitzgerald, Georgia," beamed the *Leaves of Healing* in a report on the Fourth Feast

⁷⁴ At the time of his spirit-baptism at Zion in 1906, Bosworth claimed to be healed of a spot on his lungs "from too much cornet playing." Bosworth, *Bosworth's Life Story*, 7.

⁷⁵ "Seventh Anniversary of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion," *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 19 (February 28, 1903): 593. The first mention in Zion publications of Bosworth as band director is "Zion Musical Organizations," *Zion Banner*, February 3, 1903, 178. Other references to Bosworth's work with the band include the temple site anniversary on July 14, 1903, "Third Anniversary of the Consecration of the Zion Temple Site," *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 14 (July 25, 1903): 426; the 1905 New Year's watch night service, "All Night with God in Zion," *Leaves of Healing* 16, no. 12 (January 7, 1905): 372; and "Citizens' Mid-Week Rally," *Leaves of Healing* 16, no. 22 (March 18, 1905): 701.

⁷⁶ "Zion City Brass Band," *Zion Banner*, February 17, 1903, 211.

⁷⁷ "Splendid Music By Zion Band," *Zion Banner*, February 2, 1904, 145. "Zion Musical Organizations," 178.

of Tabernacles in 1904. “He brings to us, in his splendid instrumentation, the inspiration of the Southland, and blended with it the strength of the Northland.”⁷⁸

In his capacity as band leader, Bosworth played an indispensable role in one pillar of Dowie’s organizational success. Dowie had a knack for public spectacle and celebration, creating Zion holidays out of the anniversary of the Church’s founding, the dedication of the site for the Temple (which was never erected), and an annual Feast of Tabernacles. The band was prominent at all of these celebrations. The band also played the role of ambassador for Zion City to neighboring communities. In the summer of 1904, Bosworth arranged free open air concerts for nearby Kenosha and Waukegan—“for a neighborly visit,” as Bosworth put it.⁷⁹ The *Waukegan Daily Sun* was happy to report that the concert was “greatly enjoyed” and that Bosworth’s cornet solo was “especially fine.”⁸⁰ The band also gave public concerts in Racine, Wisconsin, and Chicago in April of 1905. Local newspapers lauded the band and its leader.⁸¹ The joy of Bosworth’s musical career came later in 1903 when he accompanied Dowie and three thousand Dowieites to New York City, where the band played for ten consecutive days at Madison

⁷⁸ “Early Morning Sacrifice of Praise and Prayer,” *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 16 (August 6, 1904): 515.

⁷⁹ “Zion City Band to Give Concerts,” *Zion Banner*, June 7, 1904, 289.

⁸⁰ “Gave a Fine Concert,” *Waukegan Daily Sun*, June 8, 1904, 7.

⁸¹ “Zion City Band Concert,” *Zion Banner*, April 25, 1905, 246. This article quotes the *Racine Daily Journal* of April 19, 1905: “And it is not unjust to say that the concert by Zion City band last night was awaited with considerable apprehension, but before the forty players on the stage had swept through the first four bars of the Boieldieu’s splendid overture ‘Andantino-Allegretto’ the apprehension was dispelled and those present knew they were going to hear real music from the hands of masters of the art.” Roberts Liardon gives an almost-duplicate quote, purportedly from the New York press, referring to the series of meetings in New York in 1903. His source for this quote is Perkin’s 1921 biography, by way of Oscar Blomgren’s 1963-1964 biographical article series in *Herald of Faith*, but Perkins does not explicitly state that this quote referred to the New York performances. Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 37; Roberts Liardon, *God’s Generals: The Healing Evangelists* (New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 2011), 21.

Square Garden. Decked in conspicuous bright green uniforms, the Zion Band consisted of thirty-eight members at the time of the New York crusade.⁸² The *Leaves of Healing* described Bosworth's band in New York in both aesthetic and spiritual terms. "Zion band played with characteristic excellence while the audience gathered. The sacred strains, as they floated where the Evil One had so often held carnival, seemed to proclaim to all the world that God is indeed supreme."⁸³ Dowie himself was proud of not only the musical quality, but also the morality integrity of the band. During the New York crusade, someone complemented the Zion Band as "the sweetest music I ever heard." "Do you know why?" came Dowie's reply, "it is because those young men in the band love God, and there is no beer or tobacco in them, but the Spirit of God, and that makes the music sweet."⁸⁴ So impressed with Bosworth's abilities was Dowie that on the way home from New York, Dowie requested that the band increase tenfold.⁸⁵

Bosworth's work with the band put him in contact with other Dowieites who had a similar commitment to clean living and divine healing. J. Roswell Flower, who went on to be a high-profile denominational leader in the Assemblies of God, played cornet in Bosworth's band in Zion City.⁸⁶ D. Norton, a former Salvation Army worker, was

⁸² "Dowie and His Host," *Dallas Morning News*, October 17, 1903.

⁸³ "Early Morning Sacrifice of Praise and Prayer," *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 1 (October 24, 1903): 14.

⁸⁴ "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field," *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 23 (March 26, 1904): 693.

⁸⁵ "Zion City Bands for Next Visitation," *Zion Banner*, November 20, 1903, 10. The call for more musicians was also repeated in the November 24 (p. 19) and December 8 (p. 50) issues.

⁸⁶ Gordon P. Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World* (Shippensburg, PA: Companion Press, 1990), 31. At the time of his residence in Zion, however, Flower was not a model Christian. On July 31, 1903, just eleven days after his baptism in Zion City, the fourteen-year-old Flower, along with two other boys, ran away from Zion City, "becoming weary of the restraints imposed upon them," as a local newspaper editorialized. See "Boys Run Away from Zion City," *Waukegan Daily Sun*, August 3, 1903, 1. For Flower's baptism in Zion City, see, "Obeying God in Baptism," *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 15 (August

convinced of Zion truth after following Dowie's published attacks on William Booth. He came to Zion City in September of 1905 after Zion work in England and South Africa, and he joined the band immediately.⁸⁷ Gilbert Gay, a fourteen year-old member of the Zion Band, testified to healings of numerous ailments, including colds, toothaches, and a dog bite. His most dramatic supernatural recovery occurred in August 1902, when he tripped over a stick that cut clean through his pants, tearing his scrotum. After receiving prayer from his mother and three neighbors, the profuse bleeding and intense pain ceased. A written confirmation of Gay's healing testified that Gay was back at work within weeks.⁸⁸ Bosworth was well-liked by his bandmates, who helped orchestrate a surprise party on the occasion of his fifth wedding anniversary.⁸⁹ The people of Zion City also celebrated with the Bosworths when their son, Vernon, was born on June 16, 1903.⁹⁰ Apparently, Bosworth's leadership brought him to the attention of more than his fellow bandmates, as the *Zion Banner* felt compelled to make known that the band leader of fair features and slight frame was indeed married.⁹¹

Though Bosworth seems not to have been heavily involved in ministry beyond the Zion Band, three weeks before the 1903 New York crusade, his spiritual service in the Zion community expanded briefly and dramatically. Mary Louise Shepard, a Zion City

1, 1903): 487. Flower apparently did not become a committed Christian until his conversion experience in 1907. Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 31.

⁸⁷ "More Musicians for Zion City Band," *Zion Banner*, September 12, 1905, 411.

⁸⁸ "God's Witnesses to Divine Healing," *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 26 (April 16, 1904): 745-747.

⁸⁹ "Bandmaster Bosworth Surprised," *Zion Banner*, November 14, 1905, 58.

⁹⁰ "Zion's Birth Record for 1903," *Zion Banner*, January 12, 1904.

⁹¹ "Splendid Music By Zion Band," 145.

lace worker who as part of the Restoration Host was also scheduled to depart for New York, came down with a severe fever. She was at the time living with the family of Deacon O.L. Sprecher, and Mrs. Sprecher brought Bosworth in to pray with Shepard. Feeling intense pain as well, Shepard testified that after Bosworth prayed for her, her pain was gone. But she did not regain health immediately; her fever persisted and Bosworth was called in to pray again a few days later. This time, she testified that before Bosworth removed his hands, the fever had left her. She was without disease, but remained weak. Before leaving for New York, she was also prayed for by elder Percy Clibborn, that she might regain her strength. Shepard testified that in New York she went out with the Host on their canvassing of the city every day but one, and had commenced working in Zion without interruption.⁹² In addition to assisting occasionally with Zion's healing ministry, Bosworth may have demonstrated his budding interest in spiritual leadership by hosting cottage meetings in his home. According to John G. Lake, Charles Parham's sister-in-law Lilian Thistlethwaite preached in Bosworth's home in Zion before 1905. At this time, according to Lake, he and Bosworth experienced sanctification in preparation for spirit-baptism.⁹³

⁹² "Healed of Fever," *Leaves of Healing* 16, no. 22 (March 18, 1905): 709.

⁹³ John G. Lake, *John G. Lake: The Complete Collection of His Life Teachings*, ed. Roberts Liardon (Tulsa, OK: Albury Publishing, 1999), 164–165, 458–459. The time frame of "before 1905" is deduced from Lake's account. After describing Thistlethwaite's meeting in Zion City, Lake wrote that "Later, Brother Parham was preaching in Texas." According to Parham's wife and Parham's modern-day biographer, Parham was not in Texas before 1905. See Sarah E. Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement* (Baxter Springs, KS, 1930), 107; James R. Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), 94. Lake's account, however, is problematic because Thistlethwaite is not mentioned in any other account of the only instance of Parham representatives in Zion City prior to 1906. See Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 2; Carl Brumback, *Suddenly ... from Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), 72. Lake's account also raises the question of how sanctification related to spirit-baptism in the minds of Zionites influenced by Parham's theology. If Lake's story that he and Bosworth were sanctified sometime before 1905 is correct, they apparently did not think this experience was sufficient preparation for spirit-baptism, since Bosworth told

Pentecost in Zion

When Dowie's empire began to crumble in early 1906, everyone in Zion City was affected. Bosworth felt the financial strain on his beloved band, which reorganized musical training in January of 1906. Whereas previously music lessons were provided free of charge to those interested in joining the band, from this point forward, aspiring musicians were required to pay for instruction. This possibly indicates that Bosworth's salary was eliminated or severely cut, as Bosworth immediately began advertising for private students.⁹⁴ For pentecostal history, the most important aspect of Dowie's decline began when a group of Dowieites in Zion City invited Charles Parham to the city. On New Year's Day, 1901, Charles Parham (1873-1929) and his students at the short-lived Bethel Bible school in Topeka, Kansas, had come to the conclusion that the "indisputable proof" of baptism with the Holy Spirit (which Parham taught was a third blessing following sanctification) was speaking in tongues, by which Parham meant foreign languages that were unknown to the speaker.⁹⁵ For Parham, tongues were a way to acquire languages for foreign missions without lengthy study. But Parham also believed tongues signaled the nearness of Christ's return as a definite indicator of the "latter rain" and they designated that the recipient was "sealed" for the coming rapture.

Jean Campbell in 1906 that he "put the last thing on the altar" just before his spirit-baptism, and Lake still struggled in 1907 for sanctification leading to his spirit-baptism. See Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 7; John G Lake and Talbert Morgan, *John G. Lake's Life & Diary* (Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2006), 33.

⁹⁴ "Musicians Meet at Shiloh Tabernacle," *Zion Banner*, January 17, 1906, 129. For Bosworth's advertisement for music instruction, see *Zion Banner*, January 17, 1907, 136; January 24, 1906, 144; January 31, 1906, 151.

⁹⁵ The extant accounts of these first pentecostal spirit-baptisms contain discrepancies as to whether the doctrine or the experience of evidential tongues came first. See Grant Wacker, "Are the Golden Oldies Still Worth Playing: Reflections on History Writing among Early Pentecostals," *Pneuma* 8, no. 2 (September 1, 1986): 96-97.

Parham referred to tongues as the “Bible evidence” of spirit-baptism, and within two days more than a dozen had the experience, including Parham and his sister-in-law, Lilian Thistlethwaite. Although his teaching on tongues and spirit-baptism was Parham’s unique theological contribution, he initially found little success propagating his views. The surge of excitement for the pentecostal experience in early 1901 was followed by a series of evangelistic disappointments. Parham’s ministry focus shifted to divine healing, while he continued to spread his views on tongues and spirit-baptism among close followers. After notable campaigns in Galena, Kansas, and Joplin, Missouri, in 1903 and 1904, Parham was invited to Texas, opening another short-term school in Houston at the start of 1906. One of Parham’s students at the Houston school was William Seymour, a black holiness preacher who had earlier contact with Martin Wells Knapp’s work in Cincinnati. In February of 1906, Seymour accepted an invitation to spread Parham’s doctrine of spirit-baptism at a holiness congregation in Los Angeles. Although the congregation dismissed his views and locked him from the church, Seymour found a small group of supporters who became the nucleus of the Azusa Street Revival.⁹⁶

While Seymour was overseeing the rapidly-expanding work in Los Angeles, Parham answered the call to Zion City, arriving around September 20 and intentionally postponing a visit to Azusa Street in the process. This was not Parham’s first contact with Dowie’s ministry. In 1900, Parham made a trip across the United States observing the ministries of a number of high-profile holiness ministers who emphasized the restoration of the New Testament experience, including Dowie’s work in Chicago and A.B.

⁹⁶ For the period of 1901 to 1906 in Parham’s ministry, see Goff, *Fields White unto Harvest*, chap. 3–5.

Simpson's work in New York.⁹⁷ Parham also had indirect contact with Zion City through a Mrs. Waldron, who had received spirit-baptism under Parham in Kansas and moved to Zion City around 1904.⁹⁸ Not surprisingly, Waldron attempted to spread Parham's teaching in Zion City, believing Parham's message to be compatible with Dowie's. Dowie and his officers did not agree, and Waldron, along with a handful of others who accepted the new message, was pressured to leave the city.⁹⁹ In March of 1906, D.C.O Opperman, Zion's director of education, came into contact with Parham in Houston. Opperman became convinced of Parham's teaching on spirit-baptism, and wrote to leaders in Zion City, urging them to consider the matter. Opperman's correspondence and later brief visit probably paved the way for Parham's arrival.¹⁰⁰

When Parham came to Zion City with a handful of helpers, he found a small, but eager reception. Leading meetings in Elijah Hospice, the main hotel of Zion City, Parham steadily increased his audience, and within a week's time, had won hundreds of sympathizers. When Voliva became wise to Parham's work, he banned him from the hotel, which drove Parham's meetings into private homes. One of the homes that opened

⁹⁷ Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham*, 48.

⁹⁸ One may speculate that Waldron's presence in Zion City in 1904 corresponded with the meetings conducted in Zion City by Lilian Thistlethwaite. See Kemp Pendleton Burpeau, *God's Showman: A Historical Study of John G. Lake and South African/American Pentecostalism* (Oslo: Refleks, 2004), 42. Without sufficient evidence, Burpeau gives the date of 1904 for Thistlethwaite's Zion City meetings.

⁹⁹ Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 2; Brumback, *Suddenly...from Heaven*, 72. Waldron was baptized in Zion City on May 1, 1904. Her residence at the time was listed as 2919 Eshcol Avenue, Zion City. "Obeying God in Baptism," *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 4 (May 14, 1904): 111. Another who accepted the pentecostal message in 1904 was Louise Albach, whose address (2819 Emmaus Ave.) was very near the Bosworths, who lived at 2807 Emmaus Ave. and 2810 Elisha Ave. (These houses shared a back yard.) For Albach's address see "Directory of The Ordained Officers of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion," *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 20 (March 5, 1904): 618. This perhaps supports the contention that Bosworth was somehow involved in this 1904 visit of Parhamites in Zion. See Burpeau, *God's Showman*, 42.

¹⁰⁰ Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 142–143.

its doors to Parham was F.F. Bosworth's. As Parham's wife Sarah remarked, Bosworth's home was "literally converted into a meeting house," with four rooms that could accommodate separate meetings or one large gathering.¹⁰¹ For the time being, Parham refrained from emphasizing tongues, although it was the distinctive feature of his message. But on October 17, the pentecostal experience burst forth, as twenty-four Zionites reportedly spoke in German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, and Norwegian.¹⁰²

This incident opened the floodgates of pentecostal expectation. The next day, one of Parham's assistants, Jessie Brown, was encouraging a group of seekers at the home of a Mrs. Ames. In the language of Phoebe Palmer, who encouraged believers to claim and testify to sanctification regardless of any evidence, Brown was instructing seekers "of the need to praise for what we believed we were to receive"—in this case, the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Bernice Lee, a Zion member who had worked as a teacher in the Christian Catholic Church in Zion, sat next to Bosworth at the meeting, and she later described how the much-anticipated experience began to spread.¹⁰³ In response to Brown's encouragement, a man on the other side of Lee suddenly "rose to his feet while [Brown] was speaking, and with face uplifted, his eyes shining, he padded back and forth in the room, singing in tongues." Then, as if emboldened by what he saw, Bosworth "leaped to his feet, burst out in tongues, and sat down."¹⁰⁴ As Parham's message had been circulating in Zion for a few weeks, Bosworth's spirit-baptism was not without

¹⁰¹ Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham*, 156–157.

¹⁰² Goff, *Fields White unto Harvest*, 125.

¹⁰³ For reference to Bernice Lee as a teacher in the Central Zion Junior school, see "Personal Mention," *Zion Banner*, July 1, 1902, 98.

¹⁰⁴ Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 334. Lee would have to wait until October 30 for her pentecostal experience. *Ibid.*, 341.

preparation. “I knew these people had something I did not have and I wanted it,” he later recalled. To prove to himself and to God that he was ready for the blessing, he spent a few days doing “personal work” among his friends in Zion City. According to his later pentecostal coworker Cyrus Fockler, Bosworth had sufficiently prepared himself for spirit-baptism during these weeks, believing that “God had sanctified and purified his heart.” Incensed that Bosworth had opened his home to Parham’s party, Voliva “gave him a chance to prove” his sanctification by calling Bosworth into his office for an abusive reprimand. Bosworth was undeterred and endured the scolding with grace.¹⁰⁵

When the pentecostal blessing came, it was immediate, according to Bosworth.¹⁰⁶ Though Bosworth came to disagree with the teaching that tongues always accompanied spirit-baptism, he never doubted the authenticity of his pentecostal experience or the supernatural power he claimed it gave to his life and ministry. Throughout his life, Bosworth identified his spirit-baptism as the moment of “being divinely equipped for unlimited service to God.”¹⁰⁷ In fact, so great was the supernatural power of his spirit-baptism, that Bosworth claimed a simultaneous healing from a spot on his lungs from too much cornet playing.¹⁰⁸ After Bosworth’s own pentecostal experience, he was instrumental in leading others into the blessing, such as Jean Campbell and John G. Lake. His spirit-baptism ended one chapter in his life as it began a new one: the Sunday following Bosworth’s spirit-baptism, he was publically “read out” of fellowship with the

¹⁰⁵ Cyrus B. Fockler, *Overcomers* (Milwaukee, 1933), 20–21.

¹⁰⁶ For Bosworth’s account of his spirit-baptism, see Bosworth, *The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth*, 7.

¹⁰⁷ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 49.

¹⁰⁸ Bosworth, *The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth*, 7.

Christian Catholic Apostolic Church.¹⁰⁹ Bosworth continued to host meetings in his home and he actively encouraged others to make the necessary surrender to God. “I put the last thing on the altar coming up the hill,” he told Campbell when she was struggling with the requisite consecration.¹¹⁰ Phoebe Palmer’s altar theology had been claimed for the pentecostal cause in Zion City.

Like Dowie, Charles Parham knew how to cultivate publicity, even if he could not always ensure that it was favorable. Local newspapers viewed him as a serious challenge to Voliva’s leadership, and even the *New York Times* took an interest, declaring Parham “a new leader in Zion.”¹¹¹ Confident that he had begun a good work, and with about fifty who had testified to speaking in tongues, Parham left Zion City on October 23, leaving the work in the charge of W.F. Carothers, Parham’s right-hand-man in Texas. While

¹⁰⁹ Bosworth may have been one of the twenty at this worship service who publically affirmed their adherence to Parham’s teaching, even while Voliva accused them of being “possessed of the Devil.” “Voliva Drives Out Deacons,” *Waukegan Daily Gazette*, October 22, 1906, 15/2/5, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

¹¹⁰ Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 7. Unlike the holiness advocates coming out of the Methodist movement, Dowie did not stress a second definite crisis experience for sanctification; rather he preached multiple “consecrations” necessary for growth in holiness and spiritual power. Although Parham would later denounce the finished work teaching of William Durham that denied the second work of grace, he did not seem to stress this when he preached in Zion City. As the *Waukegan Daily Sun* put it in a description of Parham’s theology: “They believe that first one must repent and beg forgiveness, which act if sincere brings a sense that one’s sins have been forgiven, a state called sanctification, which is followed, if it is seen fit, by the bestowal of the gift of tongues.” Cited in *Ibid.*, 12. Parham at this time was content with conflating (or at least not pressing the differences) between Dowieite “consecration” and the sanctification experience. This is why Zion City pentecostal testimonies are full of discussions of consecration, laying things “on the altar” and righting personal wrongs prior to receiving spirit-baptism. Apparently such acts of consecration were congruent with Dowie’s teaching and fulfilled Parham’s demand that sanctification occur prior to spirit-baptism. *Ibid.*, 332, 339; Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story*, 7; Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 48. See also Edith L. Blumhofer, “A Pentecostal Branch Grows in Dowie’s Zion: Charles F. Parham’s 1906 Invasion,” *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6 (September 1, 1986): 136–137. However, John G. Lake claimed that he experienced sanctification in Bosworth’s home in Zion City under the ministry of Charles Parham’s sister-in-law, Lilian Thistlethwaite, before Parham went to Texas (1905). According to Lake, at this time Thistlethwaite stressed the need for a distinct sanctification experience. Lake, *John G. Lake*, 164–165, 458–459.

¹¹¹ “NEW LEADER IN ZION CITY: Says a Voice He Heard in a Vision Inspired Him -- Voliva Alarmed,” *New York Times*, September 27, 1906, 7.

Parham made his overdue trip to Los Angeles, the pentecostal movement in Zion City continued to grow. His message gained followers among hundreds of rank-and-file Zionites as well as leaders in the community. Notable among Zion leaders who became pentecostals were George A. Rogers, manager of the Elijah Hospice, A.F. Lee, the general ecclesiastical secretary of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church, Hubert Grant, Dowie's personal secretary, and J.G. Speicher, who had baptized Bosworth.¹¹² Elder William H. Piper sympathized with the dissidents, but did not identify with the movement until 1907. Piper's Stone Church in Chicago became a major organizing force for early pentecostalism. With nearly forty former Dowieites later becoming leaders in the Assemblies of God and many converts also going into independent or loosely-affiliated pentecostal work, this Midwestern utopia was clearly a flashpoint of early pentecostalism that operated largely independently of the contemporary Azusa Street revival.¹¹³

Many factors converged to bless Parham's work at Zion City. As Edith Blumhofer argues, Dowie's "essential message inclined many of his followers towards Parham's ministry."¹¹⁴ Parham himself assured Zionites and curious onlookers that he presented "no new gospel" in Zion.¹¹⁵ That was not exactly true, but many in Zion found

¹¹² Goff, *Fields White unto Harvest*, 124; Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 37–47; Edith L. Blumhofer, "The Christian Catholic Apostolic Church and the Apostolic Faith: A Study in the 1906 Pentecostal Revival," in *Charismatic Experiences in History*, ed. Cecil M. Robeck (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1985), 137. Speicher later credited his openness to the pentecostal message to the upright character of Bosworth and other pentecostal converts. See "Is It the Latter Rain?," *Zion City News*, August 1, 1907, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

¹¹³ Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 270, n. 50. The Zion Faith Homes carried on pentecostal work in Zion that had loose ties to other denominations. See Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 285–322.

¹¹⁴ Blumhofer, "The Christian Catholic Apostolic Church and the Apostolic Faith: A Study in the 1906 Pentecostal Revival," 140.

¹¹⁵ Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham*, 182.

it easy, as Kemp Burpeau puts it, to accept the “overlay of Pentecostalism” brought by Parham.¹¹⁶ Future pentecostals were particularly influenced by Dowie’s intense restorationist message and his concomitant belief in the validity of spiritual gifts. Dowieites were trained to expect a “latter rain” blessing of Holy Spirit outpouring—terminology that was decisive for pentecostal self-understanding.¹¹⁷ As J.R. Flower, the Assemblies of God statesman who lived in Zion City as a teenager, would later remark, Dowie’s ministry “awakened in many a desire for the supernatural and a longing for spiritual reality, which went a long ways toward preparing the way for the rise of the Pentecostal Movement in the twentieth century.”¹¹⁸

Dowieites were trained to see supernatural forces at work all around them. As an early scholar of Dowieism put it, “What seems to them mysterious and even miraculous is regarded by those who have made a scientific study of human nature as liable to occur at any time.”¹¹⁹ In short, Dowie’s supernaturalism stirred a hunger that Zion was ultimately unable to feed, so many latched on to the pentecostal movement as a reasonable replacement or extension of their Dowieite beliefs. Pentecostalism certainly had some different emphases than Dowiesim. While Dowie closely tied spiritual gifts to the apostolic office, later pentecostals determined the gifts were available to every

¹¹⁶ Burpeau, *God’s Showman*, 36.

¹¹⁷ For an example of Dowieite discourse on the “latter rain,” see J.G. Excell, “Notes of Thanksgiving from the Whole World,” *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 26 (April 18, 1903): 827. For the importance of the latter rain model for early pentecostalism, see D. William Faupel, “The Function of ‘Models’ in the Interpretation of Pentecostal Thought,” *Pneuma* 2, no. 1 (March 1, 1980): 54–57.

¹¹⁸ J.R. Flower, “History of the Assemblies of God,” unpublished notes for course at Central Bible College, 1949, cited in Blumhofer, “The Christian Catholic Apostolic Church and the Apostolic Faith: A Study in the 1906 Pentecostal Revival,” 144, n. 45.

¹¹⁹ Harlan, “John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion,” 182.

believer.¹²⁰ And while Dowie bred an expectation of the miraculous, he had little use for mystical spirituality that would become prominent in the lives of many pentecostals. Nonetheless, decades later, Gordon Lindsay, who worked with F.F. Bosworth in the postwar healing campaigns and whose parents had been residents of Zion City during Dowie's rule, remarked that one major lesson "vividly taught in the life of John Alexander Dowie is the all-importance and power of a supernatural ministry."¹²¹ This is the lesson that pentecostals like Lindsay and Bosworth took to heart. But without the troubles in Zion in early 1906, it is unlikely that the pentecostal message would have been able to penetrate Zion's walls. Furthermore, the instability of Zion in 1906, combined with Parham's insistence that the spirit-baptized believers go out and preach, encouraged many of the new pentecostals to leave the city, zealously proclaiming their new message as they went.¹²²

From Dowieites to Pentecostals

Bosworth was one who was not long for Zion after his personal Pentecost. With Zion in turmoil and Bosworth identifying with the pentecostals, Bosworth quickly lost or forfeited his position as band leader.¹²³ Either way, after his pentecostal experience, he

¹²⁰ For an example of the Dowieite connection between spiritual gifts and apostolic office, see "Second Special Conference of Ordained Officers of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion," *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 21 (September 10, 1904): 740.

¹²¹ Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 273.

¹²² For Parham's insistence that new pentecostals go out and preach, see Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham*, 173.

¹²³ The band reorganized in May of 1907 without Bosworth, obliquely referring to the earlier dissolution of the band "owing to various causes" and bemoaning that "quite a number of our leading players have gone away." "Zion City Band," *Zion Herald*, May 15, 1907, 2.

turned to selling pens to make money.¹²⁴ But he combined this work with a new call to evangelism. He set out on evangelistic work in Indiana and Ohio, later pastored a pentecostal church in Dallas, and then embarked on a high-profile divine healing ministry across the United States and Canada. In all these ways, he was influential in the spread of a pentecostalism that was connected to, but not reliant upon Azusa Street. And in this task he was not alone. Other Dowie-turned-pentecostals—some who joined major pentecostal denominations and some who worked more or less independently—were, like Bosworth, major carriers of turn-of-the century holiness supernaturalism into the new pentecostal movement.

John G. Lake (1870-1935) first came into contact with Dowie's work around 1894 in Chicago.¹²⁵ Lake visited Dowie's healing home and claimed to be healed of rheumatism and chronic constipation. As sickness seemed to run in Dowie's family, he was overjoyed to have the means to bring healing to his loved ones. He brought to Dowie his brother, who suffered from gum bleeding and joint pain. A sister was also healed of "five cancers" under Dowie's work. Another sister was retrieved from apparent death by Dowie's encouraging telegram and concomitant prayers. Most dear of all to Lake was the healing of his wife. Jennie Lake suffered from heart disease and tuberculosis and was often bedridden, slipping in and out of consciousness. To stimulate her heart, doctors prescribed nitroglycerine tablets, which often left her half-paralyzed. Through the prayers

¹²⁴ Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 334.

¹²⁵ Unless otherwise indicated, biographical information on Lake comes from Burpeau, *God's Showman*, 23–73. Burpeau's work is the only scholarly monograph on Lake. Although well-researched and reasonably argued, Burpeau's work contains many mistakes in citations and uncritically reproduces some of Lake's own inconsistencies in chronology and other details. For Lake's own accounts of healings under Dowie, see Gordon Lindsay, *John G. Lake, Apostle to Africa* (Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, 1978), 10–15; Gordon Lindsay, *Sketches from the Life and Ministry of John G. Lake* (Shreveport, LA: Voice of Healing Publishing Company, 1952), 24–29.

of Dowie, she was healed in April of 1898. Jennie's healing was the main spur for Lake and his wife to resign their Methodist affiliation and join Dowie's church, which according to Jennie helped her maintain health in spite of potential setbacks.¹²⁶ Jennie was also healed dramatically of a gunshot wound in August of 1900. Her many healings was the featured story of the June 15, 1901 *Leaves of Healing*. In a written confirmation of Jennie's testimony, John Lake stressed the power of "unity of the Spirit" for healing. He minced no words by stating that "the presence of an unbeliever [in divine healing] checked the healing." He advised those seeking healing thus to "keep unbelievers away."¹²⁷

Lake, who had trained for the Methodist ministry but never taken a post, was a natural fit for leadership in Dowie's organization. By early 1900 he was the lay conductor of meetings in Sault Sainte Marie. On July 18, 1900, Lake and Jennie were baptized, and the next day Lake was ordained deacon in the Christian Catholic Church at the Hall of Seventies in Chicago.¹²⁸ He early showed his commitment to Dowie's supernaturalism by testifying that at a baptismal service (he was careful to note that the baptisms were triune), "several were healed while in the baptistry."¹²⁹ Lake was a faithful soldier of Zion's army, regularly distributing 150 copies of *Leaves of Healing* in Sault Sainte

¹²⁶ "God's Witness to Divine Healing," *Leaves of Healing* 9, no. 8 (June 15, 1901): 226.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 228.

¹²⁸ "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field," *Leaves of Healing* 7, no. 13 (July 21, 1900): 410.

¹²⁹ "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field," *Leaves of Healing* 8, no. 23 (March 30, 1901): 713.

Marie.¹³⁰ Lake also dutifully preached on familiar Zion themes like “Doctor, Drugs and Devils,” and “Elijah the Restorer.”¹³¹

The Lake family moved to Zion City in 1901, and John Lake began working with the Zion City building department.¹³² He continued to serve as a minister, performing many baptisms, usually in Wisconsin. By 1905, Lake was no longer working in Zion City, but continued to preach in the evenings, while conducting a purportedly lucrative insurance business.¹³³ Through contacts in Chicago, Lake became aware of the developing pentecostal movement, particularly the revival at Azusa Street. But then the revival came closer to home, as Parham stirred pentecostal enthusiasm at Zion City beginning in September. When Parham led a watch-night service on New Year’s Eve, Lake was there, hoping to experience what some of his Zion friends had claimed. From this point forward, Lake threw in his lot with the pentecostals.

Lake had an arduous journey to his pentecostal experience. He reportedly spoke in tongues at Zion City’s New Year’s Eve meeting, but he did not recognize this as a full spirit-baptism. He spoke in tongues a few months later, when he received a word from God to go to Indianapolis, where he was to convince Tom Hezmalhalch, who had

¹³⁰ “Notes from Zion’s Harvest Field,” *Leaves of Healing* 8, no. 10 (December 29, 1900): 314.

¹³¹ “Notes from Zion’s Harvest Field,” *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 24 (April 4, 1903): 760.

¹³² Lake claimed to be head of construction in Zion City, but he was more likely a small-scale contractor—neither the first nor the last of Lake’s exaggerated claims. See Barry Morton, “‘The Devil Who Heals’: Fraud and Falsification in the Evangelical Career of John G. Lake, Missionary to South Africa 1908-1913,” *African Historical Review* 44, no. 2 (2012): 103. In 1902, Lake was identified as a “contractor and builder” with a handful of men working under him. “God Uses Diaconate,” *Zion Banner*, November 18, 1902, 1. He was later referred to simply as “a “pretty good B[uilding] & M[anagement] guy.” “The Gift of the Holy Spirit,” *Zion Herald*, July 6, 1907, 3.

¹³³ Lake claimed to leave Zion City in 1904. Lake’s residence is listed in March 5, 1904, as the intersection of Gabriel Avenue and Thirtieth Street, Zion City. “Directory of The Ordained Officers of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion.” See Morton, “‘The Devil Who Heals,’” 103.

received spirit-baptism at Azusa Street, to come to Zion City.¹³⁴ At a series of meetings beginning in May in Zion City, Lake and Hazmelhalch led dozens of seekers into the pentecostal experience. But Lake had not yet arrived. Apparently, Lake struggled with the degree of spiritual consecration he felt was necessary for this experience. In his diary, Lake recorded encouragement he received from F.F. Bosworth as he struggled for his spirit-baptism:

[S]ome months later as [Tom Hezmalhalch] visited our town again one day, I joined Bro. Tom and Bro Fred Bosworth on the sidewalk as we walked down the street; I stepped between them taking each by the arm. Bro. Bosworth turned to me saying Lake when are you going to surrender to Jesus. I said anytime Fred. Tom turned to me saying do you mean it? I replied, I do Tom. We all three fell on our knees on the sidewalk and right there I surrendered to my Lord. Then I sought God for sanctification and my Baptism in the Holy Ghost.¹³⁵

Finally, in October of 1907, Lake's search for the pentecostal blessing was over. When called to pray alongside Hezmalhalch for an invalid, Lake felt in turns a calm quiet, followed by a "warm tropical rain," then "currents of power." Praying in tongues, he laid his hands on the sick woman, and at that moment he felt he was given the enduring gift of healing, and the woman was healed.¹³⁶ This was his spirit-baptism, but this was not the end of his dramatic experiences with God. In late 1907 or early 1908, Lake received confirmation from God that he was now endowed with the ability to cast out demons—a gift he quickly put into action for the sake of an Indianapolis man whose insanity Lake

¹³⁴ Lake and Morgan, *John G. Lake's Life & Diary*, 45.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹³⁶ Lake gave at least three separate accounts of this incident. See *Ibid.*, 23; Lindsay, *John G. Lake, Apostle to Africa*, 18–19; Lindsay, *Sketches from the Life and Ministry of John G. Lake*, 15–16. These accounts vary in many details. Only in his diary account did he mention speaking in tongues. In his diary account and in *Sketches*, he claimed that God spoke directly to him telling him he was now baptized in the Spirit, while in *Apostle to Africa*, he claimed that Hezmalhalch (though unnamed in this account) was the one who informed him that he had now been spirit-baptized.

attributed to demon possession.¹³⁷ Throughout his ministry, Lake would confront demons and devils, even recounting an instance during his South African work in which upon exorcism a demon “left in a blue flame visible to all in the room.”¹³⁸

Sensing that he was now equipped for full ministry, Lake, along with Hezmalhalch and J.O. Lehman, traveled to South Africa in early April 1908. There Lake ministered for five years, building upon the work of earlier Dowie missionaries—like Daniel Bryant, who would also later cause much stir in Zion City by supporting the pentecostal cause—and Andrew Murray, an English Keswickian missionary who also taught divine healing. South Africa proved extremely welcoming to Lake’s pentecostal message, and he formed the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa to organize their work.¹³⁹ Lake’s South Africa mission was well-publicized in pentecostal publications in the United States and England. His fantastic reports of healings and conversions from the mission field quickly achieved legendary status in a movement that had no shortage of missionary exploits.¹⁴⁰

Lake permanently returned to the United States in 1913, and carried on an independent healing ministry that eventually settled in Spokane and Portland. In

¹³⁷ Lake and Morgan, *John G. Lake’s Life & Diary*, 49. Lake’s enduring fascination with demon-possession must be read alongside the traumatic events in Zion City in 1907, when a group of Parhamites conducted lengthy, physically abusive exorcisms, leading to at least two deaths. See Morton, ““The Devil Who Heals,”” 106–107.

¹³⁸ Lake and Morgan, *John G. Lake’s Life & Diary*, 73.

¹³⁹ For Lake’s South Africa work, see Burpeau, *God’s Showman*, 63–150.

¹⁴⁰ For reports of Lake’s South Africa work in the British pentecostal press, see John G. Lake, “South Africa,” *Confidence* 2, no. 8 (August 1909): 185; “Has Pentecost Come to Johannesburg?,” *Confidence* 2, no. 2 (February 1909): 27–31; “Extracts from a Very Important Letter from Bro. J.G. Lake,” *Confidence* 2, no. 3 (March 1909): 74–75. For reports in the American pentecostal papers, see “Missionaries to Johannesburg, South Africa,” *Apostolic Faith*, (Los Angeles), 11, no. 13 (May 1908): 4; “From Africa,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 33 (March 1, 1909): 1.

America, Lake continued to wield considerable influence in pentecostal circles, joining forces for a time with Cyrus Fockler, a former Dowieite elder with whom Bosworth would conduct itinerant ministry in 1907 and 1908.¹⁴¹ Lake led a revival with Charles Parham in 1924, at which Gordon Lindsay was converted.¹⁴² Lindsay became a major organizing force for the postwar healing revival that reinvigorated Bosworth's career in 1947. Generally suspicious of denominations, Lake did not join the Assemblies of God when it formed in 1914, although he attended its inaugural meeting. Lake preferred spiritual fervor over doctrinal rigor and maintained contact with pentecostals on all sides of the sanctification issue and the trinitarian controversy of 1916. Lake's approach to divine healing—particularly his use of healing rooms following the early Dowie model—continued to inspire pentecostal healing ministries in the late twentieth century.¹⁴³

Lake thoroughly imbibed Dowie's teachings that miracles had not ceased and that Satan was the cause of sickness, and he combined this with the pentecostal emphasis on the immediacy of mystical experience. "[E]very answer to prayer," he wrote, "every miraculous touch of God, every response of my own soul to the Spirit had created within me a more intense longing for an intimacy and a consciousness of God, like I felt the disciples of Jesus and the primitive church had possessed."¹⁴⁴ Like Bernice Lee, who also experienced spirit-baptism in Zion City, Lake saw supernatural forces—benevolent and

¹⁴¹ For Lake's post-South Africa career, see Burpeau, *God's Showman*, 151–198. For Lake's work with Fockler, see p. 152.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 177; Lindsay, *John G. Lake, Apostle to Africa*, 4–7.

¹⁴³ Margaret M. Poloma, "Old Wine, New Wineskins: The Rise of Healing Rooms in Revival Pentecostalism," *Pneuma* 28, no. 1 (March 1, 2006): 59–71.

¹⁴⁴ Lindsay, *John G. Lake, Apostle to Africa*, 16.

malevolent—active in the most dramatic ways at key moments in his spiritual journey.

As Lake described his own spirit-baptism,

My tongue and throat began to move in a manner I could not control presently I realized I was speaking in another tongue, a language I had never learned. Oh the sense of Power, the mighty moving of the Spirit in me. The consciousness it was God who had come. Then Satan came and suggested it is not real power it is only imagination. These are not currents of real power it is only psychic phenomena. I said, “it’s power.” I know it and God in His loving mercy proved it to me.¹⁴⁵

Despite Lake’s animosity toward Christian Science, his tug-of-war with how science related to divine healing sounded much like Mary Baker Eddy’s. “[I]n the Spirit of God there is a science far beyond physical or psychological science,” taught Lake, “and the man or woman who enters into the spirit relation with God and exercises His power is most scientific...”¹⁴⁶ Like Christian Science and New Thought, Lake’s pentecostal supernaturalism tended toward the language of law and science to explain miraculous benevolence.¹⁴⁷

While Bosworth and Lake flourished in independent pentecostal ministry, other Zion alumni became loyal pentecostal denominationalists. Marie Burgess (1880-1971) received her pentecostal baptism in Zion City the same night as Bosworth, October 18, 1906. Years before she encountered Dowie, Brown showed a predilection toward supernaturalism. As a teenager in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, and before she was a devoted Christian, she contracted tuberculosis. During her sickness, she saw in a vision her bed

¹⁴⁵ Lake and Morgan, *John G. Lake’s Life & Diary*, 25.

¹⁴⁶ Lindsay, *John G. Lake, Apostle to Africa*, 57.

¹⁴⁷ The resonance of New Thought in Lake’s teaching deserves further study. From 1914, Lake maintained close and cordial relations with the Spokane New Thought teacher Albert C. Grier and even named his son in honor of Grier (Livingston Grier “Jack” Lake, born August 1914). Lake’s initial Spokane congregation consisted of followers of Grier. See Burpeau, *God’s Showman*, 152–154, 190. In the 1920s, Lake was also in contact with E.W. Kenyon, a Baptist evangelist with clear New Thought leanings. See Lake, *John G. Lake*, 474.

being on the precipice of a hellish abyss. Crying out to God to be spared, she saw Jesus appear at the foot of her bed. “Then the Lord stretched forth His hand with the nail print—I could see it,” she testified.¹⁴⁸ Enjoining her to forsake the world and follow him, Jesus lifted her out of the sick bed. This was her conversion and the dedication of her life to Christian service, and she credited all to this mystical experience. “Once you have had a vision or a touch from the hand of the Lord,” she later remarked, “there’s no turning back.”¹⁴⁹

Burgess’s healing would come shortly after her conversion. Retelling the story years later, she was careful to note that although the man who imparted the truth of divine healing to her was a “denominational minister,” he was also “one who knew the Lord as healer”—apparently a rare combination. Immediately after the minister’s visit, her cough and sweats ceased, and Burgess’s mother determined that the minister “must have prayed the prayer of faith.” For Burgess, this event marked more than the simple cessation of illness, but the beginning of “new life, the divine touch manifested in my body.”¹⁵⁰

Burgess’s contact with Dowie began when her sister Ella showed signs of tuberculosis a few years later. The two women traveled to Colorado hoping the mountain air would refresh Ella. Ella’s condition did not improve, and while in Colorado, the Burgess sisters got word of Dowie’s healing work in Zion City. Marie telegraphed to Zion City, and leaders replied that they prayed for her, but also suggested the sisters come to Zion City

¹⁴⁸ Zelma Argue, “Chosen of God: The Story of Mrs. Robert A. Brown, Chapter One,” *Christ’s Ambassadors Herald* 13, no. 6 (June 1940): 12.

¹⁴⁹ For the story of Burgess’s vision and conversion, as well as this quote, see Gordon Gardiner, “A Herald of Glad Tidings: Part One,” *Bread of Life* 3, no. 5 (May 1954): 4.

¹⁵⁰ For Burgess’s healing and the accompanying quotes, see *Ibid.*, 8.

“for teaching as to how to hold her healing.”¹⁵¹ They stayed in Zion City for some time before returning to Eau Claire. This temporary stay in Zion City probably corresponded with the sisters’ baptism into Dowie’s church in October of 1903, while nearly half the Zion City population was crusading in New York City.¹⁵² Burgess officially became a member of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church on July 17, 1904, by which time she had become a resident of Zion City.¹⁵³ During her time in Zion, she was a faithful devotee to the First Apostle, defending his ability to heal when some followers had begun to claim that his power had ceased.¹⁵⁴

Like many in Zion City, Burgess was curious about the pentecostal work that began in Zion City in the fall of 1906. As Dowie had trained Zionites to see enemies of his church as unequivocally inspired by Satan, the polemic against Parham’s meetings that Burgess overheard was that “people were filled with the devil.”¹⁵⁵ Those who became pentecostals—like Bernice Lee and John Lake—not surprisingly had to turn the tables of satanic accusation in order to embrace the new message, putting the devil in the

¹⁵¹ Argue, “Chosen of God: The Story of Mrs. Robert A. Brown, Chapter One,” 12.

¹⁵² “Obeying God in Baptism,” *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 1 (October 24, 1903): 29. This is the first mention in *Leaves of Healing* of the Burgess family, and at this time in 1903, Marie was still listed as a resident of Eau Claire, Wisconsin. The evidence therefore supports Zelma Argue’s reconstruction of events (related here), rather than that of Gardiner or Blumhofer, who claim that while a student at Dwight L. Moody’s Chicago evangelistic training school in the late 1890s, Burgess attended Dowie’s healing meetings in Chicago and moved to Zion City in 1901, or “just shortly after Dr. Dowie started this city [Zion].” See Edith L. Blumhofer, “A Woman Used by the Spirit,” *Paraclete* 21, no. 3 (June 1, 1987): 6; Gardiner, “A Herald of Glad Tidings: Part One,” 8. The chronology is far from settled, however, since Gardiner’s account (which formed the basis of Blumhofer’s account) was based on interviews with Marie Burgess Brown.

¹⁵³ “Given the Right Hand of Fellowship,” *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 16 (August 6, 1904): 523.

¹⁵⁴ Gordon Gardiner, “The Apostle of Divine Healing,” *Bread of Life*, 6, no. 3 (March 1957): 14.

¹⁵⁵ Gardiner, “A Herald of Glad Tidings: Part One,” 8.

role of resister of pentecostalism. They could escape Dowie's specific claims, but not his worldview.

Burgess began attending house meetings of pentecostal seekers, and she quickly recognized "that the devil was not at work, but that this thing was of God." Although losing her retail position in a Zion City business in Chicago for identifying with the pentecostals, Burgess continued to attend meetings. As with John Lake, Burgess's journey into pentecostal experience was taxing. Believing that spirit-baptism was divinely promised (like salvation and healing), she was disappointed that even after three days of fasting and non-stop seeking, she had not received the experience. Only when she felt God tell her to "take it and thank him for it,"—in other words, to stop working for it—did the real experience begin. Phoebe Palmer's theology of promise and faith clearly governed the categories of attaining pentecostal experience. But unlike Palmer's belief that the divine experience needed no accompanying emotion or manifestation, Burgess believed her experience was real because of three signs: shaking in the Spirit, speaking in tongues, and a vision of the mission fields of China, India, Africa, and Japan. Burgess claimed that her experience was so visibly genuine that it helped F.F. Bosworth, who witnessed Burgess's spirit-baptism, to press on to his own personal Pentecost that same night.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 9–10. This claim that Bosworth's spirit-baptism was inspired by Burgess's experience may conflict with Bernice Lee's remembrance that Bosworth was immediately inspired by the experience of the unnamed man who sat next to Lee that same night (October 18, 1906). Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 334. Of course, these testimonies may not be contradictory, as Burgess claimed that her experience inspired a greater hunger in Bosworth to seek spirit-baptism that night, while Lee told of the more immediate instigation of Bosworth's experience. It is, however, interesting to note that Bosworth's stature was such to give birth to two high-profile stories (in addition to his own) of the circumstances of his pentecostal experience. Including Bosworth apparently increased the drama and credibility of one's own account.

Burgess seamlessly carried the supernaturalism that had punctuated her spiritual journey up to 1906 into the new pentecostal sphere. Parham asked Burgess to go to New York as a messenger of the pentecostal faith. Wanting to discern God's will in the matter, Burgess devised a test. Although Parham had offered her fare for the trip, she determined that if God wanted her to go, he would supply her fare from an outside source. When a man "who knew nothing of the matter" placed fifty dollars in her hands, she could no longer resist her call.¹⁵⁷ In the early days of her ministry in New York, she vowed that she would continue in ministry "as long as God supplied her with material needs...but would never make her needs known to anyone but Him."¹⁵⁸ In other words, if God did not supernaturally provide for her, she would take it as a sign that she was no longer to continue in ministry. Like Mattie Perry, Burgess saw God supernaturally involved in not only supplying needs for life and ministry, but directing the saints' paths.

Shortly after the infamous New Year's meeting in Zion City, Burgess arrived in New York. She was accompanied by Jessie Brown, who had led the meeting at Zion City where she and Bosworth received spirit-baptism. After completing a four-week engagement at a holiness mission, the two continued holding meetings in homes. Aided by Parham's brief visit to New York that spring, on May 5, 1907, they opened a pentecostal mission a few blocks from the holiness mission.¹⁵⁹ Burgess was later assisted by Zion alumni Bernice Lee and Edith Baugh. In 1909, she married Robert Brown, a Wesleyan Methodist evangelist who occasionally preached at the pentecostal mission.

¹⁵⁷ Gardiner, "A Herald of Glad Tidings: Part One," 10.

¹⁵⁸ Gardiner, "Herald of Glad Tidings: Part Two," *Bread of Life* 3, no. 6 (June 1954): 6.

¹⁵⁹ For Parham's time in New York, see Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham*, 194–195.

The two were married in Zion City, and returned to New York to continue their pioneer pentecostal work.¹⁶⁰ Marie Burgess Brown was active in early pentecostal conventions, such as those held at Stone Church in Chicago, which was pastored by former Zion elder William H. Piper. The Browns affiliated with the newly-formed Assemblies of God in 1915, with Robert elected to the executive presbytery—as Bosworth had been in 1914.¹⁶¹ The Browns’ ministry was marked by exorcism, healing, and numerous spirit-baptisms. The now-Mrs. Brown was also renowned for speaking many foreign languages under the power of the Holy Spirit.¹⁶² Perhaps most important was the missionary vision of the New York work, which went under the name Glad Tidings. Again like Mattie Perry, Brown was a deterred missionary who became an ardent supporter of mission work. The connections between Brown and Perry went deeper: Lilian Trasher, who before 1910 had worked alongside Perry, was also supported by Glad Tidings in her pioneering pentecostal work in Egypt.¹⁶³ The missionary support from Glad Tidings was unparalleled in the Assemblies of God. Through the 1930s, the New York church consistently gave more than any other congregation in the denomination; during some periods they gave more than double the next highest-giving congregation.¹⁶⁴ In the 1950s,

¹⁶⁰ For details of Burgess’s early work in New York, see Gardiner, “Herald of Glad Tidings: Part Two.”

¹⁶¹ For Brown’s election to the executive presbytery, see *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1915* (n.p., 1915), 9. For Bosworth’s election to the executive presbytery, see *Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1914* (St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1914), 9.

¹⁶² Gordon Gardiner, “Herald of Glad Tidings: Part Three,” *Bread of Life* 3, no. 7 (July 1954): 9–10.

¹⁶³ Gordon Gardiner, “Herald of Glad Tidings: Part Four,” *Bread of Life* 3, no. 8 (August 1954): 5; Perry, *Christ and Answered Prayer*, 169–170.

¹⁶⁴ Heather D. Curtis, “‘God Is Not Affected by the Depression’: Pentecostal Missions during the 1930s,” *Church History* 80, no. 3 (September 1, 2011): 588.

Burgess Brown left her mark on a new generation of pentecostal ministry by her support of David Wilkerson's inner-city efforts, which would blossom into Teen Challenge.¹⁶⁵

Dowieite Pentecostalism: Pentecostal Identity and Origins

Comparing Bosworth's journey from Dowieism to pentecostalism with that of John G. Lake and Marie Burgess Brown demonstrates that Bosworth was part of an important subgroup of influential first-generation pentecostals. These pentecostals distinguished themselves by carrying a Dowie-inflected supernaturalism into the new movement. While they largely accepted Parham's doctrine of speaking in tongues as the evidence of spirit-baptism, the gospel they preached was more broadly a continuation and adaptation of the gospel of the supernatural in which they had been reared by the holiness and divine healing movements, and particularly Dowieism. Marie Burgess Brown was happy to credit Dowie in her spiritual development, saying of Zion City: "That's where I got my foundation. And if it hadn't been for the truths of the Word of God as I learned them there I would not be here today."¹⁶⁶ John G. Lake too showed—and freely admitted—the patent influence of Dowie throughout his career in pentecostalism. Like Dowie, Lake took to calling himself "Apostle" and "Doctor" and used many of the "showman" techniques that had been Dowie's trade.¹⁶⁷ An editorial in a pentecostal-friendly newspaper in Zion City put it well:

The preaching of the 'full gospel' by John Alexander Dowie in which healing and holy living were added to the gospel of salvation hitherto preached was in itself a

¹⁶⁵ *In Loving Memory, Marie Estelle Brown Founder and Pastor Glad Tidings Tabernacle, New York City, 1907-1971* (New York: Glad Tidings Tabernacle, 1971), 10.

¹⁶⁶ Gardiner, "A Herald of Glad Tidings: Part One," 8.

¹⁶⁷ For Lake's debt to Dowie, see Burpeau, *God's Showman*, 34–36.

great stride towards what now seems to be the full gospel of salvation, healing, holing living and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit.¹⁶⁸

Furthermore, the stories of these Dowieites-turned-pentecostals counterbalance the traditional importance of Azusa Street, as these pentecostals' spirit-baptisms were centered on the Zion revival, not the Los Angeles mission. This distinction is not merely discerned by later historians; the participants were themselves aware of this important issue of pentecostal self-understanding. John G. Lake was adamant that the pentecostal movement owed its origin to Parham and Topeka, rather than Seymour and Los Angeles. Despite his contacts with Azusa Street and his enduring respect for William Seymour,¹⁶⁹ Lake insisted in a letter to Parham in 1924,

One thing I observe [,] however, is that the truth of the origin of the Pentecostal movement and its origin in your school at Topeka and the fact that you formulated the first Pentecostal message to the world is growing and is daily becoming a better known fact. So that now, even the prejudices of the Assemblies of God cannot submerge that truth and neither can Florence Crawford of Portland, Oregon, get the world to believe any longer that she was the first white woman baptized in the Holy Ghost after Pentecost came. And the people of Los Angeles cannot use it much further for a Los Angeles advertising stunt.¹⁷⁰

Parham's importance could not be doubted or ignored for pentecostals like Lake whose spirit-baptisms were not connected to Azusa Street.¹⁷¹ In reality, Lake's ministry illustrated the more complex truth of pentecostal origins—that various centers of

¹⁶⁸ "Epoch in History of Zion," *Zion City News*, September 4, 1908, 1. Zion Historical Society.

¹⁶⁹ In addition to his contact with Seymour at Azusa in 1907 along with Bosworth and Hezmalhalch, Lake visited Seymour during his 1909-1910 trip to the United States. See Burpeau, *God's Showman*, 118–120. Lake spoke of Seymour in glowing terms: "I do not believe that any other man in modern times had a more wonderful deluge of God in his life than God gave to that dear fellow." Lake, *John G. Lake*, 459–460.

¹⁷⁰ Lake, *John G. Lake*, 479.

¹⁷¹ Tom Hezmalhalch, who was a participant at Azusa Street, was present at Lake's pentecostal baptism, but only as a witness. Not surprisingly, the independently-minded and individualist Lake received his spirit-baptism without the ministrations of a fellow believer. See Lake and Morgan, *John G. Lake's Life & Diary*, 19.

pentecostalism inspired, interacted and influenced one another from the beginning of the movement. Shortly after Lake, Bosworth, Hezmalhalch and Fockler visited Azusa Street in 1907, Seymour came to Zion City. So impressed was Seymour with the revival there that he said “it reminds me of old Azusa ten months ago.”¹⁷²

Another telling example is that of Lucy Leatherman. As Parham was proud to report, Leatherman received her own spirit-baptism at Azusa Street, but only after witnessing the first pentecostal experiences with tongues at Parham’s Bible school in Topeka, Kansas. She was also in Zion City, where—fairly or not—she was accused of teaching that “speaking in tongues was the greatest of the nine gifts.”¹⁷³ On her way to Palestine, Leatherman spent time in New York City and implored Parham to send pentecostal workers there—a call that was answered by Marie Burgess.¹⁷⁴ Other early pentecostals were unconcerned about tracing the historical origins of the movement, content to recognize—as many scholars do today—that the early twentieth-century outpouring of the Holy Spirit sprang up in numerous locations with little connection between them.¹⁷⁵ As Alfred G. Garr, the first overseas missionary from Azusa Street and one who believed that tongues were never given to those who were not spirit-baptized, wrote in early 1907, “Reports are coming in from all over the word about how people are

¹⁷² “The ‘Latter Rain’ in Zion City,” *Apostolic Faith*, (Los Angeles), 1, no. 9 (September 1907): 1. Seymour’s co-worker and later wife Jennie Moore also visited Zion City in the spring of 1908. *Zion City News*, March 27, 1908, 1. Zion Historical Society.

¹⁷³ “Questions Lovingly Addressed to the Gift of Tongues People in Zion City,” *Zion Herald*, December 2, 1908, 3.

¹⁷⁴ “Our Trip East,” *Apostolic Faith*, (Baxter Springs, KS), 3, no. 3 (March 1927): 7; Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 130.

¹⁷⁵ Even some early North American pentecostal centers functioned quite independently of other major centers, such as the Hebden Mission in Toronto. See Adam Stewart, “A Canadian Azusa? The Implications of the Hebden Mission for Pentecostal Historiography,” in *Winds from the North*, ed. Michael Wilkinson and Peter Althouse (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 17–37.

speaking in tongues, *even before they heard of the Los Angeles meeting.*¹⁷⁶ The important thing for early pentecostals like Garr was not the historical lineage of the message, but the dramatic revival of specifically apostolic supernatural phenomenon.

In the decade after Parham brought the pentecostal message to Zion City in 1906, former Dowieites who joined the movement—like F.F. Bosworth, John G. Lake, and Marie Burgess Brown—became key to pentecostalism’s propagation and formation.¹⁷⁷ In

¹⁷⁶ A.G. Garr, “Tongues: The Bible Evidence to the Baptism with the Holy Ghost,” *Pentecostal Power*, March 1907, 2–6. Cited in Gary B. McGee, *Miracles, Missions, and American Pentecostalism*, American Society of Missiology Series, No. 45 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 93. Emphasis added.

¹⁷⁷ Numerous other examples of figures who came into pentecostalism after experiences with Dowie’s ministry could be related. Others will be addressed as they are encountered in subsequent chapters. One particularly interesting case is that of Lilian B. Yeomans (1861-1942). Trained as a regular physician at the University of Michigan, Yeomans developed an addiction to morphine and chloral hydrate in the course of her work. She sought healing through Christian Science and the “gold cure”—a therapeutic approach to chemical addiction (especially alcoholism) developed by Leslie Keeley and John Oughton that considered addiction a disease and treated it with injections of gold chloride. Without relief, Yeomans came under Dowie’s ministry in Chicago in 1898. After three weeks’ stay in Dowie’s healing home, she testified to complete healing from her addiction, regaining lost weight, her appetite, and her ability to sleep soundly. After her healing, she recognized that the addictive power of drugs was demonic—a position thoroughly in line with Dowie’s. Yeomans did not move to Zion City, but she and her sister Amelia (Amy) were baptized at Zion Tabernacle in Chicago on January 12, 1898. Following her healing, Yeomans worked as a missionary in Northern Ontario, loosely affiliated with the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Although she had forsworn medical means in the course of her healing under Dowie, her missions work compelled her to treat patients and carry drugs. In September of 1907, while living in Calgary, she experienced spirit-baptism with tongues under the guidance of a Miss Lockhart—a woman connected with the work of A.H. Argue. Aside from hearing reports from Los Angeles, Yeomans’s pentecostal experience was connected to the Azusa Street work only in the fourth degree (Lockhart experienced spirit-baptism under Argue, who had the experience under William Durham, who came to his Pentecost at Azusa Street). After 1912, Yeomans completely set aside medical practice, devoting herself to pentecostal ministry with a focus on divine healing, eventually receiving ordination with the Assemblies of God (ca. 1923). In 1921 Yeomans joined the faculty of Glad Tidings Bible School in San Francisco, and two years later she began working at L.I.F.E Bible College, a school founded and directed by Ample Semple McPherson. Here she taught for fourteen years, during which time she also wrote a number of influential works on divine healing from a pentecostal perspective. Throughout her career, she was one of the most articulate pentecostal spokespersons on the subject of divine healing, and although she did not denounce the medical profession as Dowie had, she continued to teach Dowie’s basic tenet that the devil is the author of disease. Like Lake and Burgess, Yeomans had an enduring—if guarded—respect for Dowie: “Dr. Dowie had an invincible, God-given faith in the Word of God as just the same today as it ever has been and ever will be... If there was anything in his life or teaching that you do not see to be in accordance with God’s Word, you are not called upon to follow it, but his faith in God’s Word you are exhorted to imitate.” Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 130. “While I could never fully follow Dr. Dowie in all of his teachings,” Yeomans wrote in 1926, “I could not doubt the truth of his statement that God had conferred upon him gifts of healing. The Holy Spirit answered to it in my soul, and he was approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him, which the very man in the street could neither gainsay nor resist.” Lilian B. Yeomans, *Healing from Heaven* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1973), 106. For

many ways, their lives displayed the turn-of-the-century gospel of the supernatural in narrative form. As Bosworth moved through the experiences of a Methodist-style conversion, holiness-inspired divine healing, leadership and tutelage under John Alexander Dowie, and finally spirit-baptism under Charles Parham, he was nicely equipped to become a leader in the emerging pentecostal movement. And in all of these experiences, he was in good company with others who became leading lights of early pentecostalism.

Yeomans's life and career, see James Opp, "Balm of Gilead: Faith, Healing, and Medicine in the Life of Dr. Lillian B. Yeomans" (presented at the Canadian Society of Church History, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1997); James William Opp, *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine, and Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880-1930* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 91–92, 196–202. For Yeomans's testimony to healing under Dowie, see "Cheering Words from Zion's Guests," *Leaves of Healing* 4, no. 15 (February 5, 1898): 295; *Leaves of Healing* 4, no. 18 (February 26, 1898): 350–351. See also Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 125–138; Lillian B. Yeomans, "This Is the Rest...and This Is the Refreshing," *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 845 (April 26, 1930): 1; Lillian B. Yeomans, "Out of the Depths: A Testimony," *Christian and Missionary Alliance* 29, no. 20 (February 15, 1908): 330–331.

CHAPTER THREE

Emboldened and Empowered to Preach, 1907-1913

One result of the precious baptism...[is that] God has brought one into the sphere of the supernatural, the sphere of the Holy Ghost who can now work in and through one's being much more effectively.

—Max Wood Moorhead, “A Personal Testimony” (1907)¹

In Zion City, F.F. Bosworth had matured into a position of leadership in the radical holiness and divine healing movement, but his work centered on his musical gifts and had provided him with a comfortable salary. Although he readily sought the experience of spirit-baptism when Parham brought the pentecostal message to Zion City in 1906, Bosworth was initially worried that the blessing would require him “to give up all to God [and] that he would ask me to preach the gospel.” With a wife and two children to provide for, the prospect of living on faith had little appeal, even though the holiness movement lionized such famed faith missionaries as George Müller and Hudson Taylor. Bosworth's concerns were justified, but after the life-changing pentecostal experience, he found that his priorities had been rearranged. “After I had been Baptized with the Holy Ghost,” he later testified, “I was afraid God would *not* call me to preach.”² Bosworth found that spirit-baptism not only seemed to require a new commitment to evangelization, but it also emboldened him to do so. Bosworth quickly “gave up all to

¹ Max Wood Moorehead, “A Personal Testimony,” *Cloud of Witnesses to Pentecost in India*, no. 2 (September 1907): 38. Cited in Gary B. McGee, *Miracles, Missions, and American Pentecostalism*, American Society of Missiology Series, No. 45 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 103.

² All quotes in this paragraph are from F.F. Bosworth, *Bosworth's Life Story: The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth, as Told by Himself in the Alliance Tabernacle, Toronto* (Toronto: Alliance Book Room, n.d.), 7–8. Emphasis added.

God,” setting out on evangelistic work across the Midwest and South. Eventually he planted a pentecostal church in Dallas that he pastored for almost a decade and from which he launched a wildly successful revival with Maria Woodworth-Etter. This revival solidified Bosworth’s reputation among pentecostals, situating him to attract adherents to the new message and strengthen the churches and institutions that would help turn pentecostalism into a major American denominational family by mid-century.

As Bosworth’s testimony demonstrates, pentecostals believed in a direct link between spirit-baptism and evangelism. J.G. Speicher, a Zion City leader who knew personally the missionary effect of the pentecostal experience on Bosworth, said “the one great feature of this work is the wonderful missionary spirit that it inspires in the hearts of those who come under its influence.”³ Few Christian movements of the modern era exhibited the evangelistic zeal of early pentecostalism. The expectation of supernatural empowerment, millennial fervor, and the wider mission movement of late-nineteenth century Protestantism formed a potent evangelistic cocktail in the new pentecostal movement. Charles Parham’s view of divinely-endowed tongues as missionary languages nicely represents early pentecostals’ evangelistic passion as it combined with holiness supernaturalism. Although most pentecostals by 1909 no longer limited tongues speech to foreign languages, the evangelistic zeal implied in Parham’s teaching remained.⁴ Pentecostals were self-consciously missionary people, believing that they continued the work begun by the early church but neglected since the end of the first century. As the

³ “Is It the Latter Rain?,” *Zion City News*, August 1, 1907, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁴ James R. Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), 15; McGee, *Miracles, Missions, and American Pentecostalism*, 102.

Missionary Manual of General Council of the Assemblies of God put it in 1931, “In the year 1901 the latter rain began to fall in different parts of the world. Again, waiting, hungry-hearted people were baptized in the Holy Spirit. The Lord’s Pentecostal missionary movement was resumed.”⁵

Most pentecostals believed that speaking in tongues was the sign of this baptism in the Holy Spirit, and this teaching alienated them from all other Christians, including holiness groups of all kinds and residents of Zion City who rallied to Wilbur Glenn Voliva. Yet every pentecostal would say that spirit-baptism was more than tongues. Articulations of the “real” importance of spirit-baptism differed greatly, but all pentecostals agreed that the experience imparted supernatural power and divine intimacy that could be obtained no other way. As early pentecostal missionary to India Max Wood Moorhead explained in this chapter’s epigraph, spirit-baptism’s essential import was that it brings one “into the sphere of the supernatural.” The experience was both a tangible demonstration of supernatural activity as well as a gateway for deeper supernatural power. In the words of Bosworth’s sometime-coworker Bernice Lee, spirit-baptism was only “the merest beginning; the first glimpse into the Glory as the great, beautiful door of Pentecost swings open!”⁶

By detailing Bosworth’s first seven years of ministry and placing his work within the context of the early pentecostal milieu, the character of Bosworth’s ministry and the reasons for his success come into focus. In his evangelistic zeal and his commitment to

⁵ The prologue of the *Missionary Manual*, titled “History of the Pentecostal Movement,” is reprinted in Gary B. McGee, “‘The Lord’s Pentecostal Missionary Movement’: The Restorationist Impulse of a Modern Mission Movement,” *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 8, no. 1 (January 1, 2005): 63–65. Quote is on p. 64.

⁶ Bernice C. Lee, “I Will Be Within Thee a Well of Water,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 7 (April 1909): 20.

the empowerment of spirit-baptism, Bosworth was a typical pentecostal. In his success in itinerant ministry and church-planting, Bosworth was a remarkable and influential early leader. Both of these dimensions were grounded in Bosworth's devotion to a dynamic, theologically inquisitive but non-dogmatic supernaturalism that was at the heart of the pentecostal movement.

Early Itinerancy, 1907-1910

Bosworth was a significant part of the controversial pentecostal movement in Zion City that contributed to the chaos in the months after Dowie's fall from power, and pentecostals with close ties to Bosworth continued to threaten the old guard for years after Parham left in early 1907. In the summer of 1907, the *Zion Herald*—Voliva's megaphone of righteous indignation disguised as a newspaper—railed against the pentecostal movement, finding particular delight in the allegations against Parham of "sodomy with a Jew boy." From the beginning describing the contest against pentecostalism as a "war," Voliva called upon Zion City residents to set "Zion City free from this Terrible Curse brought here by the Devil, through this Miserable Degenerate, Parham." In a cavalcade of smear that indicated who the leading spokesmen of the new movement were, Voliva called out Dowieites-turned-pentecostals Cyrus Fockler, John G. Lake, John Spiecher, A.F. Lee, and William H. Piper, as well as their leader Tom Hezmalhalch, branding them thieves, drunks, adulterers and lovers of indecency.⁷

Those who embraced pentecostalism or approached it with openness saw in the movement a much-needed source of spiritual renewal:

⁷ "A Relentless War Against Iniquity of Every Kind!!!" *Zion Herald*, July 25, 1907, supplement.

He [the Holy Spirit] is taking little children and young people and simple hearted people and is speaking through them more powerfully than He has ever spoken through the great Overseers and Elders and hundreds of officers of Zion. The ministry of Zion has been unfruitful for years. No one can deny it. We have been set aside and God is allowing us to pass through a new course of training for His glory.⁸

But to those in Zion City who rejected pentecostalism, Parham's teaching was "the mildew of Hell."⁹ For Zion's faithful, the essential difference between them was that pentecostalism was "emotionalism, spiritualism, fanaticism and other nervous manifestations," while Zion appealed to the intellect.¹⁰ But behind the bombast was hurt: "How is it," asked one harried Zion City resident, "that overseers, elders, evangelists, and deacons, who have taken such a strong stand for Zion in past years, will now throw the teachings to the wind?" The writer could only suggest that they were predators or unstable.¹¹ In addition to Parham's view of tongues as "sine qua non," Zion stalwarts described pentecostalism in terms of sexual deviance, uncontrolled emotionalism, lack of moral rigor, and stubborn belief in no human organization.¹² The pentecostals' belief that they should have no human leader was mentioned often, as this was clearly of much appeal to disillusioned Zionites who became pentecostals as well as a source of great offense to those who continued in their loyalty to Zion and Voliva. The religious battle was tangled in civic life, as Parhamites battled Voliva's party for control of the Zion City

⁸ "As Dr. Speicher Sees It," *Zion City News*, June 28, 1907, 2. J.G. Speicher wrote this plea before his own pentecostal experience.

⁹ "Warning to Zion: Parhamites Seeking to Rule," *Zion Herald*, October 25, 1907, 1.

¹⁰ Benjamin G. Hess, "Frenzied Religion," *Zion Herald*, August 2, 1907, 3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² "Invasion of the Barbarians," *Zion Herald*, August 9, 1907, 1, 4, supplement.

school board. This concern over instruction of the next generation must be taken account when judging the vitriol of anti-pentecostal voices in Zion City.¹³

The most scandalous episode for pentecostalism in Zion City occurred in September of 1907. A 64-year-old Zion City resident and invalid named Letitia Greenhalgh died on September 18 after three Parhamites physically abused her during an attempted exorcism. Apparently, by roughly straightening her impotent limbs while rebuking the spirits of illness, Greenhalgh's bones were broken, leading to her death. Although the well-known pentecostal leaders like Lake and Hezmalhalch were not involved, Zion leaders held them responsible and demanded that "Tom and his stripe of religious derelicts must be curbed in their practices and made to walk soberly."¹⁴ Even though Zionites under Dowie had previously been accused of similar abusive measures performed in the name of healing and Parham was not in Zion City at the time, the national press sided with Zion City, laying the blame of Greenhalgh's death at Parham's feet.¹⁵ The incident spurred investigations into other recent deaths.¹⁶ While it is not

¹³ "Warning to Zion: Parhamites Seeking to Rule," 4; "Zion vs. Parhamism and the Municipal League," *Zion Herald*, October 25, 1907, 2.

¹⁴ "Fruits of Parhamism," *Zion Herald*, September 20, 1907, 1; "A Tragedy," *Zion Herald*, September 27, 1907, 1. The rival newspaper *Zion City News*, while portraying the manslaughter as the act of deluded individuals, did not completely absolve the pentecostal leadership: "On many sides responsibility for this affair has sought to be placed on the Parhamites or Apostolic Faith people of this City. While we do not believe that this charge is true, it does seem that more wisdom on the part of the leaders in this movement might have prevented some of the unfortunate events which have happened in the past few weeks." "Horror in Zion City," *Zion City News*, September 27, 1907, 2.

¹⁵ "Mother Tortured in Religion's Name: Aged Woman Dies at the Hands of Son and Daughter and Three Other Parhamites. Tried to Cast Out Devils After Death Members of the Sect Attempt to 'Resurrect' Victim -- All Are Arrested," *New York Times*, September 21, 1907, 7. J.G. Speicher recalled that in earlier days under Dowie, some visitors were "disgusted and disappointed when they saw leaders lay hold of the limbs of the lame and pull with all their might until sometimes serious injuries resulted. "As Dr. Speicher Sees It," 2.

¹⁶ "Other Cases of Torture: Further Arrests of Parhamites May Be Made at Zion City.," *New York Times*, September 22, 1907, C5.

mentioned in general pentecostal histories, this incident—in which Parham was always named—should be considered another factor in Parham’s decline.¹⁷

Although Lake and Hezmalhalch left Zion City shortly after the scandalous death of Greenhalgh, loyal Zionites continued to express concern about pentecostalism within their walls through the next few years.¹⁸ William H. Piper, who had been one of the highest ranking officers under Dowie, formed his Stone Church in Chicago in December of 1906 and openly identified with the pentecostals the following summer. Rumors about the rapid growth of his church and the circulation of his paper, *Later Rain Evangel*, worried Zion leaders. Clearly the new pentecostal movement was gaining momentum; the pentecostal periodical *Household of Faith*, published in Ohio, had nearly 300 subscribers in Zion City at the end of 1908, even though they also had closer access to Piper’s paper.¹⁹ Even one of Dowie’s most famous cases of healing, Sadie Cody, attended the Stone Church on occasion, later embraced pentecostalism, and would even record a number of Bosworth’s sermons when he preached in California in 1914 and 1915.²⁰

¹⁷ Parham’s fall from leadership is usually credited to his inability to work with other leaders (demonstrated most damagingly in his criticism of Seymour’s work at Azusa Street), his sexual scandal, and his botched attempt to travel to Palestine to recover the Ark of the Covenant. See, for example, Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *The Assemblies of God: A Chapter in the Story of American Pentecostalism*, vol. 1 (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1989), 91–92. The Zion pentecostals changed their name from Apostolic Faith to Christian Assembly of Zion City in October of 1907 (less than a month after the death of Greenhalgh). Voliva’s party interpreted this as an attempt to distance themselves from Parham. “Rominger a Parhamite!!!,” *Zion Herald*, October 25, 1907, 2.

¹⁸ On the backlash following Greenhalch’s death as the reason for Lake’s departure from Zion City, see Barry Morton, “‘The Devil Who Heals’: Fraud and Falsification in the Evangelical Career of John G. Lake, Missionary to South Africa 1908-1913,” *African Historical Review* 44, no. 2 (2012): 108. Morton is rather harsh: “In light of these events it is clear that Lake and Hezmalhalch did not leave Zion City in response to divine calling. Instead, they ran away to escape popular justice.”

¹⁹ “Zion City Subscribers,” *Household of God* 4, no. 12 (December 1908): 8.

²⁰ Sadie Cody, “A Miracle of Healing,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 3, no. 8 (May 1911): 19–22. For Cody as reporter for Bosworth’s sermons, see F.F. Bosworth, “Power in the Holy Ghost,” *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 11 (November 1914): 244–47; F.F. Bosworth, “Living Faith in the Power of God,” *Triumphs*

Voliva's paper derided Piper and other pentecostals for talking incessantly about visions and other supernatural experiences.²¹

Zion City was freshly disrupted by pentecostalism when Daniel Bryant arrived in early June 1908.²² Since 1904, Bryant had served as a missionary for Dowie's church in South Africa, and his work was largely taken over by John G. Lake. Although Bryant did not arrive in Zion City as a pentecostal, and he maintained an independent ministry, for a time, Bryant identified with the pentecostals. Bryant's presence rallied pentecostal forces in Zion City, even though he apparently had doubts about the doctrine of tongues as evidence of spirit-baptism.²³ Through 1908, Bryant, Piper, and Marie Burgess continued to lead pentecostal meetings in Zion City, periodically raising the ire of Zion's faithful.²⁴

In the years following Bosworth's pentecostal experience, he was only an occasional presence in Zion City. But Zion residents followed his evangelistic work through the pages of their local newspapers, and his influence on others in the city was considerable. When Bosworth's son Vernon died on June 16, 1907, Tom Hezmalhalch and John G. Lake were among Zion's pentecostal leaders who presided at the funeral

of Faith 35, no. 2 (February 1915): 29–33; F.F. Bosworth, "Healing in the Atonement," *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 10 (October 1915): 226–31; F.F. Bosworth, "Clay in the Hands of the Potter," *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 11 (November 1915): 254–59.

²¹ "Evil Men Wax Worse," *Zion Herald*, April 8, 1908, 1; "Poor Piper," *Zion Herald*, November 11, 1908, 2.

²² *Zion Herald*, June 24, 1908, 2.

²³ Burpeau misses Bryant's close association with Zion City pentecostals. Kemp Pendleton Burpeau, *God's Showman: A Historical Study of John G. Lake and South African/American Pentecostalism* (Oslo: Refleks, 2004), 68. This failure to see figures like Bryant as quasi-pentecostal creates unnecessary confusion for classifying certain individuals, see *Ibid.*, 148–149, n. 351. For Bryant's flirtation with pentecostalism, see "Smallpox? No! Something Ten Thousand Times Worse Has Invaded Zion City," *Zion Herald*, October 21, 1908, 1; "Questions Lovingly Addressed to the Gift of Tongues People in Zion City," *Zion Herald*, December 2, 1908, 3; "Is It Not Awful?," *Zion Herald*, December 9, 1908, 3; "The Dirtiest and Biggest Lie Since the Death of Ananias and Sapphira," *Zion Herald*, December 23, 1908, 3.

²⁴ "Is It Not Awful?," 3.

service at Bosworth's home in Zion City.²⁵ In July of 1907, John Speicher, formerly Commissioner of Health for Zion City, pointed to the example of Bosworth and Lake (as well as his experience at Azusa Street) as decisive on his journey into the pentecostal fold.²⁶ Between extended meetings in Plymouth, Indiana, in September of 1908, Bosworth returned to Zion City to conduct services at the pentecostal Christian Assembly.²⁷ A report noted that Bosworth spoke "in his usual quiet and unassuming, though earnest way," on the need for caution against "extravagant manifestations" among the pentecostals. Bosworth pleaded that the pentecostal experience should above all else "make people more like Jesus."²⁸ On a brief stay in the city in January of 1909, Bosworth preached on "The Consecrated Mind."²⁹ Perhaps because of this "sensible" stance and his infrequent public appearances in the city, Bosworth managed to keep a relatively low profile and was not targeted by Voliva's *Zion Herald*.

Bosworth's first major evangelistic work occurred in April of 1907 in Milwaukee alongside Cyrus Fockler (1863-1933), who had been an elder in the Christian Catholic Church and by mid-1907 would be infamous in Zion City for his pentecostal activities. As a representative of Zion, Fockler had been in charge of the Zion work in Mansfield, Ohio. He also ministered frequently at Zion Home in Chicago, and like most of Dowie's

²⁵ *Zion City News*, June 21, 1907. See also Eunice May Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story* (Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921), 100.

²⁶ "Is It the Latter Rain?". For Speicher's experience at Azusa Street, see "As Dr. Speicher Sees It," 1, 2.

²⁷ *Zion City News*, September 11, 1908; "Crowded with Blessing," *Zion City News*, September 18, 1908, 1, 3.

²⁸ "A Sensible Talk," *Zion City News*, September 25, 1908. The writer of this article claimed that Bosworth's stance on manifestations was the same as William Piper.

²⁹ "Fred Bosworth in City," *Zion City News*, January 8, 1909, 4.

leaders, had more than one healing attributed to his prayers. His daughter, Mary, testified to healing from pneumonia by Fockler's prayers.³⁰

Fockler had made a name for himself by suffering for Dowie's unpopular gospel. In 1899, Fockler was arrested in Mansfield for interfering with the duties of a public officer—which was in reality Fockler advising a family not to use medicine advised by a physician—and released on \$7,500 bond. Fockler was later cleared, but the town was clearly unhappy with his work there, and when the child of a Zion member died a few months later, Fockler was blamed. Rumors also circulated that Fockler unwisely cast aspersions on some of the young women of the city. Feeling that the law would be of no help, the disgruntled Mansfieldians—seven or eight hundred strong, according to one report—formed a mob intending to tar and feather Fockler. Without knowing of their plot, Fockler escaped injury by making a trip at that time to his hometown of Canton, Ohio. But a few weeks later, on July 21, 1900, the mob, now in the thousands, got ahold of Fockler, stripped him naked and beat him. Fockler suffered internal injuries before he was spirited away to the safety of the local prison.³¹ Perhaps sensing that Mansfield was too volatile for Fockler, Dowie reassigned him—along with future pentecostal leader William Piper—to Chicago's South Side Zion Tabernacle in May of 1901.³² As Zion City grew, Fockler worked with Zion Securities and Investments as well.³³ Fockler continued to work in a ministerial role, performing baptisms in Illinois, Ohio, and Iowa. Somewhat

³⁰ "Voices of Children Praising God" *Leaves of Healing* 8, no. 3 (November 10, 1900): 80.

³¹ "Mansfield, Ohio," *Leaves of Healing* 7, no. 12 (July 14, 1900): 371; "The Kingdom of God Is Come," *Leaves of Healing* 7, no. 14 (July 28, 1900): 427–35.

³² *Leaves of Healing* 9, no. 3 (May 11, 1901): 73.

³³ "Paulding and Oceola, Ohio," *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 15 (January 31, 1903): 477.

abruptly in 1903, Fockler cut ties with Dowie, only to reemerge in Zion City during the pentecostal commotion of 1906.³⁴

Like his friend John G. Lake, Fockler had an intense spiritual struggle leading up to his personal Pentecost, even coming to doubt his salvation. One night during his months of seeking, he went alone to Lake Michigan in sub-zero temperatures praying for hours in “soul agony.” Fockler later surmised that this “spiritual bankruptcy” was his necessary condition for receiving spirit-baptism. Fockler connected spirit-baptism to evangelism much like Bosworth did, but for Fockler, who had yet to receive his pentecostal experience, this was a negative connection. “I guess God doesn’t want me in the ministry any more [sic],” was his response to not having his spirit-baptism.³⁵

Fockler received his spirit-baptism with tongues in March of 1907, guided by Lake and Tom Hezmalhalch in a Chicago tarrying meeting.³⁶ His wife knew the importance of this experience, telling Fockler, “I suppose you are now ready to answer any call that comes.”³⁷ He was, and he demonstrated this by answering Lake’s request to assist him and Bosworth in Milwaukee. The party held their first service on April 7, 1907. Bosworth

³⁴ The last mention of Fockler in *Leaves of Healing* is “Obeying God in Baptism,” *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 15 (August 1, 1903): 486. He performed the baptism of one person in Lost Nation, Iowa, on July 24.

³⁵ Cyrus B. Fockler, “A Message to Seekers: How I Sought and Received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost,” *Good News* 17, no. 12 (December 1926): 16–17. <http://webjournals.ac.edu.au/journals/GN/gn-vol17-no12-dec-1926/13-a-message-to-seekers/>. Accessed January 17, 2014.

³⁶ As with many Zion City believers who became pentecostals, the circumstances of Fockler’s spirit-baptism are not precisely clear. Some sources place it in November of 1906 in Zion City, see Gordon P. Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World* (Shippensburg, PA: Companion Press, 1990), 12. Fockler’s 1926 recollection placed it in March of 1907. Fockler, “A Message to Seekers,” 16. Most likely, Fockler was won to the pentecostal message at the earlier Zion City meeting, and may have even spoken in tongues, yet for whatever reason did not consider this his spirit-baptism. His experience is much like John G. Lake’s, who reportedly spoke in tongues at the New Year’s Watch Night Service of 1906, but did not claim spirit-baptism until October of 1907.

³⁷ Fockler, “A Message to Seekers,” 16.

and Fockler successfully planted the pentecostal work in Milwaukee with the healing of Alice Baumbach, who for years had been bedridden with spinal tuberculosis.³⁸

This was the beginning of a nearly two-year occasional ministry partnership between Bosworth and Fockler. After Milwaukee, the two “went south,” which may indicate that Fockler accompanied Bosworth on the latter’s evangelistic work in Texas from late April to early June in 1907.³⁹ It was perhaps after the Texas work that Bosworth, along with Fockler, Lake, and Hezmalhalch, visited Azusa Street. By March of 1908, Bosworth and Fockler—along with B.F. Lawrence—were doing extended work in South Bend, Indiana.⁴⁰ From there, they went to Plymouth, Indiana, where Bosworth conducted tent meetings from June 19 until the end of the year.⁴¹ Bosworth’s ministry at this stage reflects the strength of the early ex-Zion network: in Plymouth, Fockler was

³⁸ Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 12–13; Cyrus B. Fockler, “The Church at Milwaukee,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 146 (July 1, 1916): 11; Cyrus B. Fockler, *Tuning in with the Infinite* (Milwaukee: Gospel Tabernacle, 1925), 73–75.

³⁹ *Zion City News*, April 26, 1907, 1; *Zion City News*, June 14, 1907, 2. “Went south” could have meant that the two returned to Zion City. Fockler was still assisting in pentecostal meetings in Zion City in the summer of 1907. Hess, “Frenzied Religion,” 3.

⁴⁰ *Zion City News*, March 27, 1908, 1. Lawrence went on to write the popular and influential early history of pentecostalism, *The Apostolic Faith Restored* (1916). Bosworth returned to Zion City and back to South Bend at least once during the course of work in that area, but one gets this impression that by this time he no longer considered Zion City his home. *Zion City News*, May 8, 1908, 1; *Zion City News*, June 19, 1908, 1. A November 1910 report of Bosworth’s work noted that “Fred could not swallow the ‘one man power’ and got the cold shoulder about two years ago,” perhaps alluding to Bosworth’s final departure from Zion City in 1908. “God Approved Man Condemned,” *Zion City News*, November 4, 1910, 3.

⁴¹ Lee was expected to “assume charge of the work” in Plymouth beginning December 28, 1908, which may indicate Bosworth was no longer there. Bosworth returned to Zion City shortly after the New year. See “The Christian Assembly,” *Zion City News*, December 25, 1908, 4; “Fred Bosworth in City,” 4. The February issue of *Latter Rain Evangel* has Plymouth as Lee’s residence, but her article is unfortunately not dated. Bernice C. Lee, “Be Not Anxious for the Morrow,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 5 (February 1909): 8.

with Bosworth for about five weeks; then Jean Campbell and Bernice Lee came from New York, where they had been working with Marie Burgess.⁴²

Bosworth's report of the Plymouth meetings is the first account of his itinerant work from his hand. The report, printed in the August 21 issue of *Zion City News*, reveals him deeply concerned with supernatural guidance and confirmation of his work. "While in prayer," Bosworth testified, "God made it so plain to me that we wrestled not against flesh and blood but against the rulers and of the power of this darkness." Treating ministry itself as a supernatural endeavor, Bosworth recognized that any resistance to their message came from "wicked spirits," and he prayed that "[God] would send a stream of power upon the city which would penetrate through the darkness and drive back the foe."⁴³ He had good reason to suspect demonic activity, as in Plymouth he was intimately involved with the deliverance of a woman who was housed in a jail next door to Bosworth. She had gone insane and was threatening to kill her children. Bosworth came to her cell and encouraged her to stop resisting God and start praying specifically in Jesus' name. When she finally acquiesced, "like a flash, the thing that was tormenting her was gone!"⁴⁴ In the midst of prayer preparations, Bosworth experienced a vision in which he saw a light emerging from a single point in the heavens and widening over the city as it came down. Within the light were angelic forces traversing to and fro, while a "most intense darkness" surrounded the light. Taking this vision as assurance of divine

⁴² F.F. Bosworth, "Confirming the Word By Signs Following," *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 3 (December 1908): 7.

⁴³ "Letter from F.F. Bosworth: Zion's Former Well Known Band Leader Writes to News," *Zion City News*, August 21, 1908, 1, 2. Quote on p. 2.

⁴⁴ F.F. Bosworth, "The Enthronement of Self the Great Sin," *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 11 (August 1915): 3.

assistance for the work, Bosworth concluded that “thus far we have had little opposition.”⁴⁵

Aside from accompanying spirit-baptism, speaking in tongues was for Bosworth a definite confirmation of the word he and his party preached. At their first meeting in nearby La Paz, a woman came under conviction after hearing the tongues speech and returned to the next meeting testifying to a mystical experience and an interpretation of the tongues message. For Bosworth, the whole incident was a matter of God supernaturally confirming their work: “We praise Him for giving this sign in the very first meeting,” he wrote. In addition to conversions, healings, exorcisms and spirit-baptisms, Bosworth reported that some saw fire “with the natural eye” come upon them at the time of their spirit-baptisms. Bosworth’s final ode to supernatural guidance showed that he had fully come to terms with ministry on the faith principle: “We are taking no collections and it is beautiful to see God supply us day by day out of an unseen storehouse.”⁴⁶ Like his healer Mattie Perry, Bosworth’s supernaturalism covered the range from the fantastic to the mundane.

In February of 1909, Bosworth traveled to his old home city of Fitzgerald, Georgia, conducting revival meetings there that summer. In Fitzgerald he led the Baptist preacher S.J. Parrish into the pentecostal experience. Parrish went on to participate in camp meetings with G.B. Cashwell, known to many as the “apostle of Pentecost to the South.”⁴⁷ That same year, Bosworth attended the annual Texas camp meeting in Austin,

⁴⁵ Bosworth, “Confirming the Word By Signs Following,” 7.

⁴⁶ All quotes in this paragraph are from *Ibid.*, 8.

⁴⁷ For Bosworth’s move to Fitzgerald, where his wife and child had preceded him, see *Zion City News*, February 12, 1909, 1. For the revival services, see “Notice,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 44

where he met Elias G. Birdsall, who would become his partner in ministry for the next decade. Birdsall had been ordained as a missionary by Charles Parham and Warren F. Carothers in May of 1906 and was ordained again as an evangelist by D.C.O Opperman and Carothers a few months before he met Bosworth.⁴⁸ At the Texas meeting, Bosworth was asked to preach on the atonement, and in the course of his sermon, explained that “the bread [of communion] stood for our healing just as definitely as the blood stood for our salvation.” This was a message the sickly Birdsall needed to hear, and he was healed the next day during a communion service.⁴⁹ This Texas meeting was likely the setting of Bosworth’s first ordination in the pentecostal movement, which occurred on August 2.⁵⁰ Bosworth made other stops in Texas at Alvin, Waco, and Fort Worth and also traveled to Conway, South Carolina.⁵¹ These travels allowed Bosworth to expand his network of pentecostal workers and churches beyond the circle of ex-Zionites.⁵²

(August 15, 1909): 2. Bosworth may have been assisted by Jean Campbell, who returned to Zion City from Fitzgerald in August of 1909. *Zion City News*, August 20, 1909, 1.

⁴⁸ Elias G. Birdsall, “Application Blank for Ordination Certificate,” 1916, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁴⁹ F.F. Bosworth, “Discerning the Lord’s Body,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 3. See also Bosworth, “Healing in the Atonement,” 228.

⁵⁰ Executive Presbytery of the General Council of the Assemblies of God, “Certificate of Ordination, Fred F. Bosworth,” 1916, 30/4/1, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁵¹ Eunice May Perkins, *Fred Francis Bosworth (the Joybringer)* (River Forest, IL: F.F. Bosworth, 1927), 69. Bosworth was with Cyrus Fockler in Alvin, Texas. See Fockler, *Tuning in with the Infinite*, 61–62.

⁵² A number of camp meetings line up with Bosworth’s general route during this period. For example, a pentecostal camp meeting was held in Conway in July of 1909, followed by a widely advertised meeting for prayer. “Conway, S.C.,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 44 (August 15, 1909): 2; “Camp Meeting Notes,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 40 (June 15, 1909): 3. The annual Texas pentecostal meeting was held in Fort Worth in July of 1910. “Campmeetings,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 2, no. 9 (June 1910): 9. Bosworth may not have been in Fort Worth when he responded to the call to Dallas, however, since he recalled that he had to pray for the train fare and that he “went down, and after a while sent for my wife and little Vivian.” Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story*, 8.

Dallas, Texas: Bosworth the Rising Star

Upon receiving a telegram invitation, Bosworth came to Dallas in October of 1910.⁵³ His wife and daughter Vivian joined him shortly thereafter. Bosworth's friends in Zion City read reports of his Dallas work as early as November 4, learning that some "old-time Zion healings" were occurring under his ministry.⁵⁴ However, with no other pentecostal saints in the city,⁵⁵ the work started slowly and faced much opposition, stretching Bosworth's reliance on God. "I have seen my wife set the table without anything to put on it to eat," Bosworth later said of his early days in Texas, "and often we came down to our last crust." Yet he continued to trust in God's supernatural providence, taking turns with his wife and daughter shouting "Glory" into their empty lard tin. He demonstrated his continued faith by his frequent willingness to give away his last dollars. He believed he was vindicated in his trust in God when a stranger knocked on his door and handed him a load of groceries, later telling him that God had directed her to do so.⁵⁶

Their work turned a corner on February 2 the following year. Bosworth credited the success to their persistent prayers for revival, a theme that would remain central throughout his career.⁵⁷ Their first convert—labeled by one historian as "the first known person in Dallas, Texas, to 'speak with other tongues'"—was Harriet Wasson (or Watson), followed by a handful of others, including an "old baseball player" named

⁵³ "A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas," *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (1911): 14.

⁵⁴ "God Approved Man Condemned," 3. See also *Zion City News*, November 25, 1910, 4.

⁵⁵ The only family Bosworth knew in Dallas (presumably the one that invited him) moved "the very day we arrived," according to Bosworth, *The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth*, 8.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 8–10. Quotes are on p. 9.

⁵⁷ "A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas"; F.F. Bosworth, "Pentecostal Outpouring in Dallas, Texas," *Latter Rain Evangel* 4, no. 11 (August 1912): 10; Bosworth, *Bosworth's Life Story*, 9.

Jimmy Hutton, who served for a time as song leader for their meetings.⁵⁸ Bosworth boasted in particular of successes among “the colored saints” in the Queen City neighborhood of south Dallas,⁵⁹ with thirty experiencing spirit-baptism within a few weeks in the spring of 1911.⁶⁰ By June, Bosworth claimed that 185 people had been baptized in the Spirit with tongues, and he was particularly pleased that a number of ministers had received their spirit-baptisms and would go out to spread the pentecostal message.⁶¹ At the end of August, he put that figure at 225.⁶²

Building off this growth, Bosworth took charge of the sixth annual Apostolic Faith Interstate Camp Meeting for Texas and the Southwest, which was held in Dallas July 7-23, 1911, and which he hoped Chicago pentecostal leader William Durham would attend.⁶³ Although Bosworth’s primary professional focus had shifted from music to preaching, he still brought his cornet to meetings and used music to draw a crowd.⁶⁴ Working alongside Birdsall and conducting initial meetings in his home and then under a tent, Bosworth described the first semi-permanent facilities he used for services as “a big

⁵⁸ Carrie Frances Wagliardo Loftis, *A History of First Assembly of God; Dallas, Texas, 1912-1992, 80 Years* (Dallas, TX: First Assembly of God, 1992), 7. Bosworth mentions Wasson’s hospitality in “F.F. Bosworth to His Mother,” August 11, 1911, 9, 3/8/5, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁵⁹ Fred F. Bosworth, “Beating in Texas Follows Ministry to Blacks: F.F. Bosworth’s 1911 Letter to His Mother,” *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6 (June 1, 1986): 14.

⁶⁰ Daniel C.O. Opperman, “Our Lord Is Giving the Victory,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 4, no. 84 (April 15, 1911): 3.

⁶¹ “A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas”; Bosworth, “Pentecostal Outpouring in Dallas, Texas,” 10.

⁶² Bosworth, “Beating in Texas Follows Ministry to Blacks,” 14.

⁶³ “Campmeetings,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 3, no. 9 (June 1911): 12. Previous camp meetings of the Apostolic Faith Movement in Texas were led by Bosworth’s fellow ex-Zionite, D.C.O. Opperman. “Campmeetings,” June 1910. For Bosworth’s invitation to Durham, see “A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas.”

⁶⁴ Loftis, *A History of First Assembly of God*, 7; Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 98.

shed,” where his services sometimes had 1,000 to 1,500 participants. In one remarkable service, he related that a number of people testified to hearing divine voices, feeling a heavenly breeze, and seeing a multitude of angels “filling the rafters of the building.” To Bosworth, this meeting demonstrated the pentecostal truth dearest to his heart: “[God] confirms his word with signs and wonders.”⁶⁵

Despite growing success, Bosworth encountered one of his most traumatic experiences during this early period in Texas. On August 6, 1911, he was viciously beaten after conducting meetings in Hearne, Texas, about 150 miles southeast of Dallas. That summer, black pentecostals were holding their annual state encampment at Hearne, and the meetings were attracting large numbers of white onlookers. Becoming interested in the pentecostal message and preferring to hear it from a white preacher, the white spectators asked the black pentecostals to invite a white pentecostal preacher to the meetings. They summoned Bosworth, who arrived on a Saturday evening and straightaway preached to an audience of blacks and whites.⁶⁶ While Bosworth was on his way to spend the night with a fellow minister in the area, “several roughs” approached the two preachers. Cursing and complaining that the preachers aimed to put them “on a

⁶⁵ All quotes in this paragraph are from “Not I But Christ: Fourth Annual Convention in the Stone Church,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 4, no. 9 (June 1912): 4–5.

⁶⁶ Although Hejzlar claims that Bosworth preached to the black and white audiences separately, Bosworth related that he “stood on the platform between the tent and the arbor” while he preached. From Bosworth’s letter to his mother, we learn that the black congregants were in front of the tent and the white congregants were in the adjacent arbor. Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story*, 12; Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis Macnutt in Dialogue*, *Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies*, 4 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 241. That Bosworth preached to a single segregated audience is confirmed by the account in the *Zion City Independent*, which stated that Bosworth “was conducting meetings...at which both blacks and whites were present, although seated on opposite sides of the house.” “Victim of Race Prejudice,” *Zion City Independent*, August 18, 1911, 4. Hejzlar may be misled because Bosworth wrote to his mother that he “preached to two large audiences, one white and one black,” but this does not necessarily mean that the preaching occurred at two separate times. See Bosworth, “Beating in Texas Follows Ministry to Blacks,” 5.

level with the d- niggers,” the attackers brandished a revolver. Bosworth reasoned with the gang, telling them that he was invited by the white believers, and that he had “no thought or desire of pushing them on a level with anyone.” The ruffians relented, but ordered Bosworth and his companion to head straight for the train and leave town. Bosworth consented, and while he was alone for a moment, he was set upon by a group of twenty-five that was uninterested in talking. They knocked Bosworth down, punching him and hitting him with wooden clubs. After they were satisfied that he got the message, they demanded that Bosworth leave by foot, forcing the wounded preacher to walk nine miles to the next train station in Calvert.⁶⁷

Bosworth may have learned something about finding solace in suffering for the gospel from Cyrus Fockler, whose encounter with a mob in 1900 had become legendary among Zionites. Bosworth’s beating was clearly a seminal experience for him, as he recounted it in some detail in his brief life story in the early 1920s. In a letter to his mother a few weeks after the incident, Bosworth claimed that his left wrist was broken and that “my flesh was mashed to the bone on my back nearly to my knees.” But he also said that he maintained consciousness throughout the ordeal, and God had spared him from suffering in the aftermath. Furthermore, he claimed to meet the whole experience with equanimity and love. Although he was ambivalent on the racial issues involved,⁶⁸ Bosworth was certain that in this case, God had called him to preach “to every creature.” Considering himself blessed “to know something of the fellowship of [Christ’s]

⁶⁷ Details of this incident are recorded in Bosworth, “Beating in Texas Follows Ministry to Blacks”; Bosworth, *The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth*, 12–14; “Victim of Race Prejudice,” 4; “Mob Victim Improving,” *Zion City Independent*, August 25, 1911, 3; “F.F. Bosworth Fully Recovered,” *Zion City Independent*, September 22, 1911, 4.

⁶⁸ Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 233; Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing*, 242.

sufferings,” and content that the suffering brought his experience closer to that of the first Christians’, Bosworth interpreted the incident as classic worldly resistance to the gospel message: “I feel like I am several notches higher in the Christian life.” As the *Latter Rain Evangel* reported, Bosworth did not retaliate or seek justice. The periodical advised pentecostals to leave vengeance in God’s hands: one of the ringleaders was later mutilated by a train, and another was thrown from a car and killed.⁶⁹

Bosworth continued his outreach in Dallas with meetings on the street, under tents, and speaking to gatherings like the Business Men’s Christian League.⁷⁰ A dramatic change in his ministry occurred in May of 1912, when Bosworth attended the annual Stone Church Convention in Chicago. Before returning home to Dallas, he spent three days with Maria Woodworth-Etter in Indianapolis, where she was in the midst of an eight-month campaign.⁷¹ For years, Bosworth had admired Woodworth-Etter’s ministry as it was detailed in her numerous autobiographies, which were popular among holiness folk. During Bosworth’s brief visit in Indianapolis, he was impressed by the miracles of healing in Woodworth-Etter’s meetings. Bosworth witnessed the healing of two deaf

⁶⁹ “Miracles of Healing in Dallas,” *Latter Rain Evangel*, October 1912, 14. Similarly, the *Zion City Independent* spoke of the “condign punishment meted out” to Bosworth’s assailants. “The Wonderful Works of God,” *Zion City Independent*, September 13, 1912, 1. Bosworth received the news with more equanimity, referring to the deceased as “poor men.” F.F. Bosworth, “A Wonderful Revival,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 5, no. 118 (September 15, 1912): 1.

⁷⁰ “Local Notes,” *Dallas Morning News*, April 12, 1912.

⁷¹ Based on Bosworth’s recollection in Woodworth-Etter’s 1916 work, Barnes places the meeting with Woodworth-Etter in April. Roscoe Barnes, “F.F. Bosworth: A Historical Analysis of the Influential Factors in His Life and Ministry” (Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria, 2009), 171; Maria Beulah Woodworth-Etter, *Signs and Wonders God Wrought in the Ministry for Forty Years* (Indianapolis, IN: [Mrs. M.B.W. Etter], 1916), 173. May is deduced here from the fact that Bosworth wrote that he visited Woodworth-Etter after the Stone Church Convention, which began May 12 and lasted for about two weeks. Bosworth, “Pentecostal Outpouring in Dallas, Texas,” 11. For Bosworth’s participation in the convention, see “Not I But Christ: Fourth Annual Convention in the Stone Church,” 2, 4–5. For Woodworth-Etter’s description of the 1912 Indianapolis meetings, see Maria Beulah Underwood Woodworth-Etter, *Acts of the Holy Ghost: Or The Life, Work, and Experience of Mrs. M. B. Woodworth-Etter, Evangelist* (Dallas, TX: John F. Worley Printing Company, 1912), 343.

people and one child born blind, among other marvels. He found this thoroughly consonant with what he knew of Woodworth-Etter's ministry from her writings, and to promote their joint work and share the testimonies of Woodworth-Etter's long ministry, Bosworth procured three hundred copies of her most recent (1904) autobiography. "It is doubtful there is any record written since the 'Acts of the Apostles' that is so wonderful," exclaimed Bosworth. "[Christ] was manifested to destroy the works of the devil' as much in Dallas and Chicago as in Jerusalem," he wrote with expectation of Woodworth-Etter's arrival. "If Jesus and His apostles could not convince unbelievers without miracles of healing does He expect more from us?"⁷² This endorsement of Woodworth-Etter's ministry reveals the key motif of Bosworth's ministry: the continuity of God's supernatural activity throughout history. Bosworth's work in Dallas gained momentum through the summer of 1912, and he was already referring to his work as a "pentecostal outpouring" before Woodworth-Etter arrived on July 25.

Maria Woodworth-Etter (1844-1924) began her ministry in the early 1880s in Ohio and Indiana after the death of five of her children.⁷³ In 1880, after a number of visions had impelled her to the work of ministry, she experienced an "anointing power" (which she later labeled her baptism with the Holy Ghost) and decided she could no longer resist her calling. Within a few years, she earned a reputation for being able to revive spiritually lethargic congregations, and she moved freely between many evangelical denominations. In 1885, her ministry gained national attention, not least

⁷² Bosworth, "Pentecostal Outpouring in Dallas, Texas," 11.

⁷³ Maria Beulah Underwood married P.H. Woodworth during the Civil War. She divorced Woodworth in 1891. In 1902 she married Samuel Etter. For convenience I will use the name Woodworth-Etter throughout. Unless otherwise noted, biographical information on Woodworth-Etter comes from Wayne E. Warner, *The Woman Evangelist: The Life and Times of Charismatic Evangelist Maria B. Woodworth-Etter*, Studies in Evangelicalism No. 8 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1986).

because she and her converts publically experienced trances during the meetings. These trances were intense supernatural experiences that often brought a vision and resulted in writhing, convulsions, and uncontrolled vocalizations or left the person physically prostrate, “as if dead.” The press dubbed her the “trance evangelist,” and around this time she also gave divine healing a central role in her ministry. Intensely focused on the supernatural in both her private life and ministry, Woodworth-Etter attracted those with the same supernatural predilections. As the *New York Times* described her audiences in 1885, “all, without exception, of those affected are very impressionable in their natures, quite excitable in their dispositions, and ready believers in the wonderful, mysterious, and supernatural.”⁷⁴

Contemporaries were both repelled and drawn by the trance phenomenon, and those who commented on it used a range of explanation from mesmerism to hysteria to true holiness to diabolical counterfeit.⁷⁵ Those who recognized it as valid religion admitted that while such experiences were not new (Methodists of an earlier generation had similar experiences), the centrality Woodworth-Etter gave to them was.⁷⁶

“Manifestations are the way of the power,” proclaimed Woodworth-Etter.⁷⁷ And the

⁷⁴ “Said to Be Religion: Strange Scenes at ‘Revival Meetings’ Held in Indiana,” *New York Times*, January 24, 1885, 1. Cited in Kenneth Richard Kline-Walczak, *Testimonies of Signs and Wonders: Evangelistic Crusade of Maria Buelah Woodworth-Etter in Moline, Rock Island, Illinois and Davenport, Iowa in the Years 1902 - 1903 - 1907: Or Redigging the Wells of Holy Spirit Renewal: Our Forgotten Heritage in the Quad Cities* (Kenneth Richard Kline-Walczak, 2006), xi.

⁷⁵ Ann Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 242. Taves comments on the various positions taken on Woodworth-Etter’s ministry in St. Louis in 1890 and thus does not include the attribution of diabolical counterfeit, which was central to other holiness adherents’ rejection of Woodworth-Etter’s ministry and would continue to surface in holiness rejection of pentecostalism.

⁷⁶ Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*, 49.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 77.

record of manifestations at her meetings proves she believed what she claimed. She spoke of the trance experience as being “under the power,” and explained it in terms of Peter’s vision in Acts 10 and a vision she herself had of “falling sheaves.”⁷⁸ As Joshua McMullen argues, the overt supernaturalism of Woodworth-Etter’s meetings is the central historical significance of the woman evangelist:

With many individuals lamenting the supposed decline of evangelical zeal, Woodworth’s distinctiveness does not lie in her emphasis on enthusiasm but rather her focus on physical manifestations—trances, visions, dreams and healings—as the most accurate markers of renewal. Whereas earlier preachers may have seen religious manifestations as signs of God’s presence, Woodworth viewed these phenomena as essential aspects of her revivals.⁷⁹

Some who experienced being “under the power” in Woodworth-Etter’s meetings later testified that they also spoke in tongues, and with the hindsight of pentecostal theology, declared that they had been baptized with the Holy Spirit.⁸⁰ Woodworth-Etter’s theology of the supernatural was not systematized as it would be in later pentecostalism, but she was incredibly open to manifestations, and unless given a compelling reason to believe otherwise, regarded them as inspired by the Holy Spirit and indicators of God’s deeper work. She saw no reason to limit God’s miraculous power to a bygone era, saying, “Instead of looking back to Pentecost, let us always be expecting it to come, especially in these last days.”⁸¹

In 1889 Woodworth-Etter began a series of meetings in Oakland, California, where she came into contact with John Alexander Dowie. The relationship between the

⁷⁸ Woodworth-Etter, *Acts of the Holy Ghost*, 32, 42–43.

⁷⁹ Joshua J. McMullen, “Maria B Woodworth-Etter: Bridging the Wesleyan-Pentecostal Divide,” in *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street*, ed. Henry H. Knight (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010), 187.

⁸⁰ Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*, 145.

⁸¹ Cited in *Ibid.*, 147.

two powerhouses of divine healing would portend the friction between Dowieism and pentecostalism sixteen years later. Dowie called into question the healings Woodworth-Etter claimed under her ministry, and mocked her “continuous, croaking cry for ‘power.’” According to Dowie, Woodworth-Etter’s trances were “diabolical delusions” and the woman evangelist herself could only be compared to Jezebel.⁸² Woodworth-Etter responded by saying that the people “would see [Dowie] go down in disgrace.”⁸³ Woodworth-Etter also met Carrie Judd Montgomery in her Oakland meetings. Montgomery, who was at that time a highly respected pioneer of divine healing, gave Woodworth-Etter a solid endorsement, although she felt the meetings were marked by “unusual manifestations.”⁸⁴ Woodworth-Etter’s time in Oakland was sullied by her prophecy in January 1890 that the Oakland area would be devastated by an earthquake and tidal wave in eighty days. The thoroughly supernaturally-oriented Woodworth-Etter maintained that her ministry always enjoyed the spirit of prophecy, but this prediction incited further wild prophecies from her supporters and scathing critique from ministers and the press on a whole new scale.⁸⁵ Critical clergy would not deny the supernatural origin of Woodworth-Etter’s ministry, but as an Oakland Methodist pastor said, “if it has

⁸² “Trance Evangelism,” *Leaves of Healing*, (First Series), 1, no. 5, 6, 7 (December 1890): 99–100.

⁸³ Cited in Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*, 81.

⁸⁴ Cited in *Ibid.*, 83. For Judd’s initial positive reaction to the Woodworth-Etter meetings, see Carrie Judd, “The Work and the Workers,” *Triumphs of Faith* 10, no. 1 (January 1890): 21–22.

⁸⁵ Carrie Judd retracted her initial endorsement of Woodworth-Etter after the prophecy scandal. Judd’s criticism centered on what she believed was Woodworth-Etter’s exaltation of “the power” over Jesus, causing people to seek manifestations rather than Christ. See Carrie Judd, “The Work and the Workers,” *Triumphs of Faith* 10, no. 9 (September 1890): 213.

any supernatural basis it comes from beneath rather than from above.”⁸⁶ The prophetic failure was, in the words of Woodworth-Etter’s biographer, “the worst scare since the Millerites experienced their ‘Great Disappointment’ during 1843-44.”⁸⁷

Despite the drama of the failed prophecy, a legal battle involving two St. Louis doctors who wanted her committed for insanity in 1890, and her divorce in 1891, Woodworth-Etter had much success throughout the 1890s and early 1900s. Having encountered tongues speech in her earlier meetings, she was not offended by the new pentecostal movement. In her later accounts, she reported frequent tongues speech in her meetings beginning in 1904, no doubt reflecting the spread of Parham’s teaching. But as pentecostalism rose, Woodworth-Etter seems to have opted for the quiet life. The period from 1905 until her Indianapolis meeting that Bosworth attended in the spring of 1912 constitute a “slow-down” of Woodworth-Etter’s career.⁸⁸ During this time, she settled for a while in rural Illinois, held some meetings in St. Louis, the Quad Cities of Iowa and Illinois, Denver and Phoenix. As of 1908, a fellow holiness minister who worked with Woodworth-Etter and who was seeking his Pentecost indicated that she had also not yet had the pentecostal experience.⁸⁹ At what point Woodworth-Etter embraced pentecostalism is unknown.

⁸⁶ Cited in Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*, 113.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 163.

⁸⁹ Wayne Warner, *For Such a Time As This: Maria Woodworth-Etter Her Healing and Evangelizing Ministry* (Gainesville, FL: Bridge Logos Foundation, 2005), 153–154. This book is an updated version of Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*. For the Quad Cities work in 1907, see Kline-Walczak, *Testimonies of Signs and Wonders*, 154–163.

While Bosworth clearly bore the stamp of Dowieite supernaturalism and continued to maintain close contacts with Zion City pentecostals and former-Dowieite pentecostals across the country, Woodworth-Etter's more dramatic brand of supernaturalism was capturing his imagination.⁹⁰ Bosworth was drawn to Woodworth-Etter not only for her reputation as one who could attract a crowd, but also because of the centrality of supernatural experiences and events in her ministry. Judging by the published reports of the Dallas meetings from late July through December of 1912, Bosworth was not disappointed. Quickly recognizing the potential of Woodworth-Etter's work for the young pentecostal movement, Bosworth took on the role of promoter, publishing accounts of the meetings for numerous pentecostal periodicals and even preparing statements for the secular press.⁹¹ While he also indicated that sinners were

⁹⁰ Through Bosworth's early Texas work, he kept in contact with ex-Zionites who were now, like him, ambassadors for the pentecostal message. D.C.O. Opperman, former educator in Zion City and a leading pentecostal in Texas and the Midwest, reported on Bosworth's Dallas work in April of 1911, when the effort was just beginning to bear fruit. See Opperman, "Our Lord Is Giving the Victory." F.A. Graves, the leader of the pentecostal Christian Assembly in Zion City, was working with Bosworth in Dallas when Bosworth was beaten in Hearne. Like William H. Piper, Graves had been with Dowie since before Zion City was founded. Graves had been healed of epilepsy under Dowie in 1890, ordained as an elder, and worked as superintendent for the Junior Seventies—a sort of youth corps in Zion City. Graves earned a reputation as an especially gifted hymn writer and was among the group of pentecostals who brought the new message to Piper's Stone Church on June 30, 1907. Having experienced his own persecution for Dowie's message while ministering in Minnesota in 1899, Graves was so upset by Bosworth's 1911 beating that he composed a poem for his co-worker, lamenting the tragedy and praising Bosworth for suffering "like his blessed Master." For Graves's testimony of healing under Dowie see "God's Witness to Divine Healing," *Leaves of Healing* 3, no. 39 (July 24, 1897): 609–611, 621. His persecution was a run-in with a mob and arrest in Minnesota for killing pigs in the name of Dowie's gospel, see "The Story of Zion's Victory Over the Devil and the Pig in Minnesota," *Leaves of Healing* 5, no. 41 (August 5, 1899): 792–799. See also Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 41–42. Graves's poem for Bosworth is reprinted in Fred A. Graves, "Prayer for Persecutors," *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6 (June 14, 1986): 5. The Dallas work even attracted Zion City residents, like B.C. Jess and his family. See Woodworth-Etter, *Acts of the Holy Ghost*, 366. The pentecostal citizens of Zion City also proudly claimed Bosworth as one of their own when entertaining British pentecostal leader A.A. Boddy in early October 1912. Boddy was impressed with what he heard of Bosworth, who "had prayed down blessings on his Mission, and a Revival had broken out." See "Woodworth-Etter Meetings in Dallas (Texas)," *Confidence* 5, no. 11 (November 1912): 258–259. Bosworth's brother Burt was still part of the pentecostal services in Zion City in 1913. See "Zion City, Ill.," *Christian Evangel*, August 10, 1913, 8.

⁹¹ Probably from Bosworth's hand was the report from the *Dallas Daily Times-Herald* of September 7 included in "Miracles of Healing in Dallas," 13. See Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*, 165.

saved and saints were baptized with the Holy Spirit at these meetings, the bulk of Bosworth's coverage went to the miraculous healings.

The meetings got off to a strong start, with eight hundred in attendance on the first night.⁹² The first account in the pentecostal press of the Dallas work appeared in *Word and Witness* on August 20. While M.M. Pinson had visited the revival and reported briefly in the same issue, Bosworth's detailed account described numerous healings and announced that Woodworth-Etter would remain in Dallas for a few months. Healing was central to his account, and one participant reporting to Zion City concurred, saying that "The work in many ways is a repetition of Dr. Dowie's; and I think it is not too much to say—at Dowie's best."⁹³ But Bosworth also demonstrated the particularly pentecostal take on divine healing, relating that many who were healed experienced spirit-baptism at the same time.⁹⁴ Bosworth also wrote to his brother Burt in the early weeks of the Dallas revival. This letter was published in a number of periodicals and reproduced in Woodworth-Etter's later account.⁹⁵ Demonstrating the influence of Woodworth-Etter on his understanding of healing and other post-conversion experiences, Bosworth stressed

⁹² "Tent Revival Has Begun," *Dallas Morning News*, July 26, 1912.

⁹³ "Latest from Dallas, Tex.," *Zion City Independent*, October 4, 1912, 2. Another update on the Dallas work appeared in "Latest Word from Dallas," *Zion City Independent*, September 20, 1912, 1.

⁹⁴ M.M. Pinson, "Trip to the Southwest," *Word and Witness* 8, no. 6 (August 20, 1912): 1; F.F. Bosworth, "The Wonders of God in Dallas," *Word and Witness* 8, no. 6 (August 20, 1912): 3. On the shift in approach to divine healing under pentecostal influence, emphasizing power rather than the earlier stress on atonement and faith, see James William Opp, *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine, and Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880-1930* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 121–145. Opp's point is taken, but should not be overemphasized: pentecostals were picking up on the conflation of healing with experiences of God's power that were present decades earlier in Woodworth-Etter's ministry. For Bosworth, Woodworth-Etter's influence was direct.

⁹⁵ F.F. Bosworth, "Miracles in Texas," *Triumphs of Faith* 32, no. 9 (September 1912): 202–205; Bosworth, "A Wonderful Revival"; "The Wonderful Works of God," 1, 3; Woodworth-Etter, *Acts of the Holy Ghost*, 354–357. The *Zion City Independent* also had such demand for news of Bosworth's Dallas work that they reprinted the letter in September 27, 1912. 3.

the “power of God” in connection to a range of supernatural experiences from salvation to healing to visions to spirit-baptism. Adopting Woodworth-Etter’s terminology, Bosworth exulted in the “slaying power,” which facilitated “visions and revelations, throwing light on the coming of the Lord.”⁹⁶ According to Bosworth, some received spirit-baptism when they were slain under the power as often happened in Woodworth-Etter’s meetings. While some who “received the Holy Spirit” spoke in tongues, this manifestation was not central in Bosworth’s reports. The power of God was present, leaving no room for traditional theological nuances, even the cherished holiness-divine healing maxim that salvation must come before divine healing.⁹⁷

While hundreds reportedly received healing during Woodworth-Etter’s stay in Dallas, a few testimonies received particularly publicity. One, a young “newsboy” and orphan from Dallas named Emmett Martin, came to the meetings with one arm paralyzed since the age of one and the other arm recently broken from a fall off a street car. Woodworth-Etter laid hands on him and he was instantly healed. With his paralyzed arm he began to rip off the bandages on his broken arm and “threw both hands towards heaven, raised them high and shouted and praised God.” Another case that received considerable press was the healing of Mrs. Clay E. Martin (no relation to Emmett), also of Dallas. Born deaf and dumb, Mrs. Martin was well educated, from a prominent political family, and had been an instructor at a deaf and dumb school in Austin. She attended the meeting on the last night of July, when, as Mrs. Martin testified, Woodworth-Etter “put her finger in my mouth at the root of my tongue and then in my

⁹⁶ Woodworth-Etter, *Acts of the Holy Ghost*, 369.

⁹⁷ Bosworth, “Miracles in Texas.” Bosworth referred to God’s power no less than nine times in the letter.

ears, commanding the ‘deaf and dumb spirit’ to come out.” Although reports from the Dallas meetings often stated that many received spirit-baptism with tongues, Mrs. Martin was one of the few whose testimony of spirit-baptism was given in detail. At the time of her healing, she also received her pentecostal baptism and tongues—both English and “other tongues.”

This incident shows the wide spectrum of meaning early pentecostals attached to tongues aside from evidence of spirit-baptism. For Mrs. Martin, who had never spoken before in any language, tongues were not only the sign of her spirit-baptism, but a further confirmation of her healing and ratification of its divine source.⁹⁸ Tongues were also for her and other healed deaf mutes a type of empowerment in a culture that devalued the disabled, a very literal giving of voice to the “voiceless” that Robert M. Anderson sees as central to the pentecostal emphasis on tongues.⁹⁹ Tongues were not treated by Bosworth and Woodworth-Etter as clinical evidence of a particular spiritual experience, but as a potent supernatural manifestation capable of taking on many meanings in the pentecostal context.

Not only were tongues multifaceted, but other supernatural occurrences could serve to verify spirit-baptism in the Dallas meetings, as in the case of H.C. Mears, a “dear old minister” who was “a great student of the Scriptures.” Rather than tongues, what was emphasized as accompanying his spirit-baptism was a vision of the Holy Spirit in the

⁹⁸ The stories of Emmett Martin and Mrs. Clay E. Martin can be found in “Miracles of Healing in Dallas”; Bosworth, “The Wonders of God in Dallas.” The two accounts contain some discrepancies, such as whether Emmett’s broken arm or paralyzed arm was healed first. Quote from “Miracles of Healing in Dallas,” 13. The Dallas workers also emphasized that deaf mutes spoke in tongues upon receiving spirit-baptism in Hattie Barth, “The Dallas Revival,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 5, no. 119 (October 15, 1912): 1.

⁹⁹ Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1992), 233–235.

form of a dove over his head. A series of revelations and visions followed, centering on the nearness of Christ's return. The account clearly contrasts the minister's intellectual knowledge of the scriptures with the supernatural visions he received at the time of spirit-baptism. As with the deaf mute who received tongues, the minister received supernaturally what he had been conspicuously lacking—in this case, vital experiential knowledge of God's word in the form of revelation.¹⁰⁰ Bosworth believed that all of the supernatural experiences combined to confirm God's message. After describing a "cloud of glory" that was visible to a number of the faithful in one meeting, Bosworth stated, "[these] things, together with healing, speaking in tongues and interpreting, etc., convince the people, and the long altar is filled with seekers every night."¹⁰¹ In terms of corporate confirmation, tongues did not receive pride of place.

Originally planned to last just a week, the meetings continued under Woodworth-Etter's leadership from late July until the end of the year.¹⁰² What remained constant was Woodworth-Etter's intense brand of supernaturalism, which pitted the forces of good against the forces of evil in a dramatic battle played out in the bodies of the faithful. As

¹⁰⁰ Maude M. Delaney, "More About the Revival in Dallas, Texas," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 5, no. 120 (November 1, 1912): 2. Another version is in Maude M. Delaney, "God's Mighty Power," *Word and Witness* 8, no. 8 (October 20, 1912): 3. Faupel incorrectly identifies this account as from Bosworth. David W. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 10 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 275 n. 182. Mears's first-person testimony is also related in Woodworth-Etter, *Acts of the Holy Ghost*, 362–365. Here he is recorded as having spoken in tongues at the time of his spirit-baptism.

¹⁰¹ F.F. Bosworth, "The Revival at Dallas, Tex.," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 6, no. 123 (December 1912): 2.

¹⁰² Woodworth Etter's farewell service was the last Sunday of the year. Stanley Frodsham, "Glorious Victories of God in Dallas, Texas," *Word and Witness* 9, no. 1 (January 20, 1913): 1. For the original announcement of one week, see "Will Conduct Meeting Here," *Dallas Morning News*, July 23, 1912. In mid-August, M.M. Pinson indicated that Woodworth-Etter was planning on staying in Dallas "a month or six weeks." Pinson, "Trip to the Southwest." Faupel states that the campaign was originally planned for two weeks, but I have not been able to find any evidence for this. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 273.

Stanley Frodsham remarked, “We notice that in almost every case Sister Etter dealt with the disease as if she was dealing with the devil himself.”¹⁰³ In December Carrie Judd Montgomery visited the revival and smoothed over her criticisms of Woodworth-Etter twenty-two years prior in favor of the wonders she witnessed in Dallas.¹⁰⁴ At this time, Bosworth was still advertising two meetings daily and was particularly intent on relating stories of visions of Jesus and angels.¹⁰⁵ Woodworth-Etter conducted her last service in Dallas on December 29 and had moved on to San Antonio by the first of the year. But Bosworth and Birdsall, with the help of other ministers like Canadian A.W. Smith, continued the work, planning to move out to an unreached part of the city with a tent come spring.¹⁰⁶

The Dallas meetings were a turning point for Bosworth’s career, providing him with the means to construct a tabernacle for his Dallas congregation¹⁰⁷ and making his name respected in pentecostal circles internationally. The meetings also revitalized Woodworth-Etter’s ministry. Whatever Woodworth-Etter’s relation to the pentecostal movement was before arriving in Dallas, by the end of 1912, she was convinced that “[t]he Lord has clearly showed [sic] me that my great work is to blow the trumpet, to gather the Elect, the Household of Faith, together, that they may be baptized with the

¹⁰³ Frodsham, “Glorious Victories of God in Dallas, Texas.”

¹⁰⁴ Carrie Judd Montgomery, “The Mighty Power of God at Dallas, Texas,” *Triumphs of Faith* 32, no. 12 (December 1912): 267–270.

¹⁰⁵ F.F. Bosworth, “The God of All the Earth Working at Dallas,” *Word and Witness* 8, no. 10 (December 20, 1912): 1.

¹⁰⁶ Frodsham, “Glorious Victories of God in Dallas, Texas.”

¹⁰⁷ The first service in the tabernacle was held on November 1, 1912. Bosworth, “Miracles in Texas,” 204; Loftis, *A History of First Assembly of God*, 8.

Pentecostal baptism and sealed with the seal of the Living God.”¹⁰⁸ Upon selling out of her 1904 book in October, Woodworth-Etter set to the task of updating and releasing a new version of her story to include the marvels of the Dallas work.¹⁰⁹ Perhaps influenced by Bosworth’s repeated comparison of her ministry to the record of the biblical book of Acts, she titled the new installment *Acts of the Holy Ghost*.¹¹⁰ From Dallas, Woodworth-Etter took her recharged ministry to San Antonio, Los Angeles, Massachusetts, and Arkansas, and that all just in 1913. She was now also connected to the pentecostal work through deep personal ties. The nearly seventy-year-old Woodworth-Etter formed a close relationship with Bosworth and his assistant Birdsall, whom she referred to as her “two dear boys.”¹¹¹

For a number of reasons, the Dallas meetings were also a turning point for American pentecostalism. First, its scope and drama were unparalleled. According to Robert M. Anderson, the Dallas work was the only true revival between Azusa Street and Aimee Semple McPherson’s national tour beginning in 1918.¹¹² Nightly attendance regularly exceeded five thousand, and people came from across the country. About twelve hundred people received spirit-baptism, and hundreds of others were converted and healed. No extended campaign had attracted as many pentecostal heavyweights since Azusa Street. In addition to M.M. Pinson and Carrie Judd Montgomery, Bosworth

¹⁰⁸ Woodworth-Etter, *Acts of the Holy Ghost*, 580.

¹⁰⁹ F.F. Bosworth, “Brother F.F. Bosworth About the Dallas Revival,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 5, no. 119 (October 15, 1912): 1.

¹¹⁰ Faupel incorrectly identifies *Acts of the Holy Ghost* as the autobiography that in part inspired Bosworth to invite Woodworth-Etter to Dallas. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 273.

¹¹¹ Frodsham, “Glorious Victories of God in Dallas, Texas.”

¹¹² Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 137.

entertained numerous pentecostal leaders: Frank J. Ewart, friend and successor of William Durham; Andrew D. Urshan, the leader of the Persian pentecostal mission in Chicago; A.P. Collins, minister in Fort Worth and later elected general chairman of the Assemblies of God; and Stanley Frodsham, a leading British pentecostal who later relocated to the United States and took charge of Assemblies of God publishing ventures. Frodsham heard about the revival while in England and spent a month in Dallas. The British minister came with the intent of discovering how such a revival was attained and maintained. The Dallas revival had become a model to which other pentecostal centers aspired.¹¹³ S.A. Jamieson, previously a successful Presbyterian minister who would go on to join Bosworth in the organizing meeting of the Assemblies of God in 1914, experienced his spirit-baptism at the Christmas Eve service in Dallas.¹¹⁴

Second, the Dallas revival came at a crucial moment in pentecostal history. While most pentecostal histories imply that the waning of the initial pentecostal revival (1906-1909) made space for doctrinal crisis, none credit the renewed revival under Bosworth and Woodworth-Etter with refocusing the pentecostal movement.¹¹⁵ By mid-1912, pentecostals had been engaged for about two years in a sometimes vicious debate over the cherished holiness doctrine of sanctification. Some maintained that sanctification was

¹¹³ Bosworth, "The God of All the Earth Working at Dallas"; Frodsham, "Glorious Victories of God in Dallas, Texas." The figure of twelve hundred is from Frodsham. Frodsham also wrote about the Dallas revival in Stanley Howard Frodsham, *"With Signs Following": The Story of the Latter-Day Pentecostal Revival* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1928), 34. Since Bosworth had left the Assemblies of God at the time of this book's publication, Frodsham left Bosworth's name out of the account.

¹¹⁴ S.A. Jamieson, "God Still in Dallas," *Word and Witness* 9, no. 2 (February 20, 1913): 2; S.A. Jamieson, "How a Presbyterian Preacher Received the Baptism," *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 883 (January 31, 1931): 2-3.

¹¹⁵ Reed's analysis is typical: "Revival Wanes and Schism is Born." David A. Reed, *"In Jesus' Name": The History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, No. 31 (Dorset, UK: Deo, 2008), 83.

a second distinct crisis experience that followed conversion and prepared one for spirit-baptism, while an increasing number of others were attracted to Chicago leader William Durham's teaching that sanctification was part of the "finished work" of Calvary and so required no crisis experience beyond conversion. In 1910, Durham, along with A.S. Copley of Kansas City, began publicizing their specifically non-holiness theology of sanctification. Through Durham's indefatigable itinerant preaching and distribution of over half a million copies of his periodical and tracts, the finished work position quickly won adherents in the Midwest and along the Pacific coast. Persuading Howard Goss, who had largely taken control of Parham's work in the South and lower Midwest, was an especial boon to the finished work camp.¹¹⁶

While controversy may have been "the very life and breath" of early pentecostalism, controversy also had the potential to hobble a movement barely a decade old and virtually unknown to wider American society.¹¹⁷ At the height of the debate in 1911, some leaders required their congregations to pledge opposition to Durham's teaching.¹¹⁸ Durham claimed that second work pentecostals "had compromised and denied the truth"; these holiness pentecostals responded by suggesting that seeking spirit-baptism before a definite experience of sanctification invites the "danger of the enemy imposing a counterfeit."¹¹⁹ In the end, the finished work teaching had the stronger

¹¹⁶ See Appendix A for the chronological issues and Copley's underappreciated role in crafting the early finished work theology.

¹¹⁷ Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 193.

¹¹⁸ William H. Durham, "The Great Battle of Nineteen Eleven," *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 1 (January 1912): 7.

¹¹⁹ William H. Durham, "The Pentecostal Revival at Azusa Street--How It Began and How It Ended," *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (1911): 4; E.A. Sexton, "Sanctification the Necessary Preparation for the Pentecostal Baptism," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 3, no. 65 (July 1, 1910): 1.

biblical foundation, and those who gave Durham's message a fair hearing were generally won over to it. Those who continued to advocate the second work generally only heard Durham's message from afar, and their arguments for the teaching often relied on appeal to the experiences and teachings of Wesley and a typological interpretation of the Old Testament.¹²⁰ Still, the threat to unity loomed large, and many thought the issue was a distraction. As a writer for the second work camp put it: "Beginning from that date on, many Pentecostal preachers who had spent their time getting people to seek the baptism with the Holy Ghost, or repent, or BE HOLY, spent it in convincing Pentecostal congregations that they were mistaken in thinking that they had been sanctified."¹²¹ On the other hand, Bosworth's Dallas revival reminded pentecostals of what was attractive about pentecostalism in the first place— not rigorous doctrine but focus on supernatural experiences that bless the faithful and confirm their eschatological message and select status. In 1911, William Durham claimed Bosworth for the finished work teaching.¹²² However, numerous accounts of the Dallas revival indicate that Woodworth-Etter and Bosworth aimed to unify pentecostals in the wake of the divisions created by

¹²⁰ The denominations that resisted the finished work teaching were geographically located in the Deep South. They generally showed no interest in actually understanding the finished work teaching and also encountered the doctrine well after it had made inroads in the rest of the country. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 252–254. For the typological defense of second work teaching see Sexton, "Sanctification the Necessary Preparation for the Pentecostal Baptism"; Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 254–255. This could suggest that the controversy was in some sense less a theological issue than a social issue. That is, the existing denominations could add a new teaching (spirit-baptism), but they couldn't abandon an old teaching (sanctification). See Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 174. A similar process may be evident in the initial evidence controversy—it was upheld because the denominations had staked their identity and reputation on it. Synan notes that the second blessing was maintained among denominations already in place by 1911. Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997), 151–152. See also Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 125, 230 n. 12.

¹²¹ "History of Pentecost," *Faithful Standard*, November 1922, 14.

¹²² "A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas."

Durham's teaching. Bosworth himself reported that "controverted points of doctrine [are] not mentioned."¹²³

Third, the success in Dallas heightened expectations that God was preparing the ground for Christ's soon coming or for some new revelation.¹²⁴ This expectation bore fruit in the "World Wide Pentecostal Camp Meeting" held in Los Angeles in April of 1913. R.J. Scott, a Los Angeles businessman who attended the Dallas meetings, was so impressed with the work that he spearheaded the Los Angeles gathering, advertising Woodworth-Etter and Bosworth as headliners.¹²⁵ Woodworth-Etter's success in Dallas had the inadvertent result of creating the atmosphere where a new, divisive doctrine could begin to take shape. Pentecostal historians know this meeting as the setting in which the controversial doctrine of baptism in Jesus' name only was publically aired.¹²⁶ During the conference, R.E. McAlister preached a sermon pointing out that the apostles seemed to

¹²³ Bosworth, "The God of All the Earth Working at Dallas"; Judd Montgomery, "The Mighty Power of God at Dallas, Texas," 268; "A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas"; Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 274–275. S.A. Jamieson's testimony anecdotally corroborates the fact that the second work theory was not preached at the Dallas revival. After unsuccessfully seeking sanctification in preparation for spirit-baptism in Portland, Oregon, at Florence Crawford's mission, Jamieson went to the Dallas revival and received spirit-baptism with no mention of a sanctification experience. Jamieson, "How a Presbyterian Preacher Received the Baptism." With experience in both the Wesleyan tradition and Dowie's Keswick-inflected teaching of "consecration," Bosworth may have had sympathy for both teachings. The reader will also recall that John G. Lake claimed that he and Bosworth experienced sanctification more than a year before Parham brought the pentecostal message to Zion City, but this is uncertain. Bosworth was probably able to identify with the finished work teaching because his ambiguous pre-spirit-baptism "consecration" was more closely related to Dowie's teaching than Parham's Wesleyan view. Bosworth may have also been drawn to the finished work label because, as with E.W. Kenyon, it facilitated a systematic theology of divine healing. See chapter eight. In the end, the fact that he was working in the finished work stronghold of Texas was probably the overriding reason that he identified with Durham's camp. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 260.

¹²⁴ Judd Montgomery, "The Mighty Power of God at Dallas, Texas," 270; "Miracles of Healing in Dallas," 13; Delaney, "More About the Revival in Dallas, Texas." At least one date for Christ's return was given. See "Woodworth-Etter Meetings in Dallas (Texas)," 259.

¹²⁵ "Apostolic Faith World-Wide Camp Meeting," *Triumphs of Faith* 33, no. 2 (February 1913): 45–46.

¹²⁶ See Appendix A for a discussion of the merits of this traditional story of Oneness origins.

baptize in Jesus' name, rather using than the Trinitarian formula of Matthew 28:19. This was followed by a late-night revelation to John Schaepe, a participant of the meeting, who declared that believers must be re-baptized with this apostolic formula. Durham's former associate Frank Ewart began to ponder the issue in depth, searching for a way to reconcile the dominical commission with the apostolic practice. The emerging solution was to equate the name "Lord Jesus Christ" with "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."¹²⁷ This gave rise to further investigation of the question of the Trinity, ultimately leading to the Oneness teaching, a type of modalist theology that identifies God's revealed name with his essential nature, the divine name in the present dispensation being "Jesus." For a time, the controversy over the proper baptismal formula, the theological import of the name of God, and the correct understanding of the Trinity brewed under the surface, limited to those already in the finished work camp. But by 1916, those who sided with the new teaching were forced out of the infant Assemblies of God by an unequivocally Trinitarian doctrinal statement, and a third major doctrinal strand of pentecostalism was born—in many ways owing its origin to the atmosphere of expectancy of the Dallas revival.¹²⁸

Finally, the Dallas revival and the trail of publicity that now followed Woodworth-Etter encouraged pentecostals to work for greater cooperation and

¹²⁷ A full account of the history and theology of Oneness pentecostalism can be found in Reed, *In Jesus' Name*.

¹²⁸ In 1914, Ewart and Glenn Cook had taken a public stand for the New Issue (as it became known) by re-baptizing one another in Jesus' name. The stakes were raised when in the summer of 1915 prominent Assemblies of God leader E.N. Bell was also re-baptized. Although Bell later reaffirmed his orthodox Trinitarianism, his flirtation with the New Issue brought much hand-wringing and perhaps accelerated the conflict. Although the 1915 General Council ambivalently adopted a policy of "liberality" while condemning certain doctrinal extremes, the controversy did not cause a rift until the 1916 General Council, at which the Assemblies of God adopted a Statement of Fundamental Truths that reaffirmed the classical Trinitarian teaching. Those unhappy with this decision left the Assemblies of God, and through slow growth and merger became a major strand of worldwide pentecostalism distinct from both Trinitarian finished work advocates and second work adherents. See *Ibid.*, 147–166.

organization. The Los Angeles meeting was, in Faupel's words, "a qualified success": while it fueled further theological confusion and division, it also demonstrated the strength of pentecostal numbers and their willingness to gather in furtherance of God's work.¹²⁹ Following the Dallas and Los Angeles work, Woodworth-Etter continued to make headlines in Chicago, Framingham, Massachusetts, and Hot Springs, Arkansas. In Framingham, Woodworth-Etter's stand for divine healing became a particular *cause célèbre* for pentecostals.¹³⁰ Along with Earl W. Clark and Bosworth's former co-worker Cyrus Fockler, Woodworth-Etter was arrested in mid-August of 1913 on the charge of obtaining money through fraud. In their defense, Woodworth-Etter declared that the devil was behind the effort to destroy their work, and Fockler testified that diseases such as cancer were caused by evil spirits. Another who participated in the meetings and testified for the defense was E.W. Kenyon, whose thought would have an impact on Bosworth and the prosperity gospel movement.¹³¹

In Arkansas, a particularly influential group of pentecostals closely followed Woodworth-Etter's Framingham saga. While Woodworth-Etter was still in Massachusetts, they invited her to headline their annual state encampment in Malvern, and then continue on with a campaign in nearby Hot Springs. She arrived in September for what would be a three month campaign. While Howard Goss and E.N. Bell had nurtured a thriving pentecostal community in Malvern, Woodworth-Etter's work in Hot

¹²⁹ Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 277.

¹³⁰ "The Montwait Meeting: Testimonies Under Oath," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 8, no. 142 (October 15, 1913): 4; "Testimonies Under Oath," *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 1. According to the *Word and Witness* article, the pentecostal testimonies in Woodworth-Etter's case were also published as a tract.

¹³¹ Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*, 223, 228–229.

Springs bolstered the pentecostal presence there and may have given Goss and Bell the added nerve to call for an organizing of their work beyond the periodicals, short-term Bible schools, camp meetings, loose nominal affiliations, and network of traveling evangelists.¹³² Woodworth-Etter left Hot Springs sometime in November, and in December, the famous call for a “General Convention of Pentecostal Saints and Churches of God in Christ” that gave birth to the Assemblies of God was first issued.

Stone Church Revival: Bosworth the Revered Leader

When the call for the organizing meeting the Assemblies of God was still a year away, Bosworth found himself extremely busy. After Woodworth-Etter’s departure from Dallas, Bosworth continued to facilitate a revival in Dallas while also periodically embarking on evangelistic trips. He planned on attending the Los Angeles meeting—and in fact was listed as a headlining leader—but after participating in meetings in Chicago in March he extended his stay in the Windy City. He went on to take charge of a special convention at the Stone Church that spring (William H. Piper died in 1911), preaching a number of sermons that were published in the *Latter Rain Evangel* and later printed as tracts. Like the Los Angeles meeting that was happening at the same time, the Chicago convention was designed to foster unity among pentecostals.¹³³ And these pentecostals believed that unity was achieved not through doctrinal agreement but through revival and experience of the supernatural. “God gave us in Chicago,” wrote one participant of the

¹³² For reports of the Hot Springs meetings, see D.C.O. Opperman, “God Stretching Out His Hand to Heal,” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 1; Howard A. Goss, “Jehovah Still Working at Hot Springs, Ark.,” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 11 (November 20, 1913): 1.

¹³³ “Campmeetings and Conventions,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 6 (March 1913): 16; “Apostolic Faith World-Wide Camp Meeting,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 6, no. 129 (March 15, 1913): 2; “Stone Church Meetings,” *Latter Rain Evangel*, April 1913, 12; “Chicago Convention,” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 6 (June 20, 1913): 5.

revival, “an object lesson for the whole Pentecostal Movement of what He can do when doctrinal differences and prejudices are kept in the background and Christ is lifted up.”¹³⁴ Bosworth became their spokesperson. His sermons on “revival wrought through prayer” and “how to receive the faith of God” demonstrate that Bosworth was being viewed as an authority who could divulge the “secret” of revivals. The success of the Dallas meetings and the experience he gained working alongside Woodworth-Etter had brought Bosworth into his own as a pentecostal leader.

The nearly month-long Stone Church Convention bled into an even longer period of revival in Chicago, incorporating also its annual convention in May, with Bosworth taking the leading role. Reports of the May convention revealed how hungry Midwestern pentecostals were for Bosworth’s gospel of the supernatural. “Pentecostal saints who have seen the power of God wane where it once shone forth with great effulgency, and felt the dearth in different places, have reason to be encouraged,” reported the *Latter Rain Evangel*. “The outpouring He is now giving at the Stone Church is greater than at the beginning of the Pentecostal work in our midst.”¹³⁵

Perhaps the most important development for Bosworth’s career came when Woodworth-Etter rejoined Bosworth at the Chicago revival in July. In the Dallas meetings the previous year Woodworth-Etter was the one praying and laying hands on the sick, with Bosworth largely taking on a promotional role and apparently confining his ministry to praying over handkerchiefs and tracts that were sent to those who could not

¹³⁴ “The Cloud of His Glory Upon Us,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 9 (June 1913): 2.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.* The convention included such ex-Dowieites as L.C. Hall and Bernice Lee.

attend the meetings.¹³⁶ But reports of the Chicago meetings indicate that Bosworth assumed a large portion of the public ministry of divine healing. In one case, while a deaf and dumb boy waited for prayer, Bosworth approached him and “commanded the deaf spirit to depart.” The boy’s mother, not knowing what had happened, gave her son a note to hand to Woodworth-Etter explaining his ailment. Bosworth politely informed the mother that the boy had been healed, a fact she could not deny when her son himself told her that he could hear. Another elderly lady was seeking healing from deafness. When Bosworth offered to pray with her, she at first refused, wanting prayers from Woodworth-Etter. But Bosworth took her aside and rebuked her deafness. Soon she could hear in both ears.¹³⁷ Already in May, Bosworth was reported as the minister the sick and infirm went to for healing.¹³⁸ But the fact that he continued to take such a leading role in public healings even while sharing the stage with the best-known pentecostal healing evangelist of his era demonstrates that Bosworth was not only commanding more respect, but also embracing his new role.

Like the Dallas meetings, the Chicago revival was marked for its supernaturalism. Participants at the Chicago meetings described being “carried...into the supernatural.”¹³⁹ Anna C. Reiff, who took over publication of the *Latter Rain Evangel* after William Piper’s death, described the revival that followed the Chicago convention as “the mightiest

¹³⁶ *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 8 (May 1913): 13–14.

¹³⁷ Anna C. Reiff, “The Day of Chicago’s Visitation,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 10 (August 1913): 6–7.

¹³⁸ “The Cloud of His Glory Upon Us,” 3.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

visitation of the supernatural [Chicago] has ever known.”¹⁴⁰ For her part, Woodworth-Etter did not miss a step in bringing her message to a pentecostal audience, and in fact found that her message needed little adjustment. As always, her triumphant supernaturalism was what audiences hungered for. As she told a gathering during the Chicago revival in 1913, “If you...show the people a supernatural God, and give them light on what is coming in the millennial age—that they will be kings and priests—they will realize that the King is in our midst in power and might and glory.”¹⁴¹

Bosworth returned to Dallas in late July. He and his workers moved their tent to a new location in north Dallas before returning to the tabernacle in the winter.¹⁴² Bosworth was also performing the normal functions of more settled ministry: in November he presided at a wedding.¹⁴³ The Dallas church, which was going by the name Church of the Apostolic Faith, was now sending out workers to nearby towns, like Grand Prairie, which were experiencing their own miracles.¹⁴⁴ In the spring of 1914, Elizabeth Sisson, longtime co-worker of Woodworth-Etter, visited Bosworth’s church and reported three mission off-shoots in Dallas and a tabernacle holding nine hundred worshippers that was usually full on Sundays.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁰ Reiff, “The Day of Chicago’s Visitation,” 2.

¹⁴¹ M.B. Woodworth-Etter, “Neglect Not the Gift That Is In Thee,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 10 (August 1913): 16.

¹⁴² E.G. Birdsall, “Revival News in Home Land: Dallas, Texas,” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 11 (November 20, 1913): 1; “Our Summer Meetings,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 11 (September 1913): 13; F.F. Bosworth, “Revival News in Home Land,” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 9 (September 20, 1913): 3.

¹⁴³ “Jacobs-Wasson Marriage,” *Dallas Morning News*, November 27, 1913.

¹⁴⁴ “Church Notes,” *Dallas Morning News*, March 15, 1914; F.F. Bosworth, “Revival News in Home Land: Bro. Bosworth, Texas,” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 12 (December 20, 1913): 3.

¹⁴⁵ Elizabeth Sisson, “Healing a Man Born Blind: The Power of the Word in Dallas, Texas,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 7 (April 1914): 2.

Bosworth's Early Theology of Healing

Later in his career, Bosworth indicated that a turning point in his ministry came in 1920 during meetings at Lima, Ohio. Following a “discouraging” start, the local pastor asked him to preach on divine healing. After studying the question, he committed to preaching on divine healing, with dramatic results. Prior to this point, Bosworth said, he believed that it was God’s will “only to heal some.” He claimed that at this time God revealed to him that just as the fear of a sinner not heeding the message of repentance is not an excuse to refrain from preaching salvation, so fear of a sick person not receiving healing is no excuse to refrain from preaching healing.¹⁴⁶ More specifically, as Bosworth’s early biographer puts it, this revelation showed Bosworth that “sick people, both saints and sinners, should be invited from far and near, to hear what the compassionate Christ longs to do for their pain-racked bodies as well as for their sin-burdened souls.” The implication was that Bosworth had believed before this time that divine healing was the preserve of believers.¹⁴⁷ The payoff was that Bosworth was now clearly thinking of healing as an evangelistic tool.

Yet Bosworth’s own record of ministry and writings challenges the portrayal of this as a watershed moment in Bosworth’s thought. Divine healing was always a central aspect of Bosworth’s ministry, beginning with his healing of Mary Shepherd in Zion City in 1903, through his work alongside Cyrus Fockler in Milwaukee in 1907, the Dallas meetings with Woodworth-Etter, and into the months-long work in Chicago in 1913. Early in the Dallas revival, Bosworth reported cases of the ill who were “instantly saved,

¹⁴⁶ Bosworth, *Bosworth's Life Story*, 11–12.

¹⁴⁷ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 121. While Perkins makes the claim Bosworth’s insight concerned healing for sinners, Bosworth himself does not.

healed, and baptized in the Spirit.”¹⁴⁸ At least in Woodworth-Etter’s meetings, the traditional understanding that only the saved should receive healing was not upheld. And yet, one account of the 1920 Lima meetings carefully reported that “salvation has always preceded healing,” indicating fluidity in practice.¹⁴⁹

Furthermore, divine healing in Bosworth’s early sermons was overwhelmingly a message of certainty and inclusiveness. In May of 1913, he delivered an early version of his sermon “Discerning the Lord’s Body,” which he would preach a year later and which would be published as a tract. Here he already determined that “everyone who meets [God’s] conditions can be healed.” And God’s condition for healing was faith.¹⁵⁰ His stress on faith took on a particularly cognitive shade, much like New Thought. “We partake of the divine nature as our thoughts dwell on God and the attributes that belong to him.”¹⁵¹ Like Mary Baker Eddy and John G. Lake, Bosworth searched for the assurance of scientific language to describe divine healing, likening it to the unchanging laws of gravity.¹⁵² He also used the legal language that E.W. Kenyon would become especially known for. “We can do nothing in our own name,” Bosworth declared, “but in the name of Jesus we can do everything God wants done. Not merely using the words ‘In Jesus’

¹⁴⁸ Bosworth, “Miracles in Texas,” 204.

¹⁴⁹ F.B. Miller, “A Revival of Divine Healing,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 30 (October 23, 1920): 473.

¹⁵⁰ “The Cloud of His Glory Upon Us,” 3; Bosworth, “Discerning the Lord’s Body,” 2, 5.

¹⁵¹ F.F. Bosworth, “The Practice of the Presence of God,” *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 3 (March 1915): 8. This sermon was delivered in the Stone Church on June 30, 1913. For New Thought’s affinity with and influence on the development of pentecostal healing, see Joseph W. Williams, *Spirit Cure: A History of Pentecostal Healing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 21, *et passim*.

¹⁵² Bosworth, “Discerning the Lord’s Body,” 4.

name,' but acting, as it were, by His power of attorney."¹⁵³ He even made reference as early as 1914 to the specific conclusion that he claimed he had only in 1920: that healing was just as certain as salvation, and the fact that some are not healed does not reflect God's will, but the failure of believers to meet God's conditions for healing. "I maintain," he wrote, "that God's law for healing of the body is just as absolutely dependable as for the soul."¹⁵⁴

At the same time, in searching for a more solid biblical foundation for his theology of the supernatural, Bosworth seemed to be critiquing the excesses and unpredictability that sometimes came with Woodworth-Etter's focus on "power." "Many who have received the Pentecostal baptism in the Spirit are constantly asking for power," he opined. "I believe that one of the greatest needs of the hour is faith to use the power God has already bestowed upon us."¹⁵⁵ As Bosworth developed his ideas, he was never concerned about forming dogma or insisting that others agree with him. His project was persuasion rather than coercion, because he believed his insights could help those who struggled to receive God's blessings.¹⁵⁶ One may speculate that Bosworth obscured these early insights on divine healing in order to distance himself from the pentecostal denominations (since he left the Assemblies of God in 1918) or to provide a fresh

¹⁵³ F.F. Bosworth, "The Wonders of Faith," *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 9 (June 1913): 6. Bosworth's relation to Kenyon will be explored in chapter eight.

¹⁵⁴ Bosworth, "Discerning the Lord's Body," 4.

¹⁵⁵ Bosworth, "The Wonders of Faith," 5.

¹⁵⁶ The imploring and non-dogmatic character of Bosworth's message can be seen as he pleaded, "because many have not been shown their privilege of being healed, they have remained weak and sickly and many have died." Bosworth, "Discerning the Lord's Body," 3.

impetus for re-launching his itinerant ministry. Nevertheless, the record shows that by 1913, the main themes of his mature thought on the subject were already present.¹⁵⁷

Conclusion

As it did for all early pentecostals, Bosworth's spirit-baptism changed the course of his life. No longer was he only a believer in the gospel of the supernatural, following his spirit-baptism, he felt emboldened and empowered to become its herald as well. After being nurtured in the pentecostal community in Zion City, he itinerated for a number of years, expanding his pentecostal network while maintaining ties to the ex-Zionite pentecostals. When Bosworth established his mission in Dallas, he was firmly planted in the ranks of pentecostal ministry. Bosworth shrewdly enlisted the assistance of Maria Woodworth-Etter, a high-profile leader of the late-nineteenth century gospel of the supernatural. The Dallas revival was propitious for Bosworth, Woodworth-Etter, and pentecostalism. The meetings were Bosworth's apprenticeship in pentecostal mass revivalism, leaving a stamp on his ministry that would endure for the rest of his life. But the meetings also gave Bosworth the name recognition to venture out as an authority on revivalism and divine healing in his own right. As the only extended pentecostal revival receiving international acclaim in the decade after Azusa Street, the importance of the Dallas meetings is hard to overestimate. For both Bosworth and pentecostalism, the centrality of supernatural healing was the most important aspect of the Dallas revival, for it demonstrated that pentecostalism's inherent power rested not in doctrine but in the pursuit of the supernatural.

¹⁵⁷ A full investigation of Bosworth's theology of divine healing can be found in chapter eight.

Bosworth's commitment to and demonstrated success in a full-bodied supernaturalism propelled him to the center of the early pentecostal stage. This was a supernaturalism in which tongues played a supportive rather than dominant role. On her visit in 1914, Elizabeth Sisson credited the ongoing blessings in Dallas to unceasing prayer, relating that Bosworth once prayed for nine days straight.¹⁵⁸ These were the kinds of stories that demonstrated the movement's admiration for the young minister, situating Bosworth to join the call that spring for a new pentecostal organization and become one of its primary leaders.

¹⁵⁸ Sisson, "Healing a Man Born Blind: The Power of the Word in Dallas, Texas," 4.

CHAPTER FOUR

Organizations and Orthodoxy, 1914-1918

I believe that, to a great many Christians, the evident supernatural element in the [pentecostal] movement is a great stumbling-block. It is very strange to say the least that believers who accept freely and fully all the supernatural or miraculous which appears in the Holy Scriptures should be stumbled by the same to-day, and seek diligently to find either natural explanations of the phenomena, or worse still, in their stubborn and unreasoning disbelief, attribute the work to Satan.

—W. Bernard, “The Gift of Tongues and the Pentecostal Movement” (1916)¹

Pentecostals could not live on revivals alone, as important as revivals were to their message and self-identity. F.F. Bosworth was among the many pentecostals who agreed that as long as human organizations did not overstep their scriptural bounds and become conscience-binding usurpers, they could provide much-needed stability for the young movement. But the development of pentecostal denominations introduced new tensions, particularly in doctrinal matters. The debate over sanctification drew a dividing line that largely had pentecostals already belonging to a denomination on one side and independent pentecostals on the other. The independent pentecostals then created a new organization, calling themselves the Assemblies of God. Soon the Assemblies of God was embroiled in controversy over the doctrine of the Trinity. This battle changed the essential nature of the organization, providing the group with justification to take up the legislative role it had decried two short years earlier. One of the many doctrines that the

¹ W. Bernard, “The Gift of Tongues and the Pentecostal Movement,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 142 (June 3, 1916): 5.

Assemblies of God subsequently outlined as “a basis of unity for the ministry” concerned the exact relationship of tongues with spirit-baptism.

As a result of these developments, tongues as the “Bible evidence” of spirit-baptism (in Parham’s terminology) developed into the more tightly-defined “initial physical sign,” as construed by the Assemblies of God.² An early ambiguity and room for diversity on the relationship of tongues to spirit-baptism evaporated. Bosworth initially supported the tongues evidence doctrine, though in the ongoing work of his cross-country itineration and his Dallas pastorate, he often showed uneasiness with an overemphasis on tongues he found in some pentecostal circles and attempted to focus pentecostals’ attention to the lasting effects of spirit-baptism rather than its evidence. Finally in 1917, Bosworth openly rejected the doctrine, citing a lack of scriptural and historical foundation as well as his own pastoral struggles surrounding its implementation. As a result of his critique of the doctrine, he left the pentecostal denomination, but this did not mean he ceased being a pentecostal. An investigation of Bosworth’s pentecostal contemporaries reveals a wide range of positions on tongues comfortably sheltered under the pentecostal umbrella. Furthermore, the crystallization of the initial evidence teaching is more a reflection of external factors and second-decade developments than the inherent or original impulse of pentecostalism. Bosworth recognized, as W. Bernard did in 1916, that the central element of pentecostalism—the point that rallied its followers and repelled its foes—was its supernaturalism, of which tongues was but a part.

² The most common shorthand for the doctrine is “initial evidence,” which was first used in 1908 by the Pentecostal Holiness Church. Vinson Synan, “The Role of Tongues as Initial Evidence,” in *Spirit and Renewal: Essays in Honor of J. Rodman Williams*, ed. Mark W. Wilson (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 71. Because this exact term was not used by Bosworth and was not common among Assemblies of God writers at this early stage, I will generally refer to the “tongues evidence” doctrine, which reflects something of the ambiguity before 1918 and Bosworth’s own usage.

Formation of the Assemblies of God

Many early pentecostals were staunchly opposed to the formation of pentecostal denominations. Some, like A.A. Boddy in England, felt that the pentecostal movement should be a pan-Evangelical revival thriving within the bounds of the established denominations. Others, like Chicago leader William Durham, took the old holiness stand against all denominations. In some areas, a strong congregation could provide opportunities for continued fellowship. Such was the case with Piper's Stone Church in Chicago, which hosted annual conventions.

Yet ministers in the pentecostal movement were eager to be recognized by some official body—if for no other reason than the discounted railroad passes that came with ordination. Those holiness denominations in the South that adopted pentecostalism, like the black Church of God in Christ and the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), did not have the same anti-institutional qualms. Although Parham vocally denounced human organizations, his Apostolic Faith network ordained ministers and tended more towards a denominational structure after Parham resigned in 1907. Howard Goss and E.N. Bell largely took charge of this work, which was strong in Texas and Arkansas. In Alabama, a group centered on H.G. Rodgers was issuing credentials under the name Church of God. But by 1911 both groups had adopted the name Church of God in Christ (with possible informal ties to C.H. Mason's black Church of God in Christ) and merged soon after.³ In 1912 and 1913, Bosworth and Birdsall were both listed as ordained ministers with the

³ Many have claimed that the Church of God in Christ connected with Goss and Rodgers was part of Mason's organization and that therefore the formation of the Assemblies of God was in part a racially-motivated move to establish a white organization with white leadership. However, the evidence for this argument is weak. For a review of the issues involved, see Darrin J. Rodgers, "The Assemblies of God and the Long Journey toward Racial Reconciliation," *Assemblies of God Heritage* 28 (January 1, 2008): 50–61.

Church of God in Christ in connection with Goss and Bell.⁴ This association was loose and provided no real discipline or oversight, such that Goss called it only a “gentleman’s agreement.”⁵

By 1913, even the most independent pentecostals were growing concerned over the proper methods and channels of sending and approving workers. A.H. Argue came to Chicago after attending the Arroyo Seco meeting that had brought up the issue of baptism in Jesus’ name. As discussed in chapter three, Bosworth and later Woodworth-Etter had nourished a revival spirit among pentecostals in Chicago since the opening of the Stone Church Convention under Bosworth in May of 1913. Despite the spiritual fervor, some were troubled by issues of organization and authority. According to the editor of the *Latter Rain Evangel*, Argue pleaded with fellow pentecostals to understand that “ministers who were about to be prayed for with the laying on of hands were not being sent out by Sister Etter or to claim any authority from her or the Stone Church.” The problem was that “some had not exercised wisdom and had gone out claiming authority from certain missions because hands were laid on them in that place.”⁶ Further organization was also on the minds of Goss and Bell, who produced their official lists of ministers in 1912 and in 1913 began calling for names of ministers to add to their roster. In October of 1913, they established a Bureau of Information, which had a number of

⁴ “Ordained Ministers of the Churches of God in Christ with Their Locations,” August 1, 1912; “Ordained Ministers of the Churches of God in Christ with Their Locations (revised),” February 1, 1913; “Ordained Elders, Pastors, Ministers, Evangelists and Missionaries of the Churches of God in Christ with Their Stations for 1914,” *Word and Witness*, December 20, 1913, 4.

⁵ Howard Archibald Goss, *The Winds of God: The Story of the Early Pentecostal Days (1901-1914) in the Life of Howard A. Goss* (New York: Cornet Press Books, 1958), 163.

⁶ M.B. Woodworth-Etter, “Neglect Not the Gift That Is In Thee,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 10 (August 1913): 13.

pentecostals who were close to Bosworth, such as Lydia Piper and Marie Burgess Brown's husband Robert.⁷ As many were beginning to realize, having no organization meant having very little accountability. Goss was inclined toward a more organized system of gospel work in part because of his experiences cleaning up after unnamed ministerial vagabonds he called "the cleverest of confidence men, posing as our preachers." And yet the widespread resistance to human organizations was such that Goss and Bell thought it best to discuss their initial plans for organization secretly.⁸

Nevertheless, support for a General Council increased, especially among non- or loosely-affiliated pentecostals who identified with William Durham's theology of the finished work of Calvary. The original call in December of 1913 had only five signatories, but a month later the number had doubled and included Bosworth and Birdsall. By March, over thirty ministers were committed.⁹ The stated purpose of the council was to advance the work of ministers, missionaries, publishing and education. These were issues with which many pentecostals were growing more concerned. When the Council assembled on April 2, over a hundred delegates from about twenty states were present.¹⁰

⁷ "To Preachers," *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 4; "Bureau of Information," *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 1.

⁸ Goss, *The Winds of God*, 163–174. Quote on p. 168. For examples of resistance to the General Council, see Carl Brumback, *Suddenly ... from Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), 156–158. For Bell's defense of organizing, see E.N. Bell, "Bible Order Versus Fanaticism," *Word and Witness* 10, no. 3 (March 20, 1914): 2–3.

⁹ "General Convention of Pentecostal Saints and Churches of God in Christ," *Word and Witness* 10, no. 1 (January 20, 1914): 4; "General Convention of Pentecostal Saints and Churches of God in Christ," *Word and Witness* 10, no. 3 (March 20, 1914): 1.

¹⁰ A definite count of the delegates has not been possible. For the conflicting evidence, see Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *The Assemblies of God: A Chapter in the Story of American Pentecostalism*, vol. 1 (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1989), 417, n 34.

The Assemblies of God represented a developing commitment to bureaucratic structure in the pentecostal movement. The representatives were certain that organization would not hamper spiritual blessings: “Scriptural co-operation and fellowship...go far to guarantee the presence and power of God.”¹¹ But they were also ambivalent on the human role in such organization. “We recognize ourselves as members of said GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GOD, (which is God’s organism),” they resolved, and made it clear that the Council had no intent or authority to legislate laws or articles of faith or have “unscriptural jurisdiction over its members.” To make matters muddier, the General Council reserved the right to “recognize Scriptural methods and order for worship, unity, fellowship, work and business for God, and to disapprove of all unscriptural methods, doctrines and conduct.”¹² This ambivalence would be a thorn in the side of the Assemblies of God when it dealt with the “New Issue” of baptism in Jesus’ name and with Bosworth’s doctrinal challenge in 1918. And even after the General Council met in April, the old way of organizing through informal conventions flourished: in July, Carrie Judd Montgomery and A.A. Boddy were holding a World-Wide Pentecostal Camp Meeting in California that Bosworth hoped to attend.¹³

Bosworth was involved in the Council, but did not take a leading role. When the question on the floor dealt with the massive issue of church governance, Bosworth moved for a special night session of the Conference Committee to discuss the issue. This meeting resulted in a resolution for an executive presbytery, which became the central

¹¹ *Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1914* (St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1914), 2.

¹² *Ibid.*, 4.

¹³ F.F. Bosworth, “Letter from Dallas, Texas,” *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 3 (March 1914): 72.

office of Assemblies of God polity.¹⁴ Bosworth and his wife added their names to the ministerial roster of the new body in 1914, although at that time it was unclear what the exact nature of the organization would be. It was clearly growing, however, and within months, over five hundred workers held Assemblies of God credentials. This growth necessitated another meeting of the General Council, which convened in November at the Stone Church in Chicago. Here the number of executive presbyters was expanded, and Bosworth was one of the sixteen men who were selected to serve.¹⁵ Presbyters were, as Bell pleaded, “only servants,” charged with conducting the business of the General Council between meetings, calling meetings, and establishing official fellowship with ministers and assemblies.¹⁶ In the executive presbyter meeting following the General Council, Bosworth’s musical acumen was acknowledged, as he was appointed to serve on a song book committee.¹⁷

Dallas and Beyond: Bosworth as Pastor, Evangelist, and Denominational Statesman

Between the General Council meetings of April and November, Bosworth continued his work in Dallas. In late April, he reported to the *Christian Evangel* that his ministry was especially blessed in conversions and baptisms, with 144 being baptized

¹⁴ *Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1914*, 5.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁶ “Hot Springs Assembly: God’s Glory Present,” *Word and Witness* 10, no. 4 (April 20, 1914): 1; *Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1914*, 11.

¹⁷ “Minutes of the Executive Presbytery” (General Council of the Assemblies of God, November 25, 1914), Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center. Apparently, this intended song book never materialized. The Assemblies of God did not compile a general song book until 1924, when *Songs of Pentecostal Fellowship* was published.

since he had returned from Hot Springs.¹⁸ The fruits of his ministry may have stirred his thinking on the subject of conversion, as he published an essay on “Sin and Repentance” in the May issue of *Word and Witness*. Here he explained that sin is a larger concept than the usual matters of “stealing, cursing, adultery, [or] getting drunk.” For “[t]he best thing a sinner might do in the place of wholly yielding to God, even if it is dropping all his bad habits, is only a new and more subtle [sic] form of resistance, and leaves him still guilty of the terrible sin of rebellion.” In fact, “the sin that has damned the millions who have gone into eternity unsaved is resisting God by not obeying the Gospel.”

In line with his Dowieite training, Bosworth saw human activity as the battle ground between God and Satan. “To defer repentance is to resist God and co-operate with the Devil.” Bosworth argued against any type of *preperatio evangelica* teaching beginning to become popular in liberal Christian circles. Only a dramatic yielding of one’s will to God at the moment of conversion is sufficient to bring the sinner to God’s favor. Because true repentance “secures a man’s consent, in advance, to every future revelation of the will of God,” it is the key not only to conversion but to the spirit-filled and supernatural life. “This yielding to the truth,” argued Bosworth, “takes away every obstacle so that the mighty gushings of faith break forth and God cleanses the heart and fills it with the Holy Ghost. Such people receive the Baptism in the Spirit the first time they know their privilege.” In the concept of faith—understood as perfect yielding to the

¹⁸ F.F. Bosworth, “Tide Still Rising in Dallas, Texas,” *Christian Evangel* 2, no. 19 (May 9, 1914): 6.

gospel—Bosworth was beginning to find an organizing principle for his entire theology of the supernatural.¹⁹

After the Hot Spring meeting, R.L. Erickson, now the pastor of the Stone Church, spent a few weeks with Bosworth in Dallas.²⁰ Bosworth then returned the favor, traveling again to the Stone Church for its annual May Convention and bringing with him a man named Walter Martin, who had been healed of complete blindness and became a living emblem of the supernatural ministry Bosworth promoted.²¹ Still enjoying the revival sparked by Bosworth's work in Chicago the summer before, the Convention was glad to hear him speak on "Discerning the Lord's Body" and "An Absolute Surrender to the Will of God." Bosworth's words were themselves beginning to take on a supernatural role, as one woman testified to healing while reading Bosworth's sermon on healing through Christ's body.²² Revealing the central role faith was taking in his preaching and theology, Bosworth told his hearers at the Convention that "[a]ny person can have the baptism in the Holy Spirit before he leaves this place, even though he is the worst sinner in the

¹⁹ All quotes in this and the previous paragraph are from F.F. Bosworth, "Sin and Repentance," *Word and Witness* 10, no. 5 (May 20, 1914): 2. This work bears much resemblance to Bosworth, "The Sinfulness of Procrastination," which was originally preached in Dallas on March 15, 1914.

²⁰ For Erickson's work in Dallas, see Elizabeth Sisson, "A Series of Baptisms," *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 8 (May 1914): 10–11.

²¹ Elizabeth Sisson, "Healing a Man Born Blind: The Power of the Word in Dallas, Texas," *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 7 (April 1914): 2–4; *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 8 (May 1914): 12–13; "A Man Born Blind Now Sees," *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 19–21; Bosworth, "Letter from Dallas, Texas." Sisson's article was later published in tract form. See "New Tracts," *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 10 (July 1914): 11.

²² "Notes," *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 11 (August 1914): 12.

world, if he will yield to God.” Such preaching stirred the hearts of those who had expected a long period of tarrying, and resulted in numerous spirit-baptisms.²³

Bosworth was also a key leader at a Los Angeles pentecostal convention in October of 1914, and again Walter Martin was there to share his story of healing.²⁴ Under the leadership of A.G. Garr, well-known pentecostal missionary who had now settled in the states, the convention also boasted leadership from the British Smith Wigglesworth and Bosworth’s longtime acquaintance through Woodworth-Etter, Elizabeth Sisson.²⁵ In Los Angeles, Bosworth spoke on one of his favorite subjects, revival. Like all his preaching, this too was now subsumed under faith. “The way to have a revival is not only to ask for a revival, but to believe for it,” said Bosworth.²⁶ All of God’s blessings, from salvation to healing to revivals, were procured by faith. “Just as far as we can have a living faith,” he told the audience at Los Angeles, “it will bring to pass the things God wants done.”²⁷ In another sermon at Los Angeles, Bosworth told those who felt their faith to be small or ineffectual that the first step in living faith is “purpose with all your heart”:

Let us take hold of God with our whole hearts. God does not want us to simply CHOOSE to have a thing which is according to His will, but to PURPOSE WITH ALL OUR HEART to have it. God looks at what we have; we may not have faith

²³ *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 10; F.F. Bosworth, “The Enthronement of Self the Great Sin,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 11 (August 1915): 2. This sermon was delivered in the Stone Church on May 24, 1914.

²⁴ In the spring of 1915, investigations proved that Martin’s case was full of errors. Bosworth and others publically refuted the claims made by Martin. “A Refutation,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 8 (May 1915): 14–15.

²⁵ *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 10 (October 1914): 240; Sadie Cody, “Report from Los Angeles Convention,” *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 11 (November 1914): 263.

²⁶ F.F. Bosworth, “Power in the Holy Ghost,” *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 11 (November 1914): 245.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 246.

at first, but we have a will, and if we will with God that is all he wants of us. If we will with God, faith then will spring up with perfect naturalness...²⁸

A tension existed in Bosworth's thought on the origin of faith, a tension that was a product of the mixed Calvinist and Arminian heritage of his holiness and divine healing background. While elsewhere Bosworth maintained that faith was purely God's gift given by hearing the preached word, he also often stated that the believer must show obedience or "purpose of heart" before living faith will come.²⁹ He was consistent, however, on "the omnipotence of faith": if a believer could be certain of God's will in a matter, faith materialized the blessing.³⁰

Bosworth's leadership in the Assemblies of God seemed not to slow down his pastoral and evangelistic work. In fact, 1915 was his busiest year yet in terms of travel. In March, he reported that the Dallas work was in "excellent shape," with thirty cottage meetings across the city.³¹ During this time, Bosworth conducted a three-week campaign in Bridgeport, Texas, where a man was converted after hearing Bosworth's tongues speech in German.³² Elizabeth Sisson again reported on the Dallas work in April, describing it as an "unbroken revival" of four years. According to Sisson and Bosworth, unity in prayer was the reason for the revival's strength and longevity and its lack of

²⁸ F.F. Bosworth, "Living Faith in the Power of God," *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 2 (February 1915): 31.

²⁹ For a typical statement on "faith comes by hearing," see F.F. Bosworth, "Discerning the Lord's Body," *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 5. For a typical statement on "obedience will produce faith," see F.F. Bosworth, "The Wonders of Faith," *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 9 (June 1913): 7.

³⁰ Bosworth, "The Wonders of Faith," 11.

³¹ F.F. Bosworth, "Dallas and Bridgeport, Texas," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 81 (March 13, 1915): 1.

³² R.P. Hines, "Tongues Are for a Sign," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 85 (April 10, 1915): 2.

schism.³³ That spring, Bosworth was a key speaker at a pentecostal convention in Newark, New Jersey, where Christian and Missionary Alliance teacher C.E. Rossignol received his spirit-baptism.³⁴ Bosworth spent a short time in St. Louis in June, working alongside Woodworth-Etter.³⁵ Later that month he joined forces with his old partner Cyrus Fockler, assisting with Fockler's "six week campaign against sin, sorrow, and sickness" in Milwaukee.³⁶ The Milwaukee campaign met Fockler's expectations, as seen in the testimony of one woman alcoholic who also suffered paralysis and consumption. On her way to drown herself, she heard the joyous singing from the meetings, and "[i]nstead of going to the river she came to the meeting at the Hall and plunged into the life-giving current that never runs dry."³⁷

The Milwaukee work was also assisted by E.N. Richey, who like Bosworth and Fockler, was a Zion City veteran.³⁸ From this point forward in Bosworth's itinerant work, his brother Burt and Charles O. Benham from Chicago were frequent helpers, and music returned to a central place in his ministry.³⁹ Like Bosworth, Benham would later embrace

³³ Elizabeth Sisson, "Four Years' Continuous Revival," *Confidence* 8, no. 4 (April 1915): 69, 71–72.

³⁴ Edward Armstrong, "The Newark Convention," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 88 (May 1, 1915): 4; "Fifteen Days with God," *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 9 (June 1915): 13.

³⁵ "Sister Etter Now in St. Louis," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 96 (June 26, 1915): 1; Maria Beulah Woodworth-Etter, *Signs and Wonders God Wrought in the Ministry for Forty Years* (Indianapolis, IN: [Mrs. M.B.W. Etter], 1916), 425–427.

³⁶ Cyrus B. Fockler, "Big Meeting in Milwaukee, Wis.," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 96 (June 26, 1915): 2. In Bosworth's absence, Birdsall and Jamieson continued revival services in Dallas with the help of A.G. Garr. See E.N. Bell, "Editor's Field Report," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 101 (July 31, 1915): 1.

³⁷ "Signs Following in Milwaukee," *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 11 (August 1915): 15.

³⁸ Hardy Mitchell, "Milwaukee, Wis.," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 103 (August 14, 1915): 1.

³⁹ In his application for Assemblies of God certification, B.B. Bosworth noted that he had been in ministry since the spring of 1915. He was ordained by E.N. Richey in March of 1917 and received his

the British-Israel theory. In September and October, the Bosworth brothers were leading services in Oakland, where they received the enthusiastic support of Carrie Judd Montgomery.⁴⁰ From there, Bosworth traveled to Los Angeles, where he teamed up with A.G. Garr and Woodworth-Etter for a series of meetings. In November, Bosworth was back at the Stone Church, leading meetings that were marked by “soul travail for the lost,” visions of Christ, and numerous healings. Again, Bosworth was tapped to preach on revival and the relation of faith to God’s promise of the Holy Spirit.⁴¹

Early in 1916, Bosworth spent a month headlining a pentecostal convention in Osborne, Kansas.⁴² That summer, he was assisted in Dallas by William Black of Los Angeles. Bosworth reported that they were “having the best results in the history of our work,” particularly in number of conversions.⁴³ When the *Weekly Evangel* editorialized that “the power of God [was] again falling in Dallas,” Bosworth felt compelled to correct the publication, making it clear that “there has never been a time in the history of the work here when sinners were not flocking to the altar for salvation.” This correction was not simply a matter of personal pride for Bosworth. As seen in the previous chapter, he staked much of his pastoral insight on the nature of revival, and he wanted to make clear

ordination certificate from the Assemblies of God a week later. Burton B. Bosworth, “Application Blank for Ordination Certificate,” March 23, 1917, 30/2/8, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁴⁰ *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 9 (September 1915): 213; Carrie Judd Montgomery, “Special Meetings in Oakland,” *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 9 (September 1915): 216. For Bosworth’s sermons in Oakland, see Bosworth, “Healing in the Atonement,”; F.F. Bosworth, “Clay in the Hands of the Potter,” *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 11 (November 1915): 254–259.

⁴¹ *Latter Rain Evangel* 8, no. 3 (December 1915): 12; F.F. Bosworth, “Nothing Can Hinder a Revival,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 135 (April 15, 1916): 6–8; F.F. Bosworth, “The Promise of the Father,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 8, no. 5 (February 1916): 2–7.

⁴² “Convention at Osborne, Kans.,” *Weekly Evangel*, February 12, 1916, 14.

⁴³ S.A. Jamieson, “Revival on at Dallas, Texas,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 141 (May 27, 1916): 14. Quote from F.F. Bosworth, “The Greatest Revival in Dallas,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 143 (June 10, 1916): 7.

that he had practiced what he preached and that his principles bore fruit. As he told the *Evangel*, “I have always maintained that the revival would continue as long as the preacher and the saints stayed full of the Spirit, for then He will never fail to do His office work of convicting of sin, and righteousness and judgment.”⁴⁴

No longer an executive presbyter, Bosworth nonetheless attended the 1916 General Council of the Assemblies of God at St. Louis in October, giving a sermon on evangelism and serving on an enrollment committee that was in charge of the ministerial roster.⁴⁵ During this General Council, the Assemblies of God passed a Statement of Fundamental Truths, largely in response to the Oneness controversy. Although Bosworth was not heavily involved in the controversy, as part of the executive presbytery in May of 1915, he was attached to a statement that said, in part, “we cannot accept a doctrine merely because some one claims to have a modern revelation to that effect.”⁴⁶ As the issue came to a head at the 1916 General Council, the Council emphasized that the new Statement of Fundamental Truths was not a creed but a “basis of unity for the ministry alone,” and empowered the Credential Committee (consisting of the chairman and secretary of the executive presbytery) to refuse credentials “to those who seriously disagree” with the Statement. Aside from affirming the Trinity in a lengthy and detailed article, the Statement described the baptism in the Holy Ghost as primarily an “endowment of power for life and service,” the full consummation of which “is indicated

⁴⁴ F.F. Bosworth, “A Continuous Revival in Dallas, Texas,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 145 (June 24, 1916): 8.

⁴⁵ *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1916* (St. Louis, MO, 1916), 4, 5; “Messages of the Moment,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 162 (October 28, 1916): 8.

⁴⁶ “Preliminary Statement Concerning the Principles Involved in the New Issue,” *Word and Witness* 12, no. 6 (June 1915): 1.

by the initial sign of speaking in tongues, as the Spirit of God gives utterance.” A vague statement on entire sanctification was crafted to make room for holiness pentecostals in the predominantly finished work organization.⁴⁷ In the aftermath of the divisive meeting, the General Council recalled prior ministerial credentials and began the process of reissuing new credential certificates. Bosworth was one of the hundreds of ministers who received new credential certificates in the months after the 1916 General Council.⁴⁸

After the General Council meeting, Bosworth and his brother conducted a midwinter pentecostal convention in Pawhuska, Oklahoma, which was a combination evangelistic outreach and meeting for the Assemblies of God district council in that state.⁴⁹ Later in the spring of 1917, Bosworth was in Winnipeg, contributing to a revival that had been in process since October. Bosworth left Winnipeg on March 26, his time being “a continuous victory,” according to G.D. Lockhart’s report.⁵⁰

Bosworth was back in Dallas in April, and a new feature of the work was becoming evident. The Bosworth evangelistic party sought out the cooperation of other churches in their soul-winning efforts, enlisting the preaching of Presbyterian William M. Holderby and the use of the Cole Avenue Methodist Church facilities and choir.⁵¹ This

⁴⁷ For the above quotes from the Council, see *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1916*, 10–11.

⁴⁸ Bosworth’s new ordination certificate is dated November 21, 1916. 30/2/8, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁴⁹ “Midwinter Pentecostal Convention,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 164 (November 11, 1916): 11; W.H. Pope, “Great Times of Refreshing at Pawhuska, Oklahoma,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 171 (January 6, 1917): 16; J.W. Welch, “A Visit Among the Saints in Oklahoma, California and Texas,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 173 (January 20, 1917): 8.

⁵⁰ G.D. Lockhart, *Weekly Evangel*, no. 185 (April 14, 1917): 11; Burton B. Bosworth, “B.B. Bosworth to J.W. Welch,” March 23, 1917, 30/2/8, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁵¹ *Weekly Evangel*, no. 204 (August 25, 1917): 16. As this account states, Holderby apparently experienced spirit-baptism that summer.

interdenominational character was a point of pride for Bosworth.⁵² During August, Bosworth was in Houston, holding meetings that received much attention in the local press and focused on the message of salvation rather than divine healing, spirit-baptism, or other pentecostal themes.⁵³ A deadly uprising of black soldiers on August 23 forced Bosworth to close a meeting early, as bullets pierced the top of his tent. He later recalled that he felt divinely led to preach that night that some in the audience would not have another chance to repent—a leading that was confirmed when Bosworth learned that some in that audience were later killed in the mutiny.⁵⁴ In September, he was at the General Council meeting—again in St. Louis—preaching on the centrality of love to the Christian faith. At this meeting, Bosworth was also elected to the General Presbytery, a more widely representative body of consultative presbyters that was created the year

⁵² Elizabeth Sisson, “The Council and Missionary Conference,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 208 (September 29, 1917): 4.

⁵³ “Bro. Bosworth at Houston, Tex.,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 206 (September 8, 1917): 11. The campaign in Houston began on August 5 and closed September 2, 1917. Reports on the meetings in secular press appeared almost daily. For a sample of the coverage and indications that Bosworth’s preaching was centered on salvation, see “Large Audience Greet Evangelist Bosworth at Initial Service,” *Houston Chronicle*, August 6, 1917, 3; “Altar Is Filled with Seekers of Salvation at Bosworth Revival,” *Houston Chronicle*, August 8, 1917, 5; “Overflowing Audience Hears Rev. Mr. Bosworth on ‘The Holy Spirit,’” *Houston Chronicle*, August 13, 1917, 8; “Gospel Provides Food and Clothing for All Who Trust, Says Speaker,” *Houston Chronicle*, August 14, 1917, 8; “‘The Will of God Boiled Down into Five Words’ Is Preacher’s Subject,” *Houston Chronicle*, August 17, 1917, 5; “Second Coming of Christ Is Near Evangelist Says,” *Houston Chronicle*, August 28, 1917, 10; “Christ’s Invitation to the Thirsty Is Evangelist’s Subject,” *Houston Chronicle*, August 29, 1917, 9; “Hell Is a Reality and Full of Sorrows, Says Evangelist Bosworth,” *Houston Chronicle*, August 31, 1917, 8; “West End Revival Campaign Closes,” *Houston Chronicle*, September 3, 1917, 6. At least two of the more pentecostal-themed sermons he gave in Houston were reprinted in pentecostal periodicals, probably as a result of Raymond T. Richey’s collection of press clippings, which often included large transcriptions of Bosworth’s sermons. “‘The Will of God Boiled Down into Five Words’ Is Preacher’s Subject”; F.F. Bosworth, “The Will of God Boiled Down into Five Words. ‘Be Filled with the Spirit,’” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 229 (March 2, 1918): 1; “Overflowing Audience Hears Rev. Mr. Bosworth on ‘The Holy Spirit,’” F.F. Bosworth, “The Holy Spirit,” *Pentecostal Herald* 3, no. 12 (April 1918): 1. For an advertisement of Richey’s collection of clippings from the Houston work, see “The Bosworth Revival Campaign in Houston, Texas,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 213 (November 3, 1917): 14.

⁵⁴ “F.F. Bosworth, Raymond T. Richey, and B.B. Bosworth at Evangelistic Temple,” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 2 (February 1930): 8. For the Houston race riot of 1917, see C. Calvin Smith, “The Houston Riot of 1917, Revisited,” *Houston Review* 13 (1991): 85–102.

before.⁵⁵ After the General Council, Bosworth returned to work in Dallas, assisted by Assemblies of God evangelist William Gaston. In October, Bosworth had the privilege of officiating at the wedding of his longtime co-pastor, E.G. Birdsall.⁵⁶

Also at the September General Council was Raymond T. Richey, son of Zion City's former mayor E.N. Richey. Raymond urged support for evangelistic work among soldiers. In the pressure of wartime, the Council agreed with Richey that pentecostals must "become all things to all men that by all means we may save some"—probably indicating a willingness to support interdenominational work.⁵⁷ In December Richey invited the Bosworth brothers back to Houston, this time to work with soldiers who were preparing to enter combat in Europe. Like Bosworth's Dallas ministry, the Houston work was interdenominational, under the auspices of Richey's United Prayer and Workers' League and with frequent preaching by Holderby.⁵⁸ After Houston, the Bosworth brothers were in Oklahoma, conducting a revival meeting that preceded the state council in April.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ F.F. Bosworth, "The Call to Love," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 218 (December 8, 1917): 2; *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917* (St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1917), 11.

⁵⁶ "Mt. Auburn Revival Campaign Will Continue This Week," *Dallas Morning News*, September 30, 1917; "Gospel Tabernacle Revival Campaign to Continue," *Dallas Morning News*, October 21, 1917; "Dallas Social Affairs," *Dallas Morning News*, October 26, 1917.

⁵⁷ Raymond T. Richey, "Work Amongst the Soldiers," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 220 (December 22, 1917): 10; *General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917* (St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1917), 16.

⁵⁸ Richey, "Work Amongst the Soldiers"; Raymond T. Richey, "A Telegram from Houston, Texas," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 225 (February 2, 1918): 3; "Bosworth Brothers Here to Assist in Revival in Soldiers Tabernacle," *Houston Chronicle*, January 8, 1918; "Tabernacle Warmed for Night Service; Blustery Weather No Bar," *Houston Chronicle*, January 11, 1918. For details on the 1917-1918 campaign in the context of Raymond T. Richey's life and ministry, see John David Foxworth, "Raymond T. Richey: An Interpretive Biography" (Ph.D. diss., Regent University, 2011), 70–75.

⁵⁹ Thomas J. O'Neal, "Announcement," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 231 (March 16, 1918): 15.

The Tongues Evidence Controversy

On July 24, 1918, Bosworth, seemingly at the height of his influence and prestige in the young denomination, resigned from the ministry of the Assemblies of God. In his letter to chairman J.W. Welch, Bosworth indicated the reason for his resignation: “I do not believe, nor can I ever teach, that all will speak in tongues when baptized in the Spirit.” With his views on the tongues evidence issue spreading through the ranks, Bosworth had begun receiving letters telling him he “had no right to hold credentials,” and he recognized that Welch would be blamed if Bosworth were allowed to retain them. Bosworth also accused A.G. Garr and William Black of intentionally splitting Bosworth’s Dallas congregation and spreading “false and misleading” information that, as Bosworth claimed, “put me in a bad light with thousands of those dearest to me over the land.” By the time Bosworth resigned, Garr and Black had taken over Bosworth’s original tabernacle in Dallas.⁶⁰ Although Bosworth was clearly distraught over the slander, he was more focused on the doctrinal issues, telling Welch that “if I had a thousand souls, I would not be afraid to risk them all on the truth of my position...”⁶¹

Bosworth had probably been voicing his doubts about the doctrine since the General Council of 1917, and he told Welch that he hoped the issue would be “lovingly

⁶⁰ Loftis claims that Bosworth and Birdsall resigned their pastorate of the Dallas pentecostal church in April. Carrie Frances Wagliardo Loftis, *A History of First Assembly of God; Dallas, Texas, 1912-1992, 80 Years* (Dallas, TX: First Assembly of God, 1992), 10.

⁶¹ An indication of Bosworth’s prestige in the months before his resignation is that in December of 1917, the Assemblies of God official organ listed Bosworth among a handful of “men who are gifted with their pens and whom we expect to hear from.” *Christian Evangel*, no. 217 (December 1, 1917): 5. For Bosworth’s resignation letter and all of the quotations in this paragraph, see F.F. Bosworth, “F.F. Bosworth to J.W. Welch,” July 24, 1918, 30/4/1, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

considered from the Scriptures” at the next General Council.⁶² When the Council met in September, Bosworth got his wish. Bosworth was allowed the courtesy of presenting his views even though he was no longer affiliated with the denomination. Yet the Council held fast to language that since 1917 had been part of the Statement of Fundamental Truths, which stated that “[t]he full consummation of the baptism of believers in the Holy Ghost is indicated by the initial physical sign of speaking with other tongues as the Spirit of God gives utterance.”⁶³ In fact, the 1918 Council made their stance on the issue more explicit, referring to the initial evidence doctrine as the “distinctive testimony” of the pentecostal movement, and unofficially suggesting that tongues “invariably accompanies” spirit-baptism. The Council resolved that no minister should hold Assemblies of God credentials who “attacks as error our distinctive testimony”—a problem Bosworth, for his part, had already solved with his earlier resignation.⁶⁴

Bosworth's Early Ambivalence

Although Bosworth later recalled that during his early years in pentecostal ministry he “tenaciously contended” for the tongues evidence doctrine, he admitted that he had ceased preaching the doctrine some years before he publically came out against

⁶² According to Frodsham’s report on the 1918 Council, the doctrine had been “challenged during the past twelve months.” Stanley Frodsham, “The 1918 General Council,” *Christian Evangel*, no. 256–57 (October 5, 1918): 3. When the General Council voted on inserting the qualifier “physical” (which they claimed was an oversight of the 1916 council) in the article of the Statement of Fundamental Truths on “initial physical sign” in 1917, Bosworth’s was probably one of the “three or four dissenting votes” recorded in the minutes. *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917*, 21. Brumback claims that Bosworth had been voicing his position before the Council of 1917, which responded with a resolution requiring missionaries to sign the Statement of Fundamental Truths. Brumback, *Suddenly...from Heaven*, 220; *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917*, 22.

⁶³ *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917*, 21.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 7–8.

it.⁶⁵ In fact, his written record prior to 1917 does not show him as an enthusiastic supporter of the teaching. In Bosworth's language, tongues was one of the supernatural "signs following" that confirmed the work of God in his ministry. In a sermon in 1915, Bosworth associated tongues with spirit-baptism, but in a descriptive rather than prescriptive way. "If there is one thing above another that you can know for sure, it is when you are filled with the Holy Ghost," he proclaimed. "On the day of Pentecost it was the same, the Spirit was poured out, fell upon them, they spake in tongues, received the Holy Ghost, and it was called a baptism."⁶⁶ Bosworth was unnerved by the emphasis on tongues in pentecostal circles. As he told an audience at the Stone Church in 1913, his discomfort with the tongues doctrine was rooted in his concern for a broader pastoral approach, which viewed spirit-baptism in utilitarian terms first, then mystical:

I tell you, dear ones, there is something more to this baptism than the speaking in tongues, wonderful as that is. Let not anyone be satisfied with his experience until he has a burden for souls. The same Holy Ghost who at the time of our baptism gave us utterance in other languages is He who "Himself maketh intercession with groanings that cannot be uttered." And the groanings that cannot be uttered may be a better evidence that we have retained the experience than speaking in tongues, for after the first warmth of love has died away the tongues may continue, but the spirit of prayer will not continue without the love of God moving in our hearts.⁶⁷

For Bosworth, the chief result of spirit-baptism was that it aligned the seeker with God's will in the salvation of others, a burden he often referred to as "soul travail."⁶⁸ In this

⁶⁵ Eunice May Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story* (Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921), 57, 74.

⁶⁶ Bosworth, "The Promise of the Father," 4.

⁶⁷ F.F. Bosworth, "The Ministry of Intercession," *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 8 (May 1913): 2.

⁶⁸ The language of "soul travail" appears in the nineteenth-century holiness movement. See Doug Weaver, "Baptists and Holiness in the Nineteenth Century: A Story Rarely Told," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 169; Thomas Fudge, *Daniel Warner and the Paradox of Religious Democracy in Nineteenth-Century America* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998), 187.

context, Bosworth even challenged the later important marker of “initial,” saying, “As the Spirit falls upon some, they are given soul travail even before speaking in tongues.” He fully endorsed this order of events. “I am always glad,” Bosworth said, “when this operation of the Spirit [soul travail] precedes speaking in tongues, otherwise the seeker may be so overjoyed at receiving the Comforter that he ceases to wait upon God and misses being taken into the wonderful experiences of soul travail.”⁶⁹ While at this time, Bosworth was not aware that later pentecostals would identify Paul’s remark about “groanings that cannot be uttered” as tongues speech or the distinction the Assemblies of God Statement of Fundamentals would make about tongues as the initial *physical* sign, he was clearly challenging the common preference tongues was given in the interpretation of spirit-baptism.⁷⁰ At the same time, he did not directly question the link between tongues and spirit-baptism, emphasizing that tongues are one of the results of “living faith.”⁷¹ At a Los Angeles gathering in 1914, Bosworth wrestled with the problem of seekers who went a long time without the sign of tongues. His advice was to put faith into action:

When people ask God to baptize them with the Holy Spirit, many times the Spirit falls upon them and His power gets into their tongues, and they wait for the Spirit to utter the words through them; but the Spirit gives them utterance. . . The reason why some people have asked for the baptism for so many years is because they

⁶⁹ Bosworth, “The Ministry of Intercession,” 2.

⁷⁰ Menzies argues that D.W. Kerr and the Statement of Fundamental Truths used the qualifier “physical” to leave room for other prior evidences of a “spiritual” sort, such as Bosworth spoke of here. See Glen W. Menzies, “Tongues as ‘The Initial Physical Sign’ of Spirit Baptism in the Thought of D W Kerr,” *Pneuma* 20, no. 2 (September 1, 1998): 184–186, et passim.

⁷¹ “As the power of God begins to work upon the vocal organs of many who are seeking the baptism, they resist the Spirit by trying to continue their praise in their own language. They say, ‘I can’t speak in tongues.’ Neither could the paralytic walk and carry his bed, but he had to make the effort. If we will do this it will result in a living faith which will turn ‘stammering lips’ into real languages...” Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith,” 10.

have (when God put the power on them) shut their mouths and waited for the Spirit to do what they should do...He is already in His temple.⁷²

Again, while before 1917 Bosworth was not directly attacking the link between spirit-baptism and tongues, his comments show subtle apprehension about the tongues teaching. He asserted that the baptism may be complete (“He is already in His temple”) before tongues occur. In this situation, a believer could conceivably go days, weeks, or longer having spirit-baptism, but not yet speaking in tongues. According to Bosworth at this point in 1914, while tongues naturally followed spirit-baptism, they may be deferred due to ignorance or obstinacy. In 1915, Bosworth also took the uncommon position that “a person can be filled with the Spirit more than once,” undermining the uniqueness of a singular spirit-baptism experience and therefore the need for a singular proof of that experience.⁷³

Context: Early Pentecostal Fluidity on the Tongues Evidence Teaching

Scholars are beginning to recognize that the tongues evidence doctrine underwent significant changes in the eighteen years between Parham’s first articulation of “Bible evidence” and the Assemblies of God’s 1918 Statement of Fundamental Truths. Major pentecostal leaders disagreed about what the doctrine meant and how strictly to enforce it.⁷⁴ The most important development for the doctrine was the gradual rejection of Parham’s view that tongues were always unlearned foreign languages. Led by Parham’s associate Warren F. Carothers, as early as 1906 pentecostals began to claim that “there is

⁷² Bosworth, “Power in the Holy Ghost,” 246.

⁷³ Bosworth, “The Promise of the Father,” 6.

⁷⁴ Aaron T. Friesen, *Norming the Abnormal: The Development and Function of the Doctrine of Initial Evidence in Classical Pentecostalism* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013), chap. 2–3.

abundant use for the tongue whether any man understands him or not...[and] it is not primarily intended that any man should understand the tongues.”⁷⁵ While this eased the burden of determining what language a person was speaking when glossolalizing and seemed to conform more to the way tongues were actually being practiced in pentecostal circles, it created new problems. If tongues were not identifiable foreign languages, then they were often gibberish—at least to those listening. While it could be assumed that an identified foreign language was inspired by the Holy Spirit, non-linguistic utterances seemed to be more open to the suspicion of being inspired by the flesh or demonic powers.⁷⁶ Furthermore, since Parham had felt that the gift of tongues endowed in spirit-baptism had a definite utilitarian function as power to witness, he felt that the evidence of tongues did not need to be corroborated by other gifts or spiritual fruits.⁷⁷ Once tongues were divorced from Parham’s missionary orientation, pentecostals became concerned that tongues *alone* were not sufficient evidence of spirit-baptism. These issues combined led to deeper reflection on what pentecostals meant by tongues as evidence of spirit-baptism. Many began to define more tightly their doctrine of tongues evidence, insisting that only

⁷⁵ Carothers’ distinction between tongues as missionary languages and non-human languages is connected to, but not synonymous with, his distinction between tongues as evidence and tongues as ongoing gift—a distinction also pioneered by Carothers. W. F. Carothers, *The Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Speaking in Tongues* (Houston, TX; Zion City, IL, 1906), 21. Cf. Cecil M. Robeck, “An Emerging Magisterium? The Case of the Assemblies of God,” *Pneuma* 25, no. 2 (September 1, 2003): 174. A.G. Garr also publicized his views—based on his own inability to speak Bengali while in India—that tongues did not primarily operate as missionary languages. A.G. Garr, “Tongues: The Bible Evidence to the Baptism with the Holy Ghost,” *Pentecostal Power*, March 1907, 3. See also “The Value of Speaking in Tongues,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 1, no. 12 (April 15, 1908): 4.

⁷⁶ E.N. Bell, “What Is the Evidence of the Baptism in the Spirit,” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 6 (June 20, 1913): 7. Such concerns led even the *Bridegroom’s Messenger*, which was generally staunch in its insistence on evidential tongues, to qualify the teaching when listing its doctrinal points: “Speaking in tongues as the distinguishing evidence of the baptism with the Holy Ghost, *provided it is accompanied with the fruit of the Spirit.*” “Doctrine of the Pentecostal Movement,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 37 (May 1, 1909): 1. Emphasis added.

⁷⁷ Friesen, *Norming the Abnormal*, 46.

those spoken “as the spirit gives utterance” and confirmed by the fruits of the spirit were valid. In addition, they added qualifiers to the evidence doctrine: by labeling tongues the “initial” evidence, they suggested that other evidences would follow.

These developments show that when Bosworth began criticizing the tongues evidence position, he was not rejecting a monolithic doctrinal heritage. Rather, he was operating within the flux in pentecostalism surrounding the relationship of tongues to spirit-baptism. Even more important, Bosworth was not alone in his rejection of a rigid tongues evidence teaching. Just after Parham relinquished his title as Projector of the Apostolic Faith, his network of churches and ministers began dealing with divergent views of the role of tongues. At a February 1907 convention in Waco, Texas, held in correlation with a short-term Bible school, the issue was openly aired.⁷⁸ According to Howard A. Goss, an early pentecostal leader who had been converted at Parham’s campaign in Galena, Kansas, in 1903, those who held the “orthodox” (by which he meant non-Parhamite) position argued that any of the nine spiritual gifts could serve as evidence of spirit-baptism. But Warren F. Carothers, Parham’s right-hand-man in Texas, argued that according to Acts 10:45-46, “tongues *alone* finally convinced the Jews that the Gentiles as well as themselves had actually received the Holy Ghost.”⁷⁹ Although A.G. Canada, who led the opposition against Carothers, was “a gifted speaker,” Carothers won

⁷⁸ Robin Johnston, *Howard A. Goss: A Pentecostal Life* (Word Aflame Press, 2010), 57–59.

⁷⁹ A.G. Garr, another strong proponent of the Bible evidence doctrine, based his argument on the same text as Carothers, and insisted—like Carothers—that the “for” of Acts 10:46 was definitive proof that tongues was always the sign of spirit-baptism. Garr, “Tongues: The Bible Evidence to the Baptism with the Holy Ghost,” 2.

the debate, and according to Goss, “for most of us the question was settled once and for all.”⁸⁰

And yet, even in Goss’s recollection, the strength of Carothers’s “wise and logical deductions” was not quite enough to clinch the victory. In pentecostal-supernatural fashion, Goss had to insist on a type of “inner witness of the spirit” for confirmation of the tongues truth: “[A]s [Carothers] closed his masterly discourse, God came down upon all of us in great power and blessing, confirming this teaching in each of our hearts as never before.”⁸¹ And in a final adjudication of the issue, Carothers’s party decided to make a “test case” out of an upcoming meeting in San Antonio. Resolving not to preach tongues as the evidence of spirit-baptism but let God work as he will, this group was pleased when those seeking spirit-baptism also spoke in tongues. Believing that the San Antonio participants had no prior knowledge of the tongues doctrine, the Goss-Carothers party considered their argument vindicated by this miraculous event, as well as by prior mystical and exegetical means.⁸²

Assemblies of God historian Carl Brumback believed that after the Waco convention of 1907 (which, incidentally, also confirmed a prohibition on eating pork⁸³),

⁸⁰ Excerpt from Goss’s diary, cited in Johnston, *Howard A. Goss: A Pentecostal Life*, 58. Emphasis in original.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid., 58–59. That the San Antonio group had no prior knowledge of the tongues doctrine is unlikely, since Parham’s network was strong throughout central Texas. Furthermore, one of the participants at the San Antonio meeting was D.C.O. Opperman, who in 1906 had learned of the doctrine directly from Parham himself. See Brumback, *Suddenly...from Heaven*, 216–217; Gordon P. Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World* (Shippensburg, PA: Companion Press, 1990), 141–143.

⁸³ Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1992), 156.

no pentecostals challenged the Bible evidence doctrine until Bosworth a decade later.⁸⁴ Recent historians are more accurate in identifying the connection between tongues and spirit-baptism as “fluid” in the decade after Azusa Street.⁸⁵ A broad reading of sources indicates that, before 1918, the issue was not settled: even the judgment of the Waco convention was ambiguous, with Goss stating that “it came out victorious that tongues were the evidence of the baptism in the Spirit, though not the only one.”⁸⁶ Many pentecostals continued to raise voices of direct dissent or caution against the exclusive tongues doctrine.

The teaching of evidential tongues was particularly contentious among pentecostals with roots in Zion City. The enemies of pentecostalism in Dowie’s battered utopia were quick to notice the contradicting views of tongues in the movement. According to Wilbur Voliva of Zion City, Daniel Bryant, who despite seeking never received the sign of tongues, also took issue with the undue emphasis on tongues, arguing that “the teaching that tongues must be produced as an evidence of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit, will lead to an unscriptural use of the gift.”⁸⁷ William H. Piper also openly questioned the Bible evidence doctrine, leading Voliva to marvel in the inconsistencies of pentecostals. Voliva was perhaps straining evidence when he claimed Piper taught “that the teaching to the effect that speaking in tongues was the sign of baptism of the Holy

⁸⁴ Brumback, *Suddenly...from Heaven*, 216. Brumback may have been following Goss, *The Winds of God*, 59.

⁸⁵ Robeck, “An Emerging Magisterium?,” 177, 179; Blumhofer, *The Assemblies of God*, 1:240.

⁸⁶ Words of Howard A. Goss in Bennett Freeman Lawrence, *The Apostolic Faith Restored* (St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1916), 67. Cited in Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 162.

⁸⁷ “Questions Lovingly Addressed to the Gift of Tongues People in Zion City,” *Zion Herald*, December 2, 1908, 3.

Ghost was purely demoniacal,” but Voliva clearly saw that Piper did not hold a hard line on tongues.⁸⁸ In late summer 1908, Piper came to the conclusion that, “One of the things that has hindered this great movement of God on the face of the earth, and caused many people not to seek the blessing, is the false teaching, that speaking in tongues is the only, essential and necessary evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit.”⁸⁹ Piper’s animosity toward the teaching stemmed from his own experience of spirit-baptism:

Saturday night, while sitting in our chairs communing with God, there came a wave of spiritual power so deep and strong that it seemed to take our breath. This occurred in each of us at exactly the same instant. I am sure that at this time I was baptized in the Holy Spirit, but I would not acknowledge it nor even believe it, because I did not speak in tongues...I am now sure that I was grieving the Spirit of God in continuing to ask for that which had already been given to me.⁹⁰

Piper’s concern was pastoral. He knew of many, like himself, who had a true spirit-baptism without speaking in tongues but were hindered from enjoying the blessing. These unfortunate people, claimed Piper, “were made to believe that because they had not spoken in tongues they really had nothing and began to question and got into comparative spiritual darkness.” Ironically, however, when Piper advised them to believe they had spirit-baptism without tongues, many of them were so freed from harmful introspection that tongues speech began to flow naturally.⁹¹ Piper was disturbed by the doctrine’s power to create a “sect” out of the pentecostal movement, using the tongues evidence teaching to say “We are the people and you are not.” He pointed to the successful

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ William H. Piper, “Manifestations and ‘Demonstrations’ of the Spirit,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 1 (October 1908): 18.

⁹⁰ William H. Piper, “Long Weary Months of Spiritual Drought,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 1 (October 1908): 5.

⁹¹ Piper, “Manifestations and ‘Demonstrations’ of the Spirit,” 18.

ministries of many in church history who had not spoken in tongues. According to Piper, the purpose of spirit-baptism was more important than evidences for it, and the purpose was “qualifying us for service.” He felt that if the tongues doctrine were true, scripture would be clearer on the subject. “Is the point, if true, not so vital that the Master ought to have said not only ‘Tarry until ye be endued with power from on high,’ but also that ‘ye shall not be thus endued until ye speak in an unknown tongue’?”⁹²

William Durham, who was an outspoken advocate of the tongues evidence doctrine in nearby Chicago, knew that Piper did not agree with the majority pentecostal position. When the *Household of God* newspaper folded in 1910 and transferred its subscribers to Piper’s *Latter Rain Evangel*, Durham felt obligated to let his readers know that his endorsement did not transfer with it. “We cannot recommend a paper that in its first number took a decided stand against tongues being the evidence of the baptism in the Holy Ghost, and other truths for which the Pentecostal movement has stood from the first, and whose editor has not yet received the Holy Ghost, so far as we know.”⁹³ Years before the Assemblies of God labeled the tongues teaching as the “distinctive testimony” of the pentecostal movement, Durham recognized the teaching as the unique preserve of pentecostals. Durham indicted Piper and others who denied the teaching, saying, “The work has...suffered from the effects of those who claim to be Pentecostal people, and at the same time deny this great distinguishing truth of the movement.”⁹⁴ Piper was a major voice of dissent on the tongues teaching and a revered leader in the early movement; the

⁹² Ibid., 19.

⁹³ “Criticisms Answered,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 5 (July 1, 1910): 11.

⁹⁴ William H. Durham, “Speaking in Tongues Is the Evidence of Spirit Baptism,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 2 (May 1912): 9.

imagination is stirred to think of how the tongues teaching may have evolved if Piper had not died in 1911.

Piper was not alone in challenging—or at least nuancing—the tongues evidence teaching. In his frustration over perceived viciousness of other pentecostals and their unbiblical teachings, William Seymour gradually began loosening his stance on evidential tongues, insisting rather on the fruits of the spirit as the true evidence. By 1915 he bluntly stated, “we could not stand for tongues being the evidence of the Baptism in the Holy Ghost and fire.”⁹⁵ Agnes Ozman, the first woman to speak in tongues at Parham’s Bible school in 1901, also came to the conclusion that tongues was not the only evidence of spirit-baptism. As she told readers of the *Latter Rain Evangel* in 1909, she intended to print an article about it earlier but was hindered. Yet she contented herself with the knowledge that God had revealed the truth to her and that “He might reveal this truth to others who would spread it abroad.” Although forsaking the tongues doctrine, she maintained that “My power to speak in tongues has not been lessened by giving up the errors which have become attached to this work, but instead it has increased.”⁹⁶

In 1910, the *Pentecost*, edited by J.R. Flower and A.S. Copley, cautioned seekers against a preoccupation with tongues, advising them to “keep occupied with Jesus and move on to know Him and the new tongue will most likely come when you are least thinking about it.”⁹⁷ The phrase “most likely” speaks volumes about the ambivalence

⁹⁵ Cecil M. Robeck, “William J. Seymour and the ‘Bible Evidence,’” in *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, ed. Gary B. McGee (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 84.

⁹⁶ Agnes Ozman, “Where the Latter Rain First Fell,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 4 (January 1909): 2.

⁹⁷ *Pentecost* 2, no. 9, 10 (October 1910): 11.

toward the tongues evidence teaching. Like Piper, the writer was concerned that the emphasis on tongues would have negative spiritual consequences:

To insist that this is the only evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit is to compel us to accept all speaking in tongues as divine. Whereas some is purely human and others is certainly satanic. The Scripture...records at least three signs of the Spirit's presence...Here they are: speaking in tongues, magnifying God, and prophesying.⁹⁸

Copley later developed a strongly Pauline understanding of spirit-baptism, arguing that “the whole Church was BAPTIZED in the Spirit once, and all at one time. But individuals receive the ANOINTING as they believe for it.” While he considered it error to believe that “we can receive the Spirit without speaking in another tongue,” he also insisted that “many who speak in tongues put undue stress thereon, boastfully calling it ‘the Bible evidence,’ and exalting interpretations above the plain Word.” Apparently, Copley saw a danger in neat systematization of the pentecostal experience, especially if it were built upon faulty exegesis.⁹⁹

Another who raised doubts about the teaching was Minnie Abrams, the famed leader of the pentecostal revival in India that predated Azusa Street. Abrams believed “it is God’s rule to give speaking in tongues at the time or sometime after one’s baptism,” but this rule, she averred, “has exceptions.” In the end, the seekers must rely on “the

⁹⁸ *Pentecost* 2, no. 11–12 (December 1910): 9.

⁹⁹ A.S. Copley, *The Holy Spirit, The One Baptism, The Anointing--Personal and Practical*, 5, accessed April 7, 2014, http://www.gracegod.com/pamphlet_and_articles/pamphlets/The%20Holy%20Spirit%20-%20The%20One%20Baptism%20and%20the%20Anointing.pdf. Copley’s stance is remarkably similar to today’s pentecostal theologians who argue that the tongues evidence doctrine should be discussed in the language of invitation rather than law: “Why not?” rather than “You must.” See Friesen, *Norming the Abnormal*, 192; May Ling Tan, “A Response to Frank Macchia’s ‘Groans Too Deep for Words: Towards a Theology of Tongues as Initial Evidence,’” *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 1, no. 2 (July 1, 1998): 175–83. Copley put it this way: “Who would not receive and yield to the Holy Spirit? Who would not earnestly court His abiding Presence, and gladly yield to speaking in other tongues, rather than miss all this?” Copley, *The Holy Spirit*, 12.

witness in our hearts by the power of the Holy Ghost that says, 'I have it.'"¹⁰⁰ In 1916 the *Weekly Evangel* gave guarded advice to those who were concerned about the link

between tongues and spirit-baptism:

The question is sometimes asked... 'Then have not any who have not spoken in tongues been baptized with the Holy Ghost?' I do not feel that we can say that they have not. It is safe, however, to say that they have not had the baptism on scriptural or apostolic lines. I am inclined to think that in these days a person being baptized with the Holy Ghost will generally, if not always, be caused to speak in 'tongues.'¹⁰¹

The writer in fact seemed to endorse a theological vagueness on this issue: "It appears to me, however, that clear theological views of the subject [of the evidences of spirit-baptism], though desirable, are not strictly necessary, for as many have obtained salvation by a simple heart cry to God and without clear apprehension of the way of salvation, so God works in this blessing."¹⁰² The writer also listed the "sound...of a rushing mighty wind," the appearance of "tongues as of fire," and the accompaniments of "signs, visions, dreams, [and] prophecy" as "Bible evidences" of spirit-baptism.¹⁰³ While the majority of pentecostals wanted to endorse a necessary link between spirit-baptism and tongues,

¹⁰⁰ Minnie F. Abrams, "The Object of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit," *Latter Rain Evangel* 3, no. 8 (May 1911): 9. The pentecostal revival in India began independent from American developments. In March of 1905, a number of girls in the Mukti Mission in South India where Abrams worked testified to baptism in the Holy Spirit and fire, prompting much confession and repentance. The revival continued with visions, dreams, and prophecy, and beginning in April of 1906, tongues. After hearing of the Azusa Street revival, the participants at Mukti welcomed tongues as a sign of spirit-baptism, but the tongues evidence doctrine was not a factor until Azusa alum A.G. Garr arrived in early 1907, and the teaching was resisted by many. See G.B. McGee and S.M. Burgess, "India," in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley M Burgess and Eduard M. Van Der Maas (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003); Gary B. McGee, "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East: Early-Twentieth-Century Pentecostalism in India and the Debate over Speaking in Tongues," *Church History* 68, no. 3 (September 1, 1999): 648–65.

¹⁰¹ Bernard, "The Gift of Tongues and the Pentecostal Movement," 5. Cited in Robeck, "An Emerging Magisterium?," 179. Bernard is listed as the author at the end of the article as it continued into the June 10 issue.

¹⁰² Bernard, "The Gift of Tongues and the Pentecostal Movement," 5.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

many would not risk the potential damage to consciences or the transgressing of divine liberty by categorically insisting on it.

A number of other early testimonies indicate that, in practice, tongues were not as neatly linked to spirit-baptism as pentecostals often supposed. For some, the process was inverted. John G. Lake spoke in tongues on more than one occasion before the experience he labeled his spirit-baptism.¹⁰⁴ Ruth Angstead of Zion City testified in 1907 that she had to wait weeks after her spirit-baptism before speaking in tongues. She was not ashamed of this lack of evidence. As she wrote, “[T]he conviction that I was baptised [*sic*] so took hold upon me I constantly affirmed, to those asking if I was baptized, without having spoken in tongues.” She claimed that largely she was content with this situation until about six weeks later she “felt the need of so speaking [in tongues] as a witness to others.”¹⁰⁵

Another telling case of “delayed evidence,” explored by Cecil Robeck, is that of J.R. Flower.¹⁰⁶ In 1933, Flower, who was at the time assistant general superintendent of the Assemblies of God, published an account of his spirit-baptism experience. After witnessing pentecostal services first hand in Indianapolis in 1907, Flower was converted and began to seek spirit-baptism. After over a year of seeking—several months of which Flower described as in “a real spirit of ‘tarry’ before the Lord”—he had not received. He

¹⁰⁴ John G Lake and Talbert Morgan, *John G. Lake's Life & Diary* (Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2006), 45; Gardiner, *Out of Zion into All the World*, 17.

¹⁰⁵ Ruth Angstead, “A Grand Experience,” *Pentecost* 1, no. 2 (September 1908): 1–2.

¹⁰⁶ Robeck, “An Emerging Magisterium?,” 186–193. The term “delayed evidence” comes from a commentary on Flower’s testimony appearing in an Assemblies of God in-house publication in 1957. See *Ibid.*, 193.

responded to an invitation to assist with ministry in Kansas City, but stopped at a faith home in St. Louis on his way there. He remained in St. Louis for a month:

I continued to seek the Lord, expecting that when filled with the Spirit, I would speak with other tongues. I now believe this very expectancy drew my eyes from the Baptizer and hindered me from receiving. If I had dared to trust the Lord, I would have received much sooner.¹⁰⁷

Flower came to the realization that just like salvation and healing, the blessing of spirit-baptism was received by faith—meaning that he ought not to wait for any evidence before claiming it. So claim it he did, determining that “there was to be no more pleading that day...I sat on the floor in the corner and praised the Lord for the Baptism in the Holy Ghost, having been received.”¹⁰⁸ Although his companions continued to urge him to seek tongues as a sign, they grudgingly accepted his testimony that he had been baptized in the Spirit. Continuing on his ministry in Kansas City, Lincoln, Nebraska, and back in Indianapolis, Flower had still not spoken in tongues. Finally in July of 1910, Flower reported that tongues flowed naturally as he prayed with a woman at a camp meeting. Flower was testifying to an experience that challenged Assemblies of God dogma, which explains why he had kept the details of his experience to himself.¹⁰⁹ Robeck rightly lauds Flower’s honesty at a time when the initial evidence teaching was becoming more entrenched. Still, Flower offered significant qualifications, demonstrating that he shared the concerns that motivated the crystallization of the initial evidence teaching. These qualifications come to light through a comparison of Flower’s 1933 testimony to his

¹⁰⁷ J. Roswell Flower, “How I Received the Baptism in the Holy Spirit [Part 2],” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 983 (January 28, 1933): 6.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ He referred to his 1933 article as “break[ing] my silence” J. Roswell Flower, “How I Received the Baptism in the Holy Spirit [Part 1],” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 982 (January 21, 1933): 2.

account from 1910, which Robeck overlooks. Flower stated in 1933 that he was reticent to share his experience because he was afraid of being “misunderstood” as encouraging seekers to claim spirit-baptism by faith while never having any manifestation. He laid the fault of not experiencing tongues at the feet of those who believe with “only a mental faith.” He further cautioned that “sometimes there is a need of real heart searching before appropriating faith springs up” and that “it is useless to take a stand of faith until one has first prayed through.”¹¹⁰ But in 1910, writing before he experienced the tongues speech he identified as an indication of “final victories,” he presented no such caveats. Because the tongues evidence teaching—although dominant—had not yet become dogma, he felt no need in 1910 to have recourse to a distinction between “mental faith” and “true faith in the Spirit.”¹¹¹ Rather, in 1910, Flower, like Bosworth, simply stressed faith, not “heart searching” or “pray[ing] through” as that which comes first. Without qualifying faith in any way, Flower advised seekers in 1910 to believe they had the experience even if evidence such as tongues was not apparent, an approach that was based on his own experience:

[A]t last I realized I would seek several years more if I did not step out by faith and claim the promise. I stepped. Nothing happened. Several days later the Lord, to encourage me, gave me a big blessing, but not tongues, and I still had to testify that I had received.¹¹²

Flower’s own experience kept him from dogmatically asserting that tongues always immediately accompanies spirit-baptism. He consistently argued that faith was the central factor of the experience. But in order to be more agreeable to the official Assemblies of

¹¹⁰ Flower, “How I Received the Baptism in the Holy Spirit [Part 2],” 7.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² J. Roswell Flower, “God Honors Faith,” *Pentecost* 2, no. 3 (February 1, 1910): 1.

God position, Flower defined faith in a more stringent way, perhaps suggesting that experiences such as his were—and ought to be—extremely rare. His evolving testimony reveals the fluidity of the tongues evidence doctrine in the first decade of pentecostalism and the effects of dogmatization on those whose experiences did not precisely measure up.

Many black pentecostals were less rigorous on the tongues evidence doctrine than their white counterparts. The United Holy Church of America had formed as a body of black holiness churches in North Carolina and Virginia before it encountered the pentecostal message. By 1907, it had identified with the movement stemming from Azusa Street. Yet the church did not take a definite stance on the tongues evidence doctrine, preferring to emphasize the many spiritual gifts that are available to the sanctified believer.¹¹³ The Church of God in Christ, although formed out of a dispute over the role of tongues in spirit-baptism, did not retain a strict initial evidence teaching. The split that occurred between C.H. Mason, who embraced the pentecostal message, and C.P. Jones, who rejected it, was about tongues on the surface, but as Estrela Alexander notes, the conflict was more about what tongues represented: Jones sought a more restrained worship life, while Mason embraced the emotional worship practices of his black heritage. Tongues, in this situation, was shorthand for the divergent approaches to black religiosity in the early twentieth century.¹¹⁴ While upholding tongues as the apostolic pattern for spirit-baptism, Mason's pentecostal Church of God in Christ would “not

¹¹³ Estrela Alexander, *Black Fire: One Hundred Years of African American Pentecostalism* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), 163; William Clair Turner, *The United Holy Church of America: A Study in Black Holiness-Pentecostalism* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press LLC, 2006), 10, 126–127; Chester W. Gregory, *The History of the United Holy Church of America, Inc., 1886-2000* (Baltimore, MD: Gateway Press, 2000), 52.

¹¹⁴ Alexander, *Black Fire*, 176.

presume to teach that no one has the Spirit that does not speak with tongues.”¹¹⁵ In general, black pentecostals refused to be dogmatic about tongues, since their approach to spirituality was oral-associative rather than rational and propositional. As Ithiel Clemmons notes, rather than serving as an empirical “evidence” of a personal spiritual experience, for black pentecostals, “speaking in tongues was seen only as the sign of divine power and presence that brings all people together in reconciliation.”¹¹⁶

Beyond the American scene, the tongues evidence teaching had few staunch advocates. A.A. Boddy, the leader of British pentecostalism, could not insist that tongues always accompanied spirit-baptism, although he reported that it always had in his ministry.¹¹⁷ Boddy vacillated on the interpretation of his own experiences, finally

¹¹⁵ Cited in Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 164. Other doctrinal declarations on spirit-baptism speak of tongues only in a descriptive rather than prescriptive way: “We believe in the baptism with the Holy Ghost as God’s blessed gift of power from on high, according to the scriptures. John the Baptist spoke of it. Matt. 3:11. Jesus received it. Matt 3:16. Jesus promised it to his disciples. Luke 24:29; John 14:15-17; Acts 1:5-8. The disciples received it and spake with tongues. Acts 2:4; Acts 10:44; Acts 19:6. See James Oglethorpe Patterson and Church of God in Christ, *History and Formative Years of the Church of God in Christ; with Excerpts from the Life and Works of Its Founder, Bishop C.H. Mason* (Memphis, TN: Church of God in Christ Publishing House, 1969), 48.

¹¹⁶ Ithiel C. Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason and the Roots of the Church of God in Christ* (Bakersfield, CA: Pneuma Life Publishing, 1996), 52, 56.

¹¹⁷ Many scholars maintain that Boddy softened an initial hard stance on evidential tongues. See Cornelis van der Laan, “The Proceedings of the Leaders’ Meetings (1908-1911) and of the International Pentecostal Council (1912-1914),” *Pneuma* 10, no. 1 (March 1, 1988): 41, n. 13; Kyu-Hyung Cho, “The Move to Independence from Anglican Leadership: An Examination of the Relationship between Alexander Alfred Boddy and the Early Leaders of the British Pentecostal Denominations (1907-1930)” (Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham (United Kingdom), 2009), 199–206; Neil Hudson, “Dealing with the Fire: Early Pentecostal Responses to the Practices of Speaking in Tongues and Spoken Prophecy,” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 28, no. 2 (January 1, 2008): 153–154. To my knowledge, Gavin Wakefield is the only other scholar who recognizes Boddy’s consistency on tongues. Wakefield notes that Boddy generally supported the classical teaching of initial evidence with two caveats: love was always to be present and receive priority, and Boddy was not willing to disfellowship those who disagreed with him. Gavin Wakefield, *Alexander Boddy: Pentecostal Anglican Pioneer* (London; Colorado Springs: Authentic Paternoster Press, 2007), 163–168. Elsewhere, I argue for a third caveat: Boddy almost always spoke in terms of *his own experience* and therefore was unwilling to dictate tongues as a categorical evidence of spirit-baptism or raise it to the level of doctrine. See Christopher Richmann, “Evangelical Unity in the Pentecostal Theology of Alexander A. Boddy” (presented at the Society for Pentecostal Studies Forty-third Annual Meeting, Springfield, MO, 2014).

deciding that he had been baptized in the Holy Spirit in 1892, but this experience was much later “corroborated” by tongues.¹¹⁸ After a trip to the United States in 1909, Boddy affirmed that he was “in a great measure agreed” with A.B. Simpson’s position that tongues should not be considered a singular evidence of spirit-baptism.¹¹⁹ Boddy would not insist that only those who spoke in tongues were spirit-baptized; neither would he criticize those who looked for this sign:

Evidently some of our German brethren think of the Gift of Tongues as possible apart from the *Baptism* of the Holy Ghost, and this may be so. But if a Seeker has humbly looked to God to give him *this* Sign as a token of his Baptism, and if he is trusting the finished work of the Lord on the Cross (the Blood), then we are pressed into the belief that God would not allow him to be deceived.¹²⁰

Overall, Boddy’s was not an enthusiastic endorsement of the tongues evidence doctrine.

Boddy was probably influenced in part by Jonathan Paul, leader of pentecostalism in

Germany and influential thinker for the movement throughout Europe. In the first issue of

Paul’s *Pfingstgrüße* in 1909, Paul stated clearly, “We are not of the opinion that only

¹¹⁸ Boddy claimed also to have received the Pentecostal Baptism in the Spirit on 5 March 1907, although he was not to speak in tongues for another nine months. A.A. Boddy, “The Pentecostal Movement,” *Confidence* 3, no. 8 (August 1910): 194. Neil Hudson explains: “Therefore, in an attempt to hold a neat theological package, and possibly under pressure from Barratt who had linked the reception of tongues as being the sign of having been baptised in the Holy Spirit, he described this experience as being his Baptism in the Holy Spirit. His previous experience in Copenhagen was described as ‘a blessed and wonderful “baptism” of the Holy Ghost’; the use of quotation marks around ‘baptism’ were to indicate that it was not *the* baptism. Similarly, the events of 1892 which he had previously referred to as the baptism in the Holy Spirit were reinterpreted as being the awareness of cleansing by Jesus, his assurance of salvation. However, by 1916, he had again changed his views on these earlier experiences. The epiphany in 1892 was referred to as ‘my real baptism’, which was later ‘corroborated by the wonderful sign of tongues, when the Holy Ghost took control of my vocal powers’. This lack of clarity concerning the theology undergirding the experience was common amongst many of the early Pentecostals.” Neil Hudson, “The Earliest Days of British Pentecostalism,” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 21 (January 1, 2001): 53.

¹¹⁹ A.A. Boddy, “A Visit to Rev. A.B. Simpson,” *Confidence* 2, no. 9 (September 1909): 199.

¹²⁰ A.A. Boddy, “The Conference in Germany,” *Confidence* 2, no. 1 (January 1909): 6. Emphasis in original. Boddy’s discussion here also rests on a distinction between tongues as a permanent spiritual gift and tongues as a sign of spirit-baptism.

those who speak in tongues have received the baptism of the Holy Spirit.”¹²¹ In December of 1912, Paul chaired a session of the International Pentecostal Consultative Council in Amsterdam that produced a statement on spirit-baptism that intentionally avoided the tongues evidence doctrine:

The Baptism of the Holy Ghost and Fire we hold to be the coming upon and within of the Holy Spirit to indwell the believer in His fulness [*sic*], and is always borne witness to by the fruit of the Spirit and the outward manifestation, so that we may receive the same gift as the disciples on the Day of Pentecost... We do not teach that all who have been baptized in the Holy Ghost, even if they should speak in tongues, have already received the fulness of the blessing of Christ implied in this Baptism.¹²²

The Declaration was signed by Boddy, the Dutch leader Gerrit Polman, and the Norwegian T.B. Barratt, who later penned a critique of Bosworth’s rejection of the tongues evidence doctrine.¹²³ Interestingly, Barratt’s own experience of speaking in tongues was deferred a month after his spirit-baptism.¹²⁴ One of Barratt’s correspondents, Willis C. Hoover, was instrumental in establishing pentecostalism in Chile. He too refused to limit the evidence of spirit-baptism to tongues, as did the churches that trace their roots to his work.¹²⁵

¹²¹ Paul Schmidgall, *European Pentecostalism: Its Origins, Development, and Future* (CPT Press, 2013), 283. For a fuller discussion of Jonathan Paul’s place in German pentecostalism, see Carl Simpson, “Jonathan Paul and the German Pentecostal Movement: The First Seven Years, 1907-1914,” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 28, no. 2 (January 1, 2008): 169–82.

¹²² “Declaration, International Pentecostal Consultative Council,” *Confidence* 5, no. 12 (December 1912): 277. Cf. Simpson, “Jonathan Paul and the German Pentecostal Movement,” 178–179.

¹²³ Barratt apparently changed his mind many times on the tongues evidence teaching. See Schmidgall, *European Pentecostalism*, 283.

¹²⁴ David Bundy, “Spiritual Advice to a Seeker: Letters to T B Barratt from Azusa Street, 1906,” *Pneuma* 14, no. 2 (September 1, 1992): 164; Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity* (Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 188–189.

¹²⁵ Juan Sepulveda, “Another Way of Being Pentecostal,” in *Pentecostal Power: Expressions, Impact and Faith of Latin American Pentecostalism*, ed. Calvin Smith (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 37–62.

To the chorus of those who openly questioned or qualified the tongues evidence doctrine must be added those who intentionally downplayed it. Pentecostal leaders like Carrie Judd Montgomery, Maria Woodworth-Etter, and Mattie Perry—all of whom had significant contact with Bosworth—never came out strongly for the tongues evidence doctrine, but neither did they directly challenge it as Bosworth did. Carrie Judd Montgomery—whose own experience of tongues was delayed about a week after her spirit-baptism¹²⁶—refused to be dogmatic about tongues throughout her career, and maintained ties to the Christian and Missionary Alliance to her death.¹²⁷ Woodworth-Etter time and again sought to avoid doctrinal antagonism, so that her easy adoption of pentecostalism for the sake of a more fruitful ministry makes sense.¹²⁸ Yet she may never have fully reconciled herself to pentecostal theology, as Joshua McMullen argues.¹²⁹ This did not stop pentecostals from claiming her as one of their own.¹³⁰ Other respected

¹²⁶ Carrie Judd Montgomery, “The Promise of the Father: A Personal Testimony,” *Triumphs of Faith* 28, no. 7 (July 1908): 145–49.

¹²⁷ Miskov refers to “a lack of precision in Carrie’s language” on the initial evidence doctrine and argues that she never became an advocate for the teaching. Jennifer A. Miskov, *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery, 1858-1946* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2012), Kindle locations 7103–7194. Miskov argues that “Carrie’s views can challenge Pentecostal streams today that hold to an uncompromising doctrine of initial evidence, to allow room to embrace others who cannot wholeheartedly agree on that issue or who do not emphasize it.” *Ibid.*, Kindle locations 7579–7581.

¹²⁸ For Woodworth-Etter’s characteristic avoidance of controversial issues, see Wayne E. Warner, *The Woman Evangelist: The Life and Times of Charismatic Evangelist Maria B. Woodworth-Etter*, *Studies in Evangelicalism* No. 8 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1986), 174.

¹²⁹ “Always wary of many Pentecostal’s [sic] strict connection between the Holy Spirit’s work and speaking in tongues, she never seems to have fully embraced the [Pentecostal] movement.” Joshua J. McMullen, “Maria B Woodworth-Etter: Bridging the Wesleyan-Pentecostal Divide,” in *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street*, ed. Henry H. Knight (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010), 193.

¹³⁰ The few pentecostals who spoke against Woodworth-Etter included Charles Parham and Frank J. Ewart, both outspoken advocates of the initial evidence doctrine. Warner, *The Woman Evangelist*, 171–172.

leaders, like F.E. Yoakum and E.W. Kenyon, found much of their audience in pentecostal circles, but never felt the need to endorse the tongues evidence doctrine.

Bosworth's Critique and Pentecostal Responses

In an open letter distributed in early 1918, Bosworth outlined his objections to the tongues evidence teaching.¹³¹ Bosworth may have been pressed to publicize his views, since A.G. Garr had likely already circulated a letter attacking Bosworth as a “veritable heretic.”¹³² Bosworth claimed he was not alone in his position—a claim verified by endorsements from pentecostal ministers published in subsequent editions.¹³³ While his critiques had previously been voiced by other pentecostals, Bosworth was the first from within the movement to offer a wholesale and systematic challenge to the doctrine. At the outset, he insisted that he was not retracting his pentecostal beliefs or denying his own tongues experience, and he exulted in the good that had come out of the pentecostal revival.¹³⁴ Yet he identified the “error in teaching” of much of the pentecostal movement

¹³¹ The earliest edition of Bosworth’s open letter that I have found is F.F. Bosworth, *Do All Speak with Tongues? An Open Letter to the Ministers and Saints of the Pentecostal Movement* (Dallas, TX: Williams Printery, n.d.). Although undated, this edition asks for pentecostal endorsements that could be included in a second edition to be published May 25, 1918. *Ibid.*, 22. The letter was widely circulating by the time of the General Council, and it received a published response with specific page references in October 1918. See Seeley D. Kinne, “Open Letter to Elder F.F. Bosworth,” *Pentecostal Herald* 4, no. 6 (October 1918): 3. Furthermore, in the earliest version of the tract, Bosworth states that he had been “in the work on Pentecostal lines” for eleven years. He always dated the beginning of his pentecostal ministry to 1907. See, for example, Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith,” 8.

¹³² The timeline is not certain, but Perkins claimed that the letter attacking Bosworth came out before Bosworth’s open letter on tongues. Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 99.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 57, 77–19. Brumback notes that M.M. Pinson, Arch P. Collins, and W.T. Gaston (each of whom had worked with Bosworth in Texas) were for a time supporters of Bosworth’s position. But after the 1918 General Council, all three fell in line with the Assemblies of God. Brumback, *Suddenly...from Heaven*, 220. For Pinson’s retraction, see M.M. Pinson, “A Statement from Bro. Pinson,” *Christian Evangel*, no. 280–81 (March 22, 1919): 9.

¹³⁴ Bosworth’s letter “Do All Speak with Tongues: An Open Letter to the Saints and Ministers of the Pentecostal Movement” is reproduced in Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 53–77. For Bosworth’s recitation of the good that has come of the pentecostal movement (which was not included in the earliest

as twofold: the belief that baptism in the Spirit is always evidenced by the initial physical sign of tongues, and the distinction between tongues as a sign and tongues as a gift of the Spirit.¹³⁵ While he did not evince a broader concern over the growing authority of the Assemblies of God, in this case, he did resent that an erroneous doctrine was being made “a test of fellowship and a basis upon which to build a new church.”¹³⁶ His thorough critique was founded upon pastoral concerns and experience, history, and scripture.¹³⁷

Bosworth believed that the tongues evidence doctrine faltered on the tests of experience and pastoral concerns. Many who receive spirit-baptism do not speak in tongues, and many who “seemingly speak in tongues,” have not had the pentecostal

version of the letter), see *Ibid.*, 53–55. For Bosworth’s continued endorsement of his own pentecostal experience with tongues, see *Ibid.*, 73.

¹³⁵ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 56–57.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 71. In the midst of the controversy stirred by Bosworth, E.N. Bell demonstrated the nervousness the Council always had over its Statement of Fundamental Truths and the growing authority of the denomination:

Our object was and is to secure these [Bible order and Christian co-operation] and yet not become a hide-bound sect with a man-made discipline and a man-made creed as a basis of Christian fellowship, and yet to stand for all the great fundamental, certain Bible truths and for all the essentials of the Pentecostal freedom in the Spirit of these last days. Since then [the 1914 General Council] the surging convulsions have at times carried us near the boundary line of this Pentecostal freedom, and once or twice we came near breaking our great liberal Bible constitution and making us into a narrow sect with a written creed as a basis of love and Christian fellowship. But thank God, we, by His grace, escaped this. (See E.N. Bell, “The Coming Great Council,” *Christian Evangel*, no. 250–51 [August 10, 1918]: 1.)

¹³⁷ My categories for analyzing Bosworth’s tract can be contrasted with that of Douglas G. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 307. Jacobsen identifies four key issues in Bosworth’s letter: (1) the nature and purpose of spirit-baptism; (2) the diversity of spiritual gifts and their use for the common good; (3) criticism of pentecostals’ distinction between “sign” and “gift” tongues; and (4) “how the doctrine of the necessary physical evidence of tongues invariably undermined the role of faith in the Christian life.” Jacobsen’s categories are useful and insightful, but I believe my approach of focusing on Bosworth’s grounds for rejection of the tongues evidence doctrine is more faithful to Bosworth’s train of thought and more illustrative of the historical issues at play.

experience.¹³⁸ Bosworth's overall concern that faith be central to all spiritual experience led him to distrust the tongues evidence doctrine as an inversion that made faith dependent upon a sign.¹³⁹ This teaching, "not only leaves no place for faith," railed Bosworth, "but on the other hand destroys faith already Divinely given."¹⁴⁰ While pentecostals searched intently for a sign that would give them divine assurance, Bosworth insisted on the basis of Hebrews 11:1 that "Nothing short of real faith can satisfy the heart and put the soul at rest."¹⁴¹ Bosworth the pastor and evangelist was also concerned that the doctrine was divisive and exclusionary, "separating equally devout Christians." Furthermore, the lengthy tarrying for tongues slows down revival, as those who have already received and are empowered to win souls (though perhaps not speaking in tongues) continue to spend their time seeking at the altar, and those who are genuinely interested in spirit-baptism are put off by a God who does not seem eager to fulfill his promise.¹⁴²

Bosworth also looked to history to cast doubt on the tongues evidence teaching. Believing that spirit-baptism was for supernatural empowerment, Bosworth indicted the

¹³⁸ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 57. Bosworth seemed unconvinced by the earlier arguments of other leading pentecostals who stressed that only tongues spoken "as the Spirit gives utterance" could be regarded as evidence. In this understanding, tongues that originated in the flesh or in false spirits could seem valid, but were not true pentecostal tongues. While this distinction held up logically, it provided little help in distinguishing between false and true tongues, and relied upon fruit of the Spirit to verify tongues, which seemingly undercut the role of assurance tongues were thought to play. E.N. Bell, who championed the nuance of "as the Spirit gives utterance," wrote, "If all these things [love, joy, faith, holiness, obedience to God] are absent in the life of one who talks in tongues, it is not of God, but of the devil." Bell, "What Is the Evidence of the Baptism in the Spirit."

¹³⁹ "Jesus taught that 'these signs shall follow' faith, and not 'faith shall follow these signs.'" Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 70. Emphasis in original.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 66.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 67.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 69, 71.

ministries of so many who spoke in tongues yet fell far short of the great soul winners of history. Bosworth pointed to renown evangelists like Charles Finney (who claimed spirit-baptism, but not tongues) to demonstrate that the real work of empowerment was accomplished without tongues as evidence.¹⁴³ Bosworth felt he was unable to conclude that other leading lights of Christian history had not also been baptized with the Holy Spirit.¹⁴⁴ Although he could view the restoration of spiritual gifts as a dispensational sign, he preferred to emphasize the continuity of God’s activity throughout history. Another source of Bosworth’s discomfort on the tongues evidence doctrine was its novelty. He pointed to Charles Parham as the originator of the unscriptural teaching, and found Parham’s ministry wanting in the light of history.¹⁴⁵ Bosworth—like most historians—was mistaken in attributing the tongues evidence teaching as he encountered it in the mid-1910s to Parham, since Parham did not rely on a distinction between sign and gift and only admitted unlearned recognizable foreign language as tongues speech. But since Bosworth intended to undercut the validity of the teaching by pointing to its newness, his argument would have only been strengthened by a more insightful historical gaze.

Bosworth’s scriptural critique of the tongues evidence doctrine was his most elaborate. He began with Paul’s rhetorical question in 1 Corinthians 12:30: “Do all speak with tongues?”, which implied that not all did. Bosworth recognized that in order not to

¹⁴³ Ibid., 75.

¹⁴⁴ Bosworth may have been influenced to think this way by William Piper, who advocated in the *Latter Rain Evangel*: “If while you exalt the Latter Rain Truths and Latter Rain experiences you discount the experiences of God’s saints in this and other centuries...you do great injury to the work you try to advance.” “Notes: Holding the Truth in Love,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 2, no. 5 (February 1910): 12.

¹⁴⁵ “[H]undreds of the greatest soul-winners of the entire Christian era, without the gift of tongues, have had a much greater endowment of power and have been used to accomplish a much greater and deeper work than has Mr. Parham.” Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 58.

contradict scripture, tongues advocates had to introduce a distinction between tongues as an occasional sign and tongues as a permanent gift. This distinction held that all spoke in tongues at spirit-baptism as a sign, but not all were subsequently endowed with a permanent spiritual gift of tongues.¹⁴⁶ According to Bosworth, defenders of the tongues evidence teaching wrongly interpreted the term “manifestation” in 1 Corinthians 12:7-8 as a coded reference for the sign of tongues. Bosworth insisted on the basis of context that Paul was using the word as a corporate term for all the spiritual gifts Paul goes on to list, including wisdom, knowledge and healing as well as tongues.¹⁴⁷ Bosworth scolded pentecostals for using their unscriptural distinction between kinds of tongues as an excuse for unscriptural disorder. Bosworth’s opponents claimed that tongues as a sign is synonymous with “speaking as the spirit gives utterance.” In order to maintain a distinction between the sign and the gift, tongues advocates would claim that Paul’s instructions in 1 Corinthians to silence a tongues speaker who has no interpreter cannot refer to “speaking as the spirit gives utterance,” for that would mean that Paul was advocating silencing the Holy Spirit. Bosworth countered that all true tongues have their origin in the Holy Spirit, but it is a mistake to think that the speaker is not in control. God demands control for the sake of order, and this does not mean that one has “quenched the Spirit.”¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ This distinction, which was first articulated by W.F. Carothers in 1906, was stated in the General Council of 1917 and expanded in 1918 as a result of Bosworth’s contentions. The General Council confessed: “The speaking in tongues in this instance [as a sign at spirit-baptism] is the same in essence as the gift of tongues, but different in purpose and use.” *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917*, 21; *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1918* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1918), 10; Robeck, “An Emerging Magisterium?,” 182, 186.

¹⁴⁷ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 58–59.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 60–61.

Bosworth also charged advocates of the tongues evidence teaching with having no clear scriptural directive for their doctrine. As biblical restorationists, pentecostals agreed that all doctrine must be clearly set out in scripture. Much as Trinitarians in the Assemblies of God had challenged the Oneness pentecostals in their midst three years earlier, Bosworth charged tongues evidence advocates with having no “thus saith the Lord” for their peculiar doctrine. “It is nowhere taught in the Scriptures,” averred Bosworth, “but it is assumed from the fact that in three instances recorded in Acts they spoke in tongues as a result of the Baptism.”¹⁴⁹ According to Bosworth, his fellow pentecostals also misunderstood the purpose of tongues. Scripture clearly says that tongues are a sign for the unbeliever, but by requiring tongues as proof of spirit-baptism, pentecostals made the manifestation a sign to believers.¹⁵⁰ Finally, Bosworth challenged a favorite pentecostal proof text. Many pentecostals believed that John 15:26-27 (“When the Advocate comes...he will testify on my behalf.”) referred to the “testimony” of tongues speech. Bosworth countered this with a proof text of his own: “God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost...” (Hebrews 2:4). He pointed out that this is “how the Holy Ghost testifies”: with a plethora of signs, wonders, miracles and gifts—not the sign of tongues exclusively.¹⁵¹

Bosworth’s attack on the tongues evidence doctrine was not a retreat from his intense supernaturalism. He preferred, however, to shift the semantic field. Instead of

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 62–63.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 63, 66.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 65.

“evidences,” he focused on the expected “results” of spirit-baptism, which included everything from the nine spiritual gifts of 1 Corinthians 12 to convicting the world of sin and making intercession.¹⁵² Tongues was still a valid gift, and it often accompanied genuine spirit-baptism. But Bosworth in fact believed that the doctrine impeded God’s supernatural work, and he felt that by returning the movement to a more scriptural foundation he was “opening the way for more of the manifestations of the Spirit, and a much deeper work of God.”¹⁵³ “I find,” he wrote, “that the people get deeper into God and have more power when they are not taught in such a way that they anchor in tongues.”¹⁵⁴ Noting that the apostles never “preached tongues,” he found that pressing tongues seemed to have the opposite of the intended effect, and Bosworth claimed that one should “leave the proper place for faith...it will bring the real speaking in tongues much quicker, for where any sign is placed before faith, it hinders the Spirit, and lessens the power.”¹⁵⁵ And as he had maintained years before he publically challenged the tongues evidence doctrine, the “greatest phase” of spirit-baptism was “soul travail,” or intercessory prayer. The work of salvation and revival fueled by such prayer is supremely supernatural: “In this phase of the Baptism,” said Bosworth, “there are possibilities whose limits have never been found.”¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² Ibid., 70. Anderson’s statement that Bosworth “maintained that any of the nine gifts of the Spirit listed in 1 Corinthians was a valid sign of baptism in the Spirit” is misleading. Bosworth was not concerned about the “sign” but rather the usefulness of spirit-baptism. Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 161–162.

¹⁵³ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 56.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 74.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 70.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 75.

Bosworth's letter, his resignation from the Assemblies of God, and his defense of his position at the 1918 General Council created a stir in pentecostal circles. Over the next few years, the Assemblies of God published numerous articles in defense of their newly-solidified teaching.¹⁵⁷ In October of 1918, Seeley D. Kinne, who had pioneered pentecostalism in St. Louis and had worked with Bosworth in Chicago, responded directly to Bosworth's letter.¹⁵⁸ In typical pentecostal fashion, Kinne looked first to his own experience to verify his beliefs. Kinne had sought for the experience with tongues for about four and half months, but rather than causing permanent distress as Bosworth warned, Kinne declared that being "troubled" for a time was worth it. Tongues became the "anchor for my seeking heart," as Kinne testified, and marked the beginning of unprecedented fruitfulness in his ministry. And rather than being a waste of time, Kinne claimed that during his seeking period, he received many "additional impartations of the Spirit" that empowered him for ministry. "How could I do other than stand for this truth, seeing the effects in my own life and results that have followed its teaching?" Kinne even went so far as to say that Bosworth's own ministry was only successful because he had, as Bosworth said, "tenaciously contended" for the tongues evidence teaching. And while Bosworth viewed coercion methods like quickly repeating a word or phrase as unscriptural, Kinne, drawing on his own experience under G.B. Cashwell, essentially said that if it works, one should not cast aspersions.

¹⁵⁷ A few examples include D.W. Kerr, "Do All Speak in Tongues?," *Christian Evangel*, no. 270–71 (January 11, 1919): 7; W.T. Gaston, "The Baptism of the Holy Ghost According to Acts 2: Some Objections Answered," *Christian Evangel*, no. 302–3 (August 23, 1919): 3; Stanley H. Frodsham, "Our Distinctive Testimony," *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 320–21 (December 27, 1919): 8–9. None of these articles name Bosworth or quote his tract, but Bosworth's challenge is undoubtedly in the background. For a fuller list, see Robeck, "An Emerging Magisterium?," 186.

¹⁵⁸ Kinne, "Open Letter to Elder F.F. Bosworth."

Kinne also quarreled with many of Bosworth's specific arguments. While Bosworth held that Parham was the innovator of the tongues evidence doctrine, Kinne maintained that Edward Irving and John Chrysostom had taught it. Although Bosworth found no "thus saith the Lord" for the tongues evidence doctrine, Kinne found it clearly in Jesus' words: "these signs shall follow them that believe...they shall speak in new tongues" (Mark 16:16-17) and in the day of Pentecost as a fulfillment of Joel 2. Kinne also appealed to the Greek to show that use of the adjunctive *te* in Acts 19:6 proves that speaking in tongues "was part of the baptism." Bosworth maintained that gifts were for service, not for evidence, but Kinne saw a flaw in Bosworth's reasoning. Jesus, "the most gifted man ever on this planet," often used his gifts to bear witness to his identity and mission. Kinne failed to recognize that Bosworth was insistent that gifts not be used as evidence *to the believer* but only to the unbeliever. In this sense, Bosworth saw no conflict between service and evidence.

Kinne impugned Bosworth's ministerial integrity. While Bosworth had pinned the tongues evidence doctrine as divisive, Kinne accused Bosworth of being the one splitting his own church. Kinne also implied that Bosworth dropped the tongues evidence doctrine to achieve wider recognition in the evangelical world. "True," said Kinne, "one may obtain to a much wider ministry by coming into fellowship with the common church work of today, but...[one does so] at the expense of reality and depth." Kinne claimed that Bosworth's colleagues in the Assemblies of God charged Bosworth with a "desire to be popular with the popular evangelistic association." This charge has a ring of truth, since Bosworth had begun in 1917 to work in cooperative interdenominational revivals. But there is no reason to question Bosworth's integrity: Bosworth never hid the fact that

he wished the pentecostal message to have a wider audience. Furthermore, if Bosworth had only wanted to gain popularity among non-pentecostals, his honest attempt to convince his fellow pentecostals of his beliefs seems like a waste of time and effort.

The most insightful critique Kinne leveled at Bosworth came on the issue of faith—which was so central to Bosworth’s thinking. If teaching people to wait for tongues stands in the way of faith, argued Kinne, would not teaching the sick to wait for actual physical healing also stand in the way of faith? Claiming healing while still suffering, just like claiming spirit-baptism without tongues, “looks like the dead faith James talks about,” argued Kinne. But Bosworth would probably not have agreed with the premise of Kinne’s argument, illustrating a tension in holiness and pentecostal supernaturalism that has never been resolved. Some advocated counterfactual confession, that is, claiming that one had been healed, and acting as if healed, even if healing were not yet made physically real. Others—notably John Alexander Dowie—ridiculed counterfactual confession as unempirical and an evasion of the issue.¹⁵⁹ Bosworth insisted that faith was at its greatest when outward evidence was not available. Rather than dead, this was real living faith. While Bosworth’s thought was not fully consistent on this issue, he leaned toward the counterfactual confession position, which seemed so absurd to Kinne.

Finally, Kinne hit Bosworth at the center of his argument from experience. Bosworth had claimed that some who seemingly speak in tongues do not have the baptism, and some who do not speak in tongues have received “the most powerful

¹⁵⁹ A classic clash between these competing theologies of divine healing was between A.B. Simpson and John Alexander Dowie. See James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Holiness-Pentecostal Transition Years, 1890-1906: Theological Transpositions in the Transatlantic World* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2013), 69.

Baptisms.” Kinne asked, with good reason, how Bosworth could be certain that one has been baptized without a true sign of tongues. This question revealed the heart of the tongues evidence doctrine, which was to provide experiential, verifiable assurance of a significant spiritual experience. So Kinne accosted Bosworth, saying “[you] have just put us back in the old realm of uncertainty, where any who receive a blessing may say they are baptized in the Spirit.”

Bosworth’s tract also received a refutation from Norwegian pentecostal leader T.B. Barratt some ten years after it was first published, showing that Bosworth’s challenge still unnerved doctrinal purists a decade after it was written.¹⁶⁰ Somewhat disingenuously given his own participation in European pentecostal ambivalence on the tongues evidence doctrine, Barratt claimed, “There has always been a constant and firm belief in the scriptural statement, that the Baptism has to be followed by speaking in other tongues, just as in the case of the disciples *at the beginning*.”¹⁶¹ To Barratt, Bosworth’s argument that the tongues evidence teaching reverses faith was nonsense, since “faith leads up to the divine evidence.”¹⁶² Barratt did not seem to share Bosworth’s pastoral angst. “We do not press the necessity of seeking the outer sign or proof the Baptism,” insisted Barratt, “because what is needed *is the Baptism itself*, and when *that* comes, the outward proof or sign of the Baptism will follow as a matter of course.”¹⁶³ Unlike Kinne,

¹⁶⁰ Thomas B. Barratt, *Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Fire: What Is the Scriptural Evidence?* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.). Although this tract is undated, it appeared as a series of articles in *Pentecostal Evangel* in May of 1928.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 8. Emphasis in original. Barratt also seemed to have forgot that he said in 1908, “I believe that many have had, and that people may obtain in our day mighty Baptisms without this sign.” Cited in Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 162.

¹⁶² Barratt, *Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Fire: What Is the Scriptural Evidence?*, 17.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 19.

Barratt agreed with Bosworth's condemnation of unscriptural methods of coaching seekers, such as rapid repetition of a word. But Barratt considered it a red herring: "I have been over 21 years in this revival and have not yet seen it."¹⁶⁴ Also unlike Kinne, Barratt did not turn the tables on Bosworth's accusation that the tongues evidence doctrine splits churches. Rather, he embraced the doctrine's divisive nature. "All truth must be accepted," Barratt challenged, "or else it will split those who do not accept it, from those who do. This has been the case always."¹⁶⁵

Both Kinne and Barratt treated Bosworth's resistance to the tongues evidence teaching as a betrayal of pentecostal supernaturalism. Barratt saw Bosworth's shift on the doctrine as a denial of the truth "of this world-wide revival...that [Bosworth] so heartily commends," and implied that Bosworth's own well-respected teachings on healing were contradictory to his stance on tongues.¹⁶⁶ Kinne went farther, accusing Bosworth's tract of being "calculated to...fill men with fear of the supernatural." Kinne asked, "How is it that a sensible man like my brother writes pro and con in the same tract and sometimes in the same sentence?" For Kinne, anyone denying the teaching automatically falls into contradictions and "muddle."

In reaction to Bosworth's challenge, the Assemblies of God further built up its doctrinal walls. New language was introduced. The term "distinctive testimony" had been used in the 1917 General Council, but was not designated as referring explicitly to the

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 20.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 32.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 8, 21.

doctrine of initial evidence.¹⁶⁷ In August of 1918, D.W. Kerr used the term specifically in response to Bosworth's challenge.¹⁶⁸ This usage was enshrined in the 1918 General Council to refer to the initial physical sign doctrine, equating pentecostal identity with the teaching.¹⁶⁹ Other pentecostals, however, sided with Bosworth. In subsequent editions of his open letter, he transcribed a handful of endorsements, unfortunately allowing them to remain anonymous. Yet Bosworth clearly had support from among the ranks of "the more prominent among the Pentecostal ministry" who expressed "unqualified endorsement" of Bosworth's stance, like Bosworth, hoping that pentecostals would "cast aside this gross error" of initial evidence. We do not know how many one anonymous endorsement spoke for when he asked Bosworth, "Why did you not write it sooner?"¹⁷⁰

To some degree, the leaders of the opposing parties in the tongues evidence controversy were simply talking past one another. Bosworth seemed misinformed or intentionally unwilling to see the distinction his opponents made between gift and sign when in his letter of resignation he wrote, "some may receive the fullest baptism in the Spirit without receiving the *Gift* of tongues."¹⁷¹ And the resolution passed at the 1918 General Council only said that "the baptism of the Holy Spirit is *regularly accompanied* by the initial physical sign of speaking in tongues." As Robeck points out, the question

¹⁶⁷ *Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917*, 18. The use of the term here was, however, evidence of a hardening of doctrine in the Assemblies of God. The term was used in the context of a resolution barring from publication or publishing with a disclaimer any otherwise unobjectionable evangelical literature.

¹⁶⁸ D.W. Kerr, "Paul's Interpretation of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost," *Christian Evangel*, no. 252-53 (August 24, 1918): 6.

¹⁶⁹ *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1918*, 8, 10.

¹⁷⁰ Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 78, 79.

¹⁷¹ Bosworth, "F.F. Bosworth to J.W. Welch." Emphasis added.

remains if this statement left room for “irregular” experiences that were not accompanied by tongues.¹⁷² Furthermore, William Menzies argues that D.W. Kerr’s position on tongues as “initial physical evidence” was intended to leave open the possibility of other prior evidences that were not physical, under which category Bosworth’s continual concern about “soul travail” as an important first result of spirit-baptism would fall. Still, the perceived differences were an impasse. When Bosworth left the General Council in September, he left forever any formal association with denominational pentecostals. And with Bosworth’s departure, no other overt opposition to the teaching was left in the Assemblies of God.¹⁷³

Why the Tongues Evidence Doctrine Triumphed

Scholars commonly refer to the initial evidence teaching as the “classical pentecostal” doctrine. Such a label is misleading, suggesting as it does that the teaching belongs to genuine, original, or normative pentecostalism.¹⁷⁴ But if it can be labeled “classical,” it is only as the official position of white American denominational pentecostalism—in other words, having so many qualifiers as to be almost useless. And yet, because this subset of pentecostalism has until recently set the tone for scholarship

¹⁷² *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1918*, 8. Emphasis added.

¹⁷³ In October of 1918, Burton Bosworth told Welch that he did not believe “that all must speak in tongues as the evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit,” and asked Welch to use his judgment with regard to renewing Burton’s credentials. Burton B. Bosworth, “B.B. Bosworth to J.W. Welch,” October 13, 1918, 30/2/8, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center. Emphasis in original. Warren Collins left the Assemblies of God in 1921 and was identified by E.N. Bell as “dropped in Bosworth class.” “Warren Collins Non-Council Files,” n.d., 30/2/8, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

¹⁷⁴ Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 136. This identification leads some historians to ignore the development of the tongues evidence doctrine in the first twenty years of pentecostalism. For instance, Alexander, *Black Fire*, 17, 28, 160–162. See also Synan, “The Role of Tongues as Initial Evidence,” 67, 71.

on pentecostalism, they have successfully “misrepresented the message of the initial leaders of the pentecostal revival,” as Ithiel Clemmons argues.¹⁷⁵ If the first decade of pentecostalism is indeed the “heart” of the movement,¹⁷⁶ then the heart of the movement has no single position on the relation of tongues to spirit-baptism. Still, historians must reckon with the fact that the tongues evidence doctrine did triumph. A number of factors help explain this phenomenon—some inherent to the pentecostal ethos, others less so.

Tongues became the focal point for pentecostal spirituality because of the manifestation’s multivalent and flexible supernaturalism. Pentecostals were so committed to their supernaturalist worldview—and the place of tongues in it—that when they were forced to admit that the original theology of tongues speech as foreign language for missions was untenable, they shifted its meaning and kept the practice rather than abandon it or leave the movement. After the initial “disappointment,” of failed missionary languages, Pentecostals revised their understanding of tongues to include (and focus on) prayer language and “language of angels.” In doing this, they kept their supernaturalism intact. Tongues is a meeting point of the two main categories of supernaturalism—the mystical and the miraculous. That is, the experience of glossolalia has both a distinct internal and external component. Rare is the testimony of speaking in tongues from the first few decades of pentecostalism that does not describe a concomitant mystical experience—a vision, a feeling of warmth or electricity, or unprecedented joy.

¹⁷⁵ Clemmons, *Bishop C.H. Mason and the Roots of the Church of God in Christ*, 53–54.

¹⁷⁶ Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010), 1, 37; Walter J. Hollenweger, “Pentecostals and the Charismatic Movement,” in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 549–54. Hollenweger gives away more than he probably intends by identifying the first decade of its history as the heart of pentecostal spirituality, since his vision of early pentecostal spirituality centered narrowly on William Seymour and Azusa Street.

But tongues also had an external, empirical side that proved easier to produce and verify than other miraculous occurrences, like healing or prophecy, without any apparent diminishing of its supernatural nature. Pentecostals defended tongues as the most “severe,” test, because it demonstrated that the mind (the most stubborn member) had submitted to God. And while some might then ask why prophecy cannot also be the sign, pentecostals freely admitted that tongues did not beg verification as prophecy did.¹⁷⁷

Tongues could be displayed immediately, as T.B. Barratt put it,

Even if other gifts are bestowed, it would be impossible to reveal them, the selfsame moment the FIRE FALLS! They must, in the very nature of things, be revealed later on. Tongues because of their character, are the spontaneous and immediate outburst of the inner working of the Spirit. The soul bursts forth in thanksgiving and praise, *and as a general RULE in other languages!* That is *the* miracle of the Christian age, and the wondrous result of the Baptism!¹⁷⁸

The plenary supernaturalism of tongues combined with the relative ease with which it was produced and verified, ensured its central status in pentecostal spirituality.

Internal developments also subtly affected the theological meaning of tongues. Pentecostals received from the holiness movement a restorationist view of history. Chiefly, they viewed the restoration of the doctrine of sanctification as a pivotal historical moment, a crucial step in the progressive rehabilitation of apostolic truths leading inexorably to the return of Christ. Baptism in the Holy Spirit with tongues was therefore

¹⁷⁷ J. R. Flower, “Evidence of the Baptism,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 336–37 (April 17, 1920): 4. J.W. Welch also defended tongues as evidence on the basis of its indication that the mind had been fully yielded: “What physical phenomenon would better prove the submerging of the mind than tongues?” Cited in Gary B. McGee, “Popular Expositions of Initial Evidence in Pentecostalism,” in *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, ed. Gary B. McGee (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 123.

¹⁷⁸ Barratt, *Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Fire: What Is the Scriptural Evidence?*, 31. Donald Gee later wrote much the same: “For an immediate evidence at the beginning some simple manifestation is palpably required that needs no space of time to allow opportunity for growth and no special circumstances to give opportunity for exercise.” Cited in Friesen, *Norming the Abnormal*, Kindle Locations 3491–3493.

seen as the final restored doctrine preceding Christ's return. In the early phase of fluidity on tongues, less exactitude was necessary because the main meaning for tongues was as a signifier of the times: its very presence in the life of the church was sign enough. But when William Durham's finished work teaching repudiated the Wesleyan doctrine of sanctification, it also inadvertently cut the progressive-restorationist script off at the knees.¹⁷⁹ As one anxious Wesleyan pentecostal remarked, "Were Wesley, Whitefield...wrong?" "Was the entire Methodist Church mistaken?"¹⁸⁰ Durham's enemies met him with this argument, and Durham felt it was misplaced:

One thing surprised me very much, and that was that those who opposed us utterly refused to meet us with the Scripture, and attempt to point out to us where we were wrong. In contending against us, it was not an attempt to prove from the Bible that we were wrong, but that our teaching reflected on the teaching of some who had lived in the past, and also on the experiences of some who live at present. The question with us was, and is, 'Nevertheless, what saith the Scriptures?'¹⁸¹

If Wesleyan sanctification were not a true apostolic doctrine restored to the end times church, perhaps the entire view of history that relied on progressive steps from justification to sanctification to divine healing to premillennialism was unreliable.

Durham did not abandon the restorationist impulse, but he defined it differently than his holiness brethren.¹⁸² Rather than a divinely-orchestrated recapturing of truths throughout

¹⁷⁹ I owe my thinking along these lines to David W. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 10 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 229–230. Faupel notes the damage to the restorationist creed implied in Durham's message, but does not develop it into a discussion of how it might have affected the tongues evidence doctrine.

¹⁸⁰ Cited in *Ibid.*, 253.

¹⁸¹ William H. Durham, "The Great Battle of Nineteen Eleven," *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 1 (January 1912): 7.

¹⁸² Perhaps as a way of balancing the decreasing eschatological import of sanctification and tongues, Durham emphasized his own teaching as part of the end times restoration of doctrine. According

history,¹⁸³ Durham's restorationism simply looked to the Bible. In the holiness progressive-restorationist interpretation, speaking in tongues was a sign of spirit-baptism, but in a corporate as well as an individual sense. Tongues in general testified that apostolic doctrine had been restored to the church at large and was demonstrated vividly by the Christians who possessed it. But as millennial fervor subsided in the 1910s and as the finished work teaching undercut the progressive-restorationist view of history, tongues had to take on a slightly different meaning. That William Durham was one of the first to assert that the tongues evidence doctrine was what distinguished pentecostals is no coincidence. For Durham, the intensely personal character of the doctrine, rather than its place in a line of providentially-restored doctrines portending the parousia, was its defining characteristic and caused some to oppose it. The doctrine "locates every man that hears it," by which he meant that "[God] used it to draw the line between those who had the baptism and those who had not."¹⁸⁴

W. Jethro Walthall, a Baptist holiness leader who joined the Assemblies of God in 1917, explained that the development of the Durham's finished work teaching had helped convince him that pentecostals were "the Lord's general movement." In his defense of the tongues evidence doctrine, Walthall explicitly denied that tongues was a corporate phenomenon. Instead, tongues was an eminently personal experience, either as heavenly languages "exercised between the individual speaking and his God," or unknown human

to Durham, God was "restoring to His people, the church, the portions of truth..." William H. Durham, *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham Taken from Pentecostal Testimony*, n.d., 47.

¹⁸³ Some radical holiness leaders went so far as to say that the gradual restoration of gospel truths was fulfillment of prophecy. See Steven L. Ware, *Restorationism in the Holiness Movement in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), 101.

¹⁸⁴ Durham called the tongues evidence doctrine the "great distinguishing truth of the movement." Durham, "Speaking in Tongues Is the Evidence of Spirit Baptism," 9, 10, 11.

languages “imparted to individuals and not to the Church, as such.” This was verified, according to Walthall, in scripture’s attention to detail, recording in the majority of cases that those individuals who were spirit-baptized also spoke in tongues.¹⁸⁵ In Walthall’s reasoning, tongues had no communal, eschatological, or progressive-restorationist significance; rather the meaning of tongues was narrowed to a witness to divine blessing for individuals. Thus knowing with certainty that one had been spirit-baptized became increasingly important, and the doctrine of initial evidence was extended to meet this need. This observation is only suggestive and does not explain why certain holiness pentecostals contended for the initial evidence doctrine,¹⁸⁶ but it does help us to understand why finished work adherents in the Assemblies of God saw Bosworth’s challenge to the tongues evidence doctrine as such a threat. In a very real way, Bosworth’s attack was personal.

¹⁸⁵ W. Jethro Walthall, “Do All Speak in Tongues Who Receive the Baptism?,” *Christian Evangel*, no. 248–248 (July 27, 1918): 6. The individualism of American revivalism as well as the developing Baptist consciousness of “soul competency” were probably also factors in this more individualistic interpretation of spirit-baptism with tongues, since so many in the finished work camp came from Baptist traditions. Leading Southern Baptist theologian E.Y. Mullins published his famous work championing the religious authority of the individual, *The Axioms of Religion*, in 1908.

¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, the inner tension produced by the initial evidence doctrine among holiness pentecostal leaders corroborates this interpretation. J.H. King, leader of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, unconsciously revealed that an individual-centered doctrine of initial evidence had an unsettling effect on the larger motif of holiness eschatology. If tongues were primarily an evidence of an individual’s experience, some other manifestation or sign would have to fill the eschatological role. King found this in prophecy, which in 1934 he claimed was “distinctively Pentecostal and must be viewed as evidential in character.” As Tony Moon argues, this was probably not King’s way of equivocating on the initial evidence doctrine, as some have suggested, but of describing prophecy as a unique phenomenon of the “Pentecostal dispensation.” Moving beyond Moon’s argument, I contend that King was perhaps unknowingly wrestling with the tension between the individualism of the initial evidence doctrine and the corporate nature of the holiness restorationist heritage, which integrated both the broader theme of a New Testament dispensation and the more specific theme of progressive restoration immediately preceding Christ’s return. Whereas finished work pentecostals could quietly downplay the eschatological significance of tongues, holiness pentecostals tried to maintain this orientation by pointing to another manifestation of the Holy Spirit—in King’s case, prophecy. Tony G. Moon, “J. H. King on Initial Evidence: Did He Change?,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 14, no. 2 (April 1, 2006): 275–276. Moon argues explicitly against Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 190–191.

Another reason for the triumph of the initial evidence doctrine was the simple timing of the controversy. Just returning to stability after the upheavals of the Finished Work controversy and the Oneness debate, the Assemblies of God had little patience for another doctrinal battle. Just before Bosworth broke the peace, the Assemblies of God was celebrating a blessed lack of controversy, claiming that a “new era is dawning in the movement,” and that “the new-old issues were a thing of the past.”¹⁸⁷ In the run-up to the 1918 General Convention, Assemblies of God leaders hoped to put doctrinal strife behind them and get on with the work of building an organization:

For some year or two circumstances have driven us to spend most of our time at the Council meetings in discussing doctrines. We hope to have reached the end of this kind of program and that there will be little of this at Springfield. The statement of Fundamentals shows where the Council stands, and we purpose now to go on to the next job for God, and not to waste time thrashing over the old straw.¹⁸⁸

But the tongues evidence question would not go away, so in the next issue of the *Christian Evangel*, D.W. Kerr was adamantly defending the right of the General Council of “expressing its position relative to matters of doctrine and practice.”¹⁸⁹ The time for debate was over. Going into the 1918 Council, Assemblies of God leaders believed that, in order to carry forward the new era of productivity, the only position was one of strength and resistance to doctrinal dissent. As a report in the *Christian Evangel* put it, “In these days of apostasy it was found necessary to insist upon a stricter allegiance to

¹⁸⁷ “Controversy Languishes--Evangelism Spreading,” *Christian Evangel*, no. 193 (June 9, 1917): 7, 9. Quote on p. 7. “The Council at St. Louis,” *Christian Evangel*, no. 210 (October 13, 1917): 2.

¹⁸⁸ Bell, “The Coming Great Council,” 1.

¹⁸⁹ Kerr, “Paul’s Interpretation of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.”

these essential truths which have differentiated us from the surrounding religious bodies and ostracised [sic] us from the pale of so-called orthodoxy.”¹⁹⁰

The growing concern for that which “differentiated” the pentecostals points to probably the strongest explanation for the rapid victory of the tongues evidence doctrine. A decade out from Azusa Street, pentecostals had come to two realizations. First, Jesus might not return as quickly as anticipated; where imminent eschatology was kept alive, it was tied to geo-political events as fulfillment of prophesy rather than restorationist views of sacred history.¹⁹¹ Second, the pentecostal revival would not be welcomed by the existing denominations. Looking to the future, pentecostals concluded that they ought to work at building institutions that will last into new generations.¹⁹² They came to terms with the fact that—by mutual consent—the existing institutions had no place for them. In the light of these realizations, pentecostals began consciously to build an identity apart from evangelicalism and the holiness movement. To do this, they had to answer the question: what part of pentecostalism justified its existence as separate from the rest of Christianity? Most pentecostals found it in the teaching that tongues always accompanies spirit-baptism. This was after all, a teaching that helped birth the movement, had always been the majority position, and was already the marker that non-pentecostals usually used to identify pentecostals in their polemics. Seeley Kinne’s response in 1918 to Bosworth demonstrates the place of the tongues evidence doctrine in this growing awareness of identity:

¹⁹⁰ “The Council at St. Louis,” 2.

¹⁹¹ For instance, see the “Special Second Coming Edition” of the *Weekly Evangel*, April 10, 1917.

¹⁹² In this respect, it is no coincidence that the staunchest defender of the tongues evidence doctrine, D.W. Kerr, was also a pioneer of Assemblies of God higher education.

Would this movement ever have existed if it had not been for this teaching[?] After all, is there anything in this movement that is not in other movements? The [Christian and Missionary] alliance, for instance, claimed the baptism before this movement came, and still claims it without tongues, and objects to and disowns missionaries for this teaching. But it is all right if they call it the gift of tongues. Do you wish to pull us down to an old level of spirituality? Has there ever been such a rapid worldwide movement of the gospel through them or any other as has come with this teaching? Missionaries have suffered and been ostracized because they got the baptism with tongues. Now do you propose we shall advise them they had made a mistake and had better return to their old relations and give up the tongues? Shall we drop back to these levels and disappear, as it surely will if we join your teaching? Nay verily. It has cost us too much and brought us too great blessing of God.¹⁹³

The tongues evidence doctrine had seemingly been at the root of pentecostal success, so “Why,” as W.H. Pope put it, “at this late hour try to put out the teaching that caused the fire to fall around the world?”¹⁹⁴ Furthermore, for believers who were highly conscious of “levels” of spirituality, denying a doctrine to which many had pinned their high spiritual status was to topple down the spiritual ladder. To retract it would be “striking at the very foundations of the miraculous Pentecostal baptism.”¹⁹⁵ D.W. Kerr, one of the chief defenders of Assemblies of God orthodoxy, would later verge on holding pentecostal supernaturalism hostage to the doctrine: “whenever we, as a people, begin to let down on this particular point, the fire dies out, the ardor and fervor begin to wane, the glory departs.”¹⁹⁶ Assemblies of God leaders did not see as clearly as Bosworth did that the

¹⁹³ Kinne, “Open Letter to Elder F.F. Bosworth.”

¹⁹⁴ W.H. Pope, “Why I Believe All Who Receive the Full Baptism Will Speak in Other Tongues,” *Christian Evangel*, no. 244–45 (June 15, 1918): 7.

¹⁹⁵ Kinne, “Open Letter to Elder F.F. Bosworth.”

¹⁹⁶ D.W. Kerr, “The Bible Evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 509 (August 11, 1923): 2. Cited in L. William Oliverio, Jr., *Theological Hermeneutics in the Classical Pentecostal Tradition: A Typological Account* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 102. Durham had made a similar claim in 1912, but with the added force of denominational machinery, Kerr’s words certainly carried more weight. Durham wrote, “Whenever they cease in any place to teach that the tongues are the evidence the power of God lifts and they have very few baptisms any more.” Durham, “Speaking in Tongues Is the

pentecostal movement had more to offer than a dogmatic position on spirit-baptism. J.R.

Flower's distressed words in 1920 reveal where the question of identity had led:

If we, as a movement, are wrong in our position [on speaking in tongues as the sign of the baptism in the Holy Spirit], we have no right to an existence as a body of people, as the denominational bodies would possibly take us in if we would drop this one point of contention... The very life of the Pentecostal Movement hinges on this point.¹⁹⁷

Within a few years, the notion that the tongues evidence doctrine was pentecostalism's only contribution to wider Christianity subtly supported the growing sentiment that the teaching was so important that it superseded all other considerations. As D.W. Kerr told readers,

During the past few years God has enabled us to discover and recover this wonderful truth concerning Baptism in the Spirit as it was given at the beginning. Thus we have all that the others got, and we have got this too. We see all they see, but they don't see what we see. That is why we can't work together with those who oppose or reject this Pentecostal truth. They might invite us to come and labor with them, but you know it would not work. Some have tried and failed. You can not mix Pentecost with denominationalism.¹⁹⁸

Of course, Bosworth would disagree: he had cooperated with denominational Christians for years and after 1918 embarked on a ministry that freely mixed with pentecostals and non-pentecostals, all without forsaking his pentecostal identity. The tongues evidence controversy was a not a battle of pure versus compromised pentecostalism; it was a fight

Evidence of Spirit Baptism," 11. Though less polemical, recent pentecostal historians have tried to tie the initial evidence doctrine positively to church growth. See Synan, "The Role of Tongues as Initial Evidence." Synan's argument is unconvincing, however, for at least two reasons. First, Synan tries to adopt categories of "semi-initial evidence" and "near initial evidence" positions. This tack ignores the pastoral concerns that folks like Bosworth have always had with the hard line on tongues evidence. Second, Synan uses the Church of God in Christ as an example of a denomination whose growth correlates with the initial evidence teaching. But Synan admits that the Church of God in Christ did not enforce a hard stance on initial evidence.

¹⁹⁷ Flower, "Evidence of the Baptism." Cited in Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 164.

¹⁹⁸ D.W. Kerr, "The Basis of Our Distinctive Testimony," *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 460-61 (September 2, 1922): 4.

over the supernatural—how to pursue it, defend it, and disseminate it to the rest of the world.¹⁹⁹ Although Bosworth clearly stated that his critique of the teaching was designed to deepen God’s supernatural work in the world and increase manifestations (even tongues!), some of his pentecostal denominational colleagues saw him as a traitor to the supernaturalist creed. While the Assemblies of God opted for a doctrinally-based defense of the gospel of the supernatural, Bosworth retained a more fluid apology rooted in experience and demonstration.

Conclusion

As part of the original delegation that formed the Assemblies of God, F.F. Bosworth was clearly not opposed to the formation of pentecostal organizations. Neither was he outspoken against adopting a statement of faith for the basis of unity in ministry when faced with the threat of the Oneness teaching. On the other hand, as a rising star in the pentecostal movement, Bosworth’s success in Chicago, California, and Texas was largely independent of his ties to the new organization. Furthermore, beginning in 1917, Bosworth began intentionally cooperating across denominations in urban evangelism. As Bosworth’s ministry exponentially grew in the years after the founding of the Assemblies of God, he ironically became increasingly aware of the challenges of implementing the denomination’s dominant position on tongues as the evidence of spirit-

¹⁹⁹ For instance, Bosworth stood at odds with W.F. Carothers on nearly every theological aspect of tongues—the distinction between gift and evidence, the necessity of tongues for all those baptized in the Holy Spirit, and the human role in the spirit-baptism experience. Whereas Bosworth emphasized the experience as available immediately through faith, Carothers claimed that “there isn’t any sort of compliance (as in a sacrament) or attitude that we can possibly assume that will impress the spirit into giving us this experience [of spirit-baptism]. Regeneration and sanctification generally follow certain acts of faith and obedience, but not so with the baptism. It appears to me to just be given when it pleases the Lord to do it—after sanctification, of course, we have to learn the experimental meaning of the direction to ‘tarry,’ to ‘wait.’” W. F. Carothers, “The Baptism with the Holy Ghost,” *Apostolic Faith*, (Baxter Springs), 1, no. 9 (May 1906): 15.

baptism. His concerns erupted in public rejection of the doctrine and resignation over the issue in 1918. Bosworth critiqued the doctrine on experiential, historical, and scriptural grounds. While he was not the first or the only pentecostal to challenge the doctrine, his opposition caused unparalleled controversy because it came at a time when his denomination was beginning to harden the link between the doctrine and pentecostal identity. At the heart of the disagreement was a differing conception of how the supernatural is manifested in the natural world. Bosworth viewed his pentecostal identity in the broad terms of the gospel of the supernatural, while the Assemblies of God insisted that the tongues evidence doctrine was the narrow dogmatic gate to the supernatural experience. Despite Bosworth's critiques, the doctrine triumphed because it made a distinct supernatural experience accessible and verifiable, was useful as an individual assurance when the finished work attack on Wesleyan restorationism dismantled the corporate and eschatological meaning of spirit-baptism, was the dominant position at a time when the Assemblies of God was wearied by doctrinal controversy, and provided a social demarcation for the young pentecostal movement.

Although the tongues evidence doctrine became the "distinctive testimony" of certain pentecostals, it is an inadequate lens through which to understand the pentecostal movement. Not only was the doctrine directly and indirectly challenged from within the movement in North America, Europe and India, but many embraced pentecostalism not because they were enthusiastic about the tongues doctrine, but because the pentecostal churches carried on the more general supernaturalism of the earlier holiness movement. Bosworth's is not the only story that shows that pentecostal identity is not inextricably linked to the tongues evidence teaching. For example, without more information on how

Maria Woodworth-Etter came into the pentecostal experience, one might conclude that rather than a reorientation to a new doctrine, the evangelist simply followed her audience: by 1912, those who sought intense supernatural experiences were more likely to identify with pentecostalism than the holiness movement, as seen in chapter one. This could explain both why Woodworth-Etter did not immediately join the pentecostals when she began to have sustained contact with them in 1908 and why she had such success after identifying with the pentecostals in 1912, contrasted to her lackluster ministry of the previous seven years.

A common characteristic of many who either challenged or remained tacit on the tongues evidence doctrine is the strength of their independent ministries. In general, they did not rely on denominational structures for their ministerial success. This suggests that many more—who did not have the resources for independent ministry—possibly remained in the pentecostal denominations because they valued the supernatural gospel proclaimed therein, even if they did not heartily endorse the tongues evidence doctrine. The tongues evidence doctrine may have been necessary for a certain pentecostal denominational identity, but it was not necessary for pentecostal spiritual identity. As Bosworth's ministry would continue to prove, the pentecostal revival in all its chief features could continue without the tongues evidence doctrine.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Healing Evangelist, 1919-1932

The Bosworths proclaim first, and unceasingly Jesus Christ crucified and risen; but the success of their work is largely due...to the preaching of the little-known truth, “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today and forever.” This embodies the present experience of bodily healing as a part of the atoning power of the Cross.

—Katherine Elise Chapman, “Times of Refreshing” (1922)¹

Following his contentious departure from the Assemblies of God, F.F. Bosworth could have settled into the quiet life of a pastor. But personal circumstances, cultural forces, and his own ambition led him into an international healing ministry that far eclipsed his notable success with the Assemblies of God. In fact, the polished and impassioned work of Bosworth and a few other pentecostal evangelists “rejuvenated revivalism in North America in a period of history when classical revivalism was in decline.”² His achievements brought opposition from fundamentalists as well as modernists, compelling him to write his well-known *Christ the Healer*. In addition to showing Bosworth as a major target of fundamentalist opposition to the full gospel, Bosworth’s work during this period illuminates many aspects of 1920s divine healing, such as the tension between the healing and salvation messages, the continuing importance of testimonies and personal networks, the evolving relationship of divine healing to medicine, and the non-fundamentalist critique of modernism. Although

¹ Katherine Elise Chapman, “‘Times of Refreshing’: The Bosworth Revival Campaign in Detroit,” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 23 (August 19, 1922): 361.

² James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Years of Expansion, 1906-1930 -- Theological Variation in the Transatlantic World* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014), 171.

affiliated with the Christian and Missionary Alliance for much of this time, his spiritual identity was still pentecostal, seen in the sustained interest in his activities in pentecostal circles, his uneasy relationship with the Alliance, and his own continued focus on the supernatural.

Loss and Change, 1919-1920

Bosworth wished to enter evangelism full time when he left his Assemblies of God congregation, but his Dallas parishioners convinced him to stay, forming a congregation that quickly affiliated with the Christian and Missionary Alliance.³ “The tide of power is continually rising,” Bosworth testified of this congregation in mid-1919.⁴ Recognizing Bosworth’s abilities, the Alliance gave him the platform at the Council in May of 1919 and appointed him Assistant Superintendent for the southern district.⁵

Though Bosworth emerged successful from the professional controversy of 1918, he was soon struck by personal tragedy. On November 6, 1919, his wife died at the age of 37. Estelle had suffered from flu that yielded to tuberculosis. According to Bosworth’s biographer, Estelle’s habit of “going beyond [God’s] will and strength,” made her an “easy victim.” More warmly, the *Alliance Weekly* said she had “witnessed a good

³ Eunice May Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story* (Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921), 106.

⁴ “Dallas, Texas,” *Alliance Weekly* 52, no. 26 (September 20, 1919): 414. Another sign of success was a baptismal service in April 1919. “Baptismal Service,” *Dallas Morning News*, April 20, 1919, 9.

⁵ *Alliance Weekly* 52, no. 10 (May 31, 1919): 146. He spoke on cultivating a prayer life through practice. *Alliance Weekly* 52, no. 11 (June 7, 1919): 167. Bosworth also served as a member of the southern district for young people, which was created at the summer 1920 district conference. “Southern District Organized,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 19 (August 7, 1920): 299.

confession amidst much suffering.”⁶ Her death may have impelled Bosworth to full-time evangelism, as he soon began meetings in Louisville, Kentucky, and Chicago.⁷ But the campaign that began August 12 in Lima, Ohio, was the true beginning of a new chapter in his life and ministry.

The Alliance people of Lima had begun a revival under Joseph Hogue of the St. Paul Bible Institute. As Hogue could stay only eleven days, they called upon the Bosworth brothers to continue the work. Bosworth later recalled that the meetings had a “discouraging” start. Only after pastor R.H. Moon asked Bosworth to change his approach and “preach on Divine Healing,” did a “marvelous revival” begin.⁸ The tent was overcrowded, and the meetings moved to the 1,800-seat Memorial Hall. These meetings were quite unlike what had transpired under Hogue. As Moon reported, Bosworth was “especially used of the Lord in the matter of healing” for numerous ailments.⁹ Although the Alliance cherished divine healing, one report suggested that this work was extraordinary, pleading for adherents to seek God “for the same mighty outpouring in every Branch [of the Alliance]” and suggesting Bosworth’s ministry as a

⁶ F.F. Bosworth, “Sister Bosworth with the Lord,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 316–17 (November 29, 1919): 10; W.T. Gaston, “Sister Bosworth’s Funeral,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 316–17 (November 29, 1919): 10; “Bosworth,” *Dallas Morning News*, November 19, 1919, 12; “Bosworth,” *Dallas Morning News*, November 20, 1919, 7; Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth*, 99, 100; “Editorials,” *Alliance Weekly* 53, no. 9 (November 22, 1919): 130.

⁷ *Alliance Weekly* 53, no. 27 (March 27, 1920): 453.

⁸ F.F. Bosworth, *Bosworth’s Life Story: The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth, as Told by Himself in the Alliance Tabernacle*, Toronto (Toronto: Alliance Book Room, n.d.), 11, 12.

⁹ R.H. Moon, “When God Visited Lima, Ohio,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 26 (September 25, 1920): 414.

template: “As soon as the conditions are met, and Divine Healing is given its true place and teaching, a Revival can and will break out in your Branch.”¹⁰

The success in Lima prompted an invitation from Pittsburgh. The meetings had to be relocated twice to accommodate the crowds. Again divine healing was the key to success. “[Bosworth] preaches the gospel as Peter did at Lydda and as Paul did at Lystra,” wrote Pittsburgh Alliance pastor E.D. Whiteside, “and similar results have been vouchsafed.”¹¹ The meetings received a boost from the *National Labor Tribune*, an eight-page weekly that touted itself as the “Official Organ of the American Workmen.” During Bosworth’s Lima campaign, the *Tribune* (or its editor) underwent a conversion, shifting spiritual allegiance from “Russellism to Raderism” and beginning a long relationship with Alliance president and then pastor of the Chicago Moody Tabernacle, Paul Rader.¹² For the next six years, the paper was also the unofficial organ of Bosworth’s ministry, giving the evangelist the short-lived moniker “Texas wonder” and relating testimonies, Bosworth’s sermons, and eyewitness reports. Recognizing the *Tribune*’s “nation-wide influence,” Bosworth credited it with the surge in letters and requests he was receiving.¹³

¹⁰ F.B. Miller, “A Revival of Divine Healing,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 30 (October 23, 1920): 474.

¹¹ E.D. Whiteside, “An Apostolic Revival,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 39 (December 25, 1920): 616.

¹² For years, the *National Labor Tribune* had printed sermons and reported on the activities of Charles Taze Russell, the founder of Zion’s Watch Tower Tract Society, a precursor to the Jehovah’s Witnesses movement, and of Russell’s successor, John F. Rutherford. “How the Tribune Has Fought,” *National Labor Tribune*, September 30, 1920, 3. The switch to Rader may have been prompted by accusations that the *Tribune* supported Bolshevism, as Rader’s work had a jingoist hue.

¹³ The *Tribune* even served as a tract that was distributed prior to Bosworth’s meetings. See “Tabernacle Too Small; Balcony Helps Some; 7 Pittsburgh Papers Boost Flint, Mich, Daily Timid,” *National Labor Tribune*, December 8, 1921, 3. The paper also produced a “Special Bosworth Edition.” See *National Labor Tribune*, July 13, 1922, 3. For the Jersey City campaign, Nyack Missionary Training Students were enlisted to distribute copies of the *Tribune* to advertise for the meetings. “Dance Hall and Beer Garden Now Tabernacle Grounds--Bosworth’s Busy Again--Police Play Good Part,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 5, 1922, 3. For “Texas Wonder,” see “Gospel Tabernacle Too Small for Crowds;

With two extremely well-attended campaigns, unprecedented testimonies of healing, and backing from a national newspaper, Bosworth's new career path in healing evangelism was secured. From Pittsburgh, Bosworth continued on an unbroken succession of meetings in Detroit, St. Paul, Toronto, Chicago, Toledo, Pittsburgh, and Flint, Michigan—all before the close of 1921.¹⁴ But Bosworth's growing success cannot be appreciated in isolation; he represents a trend in American religious culture following the Great War. The careers of famous faith healers like Anglican layman James Moore Hickson and pentecostals Aimee Semple McPherson and Raymond Richey blossomed simultaneously and were interconnected with Bosworth's. An often neglected factor in the history of divine healing is the post-war influenza pandemic, which was at its height in late 1918. At a time when death rates increased tenfold and people died within hours of contracting the virus, an optimistic theology of healing could not be sustained; but the receding of the so-called Spanish flu enabled a renewed emphasis on healing.¹⁵ The post-war economic boom also made a newly confident and high-profile style of healing evangelism financially possible and psychologically attractive.¹⁶ That Hickson's world tour began in 1919 was no coincidence, and it presaged a new movement. In fact, Hickson had finished meetings in Pittsburgh just before Bosworth came to the Steel

Phenomenal Healing Astounds Multitudes," *National Labor Tribune*, October 28, 1920, 3; "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Forced into Larger Hall; Tribune Writers Seek and Write to Find Out How," *National Labor Tribune*, November 4, 1920, 7; J.H. Vitcheatnain, "Largest Hall in Detroit Packed with Seekers," *National Labor Tribune*, February 3, 1921, 3. For Bosworth's praise of the *Tribune*, see F.F. Bosworth, "Readers of Tribune Request Prayer for Healing," *National Labor Tribune*, November 11, 1920, 3.

¹⁴ See Appendix B for a detailed timeline of Bosworth's activities from 1919 to 1932.

¹⁵ See the interesting, but brief discussion of pentecostal responses to the flu epidemic in Kimberly Ervin Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series* v. 29 (Blandford Forum: Deo, 2006), 221–224.

¹⁶ Jonathan R. Baer, "Perfectly Empowered Bodies: Divine Healing in Modernizing America" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2002), 327.

City.¹⁷ Two months before Bosworth's breakthrough in Lima, McPherson led a fruitful revival seventy miles south in Dayton, Ohio.¹⁸ The Hattiesburg, Mississippi, meetings that set Richey's career path on healing evangelism began just after the Lima meetings closed and are probably indebted to Bosworth's influence.¹⁹

Aside from the change in prevailing cultural winds, an evolution in Bosworth's approach to evangelism facilitated his new dedication to healing ministry. In a sermon delivered just a few months after the Lima campaign, Bosworth described his "fresh illumination" concerning the preaching of divine healing. "I knew healing was in the atonement," said Bosworth, "but I was not quite certain that God wanted to make a universal application of it." While this could suggest that Bosworth was struggling to understand whether healing was available to nonbelievers, his further comment makes this less likely.²⁰ "From some things I had seen," said Bosworth, "I was a little in doubt; enough so that I could not radically and enthusiastically press the point [of universal healing in the atonement]."²¹ A clear perspective on the evolution of Bosworth's thought

¹⁷ "Evangelist Bosworth, Prayer and Healer, Invites Sick and Afflicted to Come," *National Labor Tribune*, October 21, 1920, 3.

¹⁸ McPherson's healing ministry reached national notoriety after meetings in San Diego and Denver in 1921. Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *Aimee Semple McPherson: Everybody's Sister*, Library of Religious Biography (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 153, 156–172.

¹⁹ Circumstantial evidence suggests Bosworth's importance for Richey's breakthrough healing meeting. Immediately after Lima (September 26 to October 10, 1920), Bosworth was in Ft. Worth, the home base of Bosworth's friend, Warren Collins. In Hattiesburg, Richey, who had recently begun assisting Collins, took over the meetings when Collins could not come. *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 28 (October 9, 1920): 445. For details of the Hattiesburg meetings, see John David Foxworth, "Raymond T. Richey: An Interpretive Biography" (Ph.D. diss., Regent University, 2011), 93, 97–102.

²⁰ Contra Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis Macnutt in Dialogue*, Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies, 4 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 21.

²¹ F.F. Bosworth, "They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them," *Latter Rain Evangel* 13, no. 6 (March 1921): 5.

and practice was offered in 1928 by the *Latter Rain Evangel*. After describing how God led Bosworth “out into a fuller ministry of Divine Healing” during the Lima campaign, the writer explained that Bosworth “had known for years that God healed the sick” and confidently used the scripture proofs for this teaching. But at some point “looking at human failures to appropriate truth, he became lukewarm and vacillating concerning healing for all.”²² What Bosworth wrestled with was not a distinction between believers and unbelievers, but between successes and failures in healing. This was a concern Bosworth knew firsthand from his wife’s death. While grieving for Estelle, he could only limply admonish his sick daughter to “join us in prayer for the supernatural in your recovery.”²³ But he now saw that failures did not invalidate truth. This was not so much an “illumination” as a return to first principles, and it translated into—as Bosworth later put it—“preach[ing] this part of the Gospel in a bolder and more public way.”²⁴

He may have initially exaggerated the revelatory nature of this shift, but Bosworth was clearly using healing as an evangelistic tool in late 1920 as he never had before. Healing served well in this function. For Bosworth, healing “opens the door into men’s hearts as nothing else does.”²⁵ Since committing to preaching healing, claimed Bosworth,

²² “Chicago’s Visitation of Miracles of Healing,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 20, no. 5 (February 1928): 14.

²³ F.F. Bosworth, “Correspondence--Re: Death of First Wife,” November 20, 1919, 2, 3/8/5, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center. Bosworth here presents no case for confidence in divine healing.

²⁴ Quoted in F.F. Bosworth, *Christ the Healer: Sermons on Divine Healing* (Chicago, 1924), 73. On another instance in 1924, Bosworth referred to this time as “when he first thought of teaching divine healing in a special way.” “Binghamton Convert Gone to Writing Poetry,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 16, 1924, 4. That his own healer Mattie Perry joined him in Pittsburgh aptly illustrates Bosworth’s renewed commitment to healing. “Testimonials,” *National Labor Tribune*, January 27, 1921, 4.

²⁵ F.F. Bosworth, “For This Cause Was the Son of God Manifest That He Might Destroy the Works of the Devil,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 13, no. 8 (July 1921): 8. He also said healing “was the best medium for evangelism.” *Ibid.*

“I have often seen more people saved in a week than I formerly saw in a year.”²⁶ The next few years would corroborate Bosworth’s bold claim.

Mounting Success, 1921-1924

In January of 1921, Bosworth resigned as Assistant Superintendent of the southern district of the Alliance, taking the appointment of field evangelist—an indication of his ministerial preference and his newfound success. The 1921 report of the secretary of the home department spoke of “a year of revivals,” thanks in particular to Bosworth.²⁷ Bosworth agreed that since Lima “God is moving in a sovereign way, and in a degree that I have not seen before.”²⁸ The basic outlines of Bosworth’s meetings during the following years remained constant, making a detailed itinerary unnecessary. But the highlights and more notorious incidents shed light on Bosworth’s ministry and his religious context.

Bosworth’s prestige was lifted by certain incredible testimonies. In Detroit, a young girl whose ear drums had been removed claimed they were “perfectly recreated and restored.” A similar testimony came from Mrs. S. A. Wright of Toronto, who after the regrowth of both kidneys, became a travelling spokesperson for Bosworth.²⁹

²⁶ “1,300 Listen to Bosworths, Evangelists,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 8, 1922, 16; “Miracles Still Are Performed, Bosworth Says,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 9, 1922, 10.

²⁷ “It has been difficult to secure places large enough to accommodate the crowds.” E.J. Richards, “Annual Report of Secretary of Home Department,” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 17 (July 9, 1921): 261.

²⁸ Bosworth, “They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them,” 5.

²⁹ “The Revival Campaign in Toronto: Services Marked by Simplicity,” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 8 (May 6, 1921): 122; “Bosworth Campaign Stirs Toronto,” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 11 (May 28, 1921): 171–72; C.C. Fitch, “Bosworth Campaign in Toledo,” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 34 (November 5, 1921): 538. Bosworth retold Wright’s story in Bosworth, “They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them,” 6–7. This healing was so well-known that it was the target of criticism in Arno Clemens Gaebelein, *The Healing Question: An Examination of the Claims of Faith-Healing and Divine Healing Systems in the Light of the Scriptures and History* (New York: Publication Office “Our Hope,” 1925), 87.

Bosworth defended such seemingly impossible events by arguing that since conversion is creation, recreation of organs is “the littlest thing in the world to God.”³⁰ The Detroiters put their own Motor City spin on this, saying, “We have a God that can reconstruct and replace any part, the requirement being ‘take the machine to the shop and let God have his way.’”³¹ Pittsburgh witnessed the widely-publicized healing of John Sproul, who had been gassed in France during the war, causing him to lose his voice, frequently choke from a buildup of pus, and experience blackouts from lack of oxygen. Following fourteen unsuccessful operations—mostly as a result of experimental treatments—and eighteen months feeding through a tube, he was released on a disability pension. Sproul came to Bosworth’s meeting. A worker told him to have faith and, mistaking the worker’s shout of “praise God” for a directive, Sproul opened his mouth to speak, emitting praises that were his first full-voiced words in over three years.³² Sproul was an instant evangelist, testifying at his former schools, the mayor’s office, and even asking strangers if they had heard “about the Soldier Boy who got his voice back.”³³ Sproul frequently assisted in Bosworth’s meetings, billed as a particular draw for veterans.³⁴

The healings were matched by Bosworth’s gift for preaching. In Toronto, P.S. Campbell, a Greek scholar at McMaster University, endorsed Bosworth’s platform

³⁰ “The Bosworth Meetings in Detroit,” *National Labor Tribune*, January 27, 1921, 3.

³¹ Eunice M. Perkins, “Detroit Druggists Doomed; Medicine Chests Ruined; Family Remedies Gone; Sick Saved and Healed,” *National Labor Tribune*, January 27, 1921, 3.

³² “John Sproul to Tell How Voice Came Back Again,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 13, 1922, 5.

³³ “Mayor E.V. Babcock Believes in Miracles,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 27, 1921, 4.

³⁴ *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 9 (May 13, 1922): 142; “Alliance Folk Give Dr. Sandford Grand Farewell,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 20, 1922, 5. Sproul’s healing was the catalyst for endorsement from a number of high-ranking Pittsburg citizens, including Mayor E.V. Babcock, who had overseen Sproul’s care for some time before his healing. “Mayor E.V. Babcock Believes in Miracles,” 3–4.

performance.³⁵ Another endorsement came from J.G. Inkster, pastor of Knox Presbyterian Church.³⁶ The accolades in Toronto boosted Bosworth's stature in the Alliance and with average followers, who by late 1921 called him "the Joybringer" in recognition of the blessings he conveyed.³⁷ Bosworth's welcome was so great in Chicago in 1921 that he accepted an offering that helped him and his brother Bert relocate to the Windy City.³⁸

Through 1922 and 1923, Bosworth's star continued to rise through meetings across the eastern half of the country. In Miami in 1922, Bosworth was asked to fill in for William Jennings Bryan's weekly Sunday school, which had attendance of more than three thousand.³⁹ A year later in Miami, Bosworth boasted the attendance of "leading divines" such as S.D. Gordon and H.C. Morrison.⁴⁰ On a return to Detroit, Bosworth had his first experience delivering a sermon to the "invisible audience" listening over the

³⁵ "His sermons show that he possesses in a marked degree the teaching gift." P.S. Campbell, "How God Worked in Toronto," *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 16 (July 2, 1921): 250. See also "Testimonies from Toronto," *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 37 (November 26, 1921): 586; "Hungry Souls Respond to Invitation without Sermon and No Pleading Hundred Say 'Yes,'" *National Labor Tribune*, May 19, 1921, 4.

³⁶ "Testimonies from Toronto." See Inkster's endorsement in "Eminent Minister Endorses Divine Healing---Rejoices and Suggests Shaking Up," *National Labor Tribune*, June 23, 1921, 7.

³⁷ After Toronto, Bosworth was billed as a featured speaker at the Alliance Annual Council in Nyack. *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 12 (June 4, 1921): 177. For "Joybringer," see "Sheraden Church Workers Erect Tabernacle for Use During Bosworth Revival Campaign," *National Labor Tribune*, October 3, 1921, 4; "'Joybringer' Bosworth and Brother B.B. Opens Campaign in Sheraden in Great Tabernacle," *National Labor Tribune*, October 20, 1921, 3. Around this time Perkins's biography of Bosworth was published.

³⁸ "Bosworth Campaign in Chicago," *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 31 (October 15, 1921): 490.

³⁹ *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 51 (March 4, 1922): 801; *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 3 (April 1, 1922): 41. For the attendance figure of Bryan's meetings, see *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 5 (February 25, 1922): 793.

⁴⁰ "Americas Leading Divines Attend Bosworth Revival," *National Labor Tribune*, March 6, 1924, 3. Gordon was the widely-respected author of the devotional *Quite Talks* series; Morrison was a holiness minister who managed to retain the respect of come-outers as well as denominational loyalists.

radio.⁴¹ These meetings were briefly disturbed by members of the Ku Klux Klan who appeared in the front lobby, dressed in their traditional white garb. For fear of a distraction, the usher kept them from personally approaching Bosworth. When their letter reached Bosworth, he was surprised to find \$25 in cash and a note of well-wishes.⁴² The Klan apparently appreciated the Christian values promulgated in Bosworth's revivalism.

Bosworth also caught the attention of the secular press. A 1922 *New York Times* editorial wrote of Bosworth's meetings in Brooklyn, describing him as "resembling Billy Sunday, but without his exuberance of humor or his astonishing acrobaticism." The editorialist was pleased with the delivery and simplicity of Bosworth's exposition but was disappointed that the preaching was not more creative and innovative.⁴³ Nearly a year after the *Times* editorial, Bosworth was featured in an article appearing in *Ladies' Home Journal*. Having attended Bosworth's meetings in New York while researching her article, Mabel Potter Daggett showed commendable balance in treating the growing phenomenon of divine healing as demonstrated in Bosworth's ministry.⁴⁴ Daggett

⁴¹ C.C. Fitch, "Campaign in Detroit," *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 18 (July 15, 1922): 282. Bosworth periodically preached over the radio in the following years in Atlanta, Chicago, and St. Petersburg, Florida. "Paul Rader Issues Warning Against the Anvil Chorus and Knockers Brigade," *National Labor Tribune*, June 7, 1923, 3; "Telling What Happened in the Big Steel Tent," *National Labor Tribune*, June 28, 1923, 3, 5; "Evangelist Bosworth Talks Over Atlanta Journal's Radio," *National Labor Tribune*, September 20, 1923, 3; "The Bosworth Party in Atlanta, Georgia," *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 10 (March 7, 1925): 167; "Bosworth Sermons Will Be Broadcast over Radio Soon," *National Labor Tribune*, January 29, 1925, 4.

⁴² "The Final Meetings of the Bosworth Brothers at Detroit, Mich., Soul-Inspiring--Many Saved, Cured and Baptized," *National Labor Tribune*, July 6, 1922, 3. Interestingly, this event occurred about two weeks after McPherson received an endorsement from the Klan in the form of a friendly kidnapping in Denver. Blumhofer, *Aimee Semple McPherson*, 186–188. The Klan also showed their support for Bosworth in Altoona, Pennsylvania, in 1927. Three hundred Klansmen sat in reserved seats and were "warmly welcomed" by Bosworth. "Great Outpouring at Last Meeting," *Altoona Mirror*, July 25, 1927, 1, 22.

⁴³ Mark W. Williams, "RELIGION ON THE CORNER: This Year's Revivals Are Like Those of Old Times. Army Hard at Work. Gospel in All Tongues.," *New York Times*, September 24, 1922, sec. Special Features, 107.

⁴⁴ "Telling What Happened in the Big Steel Tent," 5; Mabel Potter Daggett, "Are There Modern Miracles?," *Ladies' Home Journal*, June 1923, 166–167.

claimed that “[Bosworth’s] name has become a household word spoken with reverence and affection.”⁴⁵ Sproul’s case, she said, exemplified “the burning zeal of the people who have been healed, and their determination to pass on the gospel of health and salvation to the rest of the world, that is turning the [healing] movement into a crusade.”⁴⁶ In Chicago at the time Daggett’s article appeared, Bosworth publically approved the piece.⁴⁷

The growing accolades and attention were impressive, but the stories of lives changed were the heart of Bosworth’s success. Hilda Anderson of Brooklyn lost her father to the flu epidemic in 1918. Caring for her dying father took such a toll on Anderson that she also contracted the flu, spiraling into insomnia and a “complete breakdown.” She steadily declined in mind, body, and spirit and was sure that the “devil got busy and made me believe I was lost.” Threatening suicide, she wanted to be institutionalized. When Bosworth came to Brooklyn, Anderson’s sister dragged her to the meetings. A female worker “rebuked the evil spirit” and “victory came at last,” the overjoyed Anderson testified. She quickly returned to church work and began singing nonstop, something her sister had not heard in four years.⁴⁸

On April 6, 1924, Bosworth began meetings in Ottawa that marked the high point of his Alliance ministry. Nightly attendance reached 7,000, “the largest crowd ever assembled in Ottawa under one roof at a religious service.” Bosworth claimed 12,000

⁴⁵ Daggett, “Are There Modern Miracles?,” 166.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ “Evangelist Rader Warns 800 College Students Against Suicide,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 21, 1923, 3. The Bosworth party quoted the article in advertisements. See *Altoona Mirror*, May 2, 1927, 10.

⁴⁸ “Bosworth Campaign in Jersey,” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 36 (November 18, 1922): 570; Hilda Anderson, “A Demented Being, Would Kill Self,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 2, 1922, 3.

converts, and a parade of thousands gave the Bosworths their sendoff, marching to the train station singing hymns, waving flags, and carrying Bosworth on their shoulders.⁴⁹

Success and notoriety brought opposition and criticism. The Detroit chief inspector of the Board of Health offered a \$1,000 charitable donation if Bosworth could heal a hand-selected case. To add spectacle, he dared Bosworth also to regrow hair on his partially-bald head. To the latter challenge, Bosworth cheekily pointed to the fate of those who were attacked by bears after ridiculing the prophet Elisha for his baldness.⁵⁰

Bosworth refused to entertain the inspector's more serious challenge but submitted names of some who were healed. The inspector failed to follow up, which Bosworth's supporters considered an unqualified victory.⁵¹ In Toronto and Miami, Bosworth butted heads with Rowland V. Bingham, editor of a leading Canadian fundamentalist magazine.⁵² Also in Toronto, a "self-constituted committee of investigation" challenged Alice Baker, who had been healed of lip cancer in the Lima meetings.⁵³ Baker used the attention as a platform for a public forum, which apparently won many converts.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ "Remarkable Demonstration When Evangelists Conclude Campaign and Say Farewell," *Ottawa Citizen*, May 27, 1924, 18; *Ottawa Citizen* May 27, 1924, 18; "Member of the House of Commons Joins in Bodily Healing Meetings," *National Labor Tribune*, May 22, 1924, 6; "Remarkable Demonstrations When Evangelists Finish Campaign and Say Farewell," *National Labor Tribune*, June 5, 1924, 6, 7. For the sendoff, see "Ottawa Accords a Send-Off to the Bosworth Bros. Such as Rarely Seen Here," *National Labor Tribune*, June 5, 1924, 6. Reprinted from *Ottawa Journal*, May 27, 1924.

⁵⁰ "Faith Healer Is Challenged," *National Labor Tribune*, February 17, 1921; J.H. Vitchechain, "Bosworth's Challenge Stands Unrefuted; Major Roehl Fails to Report on Cases," *National Labor Tribune*, February 10, 1921, 7.

⁵¹ Vitchechain, "Largest Hall in Detroit Packed with Seekers," 3; "Want Health Inspector Inoculated with Leprosy and Tuberculosis Germs Then Try Bible Truths," *National Labor Tribune*, February 3, 1921, 7; Vitchechain, "Bosworth's Challenge Stands Unrefuted," 7.

⁵² "Where the Drys and Wets May Quaff a Draught and Maintain the Law Begging to Come and Drink," *National Labor Tribune*, April 27, 1922, 3; "The Editor's Meetings," *Evangelical Christian* 18, no. 4 (April 1922): 116. Bingham's opposition to Bosworth's divine healing is discussed in detail below.

⁵³ Bosworth often repeated Baker's story. See Bosworth, "They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them," 6. See Baker's testimony in F. Bertram Miller, "Faithful Girls Grief Stricken;

When Bosworth returned to Brooklyn early in 1923, he worked under the auspices of Greene Avenue Baptist Church. When local fundamentalist Baptists voiced their dissent, the Green Avenue pastor defended divine healing by appealing to A.J. Gordon.⁵⁵ Later in Ottawa, three Catholic priests and a Presbyterian minister publically challenged the work. The priests were alarmed that as many as 800 Catholics attended one meeting.⁵⁶ Telling Catholics it was a “grievous sin” to attend the meetings, the priests said that Bosworth’s healings were the result of Coueism.⁵⁷ The Presbyterian minister averred that he had not seen any improvement in those prayed for. Bosworth responded to these criticisms in turn by insisting that dividing Christians (as the priests seemed to do) was the real sin, that the healings of Coueism pale in comparison to his own, and that “in most miracles, there is nothing to see,” since healings are often internal.⁵⁸

Overwhelmed by Unexpected Joy; People Baffled by Case,” *National Labor Tribune*, May 19, 1921, 3; “Testimony of Alice Baker,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 20, 1921, 3.

⁵⁴ Fitch, “Bosworth Campaign in Toledo.”

⁵⁵ “Evangelistic Campaign, Bosworth Brothers Opens in Brooklyn on February 11th,” *National Labor Tribune*, February 15, 1923, 3. Since this campaign was not in cooperation with the Alliance, it was not reported in *Alliance Weekly*. Bosworth’s main opponent in New York was I.M. Haldeman.

⁵⁶ James William Opp, *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine, and Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880-1930* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2005), 154. See “Bosworth Meeting Again Attracts Huge Crowd and Many Remarkable Healing Testimonies Delivered,” *Ottawa Citizen*, May 17, 1924, 6.

⁵⁷ Emilie Coue (1857-1926) was a French pharmacist and psychologist who treated patients through a combination of medicine and training in self-affirmation. His thought centered on overcoming the negative will by strengthening the subconscious mind. His work became known to the English-speaking world in a 1920 translation of his work and particularly in America by his visit to Boston in 1922.

⁵⁸ “The Critics Answered by Evangelist F.F. Bosworth,” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 5 (August 2, 1924): 77–78. See also “The Man Whom God Used to Put to Flight Higher Critics and Unbelievers in Ottawa, Canada,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 12, 1924, 6. In addition to these direct challenges, a committee was formed to “investigate the genuineness” of reported healings after Bosworth left Ottawa. “Bosworth Revival Campaign Starts in Sheraden Tabernacle,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 1924, 6.

Responding to Critics and Encouraging Supporters: Christ the Healer

Weeks after the famed Ottawa campaign, Bosworth returned to Chicago to enjoy a lakeside vacation and work on a book that would “cover largely the questions so prevalent and make clear the confusing misconstruction placed upon the Scriptures by ministers who seek prominence through unfair criticism and attacks not well founded and contain[ing] erroneous interpretation.”⁵⁹ This book appeared in late 1924 as *Christ the Healer*, a collection of sermons and testimonies that became Bosworth’s greatest legacy.

Considering the astonishing success of *Christ the Healer* (half a million copies in print; continually in print since 1924), remarkably little is known about the circumstances that compelled Bosworth to write it. This reflects a gap in historical understanding of the fundamentalist critique of divine healing in the 1920s. Because Aimee Semple McPherson has received more scholarly treatment, historians have generally viewed her as the main lightning rod for fundamentalist opposition,⁶⁰ while those who recognize Bosworth’s role focus on *Christ the Healer* rather than the years leading up to its publication.⁶¹ A recent monograph by Gerald King has pointed the way for understanding the context for the appearance of *Christ the Healer* but has made only a weakly-supported claim that Bosworth’s book was a response to R.A. Torrey’s *Divine Healing of*

⁵⁹ “Farewell to Bosworths, Gone Back to Chicago, Will Answer Critics,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 19, 1924, 3.

⁶⁰ Matthew Avery Sutton, *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Resurrection of Christian America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 19, 36; Blumhofer, *Aimee Semple McPherson*, 221–224. Even King’s broader treatment of pentecostal-fundamentalist relations describes McPherson as the “touchstone of controversy.” Gerald W. King, *Disfellowshipped: Pentecostal Responses to Fundamentalism in the United States, 1906-1943* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2011), 97.

⁶¹ Gary B. McGee, *Miracles, Missions, and American Pentecostalism*, American Society of Missiology Series, No. 45 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 182, 188, 192, 299, n.68; Douglas G. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 294–305; Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing*. Although Hejzlar refers to the earlier *Discerning the Lord’s Body*, he offers no historical context. See pp. 74, 170, 218.

the same year.⁶² An investigation of the controversy leading up to the publication of *Christ the Healer* reveals that Bosworth was targeted by fundamentalist opponents of divine healing to an extent comparable to, if not greater than McPherson. These opponents regarded Bosworth as a threat not only because of his notoriety, but also because they saw him as the intellectual representative of the movement. Bosworth's critics read his tracts closely and published direct refutations of his theology, revealing in the process a range of motivations from dispensational cessationism to pastoral concerns to the nature of the atonement. Bosworth was familiar with these critiques and incorporated rebuttals into his preaching and more systematically in *Christ the Healer*. On the other hand, Bosworth approvingly cited Torey's *Divine Healing* in pulpit and print. The earlier published attacks, rather than Torrey's booklet, prompted Bosworth's book and form the proper backdrop for evaluating its significance, while also shedding light on the full range of fundamentalist objections to divine healing in the early 1920s.

The Opposition

In 1921 Rowland V. Bingham published *The Bible and the Body*, which began as a series of articles in 1920 and broadly attacked the teachings and practices of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Bingham was a former Salvation Army officer who had also studied at A.B. Simpson's Missionary Training Institute. He settled in Toronto and became co-founder of the Sudan Interior Mission and editor of the *Evangelical*

⁶² King, *Disfellowshipped*, 99; Gerald W. King, "Streams of Convergence: The Pentecostal-Fundamentalist Response to Modernism," *PentecoStudies* 7, no. 2 (2008): 70.

Christian magazine.⁶³ The first edition of the book was poorly timed, for almost as soon as it was off the press, Bingham encountered Bosworth in Toronto, compelling reactions in the *Christian Evangel* and a revision of his book.⁶⁴

The new edition, published in 1924, took aim at a new batch of healing evangelists: McPherson, the Bosworth Brothers, and Charles Price. Each had their own calling card: McPherson taught that Christ atoned for sickness when he was whipped, since Isaiah says “by his stripes we are healed”; the Bosworth Brothers taught healing through the Eucharist;⁶⁵ and Price frequently put people “under the power” through the laying on of hands.⁶⁶ But Bosworth was Bingham’s target, as Bingham refuted point-by-point each of the thirty-one questions Bosworth published in Toronto newspapers. Bingham was perturbed by Bosworth’s “redemptive names” theology⁶⁷ and his use of Old Testament types like the Day of Atonement. “It is a wonder,” cracked Bingham,

⁶³ Brian Alexander McKenzie, *Fundamentalism, Christian Unity, and Premillennialism in the Thought of Rowland Victor Bingham, 1872-1942 a Study of Anti-Modernism in Canada*, Canadian Theses = Thèses Canadiennes (Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1987), 27–75.

⁶⁴ The timing suggests that Bingham waited until Simpson died to print his critique. Bingham attended two of Bosworth’s meetings and “later had a long personal interview with him.” Rowland V. Bingham, *The Bible and the Body: Healing in the Scriptures*, 4th ed. (1921; repr., Toronto: Evangelical Publishers, 1952), 105. See also “Healing in the Atonement,” *Evangelical Christian* 17, no. 6 (June 1921): 164; “The Bosworth Campaign in Toronto,” *Evangelical Christian* 17, no. 7 (July 1921): 199–200, 218; R. V. Bingham, “Touching the Ark,” *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 4 (December 1921): 714.

⁶⁵ Bosworth had a near-sacramental understanding of the Lord’s Supper. According to Bosworth, Christ’s blood cleansed from sins, while Christ’s body brought deliverance from disease—if it were properly “discerned.” See chapter eight for Bosworth’s understanding of the Lord’ Supper in the context of his divine healing theology.

⁶⁶ Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, 22. Bingham also included a healer who went by the name “Isaiah,” who had “got into trouble and disappeared like a meteor in the darkness.” This “Brother Isaiah”—John Cudney—was based in New Orleans and is also mentioned occasionally in *Our Hope*.

⁶⁷ Based on an insight from the *Scofield Reference Bible*, Bosworth argued that God’s eternal nature is revealed in God’s names. Among the names of God in the Old Testament is “Jehovah-Rapha,” which means “the Lord thy healer.” Bosworth therefore reasoned that God was always the healer of his people, since it was part of God’s nature as revealed in the divine name.

“that Mr. Bosworth hasn’t found in this figure that atonement was made for our mortgages.”⁶⁸

Apart from such jabs, Bingham’s analysis was broad and thoughtful. He was concerned for those who were not healed and thus found themselves in the wasteland between faith for healing and sanctified suffering.⁶⁹ Like few others, Bingham understood the situation in historical perspective. “The church had almost excluded the Lord from the sick chamber, and talked about the age of miracles being past,” noted Bingham, “but in correcting the one extreme of the church, we have made the mistake of going to the other extreme.”⁷⁰ Unlike staunch dispensationalists, Bingham did not cordon the promise of healing in James 5 as a “Jewish truth.”⁷¹ He praised early leaders in the healing movement, like Charles Cullis. But the problem, according to Bingham, was that more recent healers “pushed to extremes” and made “dogmatic assertion” of what A.J. Gordon “wrote suggestively and enquiringly.”⁷² Although he respected Simpson, Bingham faulted the Alliance founder for teaching that “natural remedies and human help were unnecessary and were to be deprecated by those who took the Lord as their physician.”⁷³ Bingham considered Dowie the most extreme of the early faith healers but

⁶⁸ Ibid., 107.

⁶⁹ “Healing in the Atonement.”

⁷⁰ Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, 51–52.

⁷¹ Ibid., 87.

⁷² Ibid., 13, 15–17. Quotes on pp. 16, 17.

⁷³ Ibid., 19.

noted that Dowie was “logical and consistent.” The problem was the “wrong assumptions” all these divine healers had started with.⁷⁴

Although some sickness is rooted in personal sin—and healing therefore in forgiveness—Bingham denied the teaching of healing in the atonement, because “If we admit that sickness needs atonement, then we admit at the same time that sickness severs the soul from God.”⁷⁵ The divine healers, claimed Bingham, had confused cause and effect.⁷⁶ Bingham made a distinction between “atonement” and “redemption”: “The effect of atonement is present and perfect in bringing immediate acceptance with God,” but, “The work of redemption waits.”⁷⁷ Bingham also argued that Matthew 8 could not refer to the atonement, because at this time, Christ was still three years away from his atoning work. This distinction—upon which many of Bosworth’s opponents would elaborate—Bingham referred to as the “difference... between Capernaum and Calvary.”⁷⁸

Arno C. Gaebelein, the revered editor of *Our Hope* who had assisted with the Scofield Reference Bible, first became aware of Bosworth’s work in the summer of 1921, when a friend (perhaps Bingham) gave him a copy of the *National Labor Tribune*. Gaebelein was particularly annoyed with the outrageous claims and sensationalism coming from the Bosworth camp, and he soon made the attack on divine healing a

⁷⁴ Ibid., 22.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 37.

⁷⁶ “The consequences of sin need no atonement.” Ibid., 108.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 107.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 55. See also I.M. Haldeman, “Did Our Lord By His Death on the Cross Atone for Bodily Sickness and Disease No! Never!!,” *Our Hope* 29, no. 8 (February 1923): 486–488; May Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion: Dealing with the Doctrine, the Methods Prevailing and the Claims Made in the Present-Day Healing Campaigns* (New York: Loizeaux Bros., Bible Truth Depot, n.d.), 20–24.

common feature of *Our Hope*.⁷⁹ Although McPherson came in for frequent criticism (particularly because she was a woman), Gaebelein recognized Bosworth as the true theological opponent, since his “dogmatic assertions outstrip even Mrs. McPherson’s unscriptural statements.”⁸⁰ Gaebelein tried to confirm Bosworth’s healings; he received one reply and was not impressed.⁸¹ At the Moody Bible Institute in 1922, Gaebelein accused Bosworth of trading in “fake miracles” and labeled Bosworth’s work “purely a religious humbug, a lying delusion.” Here Gaebelein identified his main contention, rooted in his dispensationalism: “The age ends not in a restoration of miracles, but it ends in apostasy.”⁸²

Other writers connected with *Our Hope* targeted Bosworth. F.C. Jennings, having obtained a copy Bosworth’s “most widely circulated” tract *For This Cause*, refuted Bosworth in November of 1921.⁸³ Jennings recoiled at Bosworth’s teaching on the Lord’s Supper. This “flippant travesty” was “not far from the bloodless sacrifice of the mass in

⁷⁹ “The Healing Craze,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 3 (September 1921): 139–40; “Self-Deception and Fraud,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 3 (September 1921): 140–42; “The Believer’s Body,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 3 (September 1921): 142–44; “Miracles,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 4 (October 1921): 207–9; F.C. Jennings, “Is Bodily Healing the Work of God That Characterizes Our Day?,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 4 (October 1921): 233–47; “What Power Is It?,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 5 (November 1921): 268–71; F.C. Jennings, “Is Bodily Healing the Work of God That Characterizes Our Day?,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 5 (November 1921): 286–302; “Is This of God?,” *Our* 28, no. 7 (January 1922): 404–7; “Extreme Sensationalism,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 8 (February 1922): 466–67.

⁸⁰ Gaebelein, *The Healing Question*, 71.

⁸¹ “Self-Deception and Fraud,” 141. The respondent “said that she felt better but not all of the symptoms of the disease had disappeared.”

⁸² Arno Clemens Gaebelein, “Christianity vs. Modern Cults,” *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 3 (March 1922): 862.

⁸³ Jennings, “Is Bodily Healing the Work of God?,” November 1921; F.F. Bosworth, *For This Cause: Or Why Many Are Weak and Sickly and Why Many Die Prematurely* (New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, n.d.). For “most widely circulated,” see *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 34 (October 20, 1923): 552.

these ultra-protestant errors.”⁸⁴ Jennings hit at the heart of Bosworth’s message of the continual supernatural activity of God: “It is a quite mistaken deduction that because ‘He is the same yesterday, today and forever’ that His ways with men are ever equally unchanged.”⁸⁵ Jennings’s understanding of Christ’s substitutionary atonement led him to see an important inconsistency in Bosworth’s belief that healing was in the atonement. “Can you, by any possibility say,” Jennings asked Bosworth, “that ‘just as’ our sins were on His blessed head, our sicknesses were there too; and the judgment of God fell on Him because those sicknesses, pains, griefs...were on Him too?”⁸⁶

W.H. Griffith Thomas, who had written the introduction to Bingham’s 1921 monograph, swiped at Bosworth while reviewing Alliance writer Kenneth Mackenzie’s book on divine healing in 1924.⁸⁷ “Mr. Bosworth’s position is not only incapable of proof by exegesis,” wrote Thomas, “but is perilous in the extreme in practical life.”⁸⁸ Thomas accused Bosworth and others of “never properly fac[ing] the question of death,” since death was a result of sin as much as sickness.⁸⁹ Neither did they satisfactorily answer the issue of broken limbs.⁹⁰ The final critique may have been below the belt, as he quoted the

⁸⁴ Jennings, “Is Bodily Healing the Work of God?,” November 1921, 288, 287.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 302.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 290.

⁸⁷ MacKenzie’s book, *Our Physical Heritage in Christ*, was in part a direct response to Bingham’s book. Kenneth Mackenzie, “Book Review,” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 32 (October 22, 1921): 506.

⁸⁸ W.H. Griffith Thomas, “Divine Healing: A Criticism of ‘Our Physical Heritage in Christ’ by Kenneth MacKenzie,” *Our Hope* 31, no. 7 (January 1925): 418–419.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 419. A.B. Simpson said God willed death not in “sickness and increasing infirmity, but like the dropping of a ripe apple from the tree.” Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, 97.

⁹⁰ “Why should not God be able to heal a broken limb or to provide new teeth if we believe in healing at all?” Thomas, “Divine Healing: A Criticism,” 421.

death notice of Bosworth's wife. That Estelle died though "much prayer has been offered for the healing of our sister," was a fact that "tells its own story," wrote Thomas.⁹¹

In early 1923 I.M. Haldeman, a Baptist preacher in New York, blasted Bosworth in a pamphlet titled *Did Our Lord Jesus Christ by His Death on the Cross Atone for Bodily Sickness and Disease? No! Never!*⁹² Haldeman could not find enough abusive terms for Bosworth's theology, calling it "monstrously false," "the most excuseless, deceiving blunder," an "unspeakable doctrine, this brutal transmutation of the cross of Christ."⁹³ In cessationist fashion, Haldeman viewed Christ's miracles as his "credentials," which were unrelated to redemption.⁹⁴ Haldeman also relied heavily on the distinction between Jews and Gentiles: James 5 referred exclusively to the Jews; and since "the law was given only to Israel," the atonement did not address the diseases listed in Deuteronomy 28 that Bosworth saw as the "curse of the law" included in redemption.⁹⁵ Another plank of Haldeman's attack was the experience of the Apostle Paul. Paul's illness (Haldeman liked to describe in detail Paul's supposed eye infection) helped him to understand that God's "strength is made perfect in weakness." This, Haldeman declared, was "the authoritative, Heaven sent contradiction" of Bosworth's doctrine.⁹⁶ Beyond exegetical concerns, Haldeman summarized his particularly Reformed objection to

⁹¹ Ibid., 422. See also Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, 99, 109, 114.

⁹² Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, n.d., 18–20. Haldeman's pamphlet was first published in *Our Hope*, Haldeman, "Did Our Lord By His Death." See King, *Disfellowshipped*, 105.

⁹³ Haldeman, "Did Our Lord By His Death," 494, 501.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 487.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 494, 491–493.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 497–501. Quote on p. 499.

Bosworth's ministry: "Even when it talks of faith, this system is appealing to sight."⁹⁷ A pastoral sorrow also gripped Haldeman, who recognized that faith healers would never lack an audience for their instantaneous, free alternative to drugs and operations. The medical establishment, he said, "cannot hope to compete with this system."⁹⁸

A year later, C.E. Putnam, a prolific controversialist who worked with the Moody Bible Institute extension department, published *Modern Religio-Healing*. From reading Bosworth's tracts, attending meetings in Chicago, and an interview with Bosworth, Putnam concluded that Bosworth's teachings were "subtle, misleading, false and unscriptural," as well as "contradictory, illogical, and ridiculous."⁹⁹ Putnam found the fundamental error of the divine healing creed in Bosworth's teaching that it is "always God's will to heal."¹⁰⁰ This movement was especially pernicious because its proponents "do not deny the true gospel fundamentals, but being deceived they do add to and try to make a double-gospel."¹⁰¹ This "double-gospel" was encapsulated in Bosworth's teaching that "healing and forgiveness were provided at the same time, and are offered exactly on the same basis."¹⁰² Since for Bosworth "living faith makes disease

⁹⁷ Ibid., 502. Gaebelein had a similar complaint, Gaebelein, "Christianity vs. Modern Cults," 862.

⁹⁸ Haldeman, "Did Our Lord By His Death," 485.

⁹⁹ Charles Elsworth Putnam, *Modern Religio-Healing, Man Theories Or God's Word?* (Chicago: C.E. Putnam, 1924), 91, 121. For Putnam's visits to Bosworth's meetings (more than eight) and his conversation with Bosworth, see pp. 42, 155-156. Putnam specifically responded to Bosworth's tracts *For This Cause*, *Discerning the Lord's Body*, and *Do All Speak with Tongues?*. Putnam's book came out some time before July of 1924, see *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, 24, no. 11 (July 1924): 569. Bosworth's book was released around November. The first advertisement for the book was in *National Labor Tribune*, November 20, 1924, 3. See also "Bosworth Party Starts Old Time Gospel Revival," *National Labor Tribune*, August 21, 1924, 4.

¹⁰⁰ Putnam, *Modern Religio-Healing*, 6.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 35. See also p. 133.

¹⁰² Ibid., 94.

impossible,” Putnam pounced on what he believed was a contradiction: “it would be utterly impossible for any saved person (for all such must have a ‘living faith’) to have a disease.”¹⁰³ For Putnam, Bosworth’s teaching implied that believers should never be sick, and failures in healing would cause sufferers to doubt their salvation.¹⁰⁴

The notion of a multifaceted gospel—whether called a “full gospel,” a “fourfold gospel” or a “double gospel”—was silly to Putnam. Healing was a witness to the gospel, which meant it could not be an essential part, since “evidence and the fact proven...cannot be one and the same.”¹⁰⁵ Interestingly, Putnam’s belief in gospel as atonement for sin *only*—which relegated healing to “evidence”—was not supported by a strict dispensationalism, but by amassing scriptures.¹⁰⁶ Putnam’s concern was not cessation of miracles and sign-gifts¹⁰⁷ or whether healing was in the atonement, as such. Bosworth’s error was rather timing. Salvation from sin was “present tense,” but all other “salvation from the results of sin,” were “yet future.”¹⁰⁸ Putnam also decried Bosworth’s

¹⁰³ Ibid., 123, cf. 98.

¹⁰⁴“How could any sick one now receive forgiveness of sins, and not receive healing of the body...if they are given exactly on the same basis?” Ibid., 98. For doubting salvation, see Ibid., 101–102, 127. In this he misunderstood Bosworth, who made a distinction between faith for salvation and faith for healing. One type of “living faith” was not sufficient for both benefits, although both benefits were provided in the atonement. In other words, Bosworth’s “double gospel” required double faith. See Bosworth, *For This Cause*, 17. In his defense of divine healing, T.J. McCrossan argued that the key verb “discern” in “discern the Lord’s body” marked this double faith: to discern Christ’s blood was to obtain forgiveness, and to discern Christ’s body was to obtain healing. T.J. McCrossan, *Bodily Healing and the Atonement* (Seattle, WA: McCrossan, 1930), 73–75.

¹⁰⁵ Putnam, *Modern Religio-Healing*, 154.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 106–108.

¹⁰⁷ His theology could be described as a soft cessationism: “If we were to see some of them...exhibiting publicly real and unusual manifestations of complete immediate, Apostolic healing power, such as was manifested through the Apostles during the formation of the infant-church, before the New Testament was given, it would be evidence that God is again pleased to thus confirm His Word, spoken by true and Scripturally harmonious Bible teachers and preachers.” Ibid., 135.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 52.

methods. The teaching that “God’s power...will flow from our hearts, through our bodies, and heal,” sounded to Putman “like Spiritism and Demonology.”¹⁰⁹ His tactics also led to insincere conversions,¹¹⁰ and from Putnam’s Reformed perspective, Bosworth’s many vague “conditions” were a confusion of law and grace.¹¹¹

Response from the Bosworth Camp

Bosworth was aware of his fundamentalist opponents. In March of 1922, after reading Gaebelein’s attack in *Moody Monthly*, Bosworth stormed the Chicago editorial offices, pleading for vindication. Despite Bosworth’s protestations, the editor James Gray was unswayed. Nevertheless, Gray was impressed by Bosworth, who was willing to consent to investigations undertaken “in the right spirit.” The paper pledged one hundred dollars toward the work of a proper investigation, hoping a total of one thousand dollars could be raised. Sadly, nothing came of this challenge.¹¹² Bosworth also responded from the pulpit to Bingham’s criticisms in Miami in 1922.¹¹³ Although Bosworth avoided

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 123.

¹¹⁰ Bosworth was “holding up hopes of physical healing in this dispensation as an inducement to move people to accept Jesus as their Saviour.” Ibid., 150. See also p. 136.

¹¹¹ “Has God ordained a ‘law for salvation of the soul’? Are we saved by ‘law’ or by ‘grace’?” Ibid., 94. Beginning in Atlanta in 1923, Bosworth required those who wanted prayer for healing to fill out a nine-point questionnaire. These “conditions” may have been made official as a response to Putnam, who had spoken with Bosworth at length in Chicago a few weeks earlier. See May Wyburn Fitch, “Bosworth Campaign in Atlanta,” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 28 (September 8, 1923): 450; Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, 105.

¹¹² “A Visit From Evangelist F.F. Bosworth,” *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 10 (June 1922): 1053. For the moderate stance on divine healing of Gray and Moody Bible Institute, see Baer, “Perfectly Empowered Bodies,” 314. Still, Gray endorsed Gaebelein’s *The Healing Question*. See “Encouraging Endorsements,” *Our Hope* 32, no. 7 (January 1926): 401. The editor announced that the challenge went unmet in “Evangelism and Bodily Healing,” *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 24, no. 12 (August 1924): 593.

¹¹³ “Where the Drys and Wets May Quaff a Draught,” 3.

naming names, he went on to refute Bingham in *Christ the Healer*.¹¹⁴ Bosworth probably foresaw a published attack from Putnam after their conversation in 1923.¹¹⁵

Bosworth's supporters also came to his defense. Kenneth MacKenzie refuted Haldeman's pamphlet in *National Labor Tribune*. While Haldeman was disturbed by Bosworth's syllogism that atonement for sin included immediate redemption from sin's consequences, MacKenzie was worried that Haldeman "totally divorced" what God had joined. Perhaps in spite of himself, MacKenzie's reply was a plea for toleration rather than a strong defense. He admitted that he was won over by Haldeman's argument on Isaiah 53:4 and rather than press Bosworth's message of universal healing, he pleaded for Haldeman to "leave this to the personal dealing of the Lord with His child."¹¹⁶

Bosworth's response to Haldeman was more direct. He called out the "prominent New York minister" in his sermon "Why All Are Not Healed" and in his "thirty-one questions," which appeared in the weeks after Bosworth finished his work in Brooklyn in 1923.¹¹⁷ Repeating these arguments in *Christ the Healer*, Bosworth called Haldeman's

¹¹⁴ The "Canadian writer," wrote Bosworth, has "no argument at all." Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, 19. Cf. Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, 55.

¹¹⁵ At least Perkins was aware of Putnam's book. Eunice May Perkins, *Fred Francis Bosworth (the Joybringer)* (River Forest, IL: F.F. Bosworth, 1927), 217.

¹¹⁶ Kenneth Mackenzie, "Rev. Kenneth MacKenzie Replies to the Attack Made Upon Evangelist Fred Francis Bosworth by Rev. I.M. Haldeman, D.D.," *National Labor Tribune*, July 5, 1923, 3. While MacKenzie seemed to leave room for mystery concerning how faith for healing was given or attained, Bosworth bemoaned that "If it is God's will to heal only some of those who need healing, then no one has any basis for faith without a special revelation." "Revival Prayer Heal Injuries, Pair Assert," *National Labor Tribune*, October 2, 1924, 4.

¹¹⁷ These thirty-one questions began as twenty-six in the Bridgeport campaign. See Lewis J. Long, "Evangelistic Campaign in Bridgeport Was of Estimable Value," *National Labor Tribune*, April 26, 1923, 3. Bosworth's questions as they were preached at Bridgeport (January-February) do not contain any reference to the New York minister (Haldeman) who disputed Bosworth's interpretation of Paul's "thorn." Such responses were added in the expanded version that appeared in the Toronto campaign, which directly followed the Brooklyn campaign. Bosworth quoted Haldeman as referring to the "unspeakable puss, unspeakable looking matter running down over [Paul's] face." (*National Labor Tribune*, July 19, 1923, 5) This exact wording is not in the published versions of Haldeman's critique, but probably came "from a

treatment of Paul's sickness an "absurd exposition" and also defended himself against Haldeman's and Bingham's critique centering on Isaiah 53.¹¹⁸ Bosworth's confident rebuttal of the extreme fundamentalist position challenges the common notion that pentecostals shamelessly begged for a seat at the fundamentalist table.¹¹⁹

The Question of R.A. Torrey

Gerald King suggests that Bosworth's publication of *Christ the Healer* was spurred by three developments: growing demand from his followers for clear published exposition on divine healing, the success of the May 1924 Ottawa campaign, and the appearance of R.A. Torrey's *Divine Healing: Does God Perform Miracles Today?*¹²⁰ On the first two points, King is correct.¹²¹ But the impact of Torrey's book is less certain.

stenographic report of a sermon" Haldeman preached before he published his tract. See Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, 116. Many of Bosworth's other quotes in *Christ the Healer* against this New York minister are found verbatim in Haldeman's pamphlet, leaving little doubt that Haldeman was the "prominent New York minister" Bosworth had been debating since April of 1923.

¹¹⁸ Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, 116. According to Bosworth, Christ "not only healed disease before Calvary, but he also forgave sins, and yet both of these mercies were bestowed on the ground of the Atonement yet future." *Ibid.*, 19.

¹¹⁹ George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 94; Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1992), 149.

¹²⁰ King, *Disfellowshipped*, 99.

¹²¹ Bosworth indicated clearly that his book was published "in response to urgent requests" from those who had been blessed by his ministry. Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, preface, n.p. In July of 1924, Bosworth began publishing a "circular letter" in *National Labor Tribune* and *Alliance Weekly* summarizing key points of his teaching in response to "many inquirers who attend the meetings," indicating the growing demand for teaching from his followers. "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks," *National Labor Tribune*, July 24, 1924, 3; "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks," *National Labor Tribune*, July 31, 1924, 4; "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks," *National Labor Tribune*, August 7, 1924, 4; "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks," *National Labor Tribune*, August 14, 1924, 4; F.F. Bosworth, "How To Appropriate the Redemptive and Covenant Blessing of Bodily Healing," *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 23 (December 6, 1924): 397, 401. In October, Bosworth preached a sermon series on "Christ the Healer," suggesting that his book was completed or near completion. "Seasons of Refreshing from the Presence of the Lord? At Last Baptismal Service Bosworth Tabernacle," *National Labor Tribune*, October 23, 1924, 4.

Torrey never named Bosworth, although he did glibly dismiss Bosworth's teaching on the Lord's Supper.¹²² Bosworth surely felt the sting of this oblique censure, but rather than taking on the revered fundamentalist, he approvingly cited Torrey's book in June of 1924, agreeing with Torrey that "the greatest danger lies in the substitution of mental for spiritual process."¹²³ Bosworth quoted Torrey again in *Christ the Healer*, noting that they agreed on the basic premise of healing in the atonement.¹²⁴ Bosworth did not wish to see Torrey as an opponent, and he did not intend for his book to be a response to Torrey.¹²⁵

An unwarranted focus on Torrey risks obscuring the long-term development of Bosworth's thought. Bosworth had begun developing many of the key themes of the book long before it was published. As early as May of 1922, he was preaching systematically on "Why Some Fail to Get Healed."¹²⁶ Later that year, Bosworth introduced his

¹²² "We have not gone into a consideration of such weird, fantastic and—to a careful Bible scholar—ludicrously impossible and really blasphemous interpretations as that the bread in the Lord's Supper is for the healing of the body, and the wine for the healing of the soul." R. A. Torrey, *Divine Healing; Does God Perform Miracles Today?* (1924; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1974), 5–6.

¹²³ "One of America's Leading Exponents of Prayer and Faith Astounds Tremendous Crowds," *National Labor Tribune*, June 26, 1924, 4. Bosworth paraphrased Torrey, who wrote, "Here lies one of the saddest and most dangerous errors of the day on this whole subject of Divine healing, substituting man's faith for God's power, substituting a mental process for the work of the Holy Spirit on the body." The context for this quote was not Bosworth's brand of divine healing, but Mind Cure, Christian Science, and Couism. Torrey, *Divine Healing*, 29. Bosworth also recommended Torrey's *The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit* in his campaigns. See *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 47 (January 19, 1924): 766.

¹²⁴ Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, 29. Cf. Torrey, *Divine Healing*, 45. Here Bosworth cited Torrey very selectively, choosing not to include Torrey's next sentence, which directly challenged the immediate availability of the healing secured by Christ's sacrifice. Bosworth also cited Torrey's book approvingly in F.F. Bosworth, "The Lame Man at Lystra," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 6 (June 1930): 2.

¹²⁵ Kenneth MacKenzie, ever Bosworth's ally, reviewed Torrey's book in *Alliance Weekly*. Not surprisingly, he was distraught by Torrey's flippant write-off of healing in the sacrament. On the whole, MacKenzie faulted Torrey for lack of sympathy, hope, and constructiveness. It pained MacKenzie to have to disagree with one as revered as Torrey, and MacKenzie sighed, "We could cordially wish that he have never put forth this volume." Kenneth Mackenzie, "Book Reviews: Dr. Torrey's 'Divine Healing,'" *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 17 (October 25, 1924): 276.

¹²⁶ "Syracuse Revival: Episcopal Church Awakes, Pray and Expect Answer, Cut Out 'If Thy Will Be Done,' Pray for Sick and Watch," *National Labor Tribune*, June 1, 1922, 3.

“covenantal names of God” approach, an elaboration on an insight in the Scofield Reference Bible.¹²⁷ Bosworth’s “thirty-one questions,” were intended as a “challenge” to “various criticisms” and were extended specifically to refute Haldeman.¹²⁸

Impact of Christ the Healer

Once *Christ the Healer* was released, it began contributing in its own way to Bosworth’s supernatural ministry. Numerous testimonies echoed the man from Indianapolis who wrote, “By the time I finished the book I was sound and well.”¹²⁹ Simplicity was probably the book’s greatest virtue. May Cole, who had assisted Bosworth in his writing, wanted readers to know how “logical” his exposition was.¹³⁰ This had been Bosworth’s trademark since Eunice Perkins, who wrote Bosworth’s biography after first reporting on his meetings in Detroit in 1921, called Bosworth’s message “the acme of simplicity.”¹³¹ As one testimony put it, Bosworth’s book “made it

¹²⁷ “Autos and Busses Crowd Boulevard for Bosworth Meetings in Beer Garden--Police Guard Meetings,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 12, 1922, 3; P.S. Campbell, “The Bosworth Campaign in the Alliance Tabernacle, Toronto,” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 15 (June 9, 1923): 247; Long, “Evangelistic Campaign in Bridgeport Was of Estimable Value,” 3.

¹²⁸ “Doctrine of Healing Is Promulgated,” *National Labor Tribune*, May 3, 1923, 3.

¹²⁹ *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 8 (August 1929): 12. See, for instance, “Suffered for Five Years,” *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 3 (March 1931): 15. One woman suffering from cross-eyes was instantly healed while reading the chapter on “The Lord’s Compassion.” “Bosworth Evangelistic Campaign, Indianapolis, Indiana,” *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 3 (January 17, 1925): 42. Another woman in Indianapolis determined to read the chapter on Paul’s thorn despite throat pain, testifying that she read it “without any discomfort whatsoever.” “Bosworth Begins in Scranton,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 18, 1925, 4. By reading *Christ the Healer*, a man from Fort Wayne, Indiana, was able to claim his healing when he came to three important revelations about divine healing: (1) “ABSOLUTELY that healing was in the atonement,” (2) that Paul’s thorn was not a physical ailment, and (3) that a major obstacle to his healing was praying “if it by Thy will.” *National Labor Tribune*, May 21, 1925, 4.

¹³⁰ M.A. Cole, “Claims Thousands Neglected Rare Opportunity,” *National Labor Tribune*, May 28, 1925, 4. Cole had known of Bosworth since reading about his 1912 beating in Texas. See May A. Cole, “The End Is Not Yet---More Healings Reported,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 19, 1924, 3.

¹³¹ Eunice M. Perkins, “Great Bosworth Campaign in Northwest Twin Cities Closed Monday After Unprecedented Success,” *National Labor Tribune*, April 7, 1921, 36. Perkins’s first report was

so plain that God wanted to heal me even more than I wanted healing.”¹³² Although wary of some of Bosworth’s methods, Alliance leader Oswald Smith praised *Christ the Healer*. “Its arguments are absolutely unanswerable,” said Smith. “It is doubtful if anything simpler or more practical has ever been published on the subject... There is absolutely no come back whatsoever.” Smith borrowed heavily from Bosworth for his own defense of divine healing in 1927, sometimes citing the evangelist, sometimes not.¹³³ The *Alliance Weekly* review was positive but also recognized that “many... do not go to the lengths Mr. Bosworth traces.” For both blessing and condemnation, said the reviewer, “Mr. Bosworth has been the cynosure of all eyes.”¹³⁴

One condemnation is particularly worth noting, for it came from one who had been very close to Bosworth. May Wyburn Fitch worked at the famous Water Street Mission in New York City with her husband for twenty years, but she became interested in Bosworth’s work during the Brooklyn campaign in the summer of 1922. May soon devoted herself full time to Bosworth’s campaigns, assisting with prayer ministry, singing, and reporting for *Alliance Weekly*.¹³⁵ In 1923 May married Bosworth’s campaign

Eunice M. Perkins, “Bosworth’s Shaking Detroit with Monster Evangelistic Meetings; Crowds Bring Sick,” *National Labor Tribune*, January 13, 1921.

¹³² *Exploits of Faith*, 2, no. 2 (February 1929): 15.

¹³³ Oswald J. Smith, *The Great Physician* (Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1927). Quote on p. 21. Oswald took over Bosworth’s redemptive names argument (pp. 30-32) and Bosworth’s list of “conditions” for healing (pp. 86-94) without attribution.

¹³⁴ “Book Reviews,” *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 21 (May 23, 1925): 346. *Christ the Healer* was first advertised in *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 4 (January 24, 1925): 64.

¹³⁵ Wyburn Fitch, “Bosworth Campaign in Atlanta”; May Wyburn Fitch, “Williamsport Campaign,” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 47 (January 19, 1924): 760.

manager C.C. Fitch in Bosworth's home.¹³⁶ Fitch could not see the irony when, that same year, she praised Bosworth for "all absence of bitterness toward his critics (and they are legion)."¹³⁷ Fitch began to have increasing doubts about the way Bosworth interpreted scripture and the effects of his teachings. An acquaintance of hers testified to healing of diabetes in the Brooklyn campaign. This woman had returned to a regular diet, encouraged by Bosworth's advice to disregard symptoms. But when a cut on her toe refused to heal and gangrene set in, her leg was amputated. Within four months of her "healing," May's acquaintance had died. She unequivocally blamed Bosworth.¹³⁸

Fitch's book was unique as an attack from one who had participated in and at one time fully supported Bosworth's ministry. As she said confidently, "I know whereof I speak."¹³⁹ But in addition to the personal nature of her attack, Fitch presented some concrete arguments. Fitch sided with Haldeman on whether Christ "fulfilled" Isaiah 53

¹³⁶ Eunice M. Perkins, "Bosworth's Farewell Meeting; Eunice M. Perkins Sends a Flash of Bosworth Bros. Gospel Revival," *National Labor Tribune*, January 5, 1922, 3. Fitch was ordained a few weeks later in Chicago. See "Private John Sproul Grips Chicago Folk with Testimony That Sinks into Doubters," *National Labor Tribune*, January 26, 1922, 3. C.C. Fitch was the brother of Elmer B. Fitch, pastor of the New York Gospel Tabernacle, the "mother church" of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. C.C. Fitch, "The Bosworth's Open a Strenuous Month's Campaign in Brooklyn, N.Y.," *National Labor Tribune*, August 10, 1922, 2. In a later account of the Water Street Mission, May made no reference to her work with Bosworth or her marriage to C.C. Fitch as related to her resignation from the mission. Susie May Patterson Wyburn, "*But, until Seventy Times Seven*": *Jeremiah, Samuel, John*, (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1936), 189–191. For May's work with Bosworth, see "Bosworth Campaign in Toronto," *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 9 (April 28, 1923): 151–152; Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, n.d., 12–15; "Mrs. Wyburn Quits McAuley Mission to Wed; Romance With Evangelist Started at Revival," *New York Times*, March 13, 1923. By mid-1925, C.C. Fitch had been replaced by Floyd Reeve as secretary of the Bosworth party. See "Bosworth Campaign in Scranton, Penna.," *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 31 (August 1, 1925): 535. But C.C. Fitch rejoined Bosworth by 1929.

¹³⁷ May Wyburn Fitch, "How Jerry Mc'Auley Mission Worker Sees Evangelist F.F. Bosworth," *National Labor Tribune*, September 20, 1923, 3.

¹³⁸ Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, n.d., 8–12.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 53. Although C.E. Putnam had been a supporter of A.B. Simpson, he gives no indication that he was intimately involved with the healing ministry like Fitch.

on the cross or amid the throng in Capernaum.¹⁴⁰ She believed Bosworth's contention that "community unbelief" could prevent healing contradicted his argument that God's will is always to heal.¹⁴¹ Bosworth's attack on the prayer grounded in "if it be thy will," was to Fitch both unscriptural and contrary to experience.¹⁴²

Fitch also critiqued Bosworth's methods. She believed the long list of "conditions" (which Fitch herself had advertised in *Alliance Weekly*) was taxing to seekers. If one used Jesus' ministry as a template, no simple formula guaranteed healing.¹⁴³ While healers argued that Jesus used miracles to draw crowds, Fitch pointed out that Jesus frequently urged silence on those healed.¹⁴⁴ Rather than faulting the parents if sick children were not healed, Fitch argued that Jesus blamed the disciples when they could not cure.¹⁴⁵ Fitch was cynical about Bosworth's evangelistic use of healing, saying that sinners "will do anything, and believe anything, to get healed."¹⁴⁶ Fitch's book was not the only rough handling of Bosworth after the publication of *Christ the Healer*, but hers was the most direct attack, and it continued to resonate with opponents of divine healing throughout the next decade.¹⁴⁷ She summarized the earlier arguments and quoted

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 18–24.

¹⁴¹ "How could He refuse to have compassion and show His mercy, by withholding healing from His believing children because some unbelievers were looking on?" Ibid., 42.

¹⁴² Ibid., 48–51.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 28–29, 36–37.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 46–47.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 47–48.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 62. See also p. 53. Fitch applied this to both repentance and baptism.

¹⁴⁷ Although undated, *Healing Delusion* was published between June 1927 and February 1928. See May Wyburn Fitch, "The Healing Delusion," *Our Hope* 33, no. 11 (May 1927): 688; Frank E. Gaebelein, "Book Reviews," *Our Hope* 34, no. 8 (February 1928): 512. For later use of Wyburn Fitch, see

Bosworth's book to demonstrate that the criticisms stood. With the additional force of her intimacy with Bosworth's work, her attack was scathing.

Recognizing the fundamentalist vitriol against Bosworth's theology and practice of divine healing should not obscure the fact that fundamentalists in the 1920s did not present a united front against divine healing. Some were even supporters, like John Roach Straton, and in a more guarded way, William B. Riley. As scholars have recently recognized, pentecostals (both denominational and independent) contributed in their own way to fundamentalism.¹⁴⁸ But for the militant anti-pentecostal force in fundamentalism, Bosworth was the enemy, and *Christ the Healer* was a product of this war.

Louis Entzminger, *The Modern "Divine Healing" Racket: Are Bible Miracles to Be Performed by the People of God Today?* (Houston: L. Entzminger, 1938), 43–45. Arno Gaebelein wrote the preface to Fitch's work and in 1925 published *The Healing Question*, again making Bosworth one of his primary targets. Gaebelein, *The Healing Question*, 8–9, 42, 86–87, 99–100, 107. Unfortunately, Gaebelein shows no evidence of familiarity with *Christ the Healer*, quoting rather from earlier tracts. *Ibid.*, 71–72. But he did get some additional jabs in, saying that Bosworth "has invented an additional 'strange teaching' as to faith healing," referring to Bosworth's teaching that the bread of Communion mediated bodily healing. Gaebelein called this teaching "more than unscriptural, it is wicked." *Ibid.*, 69, 72. He referred to his book as "the most needed book we have ever written." Arno Clemens Gaebelein, "A Divine Healing Suicide," *Our Hope* 32, no. 2 (August 1925): 82. As could be expected, Gaebelein's argument was steered by a dispensational-Reformed argument for the cessation of miracles. Gaebelein, *The Healing Question*, 33.

¹⁴⁸ W.B. Riley, *Divine Healing, Or, Does God Hear Prayer for the Sick?* (Minneapolis: L.W. Camp, n.d.); King, *Disfellowshipped*, 110, 114, 131–134; Matthew Avery Sutton, "'Between the Refrigerator and the Wildfire': Aimee Semple McPherson, Pentecostalism, and the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy," *Church History* 72, no. 1 (March 1, 2003): 159–88. The fundamentalist coalition that formed in 1942 as the National Association of Evangelicals welcomed pentecostals—a belated recognition of affinity. This organization could be said to demonstrate an evolution and new openness in fundamentalism, but it also made official what had been true for decades: some fundamentalists were open to pentecostal contributions, while others were vehemently opposed. Those fundamentalists who could not countenance cooperation with pentecostals remained committed to their rival organization, the American Council of Christian Churches. This organization should be seen as upholding the legacy of Gaebelein, while the NAE championed the cooperative spirit of Straton. In fact, one of the chief architects of the NAE, William Ayer, was pastor of Straton's Calvary Baptist Church in New York. Although King presents all this evidence, he still sees the NAE mainly as a sign of change in fundamentalist attitudes toward pentecostalism. King, *Disfellowshipped*, 198–200.

New Phase: Independent Evangelism, 1924-1932

Christ the Healer increased Bosworth's visibility and influence in full gospel circles. But over the next few years, he leaned toward a new phase of less official cooperation with the Alliance and eventually more meetings close to home in Chicago.

Bosworth went into the second half of 1924 strong. In late August he held a brief series of meetings in his old home town of nearby Zion City—where he was predictably challenged by Voliva.¹⁴⁹ In November, under the auspices of the Christian Laymen's Committee, he began work in Indianapolis, where he met A.W. Tozer, who would go on to become one of the most admired devotional writers of the century.¹⁵⁰ Over the next two years Bosworth worked in St. Petersburg, Florida, Indianapolis, Ottawa, St. Paul, Minnesota, in and around the coal regions of Pennsylvania, and Philadelphia.

Although attendance was still reported in the thousands, Bosworth's ministry showed signs of alteration by the end of 1925, and Bosworth more frequently returned to Chicago between campaigns for rest.¹⁵¹ Possibly due to new requirements that Alliance evangelists actively promote the organization and its publications, Bosworth did not renew his ministerial credentials in 1926.¹⁵² Both the *Alliance Weekly* and *National*

¹⁴⁹ The Zion City work was hosted by Grace Missionary Church. See "Bosworth Party Starts Old Time Gospel Revival," 4. For Voliva's opposition, see "Zion City Is Again Scene of Holy War," *Freeport Journal Standard*, August 29, 1924, 2. The testimony of Alexander F. Wilson, newspaper editor who was healed during these campaigns, is printed in *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 12 (December 1931): 7.

¹⁵⁰ *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 24 (December 13, 1924): 410; "Bosworth Meeting in Indianapolis," *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 26 (December 27, 1924): 450; *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 9 (February 28, 1925): 142. Lyle Dorsett makes much of Bosworth's influence on Tozer during this period, but Bosworth does not mention Tozer. See Lyle W. Dorsett, *A Passion for God: The Spiritual Journey of A.W. Tozer* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2008), 73–79.

¹⁵¹ "Bosworth Holds Wonderful Meetings in St. Paul--In East Next," *National Labor Tribune*, November 19, 1925, 7.

¹⁵² These new requirements were prompted by concern from leaders in the Central District (Bosworth's home district) over "evangelists who hold Alliance credentials, but whose methods do not

Labor Tribune abruptly ceased their coverage.¹⁵³ He filled the publicity gap with a new version of Perkins's biography and reliance upon local press.¹⁵⁴

More change came in late 1927, as his brother struck out on his own in Clarion, Pennsylvania, while F.F. returned to Lima and then Chicago, where he worked for five months in Paul Rader's Gospel Tabernacle.¹⁵⁵ Coinciding with the Chicago work—which Rader's periodical exulted “began...in a sweep of victory” in early 1928,¹⁵⁶ Bosworth took two other steps in redeveloping his publicity program. First, with Rader's guidance,

rightly represent our work and testimony.” The new resolutions also forbade district superintendents from issuing credentials to those who—like Bosworth—ministered outside the boundaries of their home district, referring that duty to the Board of Directors. *Twenty-Ninth Annual Report of the Christian and Missionary Alliance for the Year 1925* (New York, 1926), 189. The focus on Alliance publications may reflect the fact that Bosworth's *Christ the Healer* was self-published, which meant it did not go through the Alliance vetting process. According to Perkins, beginning with Reading, Pennsylvania, in November of 1925, Bosworth's meetings were “sponsored by an interdenominational honorary Committee of ministers and laymen rather than by any one church organization.” She alluded to “denominational limitations” as a factor in this move. Perkins, *Fred Francis Bosworth (the Joybringer)*, 196. Bosworth is listed again on the Alliance roster in 1931, but no other year from 1925 to 1947.

¹⁵³ “Great Audience Fills Tabernacle--Forced to Seek Larger Quarters,” *National Labor Tribune*, July 1, 1926, 7. After this story, Bosworth did not appear in the *Tribune* until March of 1927, which, aside from occasional reproductions of past testimonies, was Bosworth's last coverage in the paper. “Crowd of 9,000 Jam Bosworth Meetings for Record Sunday in DuBois,” *National Labor Tribune*, March 24, 1927, 7. For reproductions of testimonies, see *National Labor Tribune*, October 6, 1927, 7; October 13, 1927, 7; and October 20, 1927, 7. The paper decreased its coverage of religious topics in general and began to devote some space to the activities of the editor's daughter, the “girl evangelist” Mary Agnes Vitchestain. My search of *Alliance Weekly* yielded only two notices on Bosworth's activities from Philadelphia on: 61, no. 29 (July 17, 1926): 471 (Philadelphia); and 61, no. 45 (November 26, 1926): 735 (Camden, NJ).

¹⁵⁴ During the Altoona meetings in May of 1927, Eunice Perkins visited Bosworth in order to update the biography. “Regains Hearing After Anointing,” *Altoona Mirror*, May 26, 1927, 15. The *Altoona Mirror* also gave the summer 1927 meetings much positive coverage, which Bosworth acknowledged. “Bosworth Farewell Draws 10,000 People,” *Altoona Mirror*, July 26, 1927, 1, 16.

¹⁵⁵ For B.B.'s ongoing work, see *Alliance Weekly* 62, no. 42 (October 15, 1927): 687; *Alliance Weekly* 63, no. 5 (February 4, 1928): 79; *Alliance Weekly* 65, no. 24 (June 14, 1930): 381; *Alliance Weekly* 65, no. 38 (September 20, 1930): 617; *Alliance Weekly* 65, no. 51 (December 20, 1931): 833. See advertisement for B.B.'s work in *Altoona Mirror*, September 5, 1927, 6.

¹⁵⁶ “New Year's Tabernacle Camp Meeting,” *World-Wide Christian Courier* 3, no. 1 (January 1928): 5.

Bosworth began regularly preaching over the radio.¹⁵⁷ Second, he began publishing *Exploits of Faith*, a monthly paper covering the campaigns and including sermons, excerpts from *Christ the Healer*, a mix of contemporary and classic holiness and divine healing writings, and—of course—testimonies.

Perhaps because Bosworth was no longer affiliated with the Alliance, from mid-1928 on he mostly held meetings in new areas rather than making return trips. After meetings in Washington, D.C., and then Luke Rader's new tabernacle in Minneapolis, Bosworth answered an invitation to Anderson, Indiana, where C.C. Fitch made explicit that Bosworth's meetings were "independent and interdenominational."¹⁵⁸ Beginning in April of 1930, Bosworth held meetings close to home: Bloomington, Joliet, Blue Island, and then the Englewood neighborhood of Chicago. The meetings garnered much attention, but Bosworth no longer commanded crowds of many thousands as he had earlier. Nightly attendance was now commonly a little over 1,000.¹⁵⁹ Another sign of change was the "Bosworth Evangelistic Prayer League," which began in Joliet as prayer support for Bosworth's revivals.¹⁶⁰ This was also a way for Bosworth to stay in close

¹⁵⁷ Beginning with the Lima work in the fall of 1927, Bosworth was periodically assisted by Floyd B. Johnson, a radio veteran and former employee of Rader's Chicago Tabernacle. Floyd B. Johnson, "Bosworth Evangelistic Campaign, Lima, Ohio," *World-Wide Christian Courier* 2, no. 10 (October 1927): 13–14; "Fans to Hear Famed Evangelist Over WJBT," *Freeport Journal Standard*, January 6, 1928, 11. Rader had begun a weekly day-long Sunday broadcast over Chicago's WHT in 1925 and at this time was on WJBT. See Larry K. Eskridge, "Only Believe: Paul Rader and the Chicago Gospel Tabernacle, 1922-1933" (M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1985), 122, 140–141. Bosworth's services at the Chicago Tabernacle were regularly broadcast. See *Exploits of Faith* 2, no.3 (March 1929): 19.

¹⁵⁸ C.C. Fitch, "The Bosworth Meetings in Anderson, Indiana," *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 3 (March 1929): 10, 12. For Minneapolis, see C.C. Fitch, "The 1929 Campaign in 'The Twin Cities,'" *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 2 (February 1929): 6–8, 12.

¹⁵⁹ For example, 1,300 was touted as a good crowd in Englewood. "Crowds Swarming to Evangelistic Services on Lot," *Southtown Economist*, August 11, 1931.

¹⁶⁰ C.C. Fitch, "More 'Good News' from Joliet, Illinois, Meetings," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 10 (October 1930): 13. In a little over a month, this group numbered around 1,500. This organization formed

contact with his supporters. It worked; Joliet became the longest single engagement of Bosworth's career.¹⁶¹

During this period, Bosworth continued to claim well-publicized successes in healing. Dorothea Bradway had become a "helpless paralytic and cripple" after contracting the flu in 1918 followed by spinal meningitis. While her family prepared for her death, she attended Bosworth's meetings in Indianapolis in late 1924 and had *Christ the Healer* read to her. Eventually she was healed through the prayers of a personal worker who visited her home, and Bradway entered her own evangelistic ministry.¹⁶²

Ruth Pieper was healed in the 1928 Chicago meetings. Born without one ear drum and with the other surgically removed, Pieper also suffered from a curved spine that required a body cast. As Bosworth prayed, she heard "a crackling sound" and could soon hear. Her back pain also stopped immediately. Greatest of all was the sense of purpose her healings bestowed. "Before my healing life seemed useless to me," said Pieper, "but now it seems like I have been born again into a new life and a new world." Her testimony included a surgeon's verification, and her story was covered by the *Chicago Daily News*, which ran a stirring picture of the 17-year-old beauty using the telephone for the first time.¹⁶³

almost simultaneously with Raymond Richey's "Richey Evangelistic Association." Who influenced whom on this is not apparent. Foxworth, "Raymond T. Richey," 156.

¹⁶¹ Bosworth ministered for seven months (with two daily radio broadcasts over WKBB as well) before finally taking a vacation in Atlantic City, only to resume the meetings for another two weeks before closing them permanently. Luke Rader took charge of the meetings for a time in Bosworth's absence. C.C. Fitch, "Report of the Joliet, Ills., Campaign," *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 3 (March 1931): 9–10; C.C. Fitch, "Report of the Joliet, Ills., Campaign," *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 4 (April 1931): 6–13.

¹⁶² C.C. Fitch, "Bloomington, (Ills.) Campaign Began on Easter Sunday," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 5 (May 1930): 7; Dorothea Ann Bradway, "Dorothea Ann Bradway's Miraculous, Instantaneous Healing," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 6 (June 1930): 12–14.

¹⁶³ "Healed of Total Deafness, Running Ear and Curvature of the Spine," *Exploits of Faith*, Special Healing Number, n.d., 23–26. Quotes on pp. 25 and 26. See also Fitch, "Bloomington, (Ills.)

Bosworth also continued to meet opposition, a reliable sign of ongoing success. In Scranton, Methodist F.E. Lott opposed Bosworth from a modernist perspective, arguing that belief in healing was better fitted to earlier, superstitious eras.¹⁶⁴ In Corpus Christi, an evangelist denounced Bosworth's teaching on healing and spirit-baptism.¹⁶⁵ Another minister attacked Bosworth during the Blue Island campaign, distributing a circular decked with skull and cross-bones and classing Bosworth with cults.¹⁶⁶

Bosworth continued to reply to his critics, in some cases simply presenting the truth as fully as he saw it.¹⁶⁷ Other times he was less gentle. Bosworth told Lott that "the time spent in studying the history of talismans, amulets, charms, powder made from baking live toads, etc., if given to the study of scriptures on the subject of Divine healing ... will convince our brother that healing is an essential element of the gospel." When Lott suggested Bosworth leave Scranton, Bosworth replied wryly that, "it was Lot who ran from Sodom, not Abraham."¹⁶⁸ Bosworth told the opposing minister in Blue Island that he was "ignorant," and on those grounds Bosworth brushed off any open debate.¹⁶⁹

Campaign Began on Easter Sunday," 6; "Deaf Six Years, Faith Cures Her," *Chicago Daily News*, March 28, 1928, 5.

¹⁶⁴ "Most Healers in Show Business, Says Rev. Lott," *National Labor Tribune*, August 13, 1925, 4.

¹⁶⁵ "Balmy Weather in Corpus Christi, Texas As the Meetings Close," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 4 (April 1930): 8.

¹⁶⁶ "Opening of Blue Island (Ills.) Campaign," *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 6 (June 1931): 6–9.

¹⁶⁷ Bosworth responded to this "virulent attack" in Corpus Christi by preaching and publishing in fullest form to date a sermon arguing that the age of miracles had not ended. "Houston Meetings Close; Bosworth Party Opens at Corpus Christi," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 3 (March 1930): 11; F.F. Bosworth, "Did the Age of Miracles Ever End?," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 3 (March 1930): 1–5.

¹⁶⁸ "3000 Hear Bosworth Reply to Dr. Lott," *National Labor Tribune*, September 3, 1925, 4. For "Lot...Abraham," see "Defy Unscriptural—But Is Willing to Have Dr. Lott Pick Out Any Healed," *National Labor Tribune*, December 17, 1925, 7.

¹⁶⁹ "Opening of Blue Island (Ills.) Campaign," 8, 9.

Methods, Means, and Message: Bosworth as a Healing Revivalist

Through the course of over a decade of almost constant evangelistic campaigns, Bosworth became a polished revivalist. As the *National Labor Tribune* put it, whether Bosworth held meetings in auditoriums, tents, or newly-built tabernacles, he was “spiritually capitalizing his forces and the King’s business is to be pushed with a zeal that will emulate, aye, probably even rival, the modern business methods.”¹⁷⁰ A report of the Toledo meetings describes the preparations that contributed to Bosworth’s success:

A chain of twenty-six county papers, by means of advertisements and write-ups, conveyed the news to a multitude of people in the towns and [indecipherable] surrounding Toledo. Some twenty automobiles bore large banners and announced the meetings as they moved about the city. Trolley cars bore [indecipherable] cards. Arrangements had been made with the city newspapers, all of which had [run?] items before the campaign started. Two of them had news articles every day during the services.¹⁷¹

Bosworth was willing to use whatever tools were effective in spreading his message. The *Anderson (Ind.) Herald* set aside three pages for Bosworth’s advertisements and increased its circulation by 50,000 for the meetings in the spring of 1929. The residents of Anderson even touted “I have been to the Bosworth meetings” bumper stickers.¹⁷² Music was always central, and around September of 1921 Bosworth released *Revival Flame*, which included many of the holiness and higher life standards as well as four songs written by B.B. Bosworth.¹⁷³ In the Bloomington meetings in 1930, the Bosworth

¹⁷⁰ “A Combination of Spiritual Forces to Sweep New England,” *National Labor Tribune*, January 18, 1923, 3.

¹⁷¹ Fitch, “Bosworth Campaign in Toledo.” Similar preparations for the Toledo meetings are described in “Bosworth Meetings Now Under Way; No Sham Battle; Healing Taught,” *National Labor Tribune*, September 8, 1921, 2; “Toledo Gets a Shake; Bosworth’s Jolt City; Some Real Revival with All the Frills,” *National Labor Tribune*, September 15, 1921, 3.

¹⁷² Fitch, “The Bosworth Meetings in Anderson, Indiana,” 11, 12.

¹⁷³ “Bosworth Meetings Now Under Way; No Sham Battle; Healing Taught,” 2.

party engaged a bannered calliope (steam organ) to advertise around the city.¹⁷⁴ As radio became a more common feature of Bosworth's work, he would frequently advertise for a few days over the airwaves before beginning a new campaign.¹⁷⁵ Unlike some early fundamentalists who resisted the technology, Bosworth's crew believed that "radio is a mighty channel for the Gospel."¹⁷⁶ Despite Bosworth's use of all the modern means of publicity, the meetings—especially when held under a tent—had a nostalgic quality:

It reminds us of the good old campmeetin' days, years and years ago (!), when Dad would hitch up the old farm horses, and Mother would bundle us all into the big 'spring wagon,' with lunch enough to last a week.¹⁷⁷

Similarly, a newspaper advertisement for Bosworth's work in Chicago in 1928 combined modern nostalgia with ancient hope when it touted "Miracles of Grace bring Campmeeting Joys."¹⁷⁸ Newly-urbanized Americans yearned for reminders of their rural past, and ironically, the new style of urban evangelism delivered by Bosworth and others met this yearning.

Early in his work as a full-time evangelist, Bosworth settled into an effective preaching routine. His first main message at each new stop was some variation on "God's Plan for Successful Revival."¹⁷⁹ Bosworth generally preached once a week on divine healing, although he prayed with the sick at every service. He also nurtured excitement

¹⁷⁴ Fitch, "Bloomington, (Ills.) Campaign Began on Easter Sunday," 5–6.

¹⁷⁵ C.C. Fitch, "The Battle at Joliet, Illinois," *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 8 (August 1930): 15.

¹⁷⁶ Fitch, "The 1929 Campaign in 'The Twin Cities,'" 8. For the fundamentalist rejection of radio, see Eskridge, "Only Believe," 114–115.

¹⁷⁷ "Scranton Revival Opens on Ideal Day," *National Labor Tribune*, June 25, 1925, 4.

¹⁷⁸ *Chicago Daily News*, March 31, 1928, 22.

¹⁷⁹ "Reports of God's Working," *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 2 (March 26, 1921): 26; "St. Paul, Minn.," *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 1 (March 19, 1921): 14; "Bosworth Campaign, New York City," *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 25 (September 2, 1922): 394.

and faith through the practice of calling on those in the audience who had at any time been divinely healed to stand and briefly name their victories. Certainly all the infirm could see themselves in the list of nearly eighty ailments of which participants claimed healing.¹⁸⁰ He often closed his campaigns by telling his life story, which, audiences agreed, “reads like a romance.”¹⁸¹

In an age of proliferating evangelists, Bosworth had his own style and concerns. Unlike many urban revivalists of the Roaring Twenties, Bosworth did not preach against amusements or other vices, a contrast not lost on contemporaries.¹⁸² Neither did Bosworth denounce other churches. As A.S. Booth-Clibborn exulted, “His message is not of the negative but of the positive order.”¹⁸³ Many logistical details also set Bosworth apart. Rather than passing out dedication cards and using “personal workers” in the audience to urge the repentant to the altar¹⁸⁴—techniques made popular by Billy

¹⁸⁰ “Bosworth Campaign, New York City,” 394.

¹⁸¹ Bosworth stated that his practice was to end campaigns with his life story. “Bosworth Bros.: Farewell--Cure for the Blues,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 8, 1922, 3. For examples, see “Bosworth Campaign Services End Today,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 28, 1922, 22; “Bosworth Tells Story of Life and Pet Pony,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 30, 1922, 10; Perkins, “Great Bosworth Campaign in Northwest Twin Cities Closed Monday After Unprecedented Success,” 3; “Bosworth Farewell Service at Toledo in St. Paul’s Episcopal Church of Wondrous Magnitude and Unusual Interest,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 3, 1921, 3; “Bosworth’s Farewell Message; Large Audience Say Good-By; Services Very Impressive,” *National Labor Tribune*, December 8, 1921, 3; Eunice M. Perkins, “Bosworth’s Big Farewell; Arcadia Hall Jammed Far Beyond Anything in Church History of Detroit,” *National Labor Tribune*, February 24, 1921, 3. For “romance,” see Kenneth Mackenzie, “Are There Modern Miracles?,” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 31 (September 29, 1923): 493.

¹⁸² “Bosworth Campaign Services End Today,” 22. “The messages delivered are freighted with a divine power that grips the heart and, strange to say, the ‘holler,’ the ‘force,’ the ‘pounding’ and the drag which accompany the usual evangelistic meetings, even those held by Billy Sunday, are entirely left out.” Bosworth’s effectiveness, argued this reporter, was in his “smoothness and sweetness.” “Bosworth’s Big Meetings in Full Swing; Evangelist and Brother Thrill Great Audience,” *National Labor Tribune*, January 5, 1921.

¹⁸³ “A.S. Booth-Clibborn London Divine, Assisting Bosworth at Toledo, Ohio,” *National Labor Tribune*, September 22, 1921, 4.

¹⁸⁴ “Many Converts Crowd Forward,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 3, 1921, 3.

Sunday—Bosworth used private inquiry rooms to counsel converts and urged those who could to claim healing or salvation from their seats.¹⁸⁵ In the counseling work, Bosworth was ably assisted by his new wife, Florence Valentine, a graduate of the Alliance Missionary Institute in New York who had been helping with the campaigns and whom he had married in late 1922.¹⁸⁶

By 1923, possibly in response to criticisms that the “conditions” for healing were not always clear, Bosworth had systematized the process. A report of the Atlanta meetings indicated that those who wanted healing were required to attend an immediate inquiry meeting, where they were given cards on which to answer these questions:

1. Have you been born again?
2. Are you committing any known sin?
3. Are you living in obedience to God’s will?
4. Are you harboring an unforgiving spirit?
5. Have you any restitution to make, or any wrongs to right?
6. Do you spend some time each day in reading your Bible and in prayer?
7. Are you convinced that it is God’s will to heal you?
8. Is your faith based exclusively on the promise of God?
9. What is the nature of your sickness?

Bosworth took these questions quite seriously and insisted upon attendance at three meetings before praying with those seeking healing, which probably had the benefit of

¹⁸⁵ “New Revival to Open Today in Tabernacle,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 7, 1922, 36; “Evangelists Optimistic in Revival Here,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 14, 1922, 20. Bosworth frequently asked those who believed the truth of divine healing to pray for their healing before his sermon. “Bosworth’s Flint Evangelist Campaign in Full Blast; Tabernacle Too Small; People Turned Away,” *National Labor Tribune*, December 15, 1921, 3; “Many States Represented at Bosworth Meeting; Some Travel Long Way to Hear Healing Message,” April 20, 1922, 3. This was probably also a logistic maneuver to help reduce the number of those who crowded the platform for healing.

¹⁸⁶ For salvation inquiry, see “Bosworth Revival Campaign Starts in Sheraden Tabernacle,” 6. On the marriage, see *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 36 (November 18, 1922): 566; “Evangelist Fred Francis Bosworth Gone and Done It--He’s Married,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 22, 1922, 3; “Rice Throwing Clue to Wedding of Evangelist,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 9, 1922, 3.

boosting attendance.¹⁸⁷ This process may have also helped to screen the most likely cases to be healed or to appear to be healed, a technique that McPherson's critics frequently derided.¹⁸⁸ An image of success was important for the perpetuation of the work, and by 1924, those who came for prayer were expected to leave all "artificial means of locomotion" at the end of the platform.¹⁸⁹ The pressure to claim healing was intense.

Balancing a Double Gospel

Bosworth's ministry in the 1920s demonstrated the larger shift in the culture and popular theology of divine healing. No longer were extended periods of tarrying and wrestling for faith in the nourishing atmosphere of a "faith home" necessary. Healings now were more public, more immediate, and rather than being merely a means of empowering a believer to be a soul-winner, were themselves means of winning souls. Bosworth's 1920 "illumination" in Lima was his personal appropriation of this shift in understanding the process and purpose of divine healing. As one supporter put it, "the Lord meant [healings] to be a testimony which should bring soul-healing to many."¹⁹⁰ Of course, a balance was difficult to strike when, "More have been saved when the subject has been Healing than ...when nothing but Salvation has been proclaimed."¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁷ "Make the matter a subject of earnest prayer and heart-searching before you fill in the answers and come for prayer." Wyburn Fitch, "Bosworth Campaign in Atlanta."

¹⁸⁸ Gaebelein, *The Healing Question*, 88.

¹⁸⁹ "One of America's Leading Exponents of Prayer and Faith Astounds Tremendous Crowds," 4.

¹⁹⁰ Chapman, "'Times of Refreshing': The Bosworth Revival Campaign in Detroit," 361.

¹⁹¹ "Bosworth Campaign Stirs Toronto," 171. In the words of another account, "The subject of Divine Healing occupied the smallest part of Brother Bosworth's preaching, and yet it was noticeable that on the evenings when this subject was presented that a larger number responded to the call to come and be saved than at any other service." Chas. N. Van Arsdale, "The Sheridan Campaign," *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 44 (January 14, 1922): 698.

Supporters were nervous that healing could eclipse salvation in such settings. So they produced plenty of accounts of conversions wrought through the miraculous. In Lima, a woman's healing of goiter "put the husband under deep, pungent conviction," and later brought him to salvation. Another professed "infidel" was convicted when his brother, who had suffered tuberculosis for eighteen years, was miraculously healed.¹⁹² Nor was this a rare occurrence, for as Whiteside commented, "whole families were deeply convicted and brought to God through the healing of one member."¹⁹³

To combat the common perception that "real salvation is not being preached sufficiently in these meetings,"¹⁹⁴ many reports insisted that salvation takes priority to healing in both emphasis and the *via salutis*. An Alliance writer assured readers that "Bosworth emphasizes salvation and sanctification in their proper order."¹⁹⁵ A *National Labor Tribune* report stated that Bosworth urged "the necessity of soul salvation as a fundamental requirement to healing" and that "bodily healing [is]...conditional, of course, upon full salvation."¹⁹⁶ But as a critic pointed out, the logic for this was strained, suggesting that it was more for the sake of appearances than from any carefully wrought theology that salvation was often considered prerequisite for healing.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹² Miller, "A Revival of Divine Healing," 473.

¹⁹³ Whiteside, "An Apostolic Revival." This healing is also related Bosworth, "They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them," 8.

¹⁹⁴ "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Opens World's Greatest Religious Campaign; Bring the Sick," *National Labor Tribune*, June 23, 1921, 4.

¹⁹⁵ *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 6 (April 23, 1921): 93.

¹⁹⁶ "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Forced into Larger Hall," 7; *National Labor Tribune*, November 25, 1920, 3. Similar language is used in Perkins, "Detroit Druggists Doomed," 3; "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Opens World's Greatest Religious Campaign," 4.

¹⁹⁷ Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, n.d., 74.

Bosworth himself was equivocal, saying that healing “usually followed those who were perfectly saved and who had received the Witness of the Spirit.”¹⁹⁸ In the heat of debate, one Bosworth supporter admitted that “men, women and children have been healed who seemed to be as ignorant as a Hottentot as to God’s one and only plan of salvation.”¹⁹⁹ Secular papers, with no interest in a “properly ordered” evangelism, frankly noted that “the healing side of the work far overshadowed the strictly evangelistic character of the campaign.”²⁰⁰ In the end, Bosworth’s supporters were betrayed by their reporting. Many accounts would disclaim that the numbers of those converted, rededicated, or spirit-baptized “far outnumber those who have been healed,” and then fill the rest of the report with detailed accounts of healings.²⁰¹

The Culture of Divine Healing

Like most other healing evangelists, Bosworth decried any power of healing in himself. In his defense against the health inspector in Detroit, Bosworth declaimed, “I do not have the slightest idea that I could heal a flea.”²⁰² “We are not divine healers in any sense,” said Bosworth, “any more than those who preach salvation are divine saviors. We

¹⁹⁸ “Every Meeting Crowded with Maimed, Halt, Blind Seeking Divine Aid--Many Souls Saved,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 18, 1920, 3. Emphasis added. In a casual way Bosworth spoke of the “transforming work God is doing at these services in the *souls of sinners* and the *bodies of believers*.” Bosworth, “Readers of Tribune Request Prayer for Healing.” Emphasis added.

¹⁹⁹ “Want Health Inspector Inoculated,” 7.

²⁰⁰ “Appeal Made at Bosworth Rally for Money to Build Tabernacle,” *Ottawa Citizen*, May 19, 1924, 4.

²⁰¹ Chapman, “‘Times of Refreshing’: The Bosworth Revival Campaign in Detroit,” 361, 367.

²⁰² Vitchestain, “Bosworth’s Challenge Stands Unrefuted,” 7.

simply proclaim God's will."²⁰³ Bosworth at this point did not discuss healing as a gift, and only claimed to "show...the way by which those who believe can be healed."²⁰⁴ This theology led logically to the conclusion that failure to be healed was the believer's fault rather than God's. Healing did not come as quickly for Dorothea Bradway as she hoped, because, as she said, "there was some failure upon my part, not the Lord's."²⁰⁵

The most common healings dealt with restoration of bodily functions, but healings were not limited to physical infirmities. In Toledo, a woman troubled by "horrible visions and terrifying thoughts" as a result of "close communion with the Ouija board" was cured through Bosworth's prayers.²⁰⁶ In St. Petersburg, Florida, a man who had been a spiritualist medium was healed through what could be called an exorcism:

His demonic associates were reluctant to go, and for some time remained about the premises not only "rapping," but seemingly "pounding" upon the outside of the house, until in answer to the brother's prayer, they were completely routed and put to flight.²⁰⁷

As with Dowie, Bosworth's supporters considered deliverance from harmful habits equally valid as healings. In Joliet, thirty testified to being delivered from tobacco.²⁰⁸

²⁰³ "Miracles Still Are Performed, Bosworth Says," 10.

²⁰⁴ "Revivalists Not Healers," *National Labor Tribune*, September 15, 1921, 3. See also "Bosworth in Erie; No Fanaticism in His Manner; A Smile Always," *National Labor Tribune*, April 13, 1922, 6.

²⁰⁵ Fitch, "Bloomington, (Ills.) Campaign Began on Easter Sunday," 7; Bradway, "Dorothea Ann Bradway's Miraculous, Instantaneous Healing."

²⁰⁶ "Ouija Board Worries Maiden; Cured of Habit; Haunted No More," *National Labor Tribune*, September 22, 1921, 3.

²⁰⁷ "Bosworth Campaign in St. Petersburg, Florida," *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 9 (February 28, 1925): 143. Mysterious "rapping" was a phenomenon associated with spiritualism since the movement's genesis with the Fox Sisters in the late 1840s.

²⁰⁸ Fitch, "Report of the Joliet, Ills., Campaign," April 1931, 8. See also "Sinus Trouble Cured," *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 2 (February 1931): 9.

Bosworth's name was the draw for thousands. But the progress of the divine healing message relied heavily on networks of personal testimony and service. Three women testified in the pages of the *Alliance Weekly* to healing in connection with Bosworth's ministry. But their healings were also intimately connected to one another. In the Pittsburgh campaign in 1921, Mary Long was healed instantly of deafness and chronic pain. She then "asked the Lord to send me to some one who needed healing, that I might tell my story." Her friend Sadie Robinson immediately came to mind.

For over a year, Robinson had suffered from a "nervous breakdown of body and mind." Despite the care of doctors and a country hiatus, her husband feared she was near death. The day after she returned from her rustic outing, Long visited her, giving her testimony, praying with Robinson, and even mending her son's clothes and preparing a meal. Soon Long brought Robinson to Bosworth's services. She was healed immediately. Though she credited her healing to Bosworth's prayers, Long's continuing care made the difference. "Since [my healing] I have been attacked a few times," Robinson admitted, referring to a relapse or reappearance of symptoms. "Each time," Robinson continued, "the dear Lord has sent Sister Long to me and she has prayed for me and bless God, each time I have been healed." Robinson's neighbor, Mrs. Bigley, requested a visit from both women. Bigley had suffered from varicose veins, high blood pressure, and dropsy. The two women prayed with Bigley and counseled her. Within days she could walk, and soon her pains and blood pressure decreased. As Bigley's son witnessed all this, his heart softened, and he was saved and testified to his own healing of nervous disorders.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁹ "God Honors Faith in Bosworth Meetings," *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 5 (April 15, 1922): 75.

“My Physician Sent Me Here to Be Healed”

Bosworth did not encourage an *a priori* rejection of medical means.²¹⁰ According to Bingham, Bosworth “believes that God frequently directs to the use of means; and that those who are not willing to use natural means are not in an attitude where they can be Divinely healed.”²¹¹ The impotence of medical science was, however, a factor in most testimonies—if only because most had tried medicine first. “Bodily healing is not to be accomplished with finding fault with medical skill and surgical genius,” commented one supporter, “but patients seeking physical healing are mostly those who are far beyond the aid of medical science.”²¹² Reports abounded of “the awful tortures through which the patients have passed under the directions of physicians.”²¹³ Some had had “five operations” and others saw as many as “twenty-five doctors.”²¹⁴ But divine healing was about “what faith can do when drugs fail.”²¹⁵ Rather than being discouraged, this “last

²¹⁰ “Many times we need a physician diagnostically and for mechanical things such as setting arms, etc. I believe in them for hygienic reasons, to conserve laws of health.” Vitchestain, “Bosworth’s Challenge Stands Unrefuted,” 7. Bosworth’s attitude toward medicine was more confrontational in his later years. See F.F. Bosworth, “Hints Regarding Healing,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1776 (May 22, 1948): 13.

²¹¹ “The Bosworth Campaign in Toronto,” 200.

²¹² Perkins, “Bosworth’s Shaking Detroit,” 3.

²¹³ “Spiritual Healings at Gospel Tabernacle and Carnegie Hall Astound Multitude,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 11, 1920, 3.

²¹⁴ “Additional Testimonies to God’s Response to Faith,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 48 (February 26, 1921): 764; “Testimonies to Divine Healing from the Bosworth Meetings,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 45 (February 5, 1920): 716.

²¹⁵ “What Faith Can Do When Drugs Fail,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 15, 1925, 7. For instance, one woman who was healed in Bosworth’s meetings in Chicago in 1928 testified that “I had decided to quit medicine...but...I vomited and had such terrible pains that I sent to a physician for some pain tablets, and took them from four o’clock until ten in the evening, without much relief.” Six days later, she was healed in Bosworth’s meeting. *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 3 (March 1929): 18-19.

resort” mentality added drama to the testimonies.²¹⁶ Bosworth’s supporters also felt few scruples about having results verified by physicians.²¹⁷ Confirmation from physicians was not viewed as casting pearls before swine, but as setting a light on a hill. Apparently, physicians often recommended Bosworth’s meetings; many of the infirm claimed that “my physician sent me here to be healed.”²¹⁸ Even if only as a foil or expert witness, this participation from physicians was integral to the divine healing narrative.²¹⁹

This shift in relation to the medical profession was an early instance of the overall pentecostal development toward a less antagonistic stance toward medical means.²²⁰ In Bosworth’s case, it was probably also reflective of the socio-economic standing of his audience. As his work now centered on thriving urban industrial centers and was sponsored by the Alliance, the faithful tended to be those who had the means for medical help. Alice Baker, whose testimony to healing from lip cancer was repeated frequently in Bosworth’s meetings, claimed to have spent \$500 in one year on anesthetics and to have

²¹⁶ “Having thus failed to secure relief, the victims seek Divine healing, there being no other alternative and therein has been found perfect restoration.” “Spiritual Healings at Gospel Tabernacle and Carnegie Hall Astound Multitude,” 3.

²¹⁷ “Bosworth Campaign Stirs Toronto,” 171. See also “Marked Movements of God in Healing,” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 12 (June 4, 1921): 186; Bosworth, “They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them,” 8; “Testimony of Her Physician, Dr. C.A.D. Fairfield,” *National Labor Tribune*, July 5, 1923, 3.

²¹⁸ “Member of the House of Commons Joins in Bodily Healing Meetings,” 6. See also Perkins, “Bosworth’s Shaking Detroit”; “Crowds Turned Away from Carnegie Hall; Evangelist Bosworth Extends His Date,” *National Labor Tribune*, December 2, 1920, 5.

²¹⁹ This calls into question the argument that “physicians find themselves on the periphery of [Bosworth’s] thought.” Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing*, 225.

²²⁰ Joseph W. Williams, *Spirit Cure: A History of Pentecostal Healing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

consulted about fifty physicians.²²¹ A man in Pittsburgh testified to seeing nearly thirty doctors and spending \$750 before his healing of “nervous trouble.”²²²

Yet a mistrust of medicine remained. Rader’s comments to Daggett in the *Ladies’ Home Journal* succinctly show the mixed signals the Alliance delivered: “None of us [in the Alliance] has the least objection to the use of medicine. Only in my own family when anyone is ill there is but one doctor we will have. We run for the Great Physician.”²²³ Bosworth likewise asserted that “there is no ‘fully competent authority’ in the matter of diagnosis.”²²⁴ Trusting in remedies, therefore, was not sinful so much as “foolish.”²²⁵ Also, a class-based critique of medicine, lingering since the Thomsonian heyday, was always a useful tactic.²²⁶

Bosworth and other divine healers also indirectly challenged the clinical approach of medical science. As historian James Opp has recognized, physicians generally thought of illnesses as scientific cases awaiting a solution, while divine healers more deeply appreciated the holistic meaning of sickness and health—what Bosworth referred to as “the full gospel for the full man.” These opposing approaches are demonstrated in each camp’s use of photographic evidence. Physicians often showed X-rays and or headless

²²¹ “Testimony of Alice Baker,” 3.

²²² “Had Nervous Prostration; 28 Drs. in 21 Months; Went and Heard Bosworth; Prayed for Instantly Healed,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 17, 1921, 3.

²²³ Daggett, “Are There Modern Miracles?,” 165.

²²⁴ He was also happy to cite statistics to the effect that nearly fifty percent of autopsies reveal a misdiagnosis. “3000 Hear Bosworth Reply to Dr. Lott,” 4.

²²⁵ “Witnesses to the Power of God,” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 49 (March 5, 1921): 780.

²²⁶ Bosworth’s supporters reminded readers that while physicians and “fake quack doctors” dope the public and charge a fee, relief is “offered by this evangelist without money and without price.” “Spiritual Healings at Gospel Tabernacle and Carnegie Hall Astound Multitude.”

pictures isolating injured or diseased body parts, but divine healers published full-body photos that emphasized the complete restoration of individuals through healing.²²⁷ Along with Dorothea Bradway's testimony in *Exploits of Faith* appeared a "then and now" collage. Both pictures showed her full body, but the "then" photo had the paralytic girl immobile on her father's lap, while the "now" picture showed her standing on her own in heels, resolutely clutching her Bible. In a similar way, Edith Watt, a severely cross-eyed woman who has healed in Bosworth's meetings in Detroit in 1921, was photographed in *National Labor Tribune* with a headline that testified to her "beauty restored."²²⁸ Another series of photos in the *Tribune* documented the healing of "Little Ruth Bellin," who had been healed of a "lazy foot." In two "before" pictures, she was shown in devices representing her infirmity—first the plaster casts on her feet, and then traveling by wheelbarrow, illustrating her "life of torture" and "misery." But the "after" photo showed the girl standing on her own wearing a bright smile, as the caption read, "ready to romp and rollick."²²⁹ Such visual aids testified to the comprehensive body-and-soul gospel embraced by Bosworth's followers. As a Presbyterian pastor in Bridgeport, Connecticut, remarked, "In the teaching [of Bosworth] there burst in upon many of us a new light, a deeper insight into the meaning and efficacy of Calvary—of the sacredness of our bodies, of the beauty and power of life 'every whit whole.' ...[A] great Gospel in two parts."²³⁰

²²⁷ Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 187–195.

²²⁸ "Beauty Restored to Girl Robbed by Affliction," *National Labor Tribune*, February 17, 1921, 5.

²²⁹ Fred A. Bellin, "Little Ruth Bellin and Her Lazy Foot; Suffered in Miserable Plaster Paris Cast; More Operations Seemed Her Fate," *National Labor Tribune*, July 20, 1922, 3.

²³⁰ Henry A. Davenport, "Surely It Was Good to Have Been There," *National Labor Tribune*, March 22, 1923, 3.

Bosworth's message also challenged the epistemological value of symptoms. Bosworth taught that "we will miss healing if we allow our symptoms to hinder us from expecting what his Word promises." As one woman declared nearly a year after she was anointed by Bosworth, "All of my symptoms have not disappeared, but I regard them as 'lying vanities,' and praise God just the same, for I know I am healed in so many ways that I cannot fail to be entirely healed in every way."²³¹ In this way, Bosworth's message undercut a cornerstone of scientific-medical authority.

Bosworth's healing evangelism exhibited a limited recognition of medical science and did not evince the vituperation against medical means that had characterized Dowie's work or even the ambivalence of A.B. Simpson. In their appreciation for the "sacredness of our bodies," faith healing advocates were on the vanguard of later holistic medicine and demonstrated their crucial divergence from other forms of non-medical healing, like Christian Science, which rather than holding the body as sacred, denied its ultimate existence. At the same time, by rejecting the import of symptoms, Bosworth and his followers denied the ultimate claims of the scientific materialistic framework.

Non-fundamentalist Critique of Modernism

Full gospel advocates saw themselves as fighting the same war, on the same side, as the fundamentalists. But they also knew they wielded different weapons. Their mutual enemy was modernism in all its guises, encapsulated in the creed that God works through the mechanisms of history and humanity rather than by revelation and supernatural

²³¹ Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, 91; "Mother and Sons Have a Wonderful Story," *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 4 (April 1931): 15. "Lying vanities" was probably from Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, 102.

means.²³² But for Bosworth's supporters, the fundamentalist approach was distant and ineffectual: "What does it profit us to meditate on how Jesus healed the sick nineteen hundred years ago if he does not heal us today?"²³³ Rather than the intellectual appeal to historical veracity, supporters pointed to the supernatural in their midst to refute modernism.²³⁴ They argued that "to combat the rising tide of apostasy and encroaches of atheism, God is today restoring the gifts of the Holy Spirit and, by mighty signs and wonders, proving that the Bible is true."²³⁵ Proving the Bible was, after all, the ultimate concern for fundamentalists. Those on both sides of the debate recognized that the supernaturalists eclipsed the fundamentalists in their "literal" approach to scripture.²³⁶ Clifton Fowler, dean of the Denver Bible Institute and outspoken critic of McPherson, wrote that "Once let the protective lines of the dispensational divisions be broken down, and we have departed from God's Word and are at the mercy of the fanatical hordes that are howling for the Bosworthian-McPhersonistic promiscuous divine healing and tongues

²³² The dichotomy between God and "human means" that led some to reject medicine was fueled in part by the conservative rejection of the overly-immanent God of modernists. Putnam, *Modern Religio-Healing*, 64.

²³³ "Chicago's Visitation of Miracles of Healing," 15.

²³⁴ "People have turned away from theoretic religion and are now seeking a religion with manifestations of Holy Ghost power." "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Opens World's Greatest Religious Campaign," 4.

²³⁵ "Chicago's Visitation of Miracles of Healing," 15. Supporters saw Bosworth's ministry as the place where "God's word will be put to the test." "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Opens World's Greatest Religious Campaign," 4. Also: "To many it seems like a new Gospel, but they find it in the old book and learn that God is simply verifying His own word to save and heal in the name of his Son, Jesus Christ." Eunice M. Perkins, "Detroit Hall Too Small; Seeking Larger Quarters; Men from Workshops Turn out in Numbers," *National Labor Tribune*, January 20, 1921, 3.

²³⁶ In the first edition of his book, Bingham accosted divine healing advocates for their "too literal construction." Rowland V. Bingham, *The Bible and the Body, Or, Healing in the Scriptures* (Toronto: Evangelical Publishers, 1921), 45. For the divine healing literalism contra the fundamentalists, see B.C. Miller, "The Fundamentalist and Divine Healing," *Golden Grain* 1, no. 5 (July 1926): 5-8; Smith, *The Great Physician*, 41-42.

fiasco.”²³⁷ Fundamentalists perceived the vital connection between dispensationalism and their defense against all forms of the supernatural gospel.

Still, the appeal to the supernatural had limited support in many pockets of evangelical Christianity in the 1920s. Bosworth often touted the 1920 Episcopal Commission on Spiritual Healing, which recognized that “healing of the body is an essential element of the gospel.”²³⁸ Alliance writers like Kenneth Mackenzie, who was himself an Episcopal priest (at this time the Alliance was not considered an exclusive denomination), began to think more deeply about the continuities between Anglican and Alliance approaches to healing. Mackenzie found this continuity in Bosworth’s argument for the sacramental power of Holy Communion—that recognizing that Christ’s body was “broken for their healing” “will bring deliverance from our diseases.”²³⁹ Mackenzie noted that, “a memorial only, does not satisfy [Anglicans]...it has a sacramental import which extends to the existing needs of the worshipper, spiritual or otherwise.”²⁴⁰ For Mackenzie, although the Anglican Church had “fallen below the standard” of its liturgy, “the truth has been embalmed all through the centuries,

that the body of the believer as well as his spiritual nature was designed to be a recipient of the correlated results of the crucifixion of our Lord; and that...He

²³⁷ Clifton L. Fowler, “Anti-Dispensationalism,” *Grace and Truth* 6, no. 11 (November 1928): 329.

²³⁸ Bosworth was particularly pleased with the document’s stance against “the faith-destroying, qualifying phrase ‘If it be thy will,’” and repeated this endorsement “almost nightly.” “Syracuse Revival: Episcopal Church Awakes, Pray and Expect Answer, Cut Out ‘If Thy Will Be Done,’ Pray for Sick and Watch,” 3; Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, n.d., 48. Bosworth voiced his approval of Anglican healers Hickson, Charles H. Brent, and others. “Interest Intense at the Great Bosworth’s Big Tent Revival,” *National Labor Tribune*, August 31, 1922, 3.

²³⁹ Kenneth Mackenzie, “Jesus and Our Mortal Flesh,” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 9 (May 13, 1922): 132–133.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 132.

designed it to be a vitalizing force in the lives of those who...should receive it worthily.²⁴¹

Hopeful to ground the Alliance position in traditional Reformation thought to resist modernism, Mackenzie affirmed that “Mr. Bosworth emphasizes what the Church of England has ever stressed” and urged fellow Alliance members “to make of the Holy Communion a fuller medium for the conferment of life for our bodies.”²⁴²

The Full Gospel and the Problem of Categorization

As with many successful evangelists, Bosworth did not fit neatly into one denomination or religious category. He continued to bear the stamp of pentecostal spirituality and to be admired in pentecostal circles while working outside the bounds of their denominations. Although affiliated with the Alliance for much of this time, ambivalence over Bosworth’s supernaturalism made this relationship tense.

Bosworth and Pentecostalism in the 1920s

On the whole, pentecostals agreed with T.B. Barratt, who, with Bosworth in mind, said that those who reject the tongues evidence doctrine “either *never joined* the Pentecostal Revival, or they have *placed themselves* outside the whole revival and its teaching.”²⁴³ But in reality, Bosworth’s break from pentecostalism was not so clear.

Some pentecostals admired Bosworth from a distance:

From the north, from the south, from the east, and from the west comes reports of revivals. Pentecostal revivals with signs following...F.F. Bosworth, who used to

²⁴¹ Ibid., 133.

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ Thomas B. Barratt, *Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Fire: What Is the Scriptural Evidence?* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.), 8. Emphasis in original.

be connected with Pentecost, has been conducting wonderful revival services where many hundreds have been saved and many [experienced] wonderful healings.²⁴⁴

Others were less equivocal. A 1921 report on Bosworth's meetings in *Pentecostal Evangel* happily noted that—according to Bosworth's own account—many who were baptized in the Spirit “broke out speaking in tongues.” Bosworth's work was an occasion to marvel that tongues was “the one generally accepted evidence that one has reached the place where the whole being, *mind and all*, has been brought under the dominion of the Spirit.” Denominational pentecostals sanctioned their embrace of non-dogmatic pentecostals like Bosworth by suggesting that his results confirmed their dogma.²⁴⁵

Pentecostal papers gave Bosworth intermittent coverage throughout the decade. Independent pentecostals associated with A.E. Humbard's loose Church of God read reports of Bosworth's work in the early 1920s.²⁴⁶ In 1921 and 1922, the *Latter Rain Evangel* published Bosworth's sermons and testimonies from his meetings, as did the *Bridegroom's Messenger* of Atlanta and *Word and Work*, a pentecostal paper billed as a “nonsectarian undenominational.”²⁴⁷ The *Pentecostal Evangel* related a testimony of a woman who was healed of gallstones during the Allentown campaign in 1926.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁴ “Revival Fires,” *Bridegroom's Messenger* 14, no. 227 (February 1921): 1.

²⁴⁵ “The Bosworth Meetings,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 386–87 (April 2, 1921): 7. Emphasis in original. On the apology for the tongues evidence doctrine based on “subjection of the mind,” see chapter four.

²⁴⁶ “Evangelist Bosworth's Great Meeting at Lima, Ohio,” *Word and Witness*, (Pangburn, Arkansas), 3, no. 2 (January 15, 1922): 1, 3; F.F. Bosworth, “Do All Speak with Tongues?,” *Word and Witness*, (Pangburn, Arkansas), 3, no. 2 (January 15, 1922): 1, 4; F.F. Bosworth, “Brother Bosworth's Minneapolis and St. Paul Meetings,” *Word and Witness*, (Pangburn, Arkansas), 3, no. 2 (January 15, 1922): 3. The Lima report is a reprint from *Alliance Weekly*, Miller, “A Revival of Divine Healing.”

²⁴⁷ Bosworth, “For This Cause Was the Son of God Manifest”; F.F. Bosworth, “The Potter and the Clay,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 13, no. 10 (September 1921): 20–23; Rose Mueller, “The Blind See, the Deaf Hear, Cancers Healed,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 15, no. 7 (April 1922): 20–21; “A Miracle of Healing of a Gassed Soldier,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 15, no. 4 (January 1922): 22–23; “The Wonderful Works of God,”

The *Latter Rain Evangel* gave Bosworth's work significant attention in the late 1920s. The paper ran the lengthy testimony of Freda Hugh, who was encouraged by her pentecostal housekeeper to read "Discerning the Lord's Body" and *Christ the Healer*. Bosworth's book was the turning point on Hugh's journey from sickness to health and from Methodism to pentecostalism.²⁴⁹ Bosworth's secretary Rose Meyer reported in the paper on healings in the meetings in Scranton, DuBois and Altoona, Pennsylvania.²⁵⁰ The periodical also mused on Bosworth's work at Rader's Tabernacle in early 1928.²⁵¹

Just as pentecostals had not given up on Bosworth, Bosworth was still evincing a fully pentecostal ministry. He continued to preach versions of many sermons from his pentecostal days, indicating that his spiritual identity changed little after his break with

Bridegroom's Messenger 14, no. 229 (April 1921): 2; "Healed at the Bosworth Meetings," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 14, no. 232 (September 1921): 2; "Revivals in Atlanta, GA.," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 16, no. 246 (August 1923): 2; *Word and Work* 43, no. 14 (October 8, 1921): 7; "Brooklyn, N.Y.," *Word and Work* 44, no. 10 (October 1922): 15; "Bosworth Bros., in New York," *Word and Work* 44, no. 12 (December 1922): 16.

²⁴⁸ "Healed of Gallstones," *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 673 (November 20, 1926): 8, 17.

²⁴⁹ Freda Hugh, "Divinely Healed of Tuberculosis: How the Lord Used the Printed Page," *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 1 (October 1926): 16–22. That Bosworth's book was a catalyst for a pentecostal's healing was to be expected, since *Latter Rain Evangel* and *Pentecostal Evangel* regularly advertised and endorsed *Christ the Healer*. See the following in *Pentecostal Evangel*: no. 637 (March 6, 1926): 15; no. 653 (June 26, 1926): 16; no. 690 (March 26, 1927): 13; and in *Latter Rain Evangel*: 18, no. 6 (March 1926): 24; 18, no. 7 (April 1926): 24; 25, no. 3 (December 1932): 24.

²⁵⁰ Rose Meyer, "When the Good Samaritan Came to Altoona," *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 9 (June 1927): 5–8; Rose Meyer, "Child Healed of Sarcoma Cancer," *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 10 (July 1927): 21–22; Rose Meyer, "Moving Pictures in God's Kaleidoscope," *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 12 (September 1927): 18–21. See also brief note of a woman who was healed in DuBois and went on to perform eighteen healings in an insane asylum, *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 11 (August, 1927): 15. That same year, the *Latter Rain Evangel* also published the testimony of a Baptist pastor named Amos Oyer, who had suffered with spinal trouble for eighteen years and had been on the verge of suicide. Amos Oyer, "Healed of Spinal Trouble After Years of Suffering," *Latter Rain Evangel* 20, no. 3 (December 1927): 22–23.

²⁵¹ "Chicago's Visitation of Miracles of Healing."

the Assemblies of God.²⁵² Baptism in the Holy Spirit accompanied by tongues continued to be a common feature of his meetings.²⁵³

In many ways, pentecostals and Bosworth were on the same side. After *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* criticized Aimee Semple McPherson and distanced itself from the Bosworth brothers in 1921, W.F. Carothers came to their defense, saying, “The Bosworth Brothers...have the definite experiences for which the [pentecostal] movement stands (and owe their power to it).”²⁵⁴ When Haldeman published his attack on Bosworth in February of 1923, Stanley Frodsham took up his defense in the *Pentecostal Evangel*.²⁵⁵ For opponents, divine healing and pentecostalism were so connected that they really represented one threat. For polemical purposes Bosworth was a pentecostal, since Bosworth “endorse[s] the ‘gift of tongues’ as one of the evidences of having received the Holy Spirit.”²⁵⁶ Gaebelein boiled pentecostalism down to “the claim of two manifestations of the supernatural; the physical sign of speaking in unknown, or strange

²⁵² A reprint of “Nothing Can Hinder of Revival” with some additions is F.F. Bosworth, “Faint-Hearted Get Go-By; Ask, Stand Pat and Watch; Beg Big Things and Run; Golden Chance Awaiting,” *National Labor Tribune*, February 17, 1921, 2, 7. Bosworth preached on “The Potter and the Clay” at seemingly every revival. See, for example, “Syracuse Revival: Indians Hear Bosworth’s, Big Chief Made Welcome, Private John W. Sproul Tells a Pathetic Story,” *National Labor Tribune*, May 25, 1922, 3.

²⁵³ For example, an Episcopalian woman with cancer was saved, and “when the spirit that was afflicting her went out, the Holy Spirit came in and she went right over on the floor. She broke out speaking in tongues; didn’t even know what it was, and for an hour and a half spoke beautifully in tongues, her eyes filled with tears.” Bosworth, “They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them,” 9.

²⁵⁴ W. F. Carothers, “The Baptism of the Spirit and Speaking with Tongues,” *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 5 (January 1922): 762.

²⁵⁵ Stanley Frodsham, “Did Our Lord By His Death on the Cross Atone for Bodily Sickness and Disease? Yes! Praise the Lord!,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 496 (May 12, 1923): 8–9; Stanley Frodsham, “Did Our Lord By His Death on the Cross Atone for Bodily Sickness and Disease? Yes! Praise the Lord!,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 497 (May 19, 1923): 10. The second installment gives the author as “S.H.F.”

²⁵⁶ “A Strange Fire,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 2 (August 1921): 83–85. Quote on pp. 84–85.

tongue, and miraculous healings.” And now that “miraculous healings have almost overshadowed the gift of tongues” in pentecostalism, Bosworth clearly fit this mold.²⁵⁷

Bosworth and the Christian and Missionary Alliance

As many pentecostals retreated into their doctrinal enclaves,²⁵⁸ Bosworth—like other pentecostal healing evangelists McPherson, Richey, and Price—freely cooperated with leaders and laity of many denominations.²⁵⁹ He also retained membership in numerous nondenominational associations.²⁶⁰ This aspect of Bosworth’s work reflected his own priorities and the nature of the Alliance during this time. As early as 1917, Bosworth enthusiastically assisted the interdenominational work spearheaded by Raymond Richey. At this time, the Alliance still considered itself a “nondenominational mission society.” But Bosworth was working with the Alliance during a “troubled transition.”²⁶¹ Torn between its evangelistic efforts and the forces of denominationalism, the Alliance severed its relationship with the denominationally-indifferent Paul Rader in

²⁵⁷ Gaebelein, “Christianity vs. Modern Cults,” 859.

²⁵⁸ Notwithstanding the extremely guarded relationship of the Assemblies of God with the Foreign Missions Conference beginning in 1920. See Cecil M. Robeck, “The Assemblies of God and Ecumenical Cooperation: 1920-1965,” in *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, ed. Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008), 107–150.

²⁵⁹ “Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians and Pentecostal brethren took an active part.” Bosworth, “They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them,” 5. He received musical support from several Salvation Army bands and even one local Lutheran Church. Perkins, “Bosworth’s Shaking Detroit.”

²⁶⁰ In addition to his affiliation with the Alliance, Bosworth was a member of the Ministerial Association, the International Federation of Christian Workers, and the International Association of Evangelists, whose vice president was Billy Sunday. “Gospel Truths, Faith Healing,” *Chicago Heights Star*, January 19, 1922, 1; “Bosworth Brothers Evangelist and Aids Ready for Big Time; Great Crowds Waiting,” *National Labor Tribune*, December 30, 1920, 7.

²⁶¹ Robert L. Niklaus, John S. Sawin, and Samuel J. Stoesz, *All for Jesus: God at Work in the Christian and Missionary Alliance, 125th Anniversary Edition* (Colorado Springs, CO: Christian & Missionary Alliance, 2013), chap. 9.

early 1924. The presidency of H.M. Shuman (1925-1954) ushered in a clear denominational phase that coincided with Bosworth's departure.

Earlier signs suggest a troubled partnership. Before Bosworth was invited to Toronto in 1921, an Alliance delegation investigated his work in Detroit, reporting some concern about his understanding of spirit-baptism and the atonement.²⁶² Despite the debt he owed to Bosworth, Oswald Smith said that “we would have preferred to have salvation alone, and not physical healing, proclaimed from the platform.”²⁶³ Rader too worried that Bosworth was turning the Alliance into a “healing cult” and recommended Bosworth not be invited back to Toronto unless he changed his approach. Rader claimed he “never contended for the doctrine of Divine Healing”—in the midst of a Bosworth campaign!²⁶⁴ Alliance adherents were uncomfortable with some of the supernatural manifestations at Bosworth's meetings. *Alliance Weekly* went out of its way to describe the “unusual quietness” of the meetings, protesting that “the power of God does not

²⁶² Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 151; Lindsay Reynolds, *Rebirth: The Redevelopment of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada* (Willowdale, Ontario: Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada, 1992), 60.

²⁶³ “Faith Cure Miracle Bubble Is Bursting,” *Our Hope* 28, no. 12 (June 1922): 762. For Bosworth's impact on Smith and the ongoing Alliance work in Toronto, see Reynolds, *Rebirth*, 59–60, 66–69.

²⁶⁴ For “healing cult,” see Opp, *The Lord for the Body*, 153; Reynolds, *Rebirth*, 69. For “never contended,” see “Great Revival in Big Steel Tent Closes Monday, July 30, 1923,” *National Labor Tribune*, July 19, 1923, 3. Both Smith and Rader would later come to support Bosworth's brand of divine healing, but also, significantly, both would leave the Alliance. Smith continued to have reservations about anointing services “held in the open congregation” and admitted confusion as to why healings in contemporary meetings did not more closely resemble those of the Gospels. Smith, *The Great Physician*, 107–110. Rader's book on healing was written while Bosworth held a five-month campaign in his Chicago tabernacle. Rader evinces some specific evidence of Bosworth's influence in his use of the redemptive names argument and his discussion of Paul's thorn. Paul Rader, *The Man of Mercy* (Chicago Gospel Tabernacle, Chapel Book Stall, 1928), 36–42, 105. According to one pentecostal controversialist, Rader had confessed that “if he had his life to live over again, he would cast his lot with the Pentecostal people.” Jonathan Ellsworth Perkins, *The Baptism of the Holy Spirit* (Los Angeles: B.N. Robertson, 1945), 27–28.

necessarily have to manifest itself in noise or outward emotion.” Scholars have too often taken such descriptions at face value.²⁶⁵ Bosworth’s words tell a different story:

People received the baptism of the Holy Spirit right on the platform, the atmosphere was so charged with the power of God. One night, without any suggestion from anyone, three different ones broke out speaking in tongues.²⁶⁶

R.V. Bingham happily exploited the tension in a remarkably perceptive description: “The Christian Alliance leaders are decrying the spectacular methods of Mr. Bosworth, while trying to hold onto the addition to their membership largely gleaned...through his ministry.”²⁶⁷ This ambivalence portended deeper changes in the Alliance, which began taking marked steps to distance itself not just from pentecostal doctrine (evidential tongues) but also from pentecostal practices like healing, tongues, and other supernatural gifts and manifestations. Their “full gospel,” contracted to “gospel.” Bosworth’s departure from the Alliance in 1926 should be seen as an early symptom of this move.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁵ “Bosworth Campaign in Chicago.” Hejzlar and Robinson uncritically accept Eunice Perkins’s descriptions, see Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing*, 22; Robinson, *Divine Healing*, 168–169. Even the *National Labor Tribune*, which usually emphasized the decorum of Bosworth’s meetings, could not obscure the shouts of “glory-glory” in the baptismal service at the end of the Toledo meetings. C.C. Fitch, “Great Rush for Baptism; Presbyterians in Line; Candidates Rejoice; Hundreds Join In,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 18, 1921, 3.

²⁶⁶ Bosworth, “They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them,” 9.

²⁶⁷ R.V. Bingham, “The Healing Movement in Crisis,” *Evangelical Christian* 18, no. 2 (February 1922): 39.

²⁶⁸ Paul L. King, *Genuine Gold: The Cautiously Charismatic Story of the Early Christian and Missionary Alliance* (Tulsa, OK: Word and Spirit Press, 2006), 234. Without drawing a rigid timeline, King locates this shift in the 1930s. King also suggests that Bosworth “remained with the Alliance for a period of time” after 1927, but this is unsupported by either his ministerial credentials or by coverage in *Alliance Weekly*. *Ibid.*, 227. For a study of the Alliance shift through the lens of its developing approach to tongues, see Christopher Richmann, “Blaspheming in Tongues: Demons, Glossolalia, and the Christian and Missionary Alliance,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 139–155.

As one of many who moved freely in full gospel circles at this time, Bosworth illustrates the inadequacy of denominational categories.²⁶⁹ While on paper his doctrine matched the Alliance, his worldview and practices squared with the pentecostals. Bosworth was celebrated by both and kept at an arm's length by both. It is no wonder he felt most comfortable in the role of an independent evangelist.

Conclusion

Bosworth's ministry noticeably cooled by the early 1930s, undoubtedly a result of the depression-era economy. But Bosworth had made his mark, and few could rival his impact on the thought and culture of divine healing in the 1920s. His meetings drew attention and burst attendance records at nearly every location. His "panoramic view of the truth" raised the hopes of the faithful and the ire of the opposition.²⁷⁰ The abundance of sources and the influence of his writings make Bosworth a wealth of insight into the evolution of divine healing and its role in the search for certainty that characterized the religious controversies of the 1920s. Divine healing was not only a blessing to body and soul, but also a defense against modernism. In this full gospel, personal intimacy combined with the phenomenon of the celebrity evangelist to offer a message that comforted as much as it excited. Although flourishing in independent and interdenominational circles, divine healing was driven by the supernaturalist impulse of pentecostalism. This impulse would soon move Bosworth into a quieter chapter of his

²⁶⁹ King describes many of these figures, including Edward Armstrong, Warren Collins, Hardy Mitchell, the Richeys, C.O. Benham and Carrie Judd Montgomery. See King, *Genuine Gold*, 196–202.

²⁷⁰ "Love Offering to Bosworth Brothers," *Ottawa Citizen*, May 26, 1924, 4.

ministry and also facilitate his acceptance of a theory of scriptural interpretation that many other full gospel advocates openly rejected.

CHAPTER SIX

The Lost Years, 1933-1947

If Israel is not in existence today as “a nation and a company of nations” and a people as numerous as “the stars” and “the sand,” then the veracity of Jehovah God, is open to question.

—Charles O. Benham, “Joseph is Yet Alive”¹

As F.F. Bosworth turned fifty-six in 1933, he understandably slowed the pace of his ministry. The economic depression also made travel more difficult and considerably decreased his financial base. No longer attached to a denomination or conducting high-profile healing campaigns, Bosworth seems almost to disappear from the historical record. Historians have in fact referred to the period of about 1933 to 1948 as a historical “gap.”² This relative lack of sources should not lead one to conclude that Bosworth was inactive or unproductive, however. As is well-known, Bosworth continued to print *Exploits of Faith* and minister almost daily on the radio. He also produced numerous new tracts and booklets during this time. Perhaps the greatest sign of his continued vibrancy was his adoption of British-Israelism. Not only did his acceptance of this teaching require active study and discernment, but it also entailed a reconfiguration of Bosworth’s professional circle.

¹ Charles O. Benham, “Joseph Is Yet Alive,” in *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, ed. Charles A. Jennings (Owasso, OK: Truth in History, 2010), 288.

² Roscoe Barnes, “F.F. Bosworth: A Historical Analysis of the Influential Factors in His Life and Ministry” (Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria, 2009), 54–55. The only source scholars have definitely identified with Bosworth during this period is the undated sermon “The Bible Distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah,” discussed below.

Through the recovery of several hitherto unknown sources, this chapter will help narrow the historical gap in Bosworth's story. Both secular newspaper reports and British-Israel sources show Bosworth's continued activity. New sources press new questions, especially since the prior historical gap has been convenient for pentecostals and scholars who for theological reasons would downplay Bosworth's British-Israelism. In light of the sources indicating his commitment to British-Israelism, any serious study of Bosworth must deal with the teaching, seeking how it fits into Bosworth's story and that of American pentecostalism. Historically evaluated, British-Israelism need not be seen as inherently contradictory to pentecostalism or an aberration in Bosworth's story. Bosworth and other pentecostals embraced the teaching as a mechanism of defense against modernism while also rejecting the dominant fundamentalist approach to the scriptures.

Meetings, Radio, and Print, 1933-1940

Bosworth continued to travel occasionally for evangelistic services. In the summer of 1933, he held meetings in the Philadelphia area.³ In 1938 and 1939, he was a featured speaker at the summer Bible park camp meetings in Oregon, Wisconsin.⁴ Also in 1939, Bosworth participated in a "Church and Public Affairs Institute" hosted by River Forest Methodist Church. At this extended public forum for the discussion of religion and political issues, Bosworth was billed as an expert on "Evangelism, the Imperative Task of

³ "Evangelistic Services," *Chester Times*, June 24, 1933, 4; "Is Conducting Campaign," *Altoona Mirror*, July 17, 1933, 15.

⁴ "Eureka Singers Appear at Oregon," *Madison Wisconsin State Journal*, August 17, 1938, 16; "Oregon Meet Opens Friday," *Madison Wisconsin State Journal*, August 10, 1939, 20.

the Church.”⁵ In 1939 and 1940, Bosworth led healing and evangelistic services in the Gospel Tabernacle in Freeport, Illinois, attracting participants from dozens of nearby cities.⁶

But by this time, Bosworth’s energies were not focused on traditional evangelism. As he said in an address in Chicago in 1937, “the days of revivals are not over and never will be. But the days of the huge tabernacle building program and all that it implied in the way of tremendous physical and financial effort which distracted from the spirituality of the meetings, are definitely past.”⁷ Uttered in the midst of the Depression, Bosworth’s poor predictive skills can be overlooked. Nonetheless, Bosworth turned his focus to radio, which he referred to as the “handmaid of the church of God.”⁸ Sagaciously omitting any reference to dwindling crowds or finances, Bosworth’s admirers later explained the switch to radio as a calculated decision to reach more hearers with the gospel while putting less physical strain on the evangelist.⁹ In June of 1935, he began a daily program over Chicago’s WJJD, using his home office as a satellite studio. In less than a year, Bosworth reported receiving more than 17,000 letters from listeners.¹⁰ His “National Radio Revival” was quickly airing on a handful of other Chicago-area stations,

⁵ “Speakers at ‘Church and Public Affairs Institute,’” *Oak Park Leaves*, September 21, 1939, 13.

⁶ “Evangelist Speaks Here Next Sunday,” *Freeport Journal Standard*, November 16, 1939, 6; “Freeport Gospel Tabernacle,” *Freeport Journal Standard*, November 21, 1939, 6; “At Gospel Tabernacle This Coming Sunday,” *Freeport Journal Standard*, October 30, 1940, 6; “Evangelists at Gospel Tabernacle,” *Freeport Journal Standard*, October 7, 1940, 7.

⁷ “River Forest Minister on Radio Often,” *Oak Park Leaves*, September 16, 1937, 46.

⁸ “Tabernacle Evangelist Now on Radio,” *Chicago Daily Herald*, September 17, 1937, 18.

⁹ Oscar Blomgren, Jr., “Man of God: Fred F. Bosworth, Part VII: The National Radio Revival,” *Herald of Faith*, May 1964, 14.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*; “Evangelist Rev. F.F. Bosworth,” *Oak Park Leaves*, June 6, 1935, 36; “F.F. Bosworth Heard Over WJJD Daily,” *Oak Park Leaves*, February 20, 1936, 18.

and eventually on stations in Philadelphia, Salt Lake City, Detroit, North Dakota and even Panama.¹¹ In the fall of 1938, Bosworth and his wife traveled to Haiti to establish his radio program there and then made a trip to Jamaica.¹² His radio broadcasts and *Exploits of Faith* worked in tandem, as listeners would write to Bosworth and then see their testimonies—and those of others—in print. Within the first two years of broadcasting, Bosworth produced a fifty-six-page “National Radio Revival Number” of *Exploits of Faith*.¹³

Bosworth also continued writing, no doubt enabled by his constant radio preaching. Between 1932 and 1937, he published a number of pamphlets, dealing with a wide range of spiritual issues including divine healing, sin, the Great Commandment, financial sowing and reaping, and psalm meditations.¹⁴

About a year before his radio program started in 1935, Bosworth also began interacting with those involved in British-Israelism (or Anglo-Israelism). While this approach to biblical prophecy was fully consistent with Bosworth’s overall focus on the continuing supernatural activity of God, it was not viewed favorably by most other Christians at the time, including most full gospel believers. Bosworth continued a fruitful

¹¹ In 1937, Bosworth’s program was heard over Chicago stations WCFL, WCBBD, and the shortwave station W9XAA. *Exploits of Faith* 10, no. 7 (July 1937). See also *Destiny* 7, no. 12 (December 1936): 7. By 1939, he had greatly expanded his audience. *Herald of Our Race* 2, no. 4 (April 1938): 6; *Destiny* 10, no. 12 (December 1939): 15.

¹² “U.S. Evangelists on Visit to Jamaica,” *Daily Gleaner*, October 17, 1938, 10; “Radio Revivalist Guest Preacher at City Tabernacle,” *Daily Gleaner*, October 24, 1938, 10; “Most Pleasurable Experience in 16 Years,” *Daily Gleaner*, October 24, 1938, 5.

¹³ This issue is not extant but is advertised in *Exploits of Faith* 10, no. 7 (July 1937): 19, 20.

¹⁴ See advertisements in *Exploits of Faith* 10, no. 7 (July 1937): 20.

radio and print ministry, but his acceptance of British-Israelism may have alienated him from a large contingent of his potential audience.

The Distant Past and the Uncertain Future: Bosworth and British-Israelism

British-Israelism was one of many premillennial theologies gaining acceptance among evangelicals at the turn of the twentieth century. Like other premillennial systems, it centered on two concerns: the expectation of Christ's soon return and the veracity of scripture. British-Israelism differed, however, from other forms of premillennialism in that it held that the fulfillment of much biblical prophecy was discernible in history. In hermeneutical terms, British-Israelism was historicist. In this way it challenged the futurist approach of the more popular dispensationalism, which posited a prophetic "parenthesis" identified with the church age, postponing the fulfillment of most biblical prophecy to the future. British-Israelism was also unique in that it held the Anglo-Saxon peoples to be Israelites, or descendants of the biblical Northern Kingdom. From the mid-1930s, Bosworth became involved in the growing American British-Israel movement, working in its circles, publicizing its work, and contending for a moderate version of the British-Israel message. Gaining constituents from a diverse base of fundamentalist and full gospel adherents, British-Israelism made its enemies in the same corners.

The British-Israel History and Message

When a handful of British subjects in the last half of the nineteenth century began to preach that Britain and all who shared her blood were the direct descendants of Israel, they joined a quest that was as old as the Assyrian exile itself. Since antiquity, the clever and the curious have bandied their theories about the fate of the Israelites who were

exiled by Assyria in 722 BC. The earliest writers, such as the apocryphal 2 Esdras, Josephus, and Christian historian Severus, simply affirmed that they were “out there,” somewhere.¹⁵ But as knowledge of lands and peoples increased, vague claims were no longer sufficient; explorers could easily fact-check. So they had to be identified among the populations known to exist. This transition from “where?” to “who?” was crucial for the later rise of British-Israelism. An eschatological motive was also central: Columbus believed his discoveries hastened the end of the age, and identifying lost Israel was key in the latter days script.¹⁶ To many a voyager in the New World, natives were the lost tribes.¹⁷ Supported by alleged similarities in customs and languages, this theory was popular among American colonists well into the eighteenth century, and it later received a powerful impulse in the form of Mormonism.¹⁸ For others, any single-location theory was not wholly satisfactory. Manasseh Ben-Israel’s *Hope of Israel* (1652) popularized the notion that although the tribes were still identifiable (i.e., they had not blended into local populations), they had traveled by many routes, and pockets of lost Israel could be found in many locations.¹⁹

The search for remnants of Israel in existing populations throughout their supposed migrations prepared the way for British-Israelism. The seer Richard Brothers

¹⁵ Zvi Ben-Dor Benite, *The Ten Lost Tribes: A World History* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 57, 58, 79, chap. 2.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 141; Tudor Parfitt, *The Lost Tribes of Israel: The History of a Myth* (London: Phoenix, 2003), 91–114.

¹⁷ The Spanish, trained by the Inquisition, felt themselves particularly adept at spotting hidden Jews and transferred this knowledge to the populations of the New World. Ben-Dor Benite, *The Ten Lost Tribes*, 159.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 142.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 165–167, 177–181.

(1757-1823) had many of the bedrock notions that would become currency in British-Israelism, most importantly, the idea that some (though not all) descendants of Israel now lived in Britain. Brothers, like Joseph Smith of the Mormons, mainly based his insights on revelation. But a broader movement needed a more scholarly approach. Supported by earlier linguistic studies that identified the lost Israelites with the Scythians—the supposed seed race of Europe—John Wilson’s *Our Israelitish Origin* (1840) bowled audiences with innumerable connections between English and Hebrew words and institutions, not unlike earlier attempts to identify American Indians as the lost tribes. Such theories also benefited from the developing biological notions of race and the widely-shared concern to explain scientifically the superiority of European cultures.²⁰

What set the British-Israel theory apart was its unique claim to fulfilled prophecy. Specifically, Jacob had blessed Ephraim as a “company of nations,” a description that fit only Britain and its unprecedented empire, argued British-Israelists. The early British-Israelist Edward Hine (1825-1891), more biblically oriented than Wilson, emphasized the priority of England at the expense of other possible lost tribes repositories in Europe, particularly Germany. As Hine noted, scripture insisted that the ten tribes would be “consolidated in an Island Nation.”²¹ Early British-Israelists found in the message a convenient theological argument for the imperial superiority of Britain. Thus, early adherents tended to be the patriotic upper-class (even noble) and belong to the Church of

²⁰ Among the many attempts to explain Anglo-Saxon superiority was the “Nordic theory” of Madison Grant (1865-1937), which claimed that the Nordic races were farther along in their evolutionary development than other peoples.

²¹ Cited in Michael Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origins of the Christian Identity Movement* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 11.

England. As a popular movement in England, British-Israelism's wave crested and broke with the fate of the empire.

British-Israel ideas were present in America as early as the 1870s. Influenced by Wilson and Hine, the New York Congregational minister Joseph Wild sermonized, published books and pamphlets, and organized a local British-Israel society. Charles A. Totten, a military instructor who lectured at Yale, was the most prolific early American adherent. Next to him in influence was J.H. Allen, a holiness minister whose *Judah's Sceptre and Joseph's Birthright* (1902) became a foundational text for the American movement.²² Allen's ideas can be taken as representative—although not normative—of American British-Israelism.

According to Allen, understanding the identity of Israel begins with Jacob's blessing to his children and grandchildren (Gen. 48-49). Judah is blessed with rule—the “sceptre”—while Joseph (through his sons Ephraim and Manasseh) is blessed with becoming a multitude on earth, thereby perpetuating Jacob's name—the “birthright.” Although both blessings seemed threatened by exile—the northern tribes (Joseph's descendants) by the Assyrians in 722 BC and then the southern tribes (Judah's descendants) by Babylon in 587 BC—God had not forgotten his promises. The birthright promise lived on, for after the northern tribes were exiled, they went elsewhere, becoming a multitude to be revealed and brought back to their land in the last days. Allen charted their trip through the “Caucasian Pass” and westward through Europe, placing them finally in Ireland. The scepter promise was maintained through the work of

²² Ibid., 17–21.

Jeremiah, who preserved the royal line by ushering a Davidic princess to Ireland (Jeremiah 41:10, 43:6).²³

Allen leaned on a patchwork of scriptures to support his claims. Prophecies of easterly winds, isles, passage through gates, and spreading vines were all taken to refer to Israel's trek to Britain and establishment of an empire.²⁴ Although Allen's proof-texting may have been strained, his method was in reality the popular Bible conference and camp meeting "Bible Reading" technique (which "consisted of stringing together a series of scriptural passages on a given topic" with the aid of concordance²⁵), simply put to the use of British-Israelism.

Beyond his many proof-texts, Allen looked to history to corroborate his identification of Britain-Israel. In fact, Allen admitted that history must play the dominant role, for while scripture prophesied Jeremiah's work, it did not record it. Allen verged on turning secular history into scripture, ironically in an effort to prove scripture: "Both ancient and modern history," said Allen, "come honestly to the rescue of prophecy."²⁶

²³ The princess of Jeremiah's party was united with a "prince of the scarlet thread"—a descendant of the line of Judah's son Zarah. According to Genesis 28, of Judah's twin sons, Zarah partially emerged from the womb first, prompting the midwife to tie a scarlet thread on his arm for identification. However, Zarah reentered the womb and his brother Pharez was first born. Pharez therefore inherited the royal imperative. Allen argued, however, that Zarah's line—a "prince of the scarlet thread"—was at some point in history due the throne on account of this "breach." Allen had placed a group of Danites, ruled by a prince in the line of Zarah, in Ireland at least a century prior to Jeremiah's arrival. See J. H. Allen, *Judah's Sceptre and Joseph's Birthright: An Analysis of the Prophecies of Scripture in Regard to the Regard to The Royal Family of Judah and the Many Nations of Israel*, 18th ed. (1902; repr., Merrimac, MA: Destiny Publishers, n.d.), 221, 267–268.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 223–227, 247–248. Allen even believed that the loss of America to the empire and the violence done to Native Americans were foretold. *Ibid.*, 276, 280.

²⁵ Timothy P. Weber, "The Two-Edged Sword: The Fundamentalist Use of the Bible," in *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, ed. Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 110.

²⁶ Allen, *Judah's Sceptre and Joseph's Birthright*, 224, 225, 247.

Allen's "history" was in reality strained folklore,²⁷ and some of his proofs seem more like pasta thrown against a wall to see if it sticks. For instance, the English expression "red-tape" was somehow linked to the prophetic "scarlet thread." Nevertheless, Allen claimed that the secular record confirmed Jeremiah's arrival in Ireland and the identity of the biblical "Stone of Destiny" with the coronation of stone of Irish, Scottish, and English monarchs. Historical trace of the tribes' migrations was left in place-names that have some supposed corruption of "Dan," such as *Denmark*, *Danube*, and even *Londonderry*.²⁸

That the apparently obvious identity of Israel went unrecognized for centuries did not bother British-Israelists: Israel's hiddenness was divinely orchestrated until God raised up servants to declare its true identity—a quasi-messianic role Allen and other British-Israelists happily claimed. This entailed a sense of eschatological urgency, for only after Israel had been found could they return to Palestine. Since this was now happening, Allen believed—in good premillennial fashion—that Christ's return was "just ahead."²⁹ Implicit in the British-Israel message was a demotion of the Jews. Not only were the scepter and the birthright continued in Israel, but because the Jews rejected Christ, Israel monopolized the gospel message as well.³⁰

²⁷ Much of Allen's "history" was gleaned from other British-Israelists, such as F.R.A. Glover, A.B. Grimaldi, Morton W. Spencer and Charles A. Totten.

²⁸ Allen, *Judah's Sceptre and Joseph's Birthright*: "red-tape," p. 304; "notable man" and eastern princess, pp. 228-229; Denmark, Danube, etc., pp. 266-267. The justification for picking out Dan for philological evidence was found in Genesis 49:17—that Dan should be the "trail," which, by leaving evidence of its presence, led inquirers to the truth of British-Israel.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 129, 227, 296–297, 355. Quote on p. 362.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 220, 246, 283, 362, 367–368. According to Allen, salvation was through Israel, and those who accepted the gospel also need to be adopted into fleshly Israel. What exactly he meant by this is unclear. See p. 337. Scholars who claim that the British-Israel message is not soteriological have missed

Upon the intellectual foundation of Hine, Trotten, Allen, and others, British-Israelism grew unevenly and without centralization in the first decades of the twentieth century. In the late 1920s Howard B. Rand, a Massachusetts lawyer, began vigorously promoting the doctrine, creating a national movement in the process. Inspired by the British-Israel World Federation based in London (created in 1919), Rand organized the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America in 1930. Headquartered in Detroit, within two years the Federation had branches spreading across the country. The Federation attracted prominent supporters, including Henry Ford's publicity manager William J. Cameron, who for a time served as president.³¹ The Anglo-Saxon Federation also drew Bosworth into its orbit in the mid-1930s.

Bosworth's Involvement

When exactly Bosworth adopted British-Israelism is difficult to pinpoint. The theory was current, although not dominant, in Dowie's Zion City.³² Dowie himself affirmed that "the Anglo-Saxon race is the lineal descendant of the Ten Tribes of Israel who were scattered abroad."³³ Daniel Bryant, who led a faction in Zion City after Dowie's death, and whom Bosworth quoted in *Christ the Healer*, was also a British-

this, for instance Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right*, 15. Charles Parham's British-Israelism also had soteriological implications. See Christopher Richmann, "Prophecy and Politics: British-Israelism in American Pentecostalism," *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 22 (January 2013).

³¹ Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right*, 29–40.

³² When an Anglo-Israel writer named C.F. Vandervoort visited Zion in 1904, the *Zion Banner* declared that he "believes with Zion that the Anglo-Saxon race belongs to the lost ten tribes of Israel." "A Writer on Anglo-Israel," *Zion Banner*, August 9, 1904, 367.

³³ "Let Us Go Up to Zion," *Leaves of Healing* 8, no. 16 (February 9, 1901): 498. For additional references from Dowie, see Charles Jennings, "'Dr. Dowie and the Anglo-Israel Belief,'" http://www.johnalexanderdowie.com/attachments/File/british_Israelism_charles_jennings.pdf. Accessed June 30, 2014.

Israelist.³⁴ A tenuous possibility is that while vacationing in Pasadena in 1929, Bosworth became aware of the work of J.H. Allen, who pastored a church in the city. Bosworth could also have been influenced by Luke Rader, who also began to identify with the Anglo-Saxon Federation in the mid-1930s.³⁵ Bosworth could have simply been drawn into the teaching through local contacts: in the early 1930s, the Federation began to have a sustained presence in Chicago, holding its national convention in the Windy City in September of 1931 and soon after establishing a local branch.³⁶ More fundamentally, Bosworth's controversies with hardline dispensationalist like I.M. Haldeman and Arno Gaebelein predisposed him to a teaching that directly opposed the dispensationalist hermeneutic.

Regardless of when Bosworth accepted the teaching, by February of 1934, he was allowing British-Israelist writer William Pascoe Goard to promulgate the teaching in *Exploits of Faith*.³⁷ In 1935, the Anglo-Saxon Federation advertised Bosworth as a participant in the national convention in Detroit.³⁸ Later in 1935, Bosworth, Rader, and Bosworth's associate from years earlier, Charles Benham participated in a Midwestern

³⁴ Daniel Bryant, "Shiloh and Messiah," *Zion City News*, December 24, 1909, 3. Bosworth quoted Bryant's *Christ Among our Sick* (1923). F.F. Bosworth, *Christ the Healer: Sermons on Divine Healing* (Chicago, 1924), 10, 95.

³⁵ C.R. Cook, "At Headquarters," *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 66 (June 1935): 5. Rader said in 1936 that he had studied British-Israelism for eight years. "These Two Letters Speak for Themselves," *Sunshine News*, An Excerpt from the *Sunshine News*, July 16, 1936. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

³⁶ John W. Stephens, "Our Chicago Convention," *Bulletin of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America* 2, no. 22 (October 1931): 75-76; "New Branch Organizations," *Bulletin of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America* 2, no. 23 (November 1931): 87.

³⁷ Although this issue of *Exploits of Faith* is not extant, Goard's writing is referred to in N.P. Thomsen, "Anglo-Israelism, Under the Searchlight of God's Word," *Latter Rain Evangel* 26, no. 8 (May 1934): 6.

³⁸ "The Convention Program," *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 65 (May 1935): 2; "Convention Program," *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 66 (June 1935): 7.

conference for the Federation in Chicago.³⁹ In preparations for the Detroit national convention in 1936, executive secretary S.A. Ackley referred to Bosworth, along with Luke Rader and William J. Cameron, as one of “our old and tried leaders,” who are each “a convention in himself.”⁴⁰ At another regional convention in 1937, Bosworth addressed the Federation on “The Bible Teaching on Healing.”⁴¹ Bosworth and his wife were billed as speakers for a national convention in Chicago in October of 1938.⁴²

The Anglo-Saxon Federation was pleased with the publicity afforded the British-Israel message through Bosworth’s radio program, calling it one of the “outstanding influences for the extension of our work.” Bosworth announced meetings for the Federation over the airwaves, and the Federation claimed that “a large percentage of our attendants are regular listeners” of Bosworth’s program.⁴³ Bosworth gave over the microphone once a week to Howard B. Rand, the elder statesmen of the American British-Israel movement. Not only did Bosworth give space for the message, “but [he] speaks often upon the Gospel of the Kingdom, in which he is a most sincere believer.” In this way, the Federation mused, “much good is being accomplished in thus spreading the

³⁹ “Plan 2 Regional Conventions,” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 68 (August 1935): 6; *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 72 (December 1935): 3.

⁴⁰ S.A. Ackley, “Detroit Convention,” *Destiny* 7, no. 4 (April 1936): 7. See also “Anglo-Saxon Federation Detroit Convention,” *Destiny* 7, no. 5 (May 1936): 6; “Convention Story,” *Destiny* 7, no. 7 (July 1936): 3.

⁴¹ “From Headquarters,” *Destiny* 8, no. 3 (March 1937): 7.

⁴² *Destiny* 9, no. 10 (October 1938): back cover.

⁴³ S.A. Ackley, “Chicago Branch Activities,” *Destiny* 7, no. 4 (April 1936): 3. See also Howard B. Rand, “Convention Declared Success,” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 67 (July 1935): 7; C.R. Cook, “At Headquarters,” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 71 (November 1935): 7.

Kingdom Truth.”⁴⁴ Testimonies bore this out. One grateful correspondent told Bosworth in 1937 that the message on “The Proofs of Anglo-Israel Truth” was “convincing as well as inspiring,” and he felt assured that through Bosworth’s work, “this glorious truth grows more and more wonderful despite the sceptics and critics.”⁴⁵ The Federation returned the favor by periodically advertising Bosworth’s tracts.⁴⁶

Bosworth also published articles in the Federation’s periodical. In May of 1936, *Destiny* published “New Covenant Obedience,” a fairly standard evangelical message describing the believer’s spirit-enabled participation in good works.⁴⁷ This is one of the few articles in Anglo-Saxon Federation publications that did not focus on the British-Israel message, the Second Coming, or pyramidology.⁴⁸ The inclusion of this article shows that the Federation aligned itself with traditional evangelical concerns and saw Bosworth as an able voice for these concerns. This article also gives dated evidence that Bosworth still focused largely on traditional evangelical themes while he was heavily involved in British-Israelism.

Destiny published another message from Bosworth’s pen in late 1940. In “The Prophecy of Daniel’s ‘Seventy Weeks,’” Bosworth implicitly supported the British-Israel

⁴⁴ “At Headquarters,” *Destiny* 7, no. 4 (April 1936): 10. The Federation also made it clear that Bosworth taught the British-Israel message in “From Headquarters.”

⁴⁵ “Our Hearts Have Been Thrilled and Blessed,” *Exploits of Faith* 10, no. 7 (July 1937): 11.

⁴⁶ *Destiny* 7, no. 1 (January 1936): 5.

⁴⁷ Bosworth argued “for more than IMPUTED righteousness; it is Christ’s own righteousness and obedience IMPARTED to us.” This “divine nature” is given to the sinner in the new birth, Bosworth said, but also made complete by a “single act of surrender.” F.F. Bosworth, “New Covenant Obedience,” *Destiny* 7, no. 12 (December 1936): 4.

⁴⁸ Many British-Israelists (as well as occultists and not a few dispensationalists) believed that the Great Pyramid at Giza contained measurements that corresponded to biblical prophecy. For British-Israelists, the classic text was David Davidson’s *The Great Pyramid: Its Divine Message* (1924).

message by refuting the “parenthesis” argument of dispensationalism. According to most dispensationalists, an indeterminate gap existed between the first sixty-nine weeks of the Daniel 9 end-time prophecy (signifying the time from the return of the Jews from exile to the ministry of Christ, with each week being a seven-year period in prophetic reasoning) and the final week, which would commence with the return of Christ to gather the saints. Bosworth derided the dispensationalist scheme as “a new interpretation... unknown to the Church for the first eighteen centuries.”⁴⁹ Rather than postponing the fulfillment of Daniel’s prophecy to the time after the rapture, Bosworth argued that “our Lord’s personal [i.e., earthly] ministry lay entirely within the seventieth week.” While dispensationalists inferred that the Antichrist would make a covenant with the Jews during the Great Tribulation, Bosworth insisted that it was Jesus who had “confirmed” the promised covenant through his death. The dispensationalist error amounted to confusing Christ for Antichrist.⁵⁰

Bosworth could not abide the removal of these clearly messianic prophecies “from the distant past to the uncertain future” as dispensationalism cavalierly did. “There

⁴⁹ F.F. Bosworth, “The Prophecy of Daniel’s ‘Seventy Weeks,’” *Destiny* 11, no. 10 (October 1940): 19. Along with other British-Israelists, Bosworth claimed that the innovative parenthesis theory originated with the Jesuits in the sixteenth century and was brought into Protestant thought by Samuel R. Maitland, a nineteenth-century Anglican cleric. *Ibid.*, 21. Jesuit Francisco Ribera (1537-1591), confessor for Teresa of Avila, developed his parenthesis theory as a refutation of Protestant claims that the Antichrist of Revelation was the Roman Catholic Church. Instead, Ribera argued that the early chapters of Revelation referred to pagan Rome, while a future literal 3½ years would see fulfillment of the rest of apocalyptic prophecy, including the rise of a personal, rather than institutional, Antichrist. Ribera’s theory was supported and popularized by the celebrated Catholic polemicist of the Counter-Reformation Robert Bellarmine. Maitland took up Ribera’s futurism (via Manuel Lacunza) as a defense against Edward Irving’s historicist day-year theory. This dispute was bound up in the early stages of the Anglo-Catholicism debate, as Irving posited Rome’s historical apostasy and defended heretical groups like the Albigenses, while Maitland leaned toward Rome and condemned the Albigenses. LeRoy E. Froom, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* (Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1946), 2:484–502; 3:541–544. Bosworth likely gleaned his information on this history from Henry Grattan Guinness.

⁵⁰ Bosworth, “The Prophecy of Daniel’s ‘Seventy Weeks,’” 19.

is not a verse of Scripture in the Bible,” Bosworth said, “which suggests a parenthesis of many centuries between the sixty-ninth and seventieth weeks of Daniel.” The idea of a prophetic gap was foreign to scripture and risked “destroying the prophecy as a whole.” The integrity of biblical prophecy, said Bosworth, was “entirely frustrated by this new idea, that God’s measuring line is an elastic one which can be stretched out to a length of thousands of years.”⁵¹ As with divine healing, Bosworth argued from the premise of the consistency of God’s dealings in human affairs, rather than what he saw as an artificial interruption in supernatural activity.

Another source for understanding Bosworth’s British-Israel sympathies is an undated radio address entitled “The Bible Distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah.”⁵² Bosworth claimed in this sermon that the differentiation between Israel and Judah was divinely ordained, clearly expounded in scripture, and continued to the present day.⁵³ He rejected the “amalgamation theory,” which posited that Israelite exiles were incorporated into the Jewish people after the exile. Only at “the end of the ‘latter days,’” claimed Bosworth, would these houses be reunited.⁵⁴ Therefore any attempt to assign to Jews (House of Judah) what scripture assigned to Israel was a

⁵¹ Ibid., 20–21.

⁵² The earliest dated version I have found of this is a reprint, F.F. Bosworth, “The Bible Distinction Between the House of Israel and the House of Judah,” *New Beginnings* 10, no. 5 (May 1980): 6-10. As this version is not very accessible, I will cite F. F Bosworth, *The Bible Distinction Between the House of Israel and the House of Judah* (Owasso, OK: Truth in History Ministries, 2002).

⁵³ “This division of the Tribes of Israel into two nations was Divinely Predetermined, Divinely Predicted, Divinely Emphasized, Divinely Maintained, Divinely Accomplished, Divinely Explained, Divinely Approved. The Scriptures show that this division into Two Kingdoms had behind it and controlling it, the fore-ordaining eternal councils of God; and it took place for great, beneficent, well-defined and Divine reasons.” Ibid., 4.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 8, 9. Also p. 11: “The bringing together of these “two families” is to be associated with the Kingdom-Age.”

distortion of scripture. “Until this distinction is clearly understood,” said Bosworth, “a great portion of the Bible will remain a closed book.”⁵⁵ Like other British-Israelists, Bosworth claimed that without this distinction, scripture appeared contradictory and ineffectual and led to “much of the infidelity of today.” Such observers “have accused God of unfaithfulness” to biblical promises, but in reality they have been looking to the House of Judah when they should be focused on the House of Israel.⁵⁶ Quoting J.H. Allen, Bosworth referred to a willful disregard of this truth as “the great ecclesiastical crime of the ages.”⁵⁷

In his typical rhetorical fashion, Bosworth led his listeners to the conclusion, rather than insisting upon it. He made it clear that history was the final arbiter of prophetic interpretation: “That this promise to Israel [“His seed shall become a multitude of nations”] was not to Judah is proven by the fact that Judah has never been a multitude of nations, and never will be.”⁵⁸ Likewise, prophecy determines that “Israel shall be a great military power, [which] cannot be applied to the Jews.” Nor can the description of Israel as a “maritime people” apply to the Jews, “but they apply perfectly to the BIRTHRIGHT section of Isaac’s descendants.”⁵⁹ To Bosworth, it was obvious which modern people fit these biblical descriptions. In his most direct statement, Bosworth said,

⁵⁵ Ibid., 6.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 1.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 6. This quote is from J. H. Allen, *The National Number and Heraldry of the United States of America* (Boston, A.A. Beaumont, 1919), 29–30. This was an oft-quoted passage among British-Israelists. See Curtis Clair Ewing, *The Distinction between Judah and Israel as Shown by the Weight of Scholarship* (Chicago: Curtis Clair Ewing, n.d.), 1. Bosworth also echoed Allen’s classic designation of Israel as the “birthright” nation and Judah as the “scepter” nation. Bosworth, *The Bible Distinction*, 7.

⁵⁸ Bosworth, *The Bible Distinction*, 10. Strangely for a thoroughgoing historicist, Bosworth cites Scofield for support that “the two Kingdoms are to be reunited in the future Kingdom.” Ibid., 14.

⁵⁹ Bosworth, *The Bible Distinction*, 14, 15.

“The Anglo-Saxon Nations are Isaac’s sons or Saxons, but they are not Jews. Only one of the twelve Tribes are descendants of Judah. The Promise of ‘A Multitude of Nations’ was made to Ephraim, not to Judah.”⁶⁰ As with other British-Israelists, Bosworth found fulfillment of scripture in Britain’s occupation of the Holy Land following the Great War:

Obadiah the 17th verse speaks of the soldiers under General Allenby, who delivered Jerusalem from the Turks on the exact day and in the exact manner in which God says Jerusalem would be delivered, as belonging to the House of Jacob... The next verse shows us what part of the “The House of Jacob” they were—“The House of Joseph.” And the next verse shows us what part of the House of Joseph they were—“Ephraim;” and in the same verse He speaks of them as “the children of Israel”... To insist that these Scriptures addressed to Israel are to be applied to the Jews is to call the soldiers of General Allenby Jews.⁶¹

For Bosworth, a rigid hermeneutic combined with global political developments to reinforce his particular historicist approach to scripture.

Historian Paul King claims that Bosworth publically recanted his British-Israelism in 1944, although he offers no documentation for this assertion.⁶² On the other hand, British-Israel writers claim that “Bosworth maintained the same position on Prophecy to his triumphant home going.”⁶³ Regardless, Bosworth has continued to be held in high esteem by pentecostal British-Israelists. Although no evidence directly links Bosworth with the Los Angeles British-Israelists who published *Herald of our Race* and

⁶⁰ Ibid., 16. Anticipating the objection that no other people on earth bore the same physical features as the Jews, Bosworth pointed to the fact that the Jews had intermarried with foreigners during the exile. “You can see how the facial expressions [features] of all the descendants of these intermarriages would differ from that of the pure descendants of Judah, and still more from the BIRTHRIGHT TRIBES [Israel] who were only half brothers of Judah to begin with.” Ibid., 10.

⁶¹ Bosworth, *The Bible Distinction*, 15.

⁶² Paul L. King, *Genuine Gold: The Cautiously Charismatic Story of the Early Christian and Missionary Alliance* (Tulsa, OK: Word and Spirit Press, 2006), 235, 239, n. 24, 242, 248, n. 11.

⁶³ George W. Southwick, “Controversy in Zion: For the Benefit of Our Pentecostal Brethren,” in *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, ed. Charles A. Jennings (Owasso, OK: Truth in History Ministries, 2010), 198.

ran the Kingdom Bible College, this group advertised Bosworth's radio services and reprinted excerpts from *Christ the Healer*.⁶⁴ John A. Lovell, the influential British-Israelist of the 1940s and 1950s who worked in Texas and California, reprinted a number of Bosworth's articles in his *Kingdom Digest*. Lovell even reprinted Bosworth's article on the distinction between Judah and Israel as a lesson of his correspondence course.⁶⁵ Charles Benham, sometime coworker of Bosworth, published a paraphrase and elaboration of this article that also saw many reprints, sometimes with credit given to Bosworth, more often not.⁶⁶ C.O. Stadslev, a British-Israel minister in Minnesota, referred to Bosworth as "one of the most Christ-like men (both in and out of the pulpit) I ever knew." Stadslev republished several of Bosworth's sermons.⁶⁷ Eldon Purvis, who was central to the charismatic movement in the 1960s, later published Bosworth's "Bible Distinction" article in his periodical *New Beginnings*.

Bosworth's British-Israelism was typical and somewhat derivative. But he attached great meaning to the teaching as a way to maintain the integrity of biblical

⁶⁴ F. F Bosworth, "Is God the Author of Disease?," *Herald of Our Race* 2, no. 4 (April 1938): 9. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁶⁵ F. F Bosworth, "Recipe for Healing," *Kingdom Digest*, August 1950, 33–37; F.F. Bosworth, "Is Healing for All?," *Kingdom Digest*, September 1949, 18–21; F. F Bosworth, "The Windows of Heaven," *Kingdom Digest*, January 1948, 14–17. F. F Bosworth, *Judah vs. Israel*, Kingdom Study Course, Advanced Series: Lesson No. 4, n.d. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center. The Anglo-Saxon Federation cited also Bosworth's "Daniel's 'Seventy Weeks,'" in *Destiny* 15, no. 2 (February 1944): 42.

⁶⁶ "The Distinction Between Israel and Judah," *Kingdom Digest*, June 1952, 27–29; "Israel vs. Judah," *Kingdom Digest*, May 1947, 7–10. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁶⁷ F. F Bosworth, "The Greatest Sin; Or, the Sin of Omission," *Truth and Liberty*, October 1956, 20–30; F. F Bosworth, "Do All Speak with Tongues?," *Truth and Liberty*, September 1972, 23–31. Quote on p. 23. Carl Oliver Stadslev may have been related to Julius Stadslev, who accompanied Bosworth, Branham, and others in their work in South Africa in 1951. Julius was the author of *William Branham: A Prophet Visits South Africa*.

prophecy and the consistent supernatural activity of God as contrasted with the “elastic” method of dispensationalism.

Pentecostalism and British-Israelism

The dominant interpretation of British-Israelism as “a religious and emotional expression of British imperialism and American manifest destiny,” has obscured the deeper theological concerns that attracted adherents to its message.⁶⁸ Because early pentecostals do not fit the profile of the “well-to-do and patriotic” that this interpretation implies,⁶⁹ British-Israelism is often sidelined by historians of pentecostalism.⁷⁰ But the theory was adopted by a significant number of pentecostal leaders in America and Great Britain.

In the logic of the earliest phase of British-Israelism, the reliability of the Bible was the antecedent and British dominance was the consequent:

Certain it is that this Nation fulfils at the present day the destined role of Israel. This can only be due to the fact that Israel is in Britain: no other nation can have stepped into the promises entailed by God on Israel, for God cannot lie.⁷¹

⁶⁸ J. Gordon Melton, *Melton's Encyclopedia of American Religions*, 8th ed. (Detroit: Gale Cengage Learning, 2009), 565. See also Rivka Gonen, *To the Ends of the Earth: The Quest for the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 2002), 126–127, 140–143.

⁶⁹ Bryan R. Wilson, *Sects and Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 55.

⁷⁰ Pentecostal historians who mention British-Israelism relegate the teaching to an eccentric and inconsequential fringe. Walter J. Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 21–23, 185; James Robinson, *Pentecostal Origins: Early Pentecostalism in Ireland in the Context of the British Isles*, *Studies in Evangelical History and Thought* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005), 114, 117, 119, 159–160, 265; Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 115; James R. Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), 57–58, 101–102, 131; Desmond W. Cartwright, *The Great Evangelists: The Lives of George and Stephen Jeffreys* (Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986).

⁷¹ Oxonian (Walter Metcalfe H. Milner), *Israel's Wanderings; Or, The Sciiths, the Saxons, and the Kymry*, 1885, 4. Cited in Ben-Dor Benite, *The Ten Lost Tribes*, 196.

Although its political importance never disappeared,⁷² the British-Israel theory in the first half of the twentieth century was pressed into the service of the emerging debates over scripture. Particularly, those who embraced the theory in the 1920s and 1930s saw its value as an argument for the authority of scripture. In essence, the antecedent and the consequent were reversed: because England and America were the superior global powers, therefore scripture was vindicated. These later adherents, therefore, were more likely to come from holiness, pentecostal and fundamentalist ranks—those who were concerned about the modernist critique of scripture. As a later pentecostal adherent would claim, “the identity of modern Israel is essential to the vindication of the character of God and to the demonstration of the veracity of the Scriptures.”⁷³

Pentecostalism emerged as British-Israelism was spreading in the English-speaking world. Many holiness and pentecostal believers were already freed from denominational constraint, making them more receptive to innovative theological ideas. Frank Sandford, the charismatic ex-Baptist evangelist who directly influenced first generation pentecostals Charles Parham and A.J. Tomlinson, enthusiastically propagated the British-Israel message. Convinced especially by the arguments of Charles Totten,

⁷² Thus challenging the common notion that early pentecostals were basically apolitical. Richmann, “Prophecy and Politics.”

⁷³ Rupert C. Thomas, *The Coming of Christ and Israel-Britain's Identity* (London: The Covenant Publishing Company, 1935), 20. In addition to challenging the imperialistic interpretation, this emphasis also nuances scholarship that sees American British-Israelism primarily as the seed for anti-Semitic political ideologies. Richard V. Pierard, “The Contribution of British-Israelism to Antisemitism within Conservative Protestantism,” in *Holocaust and Church Struggle: Religion, Power and the Politics of Resistance*, ed. Hubert G. Locke and Marcia Sachs Littell, Studies in the Shoah (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996), 45–68. Barkun sees William J. Cameron as the main proponent of anti-Semitic British-Israelism in the 1930s. Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right*, 32–40. This is correct, but Barkun emphasizes Cameron’s role at the expense of full gospel British-Israelists—like Bosworth—who, although working alongside Cameron, did not evince anti-Semitism.

Sandford incorporated the teaching into his Maine community and Bible school.⁷⁴

Charles Parham, from whose Bethel Bible School in 1901 came the pentecostal doctrine of spirit-baptism, also taught the British-Israel message. No doubt influenced by Sandford, with whom he spent weeks in 1900, Parham preached and published British-Israelism as an integral part of his full gospel message.⁷⁵ Parham was also influenced by J.H. Allen, whose writings occasionally appeared in Parham's *Apostolic Faith* and who in February of 1927 became associate editor of the paper.⁷⁶ In the theological fluidity of early pentecostalism, leaders like W.H. Cossum could admit "definite sympathy" for the Anglo-Israel position, without "speak[ing] dogmatically about it."⁷⁷

John G. Lake, Bosworth's associate from their Zion days, also accepted the British-Israel doctrine. The interconnected circles of British-Israelism and pentecostalism are evident in Lake's meeting with Henry Dallimore at a British-Israel conference in 1920 (probably in Vancouver). Lake persuaded Dallimore to enter pentecostal ministry, and Dallimore became a pioneer of pentecostalism in New Zealand, continuing to preach

⁷⁴ Frank S. Murray, *The Sublimity of Faith: The Life and Work of Frank W. Sandford* (Amherst, NH: Kingdom Press, 1981), 163.

⁷⁵ "I do not think that any Full Gospel preacher ought to longer delay in acquainting himself with this subject as I believe it belongs with the Full Gospel message and that the message of the last day must include this subject or we are not preaching the full gospel." Charles F. Parham, "The Ten Lost Tribes," *Apostolic Faith* 4, no. 2 (February 1928): 10.

⁷⁶ Parham claimed to have known Allen since about 1890, and to have been familiar with his British-Israel writings for some years. Charles F. Parham, "A Pleasurable Meeting," *Apostolic Faith* 2, no. 4 (April 1926): 11. See J. H. Allen, "What We Saw at Windsor Castle," *Apostolic Faith* 2, no. 11 (November 1926); J. H. Allen, "What We Saw at Westminster [sic] Abbey," *Apostolic Faith* 2, no. 11 (November 1926).

⁷⁷ W.H. Cossum, "Mountain Peaks of Prophecy and Sacred History: Prophecy Fulfilled and Unfulfilled," *Latter Rain Evangel* 2, no. 6 (March 1910): 3. Anglo-Israelism is assumed, but not expounded in Everett Wilson, "Wonderful Signs: Soon Coming Christ," *Bible Standard* 3, no. 3 (1922): 4. A more forthright exposition of British-Israelism was presented in Jay. C. Kellogg, "The United States in Prophecy," *Bible Standard Overcomer* 15, no. 9 (September 1934): 3-4, 13-14. Kellogg was probably not pentecostal, but traveled in full gospel circles.

British-Israelism until his death.⁷⁸ Around 1925, Lake began work with Philip E.J. Monson, preaching British-Israelism to a San Diego congregation.⁷⁹ Lake's younger coworker, Gordon Lindsay, also promoted British-Israelism. According to Lindsay in a 1940 articles series, "the cycles [of Bible Chronology]...point unmistakably to the fact that the identity of Britain and the United States of America is to be found in Israel."⁸⁰ Lindsay, significantly, later became the manager for William Branham's campaigns when Bosworth also joined Branham's team. However, apparently neither Lindsay nor Bosworth continued publically to promote British-Israelism during their time with Branham.

Later pentecostal leaders—particularly those in non-denominational ministries—also proclaimed British-Israelism. George Hawtin, the controversial leader of the Latter Rain movement originating in Saskatchewan in the late 1940s, preached a British-Israelism that evinced some of the anti-Semitism of the later movement. Eldon Purvis, an influential leader in the early charismatic movement, combined his British-Israelism with an independent charismatic ministry.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Kemp Pendleton Burpeau, *God's Showman: A Historical Study of John G. Lake and South African/American Pentecostalism* (Oslo: Refleks, 2004), 219, n. 42.

⁷⁹ "Did You Know?," *Herald of Our Race* 4, no. 8 (August 1940): 3. Monson would later become identified with the anti-Semitic expression of British-Israelism. See Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right*, 175. Monson also republished Lake's *The Truth About Divine Healing* (Los Angeles: Covenant Evangelistic Association, n.d.), Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁸⁰ Gordon Lindsay, "The Wonders of Bible Chronology," *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 2 (February 1, 1940): 3–4, 7. Other articles in the series: Gordon Lindsay, "The Thirteen Cycles of the United States," *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 3 (March 1, 1940): 4–5, 12; Gordon Lindsay, "Cycles of the 'Sign Woman' - Israel," *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 3 (April 1, 1940): 9–12; Gordon Lindsay, "Cycles of Canada," *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 5 (May 1, 1940): 3–5, 15. These articles were an early version of Gordon Lindsay, *The Blueprints of God: Wonders of Bible Chronology*, vol. 1 (Portland, OR: Cosbys Printers, 1940). Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

⁸¹ For Hawtin, see Richmann, "Prophecy and Politics." For Purvis, see Melton, *Melton's Encyclopedia of American Religions*, 609.

A number of leading British pentecostals were committed to British-Israelism. William Hutchinson, who founded the first pentecostal church in Britain, was an ardent British-Israelist. His supporters believed that the apostolic offices were being revived in the pentecostal movement, and that this revival “is the sign that we are Israel.”⁸² Around 1920, the wildly successful pentecostal evangelist and founder of the Elim Pentecostal Church, George Jeffreys, was won over to British-Israelism. “God is restoring Israel as a servant-nation in the Celto-Anglo-Saxon peoples as the descendants of the ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel,” wrote Jeffreys in his clearest exposition of the teaching, “just as the Jews are the descendants of the Kingdom of Judah.”⁸³ When George Jeffreys split from the Elim church in 1940, his British-Israelism was a dominant factor.⁸⁴ The rejection of British-Israelism reminded Jeffreys of pentecostalism’s reception thirty years earlier:

The attitude of God’s people towards the restoration of Israel very much resembles that with which the Pentecostal outpouring was received in the early days. Then, as now, there were some for Pentecost, some against, and many were the misrepresentations and exaggerations with which both sides had to contend.⁸⁵

Jeffreys did not insist on uniform adherence to British-Israelism, but he fought for its right to be considered.⁸⁶ American British-Israelists, upon hearing of Elim’s censure of

⁸² Cited in Malcolm R. Hathaway, “The Role of William Oliver Hutchinson and the Apostolic Faith Church in the Formation of British Pentecostal Churches,” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 16 (January 1, 1996): 48.

⁸³ Cited in Albert W. Edsor, *Set Your House in Order: God’s Call to George Jeffreys as the Founder of the Elim Pentecostal Movement* (Chichester, West Sussex: New Wine Press, 1989), 127.

⁸⁴ David Neil Hudson, “A Schism and Its Aftermath: An Historical Analysis of Denominational Disruption in the Elim Pentecostal Church, 1939-1940.” (Ph.D. diss., King’s College London (University of London), 1999), 180.

⁸⁵ Cited in Edsor, *Set Your House in Order*, 126.

⁸⁶ George Jeffreys, “The Israel Question,” in *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, ed. Charles A. Jennings (Owasso, OK: Truth in History, 2010), 301–305.

the teaching, pleaded with the denomination to recognize that “almost every outstanding teacher and deep student of the Bible whose heart has been yearning over souls has accepted and taught this message,” including “Dr. F.F. Bosworth.”⁸⁷ James McWhirter, a colleague of Jeffreys, was also an avid British-Israelist. His *Britain and Palestine in Prophecy* (1937) was part logbook of his Holy Land tour, part apology for British-Israelism. In the British Mandate for Palestine, McWhirter saw evidence for the return of a portion of British-Israel, which for British-Israelists was an eschatological necessity.⁸⁸

The earliest pentecostal British-Israelists focused on the imperialistic implications of the message. While on a venture in the Holy Land, Sandford claimed to have identified the lost tribes by a simple process of matching a biblical description with present reality:

The United States is a ‘great’ nation: England is a ‘greater’ nation, ruling over sixty colonies and three hundred and fifty millions of people—a great, dominant power among the nations; and these two, the ‘great’ and the ‘greater’ nations, are *of the same blood*, and in every particular meet the sevenfold description of the text. NO OTHER TWO NATIONS ON THE GLOBE MEET THE DESCRIPTION. THESE TWO DO. OUR SEARCH IS ENDED. *The lost is found.*⁸⁹

Parham echoed Sandford’s imperialistic foundation for the teaching.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ “Foursquare Leaders Deny Members a Fuller Gospel,” *Kingdom Voice* 2, no. 5 (March 10, 1940): 2.

⁸⁸ James McWhirter, *Britain and Palestine in Prophecy* (London, Methuen & Co., 1937), 26.

⁸⁹ Frank Sandford, “Who God’s Ancient People Are,” in *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, ed. Charles A. Jennings (Owasso, OK: Truth in History, 2010), 259.

⁹⁰ “Some of these prophecies: ‘They should be the head and not the tail of nations; ‘Never overcome except by their own people; where [*sic*, were] to be the Mistress of the seas; Possess the gate ways [*sic*] of their enemies; which accounts for the possession of Gibraltar, Suez and Panama Canal; they were to possess the gold and silver and precious stones of the world. This accounts for the U.S. acquiring Alaska and the way the boor [*sic*] war was settled.’ Parham, “The Ten Lost Tribes,” 11.

The notion that identifying the tribes vindicated scripture—and its correlate, that denying the identity of the tribes fueled atheism—was common from at least the eighteenth century.⁹¹ As J.H. Allen put it,

The failure, hitherto, to identify the Gospel promise as belonging to that branch of the Abrahamic posterity which has the accompanying national characteristics, has been the cause of untold confusion, untold harm, untold skepticism, as well as much loudly-told infidelity, both within the pale of Christian denominations and out of them.⁹²

“Great violence has been done to the truth of God by those who have tried to spiritualize these prophecies,” said Allen, describing the modernist understanding of prophecy, which sought spiritually to apply the Israelite promises to the church.⁹³ Allen would not have it: “Jesus died to confirm the promises made to the fathers, not to transfer them.”⁹⁴ This was even a concern for the imperialist McWhirter.⁹⁵ The modernist-spiritualizing interpretation was not only spiritually unsatisfying, but, said Parham, it begged infidels to point out that “Your God has lied.”⁹⁶

As the modernist-fundamentalist controversies intensified after 1920, British-Israelist rhetoric focused more on buttressing the authority of the Bible, much like

⁹¹ Ben-Dor Benite, *The Ten Lost Tribes*, 19. In truth, this symbiotic relationship of history and scripture proving one another in turn is at the root of all ten tribes quests. As one historian of the quest for the lost tribes has appreciated, “the power of the tribes as a mystery...owes its persistence to the authority of the biblical narrative—the *ur-text* of the tribes’ story.” *Ibid.*, 15.

⁹² Allen, *Judah’s Sceptre and Joseph’s Birthright*, 339–340.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 359.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 349.

⁹⁵ “The spiritualizing of the *unconditional* material promises made to Abraham and the claim that they are fulfilled in the church are not only unsatisfactory to unbelievers but also to an ever-increasing number of believers.” McWhirter, *Britain and Palestine in Prophecy*, 70. Emphasis in original.

⁹⁶ Charles F. Parham, *The Sermons of Charles F. Parham*, ed. Donald W. Dayton, *The Higher Christian Life* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 92.

dispensationalism. As one American British-Israelist put it in the early 1930s, “Anglo-Israel truth proves the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, and makes the Bible a new Book, fascinating and intelligible, revealing a coherent plan from Genesis to Revelation.”⁹⁷ J.F. Bradford, a Texas British-Israelist, confidently asserted in 1932, that “in identifying the once lost House of Israel, we are, incidentally, proving the consistent truth of Holy Scripture.”⁹⁸ In a list of the functions of the British-Israel message that was reprinted often in *Herald of Our Race*, the first line read: “Proves the inspiration of the Scriptures.”⁹⁹ According to Charles Benham, “if we identify Israel as a *national entity* functioning today, the English-speaking nations being the Joseph nations, it becomes unnecessary to question the veracity of the Holy Bible.” For Benham, British-Israelism provided plenary support for his conservative convictions. Christ’s death, in part, provided forgiveness for the national sins of Israel, allowing the Anglo-Saxons to become the chief evangelists of the world. Therefore identifying Israel meant that none could “doubt the efficacy of the atoning work of our Lord in fulfilling His appointed task in coming to earth.”¹⁰⁰ Benham believed that the buttressed scriptural authority in the national message also had an eschatological function. Because “the prophecies of God

⁹⁷ William F. Groom, “Introduction,” in Jesse F. Bradford, *Are Anglo-Saxons Israelites? The Greatest Religious Question of the Day Discussed from a Bible Standpoint and Identifies the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel as the English Speaking Race, and God’s Appointed Servants* (Dallas: Bradford Printing Company, 1932), 8.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁹⁹ See, for example, *Herald of Our Race* 2, no. (January 1938): 2.

¹⁰⁰ Benham, “Joseph Is Yet Alive,” 285–286. Emphasis in original.

regarding the past have been literally fulfilled,” wrote Benham, “we can now look with assurance to the fulfillment of His promises for the future.”¹⁰¹

Like dispensationalists, British-Israelists argued that scripture was so integral to the nature of God that the veracity of scripture implicated God’s character. Therefore Hawtin was compelled to assert that the ten tribes “are not lost! *God would not be God* if they were not *at this very moment* fulfilling every detail of his covenant with them. . . .”¹⁰² But aside from the historicist stance, British-Israelism differed from dispensationalism in yearning for a sacred narrative that put proponents in the center of the drama. “We are the people to whom the prophets addressed their message,” said Benham.¹⁰³

Pentecostals and other full-gospel advocates generally identified with fundamentalists against modernists in the inter-war-years debates over scripture. But as demonstrated in the previous chapter, these believers also critiqued the fundamentalist defense of scripture, particularly the cessationism of certain Reformed theologies and dispensationalism. British-Israelism should be seen in this same light—an argument for scriptural authority that objected both to modernism (spiritualism) and fundamentalism (futurism). British-Israelism supported eschatological urgency and an inerrant Bible. Although ideologically opposed to dispensationalism in its hermeneutical approach,

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 286.

¹⁰² George Hawtin, *The Abrahamic Covenant* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Artisan Sales, 1988), 124. Cited in Richmann, “Prophecy and Politics.” Emphasis in original. Benham, “Joseph Is Yet Alive,” 288.

¹⁰³ Benham, “Joseph Is Yet Alive,” 288.

British-Israelism fulfilled a remarkably similar role for those wishing to combat modernism.¹⁰⁴

Opposition to British-Israelism

As a novel approach to scripture, British-Israelism was bound to receive criticism. As an interpretation that appealed to religious conservatives, it was bound to receive its fiercest criticism from other religious conservatives who felt threatened by it.

In the new era in which British-Israelism became entangled in the debates over scripture, dispensational fundamentalists were the first to attack British-Israelism in a sustained manner. Not surprisingly, many of the same figures who would later critique Bosworth's divine healing publically refuted British-Israelism as well. In 1921, Arno Gaebelein found many scriptures that seemed to contradict the notion of a perpetual distinction between the house of Israel and the house of Judah. From his dispensationalist mindset that proposed a prophetic parenthesis between the apostolic age and the rapture, Gaebelein took for granted that "all the promises and blessings of Israel are always conditioned in their fulfilment on the Return of the Lord." For Gaebelein, British-Israelism was "worse than post-millennialism" because it confused the dispensations. Accordingly, both British-Israelists and dispensationalists could both affirm that when Jesus sent his disciples "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" this meant a literal, lineal people, rather than a spiritualized Israel represented by the church. But for Gaebelein, this

¹⁰⁴ Recognizing this religious function of British-Israelism should temper scholarly treatments of the teaching that highlight its scientific shortcomings, for instance Gonen, *To the Ends of the Earth*, 137–140; Parfitt, *The Lost Tribes of Israel*, 47, 54–55.

people would only become visible in the coming age, “not the present dispensation as erroneously taught” by British-Israelists.¹⁰⁵

Another 1931 article in *Our Hope* accused the doctrine of “mutilat[ing] God’s word,” maintaining that the only proper method of handling prophecies was to “distinguish between the dispensations.” Despite these efforts, Gaebelein was disappointed to discover that some *Our Hope* readers were British-Israelists.¹⁰⁶ No one more than Gaebelein stressed the differences between the futurist and historicist positions at issue. “These are the times of the Gentiles,” said Gaebelein, “during which Israel cannot be blessed. Israel’s blessing cannot begin until the expiration of the seventy weeks of Daniel, the last of which is still future, and the date of its beginning unrevealed.”¹⁰⁷ In 1938, Gaebelein published an attack from the pen of Anton Darms, an overseer in Dowie’s Christian Catholic Church who had previously held the teaching. Darms believed the system was built on a faulty foundation, for its early proponents “lacked the proper understanding of Dispensational truth.”¹⁰⁸ Darms astutely blamed modernist spiritualized interpretations of Israel for the doctrine’s appeal. “In repudiating this wrong

¹⁰⁵ Arno Clemens Gaebelein, “The British-Israel Invention,” *Our Hope* 27, no. 7 (February 1921): 463–68. Quotes on pp. 465, 466. Seven years later, Gaebelein repeated the same arguments: “We are still living in the times of the Gentiles, and before Israel can have her blessing the times of the Gentiles must end. They will not end till the predicted events connected with that end have been [fulfilled].” Arno Clemens Gaebelein, “The Anglo-Israel Delusion,” *Our Hope* 34, no. 8 (February 1928): 478.

¹⁰⁶ Arno Clemens Gaebelein, “Anglo-Israelism Once More,” *Our Hope* 38, no. 7 (January 1932): 421.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 422.

¹⁰⁸ Anton Darms, “The Fallacy of the British-Israel Delusion,” *Our Hope* 45, no. 5 (November 1938): 321. Cf. Anton Darms, *The Delusion of British-Israelism: A Comprehensive Treatise* (New York: Publication Office “Our Hope,” 1938).

allegorical teaching of the Church, British-Israelism declares that Great Britain, not the Church constitutes the Israel entitled to the special favor and blessing of God.”¹⁰⁹

Pentecostals occasionally critiqued British-Israelism. Perhaps because of the proximity of British-Israel activities in Chicago, those associated with the Stone Church were the first to denounce the teaching. Pastor Philip Wittich off-handedly refuted British-Israelism as “unscriptural and unhistorical” in a sermon on Jonah in 1926.¹¹⁰ Around the same time, a brief note in the *Bible Standard* asserted that the teaching had no scriptural support.¹¹¹ From mid-1930, the *Latter Rain Evangel* advertised Leonard Sale-Harrison’s booklet critique.¹¹² In 1934, the same paper published a critique of British-Israelism, focusing particularly on the frequent partial biblical citations British-Israelists employed. The writer was particularly “saddened that evangelical, seemingly fundamental teachers of the Word of God could so take the scriptures out of their setting and do violence...to the Word of God.”¹¹³ The *Latter Rain Evangel* also published a 1936 address Daniel Finestone gave to the Hebrew Christian Conference attacking British-Israelism. According to Finestone, the teaching robs Jews of their chosen status and their

¹⁰⁹ Darms, “The Fallacy of the British-Israel Delusion,” 322.

¹¹⁰ Philip Wittich, “Answering the Objections in the Book of Jonah,” *Latter Rain Evangel*, March 1926, 6. For another incidental critique, see Otto J. Klink, “The Jew,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 26, no. 7 (March 1935): 8.

¹¹¹ “The Anglo-Israel Movement,” *Bible Standard* 7, no. 2 (1926): 7–8.

¹¹² *Latter Rain Evangel* 22, no. 11 (August 1930): 24.

¹¹³ Thomsen, “Anglo-Israelism, Under the Searchlight of God’s Word,” 3.

future glory, robs Christ of his royal prerogative, and robs the church of its mission and its gospel.¹¹⁴

The Assemblies of God was a little later in taking British-Israelism seriously.¹¹⁵ A brief note in 1936 called the theory “utterly unfounded.”¹¹⁶ A few years later, general superintendent Ernest S. Williams, while answering a question on the destinies of Israelites and Jews, averred that the Anglo-Israel teaching “provoke[s] racial and national pride and egotism.” Without further comment, Williams said that “the teaching also throws out of balance the correct understanding of prophecy.”¹¹⁷ In 1940, the Assemblies of God’s Gospel Publishing House sold Anton Darms’s *The Delusion of British-Israelism*, bemoaning that the teaching was “now claiming a number of good people as its dupes.”¹¹⁸ The next year, the *Pentecostal Evangel* expressed frustration that British-Israel writings were being used in Europe to associate Anglo-Saxons with Jews.¹¹⁹ Again in 1943, the *Pentecostal Evangel*, citing British pentecostal Donald Gee, refused to deal theologically or exegetically with British-Israelism. Instead, the paper tried to take the spiritual high ground and encouraged believers to consider such theories—even if true—

¹¹⁴ Daniel Finestone, “Anglo-Israelism -- Fact or Fancy?,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 27, no. 8 (May 1936): 13–15. Finestone was confident that William J. Cameron’s involvement in British-Israelism was sufficient to denounce the whole movement as anti-Semitic.

¹¹⁵ In late 1917, the Assemblies of God organ took notice of Anglo-Israelism, promising to deal with the teaching. No article on the teaching appeared, and no indication was given if a pro or con stance would be taken. *Weekly Evangel* no. 217 (December 1, 1917): 5.

¹¹⁶ “Lost Tribes,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1175 (November 14, 1936): 10.

¹¹⁷ *Pentecostal Evangel* no. 1316 (July 29, 1939): 11.

¹¹⁸ “The British-Israel Delusion,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1357 (May 11, 1940): 7. From the early 1940s, the Assemblies of God also promoted the refutation of British-Israelism written by George L. Rose. *Pentecostal Evangel* no. 1484 (October 17, 1942): 13; *Pentecostal Evangel* no. 1742 (September 27, 1947): 16.

¹¹⁹ “The Anglo-Israel Error,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1392 (January 11, 1941): 12.

“refuse” compared to knowing Christ.¹²⁰ The paper also published Australian evangelist Frank Varley’s terse critique in 1944.¹²¹

The Christian and Missionary Alliance also attacked British-Israelism. In 1924, the *Alliance Weekly* summarized for its readers the critique of D.M. Panton, a highly-regarded British fundamentalist. According to Panton, British-Israelism was “historically impossible,” “directly contradicts explicit Scriptures,” was an “unconscious betrayal of the Gospel,” and a “grave menace to the Jew,” as well as an “an abandonment of Grace for Law.” Besides “[lend]ing itself to the wildest extravagancies,” the theory, according to Panton, violated “dispensational truth.”¹²² Frustrated that the theory had not dissipated, *Alliance Weekly* reprinted a full article on British-Israelism from Panton in 1933. Panton admitted his frustration that British-Israelism “numbers some honored evangelical names among its adherents.”¹²³ Oswald Smith, a former close associate of Bosworth, wrote against the teaching in 1936, perhaps unaware that Bosworth had adopted the teaching. Smith condemned the teaching for its association with eccentrics like Richard Brothers and Edward Hine and its reliance upon dubious pyramidology.¹²⁴ Smith’s attack of British-Israelism struck Luke Rader as odd, since Smith was so indebted to Bosworth’s

¹²⁰ “The Anglo-Israel Theory,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1497 (January 16, 1943): 10.

¹²¹ Frank Varley, “Is Britain Israel?,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1551 (January 29, 1944): 3.

¹²² D.M. Panton, “British Israelism or Anglo Israelism,” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 19 (November 8, 1924): 315.

¹²³ D.M. Panton, “Anglo-Israelism,” *Alliance Weekly* 68, no. 32 (August 12, 1933): 500.

¹²⁴ Oswald J. Smith, “British Israelism, A Dangerous Fallacy,” *Defender*, July 1936, 16–19, 21. Quote from Oswald J. Smith, *Who Are the False Prophets?* (Toronto: Peoples Press, 1953), 35–36. See Darms, *The Delusion of British-Israelism*, 223.

work.¹²⁵ Another British-Israelist, Curtis Ewing, also seemed to think that Bosworth's adherence to the teaching was enough to refute Smith's attack.¹²⁶

John A. MacMillan, respected Alliance missionary, wrote against British-Israelism in 1934—the same year as the earliest evidence of Bosworth's acceptance of the teaching. Concerned that the doctrine “of late has been gaining adherents rapidly,” MacMillan had no patience for what he identified as a “doctrine of demons” that was “not in any sense Christian.” MacMillan saw the menace of British-Israelism to be its truth mixed with error. In describing British-Israelism as “a purely national movement,” MacMillan missed—like historians after him—the doctrine's scriptural appeal. MacMillan also took issue with some modernists' conflation of fundamentalism and British-Israelism, wishing rather “to disconnect...the idea that British-Israelism and Fundamentalism have anything in common.”¹²⁷ MacMillan took apart every pillar of British-Israelism, scriptural, historical and philological.¹²⁸ In 1937, the Alliance paper published Canadian fundamentalist Baptist W.F. Roadhouse's refutation of the “now widely-stressed Anglo- or British-Israelism.” Disdained by secular scholarship, British-Israelism “stands condemned before the world,” said Roadhouse. Historical validity

¹²⁵ Luke Rader, “Is British-Israelism a Dangerous Fallacy?,” *Sunshine News*, An Excerpt from the *Sunshine News*, July 16, 1936. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center. Whatever the personal issues involved, Bosworth was either unphased by Smith's criticism or unformed, for Bosworth visited Smith's evangelistic services in Jamaica in 1948. “Plane Passengers,” *Daily Gleaner*, January 17, 1948, 21.

¹²⁶ Curtis Clair Ewing, *The Anglo-Israel Belief: Is It a Cult?* (Pasadena, CA, n.d.), 2, 5. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

¹²⁷ J.A. MacMillan, “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy,” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 35 (September 1, 1934): 548.

¹²⁸ “We freely admit the ingenuity of these coincidences,” wrote MacMillan of the British-Israelist contention for Hebrew derivation of “British” and “Saxon,” “but the relationship of the words is not so easy to prove.” J.A. MacMillan, “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy,” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 37 (September 15, 1934): 580.

aside, Roadhouse claimed that the theory leads to “absurd incredibilities” in biblical interpretation.¹²⁹

As united as many full gospel advocates were in their opposition of British-Israelism, they were not agreed on its errors or on how to refute it. To one pentecostal commentator, the whole notion of identifying the ten tribes was silly, for “if we knew where they were, they would not be the *lost* tribes!”¹³⁰ Another pentecostal critic, however, insisted that “the ten tribes of Israel are not lost, and never have been. The God of Abraham knows where they are, and when his time comes for dealing again with Israel as a nation, they will be forthcoming in fulfilment of his purposes of grace toward them.”¹³¹ Some, like Gaebelien, maintained dispensationalist futurism as a sure defense, while others fought the British-Israelists on their own historicist turf. MacMillan insisted that Genesis 9:27 (“God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem”) foretold the overturning of the Semitic people in favor of Gentiles.¹³² While some opponents wanted to refute British-Israel claims point-by-point, for others it was enough to critique their haphazard method of proof-texting as “a medley of unconnected passages” (a hollow critique coming from a thoroughgoing dispensationalist).¹³³ Roadhouse and Smith appealed to scholarly historical consensus, thus leaving themselves

¹²⁹ W.F. Roadhouse, “Anglo-Israelism,” *Alliance Weekly* 62, no. 36 (September 4, 1937): 563, 564.

¹³⁰ “Lost Tribes.” Emphasis in original.

¹³¹ Varley, “Is Britain Israel?”

¹³² J.A. MacMillan, “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy,” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 38 (September 22, 1934): 596. Many critics also believed that certain Old Testament prophecies foretelling curses on Israel precluded any identification with Britain. See for example, Varley, “Is Britain Israel?”; Roadhouse, “Anglo-Israelism,” September 4, 1937, 564.

¹³³ Darms, “The Fallacy of the British-Israel Delusion,” 323.

open to the reasonable charge from British-Israelists that they placed human wisdom above God's word.¹³⁴

More than any specific historical or exegetical issue, the materialism of British-Israelism scandalized its critics. "British-Israelism is dangerous," said Oswald Smith, "because it places the emphasis on national instead of individual salvation."¹³⁵ Daniel Finestone voiced the concern of many Christians, that, if taken to "its logical conclusion," British-Israelism "is really a gospel of *race* and *place* which has been substituted for a Gospel of grace."¹³⁶ This slippery-slope argument served critics well, and in the charged atmosphere of World War II-era nationalism, this could be a devastating moral indictment.¹³⁷ God's plan, said critics, was "not the going far afield into a purely Gentile race for the perpetuator of David's 'house,' but the lifting it out of the earthly 'seed' into the heavenly."¹³⁸ Gaebelien asserted that "the greatest blessing God bestows is the blessing of the new birth, to which the earthly blessings of Israel are only sequel. *This is completely lost sight of by Anglo-Israelism.*"¹³⁹ Despite British-Israelist protests to the contrary, opponents felt that British-Israelism "would make identification with Britain or America the only requisite for final salvation."¹⁴⁰ As MacMillan put it, British Israelism's

¹³⁴ Rader, "Is British-Israelism a Dangerous Fallacy?"

¹³⁵ Smith, *Who Are the False Prophets?*, 42.

¹³⁶ Finestone, "Anglo-Israelism -- Fact or Fancy?" Quote on p. 15. Emphasis in original.

¹³⁷ A 1939 editorial compared British-Israelism with pan-Germanism, for "each proclaims a superior and exclusive nationality as its basis." "A Migration Register," *Alliance Weekly* 74, no. 1 (January 7, 1934): 3.

¹³⁸ W.F. Roadhouse, "Anglo-Israelism," *Alliance Weekly* 62, no. 37 (September 11, 1937): 581.

¹³⁹ Gaebelien, "The Anglo-Israel Delusion," 478. Emphasis in original.

¹⁴⁰ Stewart P. MacLennan, "Anglo-Israelism," *Our Hope* 38, no. 2 (August 1931): 114.

“tendency is placed upon the earthly, whereas the New Testament lays it upon the heavenly...[the Christian’s] blessed hope is not to be established in this world, but to be caught away out of it.”¹⁴¹ Therefore, the theory “could have no spiritual value for the Christian. The deeper blessings of this age are not for a fleshly Israel, but belong to those redeemed ones.”¹⁴² Opponents felt confident that preachers of British-Israelism would inevitably lose their simple message of salvation—a critique remarkably similar to that leveled against Bosworth and other divine healers for their focus on health.¹⁴³

In discussing Charles Parham’s legacy, Pentecostal historian Walter Hollenweger says that Parham’s British-Israelism “has been contradicted by Pentecostalism.”¹⁴⁴ Whether this is a historical-descriptive or a theological-normative claim is not clear. In either case, such a position cannot be maintained. Although the majority of pentecostals did not identify with British-Israelism—and an outspoken few attacked it—enough pentecostals embraced the teaching to call Hollenweger’s claim into question. More important is the nature of the pentecostals’ critique of British-Israelism. Never did the opponents call to their support any of the distinctive or favored pentecostal teachings or practices. In other words, those who rejected it did so for reasons other than their pentecostal identity. In fact, the pentecostal critique was in no way distinguished from that of other full gospel adherents or fundamentalists. The rejection of British-Israelism

¹⁴¹ J.A. MacMillan, “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy,” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 39 (September 29, 1934): 612–613.

¹⁴² MacMillan, “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy,” September 1, 1934, 548.

¹⁴³ “The fact that some faithful preachers and evangelists are in the movement argues nothing in its favor. The time will most assuredly come for them, if they continue in its fellowship, when their testimony for the truth will grow weaker. The change may be so slow as to be imperceptible, but it will be non the less sure.” MacMillan, “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy,” September 29, 1934, 612.

¹⁴⁴ Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism*, 23.

in pentecostal and Alliance circles—trailing the fundamentalists by about a decade—mirrors the larger trend of fundamentalization in these denominations in the late 1930s and 1940s.

Critics derided British-Israelism as a hopelessly convoluted system of scriptural interpretation, championing themselves as defenders of “the simplicity of Christ.”¹⁴⁵ But dispensationalism—the prophetic system historically favored among British-Israel critics, including pentecostals—had no more claim as a “common-sense” approach to scripture than British-Israelism,¹⁴⁶ and as pentecostal theologians have been recognizing for decades, dispensationalism is in many ways incompatible with the pentecostal worldview.¹⁴⁷ Dispensationalism, however, had the polemical advantage of being a non-refutable hypothesis. One could accept the hermeneutics of dispensationalism or not, but one could not prove or disprove its material claims, because (in terms of the present age) it made none.¹⁴⁸ Critics could attack British-Israelism on historical and philological grounds without fear of reprisal. As valid as such arguments might be, they were dispensable in light of the larger objection that British-Israelism substituted material for

¹⁴⁵ MacMillan, “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy,” September 1, 1934, 548.

¹⁴⁶ Of course, one can detect the irony of the fundamentalist “common sense” approach to scriptures, for while always insisting that the interpretation of scripture is accessible to every believer, dispensationalist teachers made their adherents extremely dependent on their particular grid of interpretation. Dispensationalism and British-Israelism are anything but inductive. See Weber, “The Two-Edged Sword,” 113–117.

¹⁴⁷ Gerald T. Sheppard, “Pentecostals and the Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism: The Anatomy of an Uneasy Relationship,” *Pneuma* 6, no. 2 (September 1, 1984): 5–33; Peter Althouse, *Spirit of the Last Days: Pentecostal Eschatology in Conversation with Jürgen Moltmann*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, 25 (London, New York: T & T Clark International, 2003); Matthew K. Thompson, *Kingdom Come: Revisioning Pentecostal Eschatology*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, 37 (Blandford Forum, Dorset, U.K.: Deo Publishing, 2010).

¹⁴⁸ As W.F. Roadhouse put it: “Thus *only regeneration avails*, and that is never communal, nor nationalistic, nor world-wide in this dispensation.” Roadhouse, “Anglo-Israelism,” September 4, 1937, 565. Emphasis in original. The modernist-spiritualizing system of interpretation was similarly non-refutable, since it made no material claims whatsoever.

spiritual blessings. That pentecostals and full gospel believers should join forces with fundamentalists to deny empirical signs of God's favor and reprove the teaching for its emphasis on physical blessings is perhaps the greater contradiction.¹⁴⁹

Bosworth's British-Israelism, like his rejection of the tongues evidence doctrine, is not sufficient to cast him outside the bounds of pentecostalism, for pentecostalism presented no inherent contradiction of British-Israelism. Scholars are on safer ground recognizing, with Donald Dayton, that pentecostalism's "eschatological motif... could coalesce with, or perhaps better, express itself through a variety of distinct eschatological schemes from dispensationalism through British-Israelism that circulated in the fluid, popular Evangelical culture."¹⁵⁰ Both dispensationalism and British-Israelism were honest attempts to deal with the question Paul addresses in Romans 9-11: how will God be faithful to the promises he has made to Israel? Both groups rejected the spiritualized solution of the modernists. While dispensationalism answered this by postponing prophetic fulfillment to another age, British-Israelism claimed that the prophecies had been fulfilled in the Anglo-Israel population throughout history up to the present day. Although British-Israelism had its scientific weaknesses, its exegetical merit was comparable to that of dispensationalism. Using the same literalist proof-texting methodology, the two systems simply chose different texts as proofs. Both systems also functioned the same way as a defense against modernism, championing biblical authority and the imminent premillennial return of Christ.

¹⁴⁹ See chapter eight for a fuller discussion of Bosworth's British-Israelism in relation to the pentecostal supernaturalist worldview.

¹⁵⁰ Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Studies in Evangelicalism, No. 5 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987), 145.

Winding Down?, 1940-1947

Bosworth seems to have cut his public ties with the Anglo-Saxon Federation in late 1940. Records do not place him at their conferences, and he no longer advertised or published articles in its journal. Around 1942, Bosworth moved to Philadelphia, perhaps to be closer to his brother, who was working as a regional evangelist for the Alliance. Bosworth continued his radio show for at least another year in Philadelphia, claiming at the end of fourteen years of radio ministry to have received 250,000 letters.¹⁵¹ He also preached occasionally at area Alliance churches, calling into question the claim that Bosworth was ostracized from the denomination until he allegedly recanted British-Israelism in 1944.¹⁵² Bosworth may have considered himself at least partially retired by the mid-1940s: he told his wife around this time that he suspected he was “through” with full-time ministry. But he was not completely done working; he soon received a revelation that “the Lord is my strength,” and in April of 1947, Bosworth opened a two-week campaign at the West End Alliance Tabernacle in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, where parishioners said they were amazed at the “pep” in Bosworth’s preaching. The publicity of this campaign also suggests that rather than settling into retirement, Bosworth was itching for a fuller return to public ministry.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ F. F. Bosworth, “Gifts of Healing Plus,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 10 (January 1950): B.

¹⁵² “Alliance Group to Hear Rev. Bosworth,” *Pottstown Mercury*, February 14, 1942, 10; “Christian Alliance,” *Pottstown Mercury*, March 6, 1943, 12. In *Exploits of Faith* 15, no. 3 (March 1942), Bosworth’s address is listed as Philadelphia. Pennsylvania papers began advertising Bosworth’s radio program around this time. See *Harrisburg Telegraph*, January 23, 1943, 2.

¹⁵³ F.F. Bosworth, “Be Ye Doers of the Word” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 22, 1954), <http://www.brothermel.org/audio-video/74>. Accessed September 29, 2014; “To Open Campaign,” *Williamsport Sun Gazette*, April 19, 1947, 2. See also advertisements in *Altoona Mirror*, April 19, 1947, 4; and *Williamsport Gazette and Bulletin*, May 3, 1947, 7.

Conclusion

Although Bosworth's ministry was slowed by age and finances, he was not necessarily looking toward retirement in his fifth and six decades of life. He continued to preach, write, and travel. He even took the probably taxing step of reevaluating his approach to biblical prophecy—not a small concern for a conservative evangelical in the twentieth century. In his embrace of British-Israelism, Bosworth continued his non-fundamentalist critique of modernism that was so prominent in his divine healing message and his promulgation of a gospel that emphasized the ongoing supernatural activity of God. Although the teaching was greeted with hostility by many conservative Christians in the 1920s and 1930s, British-Israelism was refined by the same concerns for biblical authority and Christ's return that drew so many to dispensationalism. That British-Israelism did not win a majority of pentecostals reflects not its exegetical strength or theological integrity, but its scientific vulnerability and the social forces of fundamentalism.

In their critique of British-Israelism's focus on the material, J.A. MacMillan and Oswald Smith claimed that its adherents would surely weaken in their conviction for spiritual truths and evangelism. But as Luke Rader pointed out, Bosworth's ministry proved otherwise, as he continued to stress evangelism, divine healing, the new birth, and Christian obedience alongside his commitment to British-Israelism.¹⁵⁴ Furthermore, the next phase of Bosworth's ministry would take him to the greatest heights of his career in promotion of the spiritual truths of the gospel of the supernatural.

¹⁵⁴ MacMillan, "British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy," September 29, 1934, 612; Smith, "British Israelism, A Dangerous Fallacy," 19, 21; Rader, "Is British-Israelism a Dangerous Fallacy?"

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Voice of Healing Years, 1948-1958

[B]elieve it or not, despite the trend of materialistic thinking that has engulfed the intelligentsia and the schools of learning of our day, there does and always will exist a longing for the manifestation of the power of the supernatural.

—Gordon Lindsay (1950)¹

In late 1947, at the age of seventy, F.F. Bosworth's best years in ministry appeared to be behind him. But as Bosworth entered his seventh decade, pentecostalism entered a period of ferment and creativity that was unseen since its first decade. Social factors help explain this transition, particularly the passing of most first generation pentecostals and the economic boom following World War II. Independent pentecostalism expressed this creative drive in a divine healing revival that brought Bosworth—initially through his close relationship with William Branham—back into the main current of American pentecostalism.

The postwar healing revival was in many ways a continuation of earlier independent pentecostal healing ministries, like that of Raymond Richey, Aimee Semple McPherson, Charles Price, and of course, Bosworth himself. What was new in the late 1940s was the influx of cultural support for the healing ministry. The healing evangelists of the late 1940s and 1950s achieved unprecedented success, if success be measured in conversions, miracles, and income. American culture seemed to welcome their supernatural gospel in a way that it had not before, even during the heyday of Sister

¹ Gordon Lindsay, *William Branham: A Man Sent from God* (Jeffersonville, IN: William Branham, 1950), 20.

Aimee. Hundreds of big- and small-time evangelists took to the trail from about 1948 to 1958, and they took the same basic gospel of the supernatural to the masses of North America and dozens of other countries that Bosworth had cherished since his healing in Fitzgerald, Georgia, in the late 1890s. In the process, they laid the foundation for some of the most important developments in twentieth-century Christianity: the charismatic revival, the word of faith movement, and signs and wonders evangelism.

A Fresh Anointing from the Lord, 1948-1951

Shortly after his meetings in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, in the spring of 1947, Bosworth moved to Miami, Florida. There, in January of 1948, Bosworth heard over the radio the testimony of two boys who had been healed of blindness at the local tent meetings of William Marrion Branham (1909-1965), a Baptist-turned-pentecostal healing evangelist from Indiana. Although originally skeptical of Branham's grandiose claims of spiritual giftedness, Bosworth decided to attend a meeting. Bosworth watched as a young girl came through the prayer line multiple times without being healed. Determining that the girl did not have sufficient faith for healing, Branham invited her on to the stage and instructed her to hold on to his coat and pray until she had enough faith. When Branham supernaturally discerned that her faith had risen sufficiently, he declared her healing to her and demanded that her braces be removed, revealing that her legs were now "perfectly normal."² This scene, among others, convinced Bosworth, who reportedly exclaimed: "That's what I've looked for!...I've watched the Scriptures for that."³ The two

² William Branham, "Diseases and Afflictions" (Sermon, Louisville, Kentucky, January 1950), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0100-diseases-and-afflictions>. Accessed September 7, 2014.

³ William Branham, "Mary's Belief" (Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, March 11, 1960), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0311-Marys-belief>. Accessed September 20, 2014.

evangelists began a friendship that would span the final decade of Bosworth's life. Their meeting was propitious for both men, as Branham revived the aged Bosworth's career, and Bosworth taught and counseled the enigmatic Branham.

William Branham: The Healer-Prophet

On May 7, 1946, an angel visited William Branham and commissioned him "to take the gift of divine healing to the peoples of the world."⁴ This was not the first time Branham had entertained a "supernatural visitor." When Branham was seven, an angel had commanded him never to drink or smoke, causing the peculiar boy to live the life of a modern Nazirite. Branham had grown up in poverty and obscurity, miraculously escaping death on more than one occasion, and his ministerial life continued the trend of despair balanced with divine assurance. Although he had a successful tent meeting early in his pastoral career, Branham's congregation was too poor to pay a salary. Branham also lost his wife and infant daughter in the aftermath of the Ohio River Flood of 1937.⁵

Branham came into pentecostalism through the back door. His first pastorate was at a Baptist church with pentecostal leanings, such as worship in the spirit and tarrying meetings for spirit-baptism. Branham was also exposed more directly to pentecostalism when he attended a Oneness pentecostal conference in 1936. Although he did not immediately embrace pentecostalism, the experience impressed the young minister.⁶

⁴ Gordon Lindsay, "The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part I," *World-Wide Revival* 10, no. 12 (March 1958): 5.

⁵ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 27–35. Like Bosworth, Branham frequently told the story of his life during his campaigns. See *Ibid.*, 132.

⁶ C. Douglas Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet, William Marrion Branham: A Study of the Prophetic in American Pentecostalism* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2000), 32–33; Lindsay, *William Branham*, 46–50.

By the early 1940s, Branham worked as a small-time healing evangelist. Some successes occurred, and he began crafting a narrative explaining how the gift of healing miraculously came to him. A few years later, a Oneness pentecostal minister in St. Louis asked Branham to pray for his sick daughter. The healing of Betty Daugherty was pivotal for Branham's career, as Branham returned to St. Louis for a successful campaign and began receiving invitations to minister in Arkansas. After this clear mark of success, the 1946 visitation became the center of Branham's autobiographical narrative. In many ways, it fulfilled the same function as Bosworth's "revelation" of the universality of divine healing in 1920: both crucible events provided a biographical and theological justification for a successful healing ministry, and both occurred shortly after the end of a world war and on the eve of a major cultural revival of divine healing.⁷

Some of the participants in Branham's Arkansas meetings brought word of what they had witnessed to their pastor, Jack Moore, in Louisiana. Moore, also a Oneness pentecostal, assisted Branham in meetings in Texas, Arizona, and California. In the spring of 1947, Moore wrote of Branham to his friend Gordon Lindsay. Lindsay was an independently-minded and well-connected pentecostal whose family had ties in Dowie's Zion City and who had close contacts with pentecostal pioneers Charles Parham and John Lake. Lindsay remarked that Branham's meetings were "different from any we had ever been in before."⁸ Moore and Branham thought Lindsay could help Branham's ministry

⁷ Conflicting stories of Branham's angelic visitations raise doubts for the historian about whether the visitation in 1946 was the watershed moment Branham claimed. Although the reigning version put it and the visit to Daugherty in 1946, an earlier source has it in 1945. Peter Duyzer, *Heterodox Tsunami: The Theology of William Branham, Scriptural or Heretical?* (Delta, BC: Peter Duyzer, 2004), 53, 540. Cf. William Branham, "I Was Not Disobedient to the Heavenly Vision." <http://tosworg.globat.com/Special/I%20Was%20Not%20Disobedient.htm>. Accessed October 16, 2014.

⁸ Lindsay, "The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part I," 5.

grow, since Lindsay's "associations have been in the larger Full Gospel circles."⁹

Branham's work with Lindsay began in the Pacific Northwest in the fall of 1947. These were decisive meetings for Branham's ministry, for under Lindsay's guidance, Branham's work was conducted on an "inter-evangelical basis," reaching beyond the confines of Oneness pentecostal groups and influencing countless pentecostal leaders.¹⁰

Bosworth, Branham, and the Early Voice of Healing Network

When Branham met Bosworth in Miami, the two immediately bonded. "It was 'love at first sight' for Brother Bosworth and Brother Branham," recalled Moore.¹¹ Later witnesses spoke of the "harmony existing between Brother Bosworth and Brother Branham."¹² For the rest of his life, Branham spoke of "Daddy Bosworth" in loving and respectful terms. To Branham, Bosworth was "my old saintly dad" and "one of the greatest teachers on Divine healing that I ever heard in my life." Branham likened their friendship to Jonathan and David or Elijah and Elisha.¹³ According to Lindsay, Bosworth

⁹ Ibid., 22.

¹⁰ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 127–128. For example, during these 1947 meetings, Branham met Ern Baxter, who worked with Branham for the next decade and later became an influential and controversial leader in the charismatic movement. Also inspired by Branham's meetings in the fall of 1947 was George Hawtin, who initiated a spiritual movement in Saskatoon that became known as the Latter Rain revival. For the origin and early development of the Latter Rain revival, see D. William Faupel, "The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought" (Ph.D. diss., Department of Theology, University of Birmingham, 1989), 400–422.

¹¹ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 110.

¹² Paul E. Freligh, "Pastor Reports Continuation of Revival After Campaign Closes," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 9 (December 1948): 1.

¹³ William Branham, "The Queen of Sheba" (Sermon, Waterloo, Iowa, January 25, 1958), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/58-0125-Queen-of-Sheba>. Accessed September 10, 2014; William Branham, "Africa Trip Report" (Sermon, Owensboro, Kentucky, November 9, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1109-Africa-trip-report>. Accessed September 8, 2014; William Branham, "Our Hope Is in God" (Sermon, New York, September 29, 1951), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/51-0929-our-hope-is-in-God>. Accessed September 8, 2014;

received in Branham's meetings "a fresh anointing from the Lord, and a renewed vision," and "nearly ten years of added ministry after his supposed time of labor was over."¹⁴

Bosworth preached at least once in Branham's Miami meeting and soon began traveling with the younger evangelist.¹⁵ Over the next few months, Bosworth accompanied Branham in meetings in Phoenix, Florida, Missouri, Illinois, Washington, and Oregon. In these meetings, Bosworth led the morning or afternoon teaching sessions, while Branham handled the more intense evening healing services. Healings also continued to occur as a direct result of Bosworth's work.¹⁶ Since Branham, in the early years of the revival, viewed his role as primarily praying for the sick, rather than preaching, Bosworth's preaching and teaching skills were a welcome complement to the ministry. As a report of the Elgin, Illinois, meetings said, "The grand old man of the party, F.F. Bosworth, laid a rich foundation for each day with his mature Bible instruction each morning."¹⁷ Along with Ern Baxter, Bosworth was part of the "dynamic revival trio," that helped take "Branham to the pinnacle of success" in the early postwar healing movement.¹⁸ Seasoned pentecostals like Stanley Frodsham determined that a general

William Branham, "Jehovah-Jireh" (Sermon, Indianapolis, Indiana, June 12, 1957), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0612-Jehovah-Jireh>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

¹⁴ Gordon Lindsay, "The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part II," *World-Wide Revival* 11, no. 1 (April 1958): 18.

¹⁵ In Miami, Bosworth brought a message on "Faith" that was "greatly appreciated by the congregation." "Conversations with F.F. Bosworth," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 1 (April 1948): 4.

¹⁶ "Woman Completely Healed While Bro. Bosworth Is Preaching," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 8 (November 1948): 12; "Elgin, Ill., Unable to Accommodate Crowds Attending Meeting," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 3 (June 1948): 2; "Minister Is Healed as Brother Bosworth Prays," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 4 (July 1948): 10.

¹⁷ "Elgin, Ill., Unable to Accommodate Crowds Attending Meeting," 1. See also Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 68.

¹⁸ Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 52.

revival was brewing in Branham's ministry.¹⁹ Historians have agreed that in the postwar divine healing movement, Branham was the "initiator," "visionary," and "pacesetter."²⁰

As Branham's ministry grew, publicity became a concern. The editor of the *Oneness* periodical that had been featuring Branham declined to produce an interdenominational magazine to fit the character of Branham's developing work.²¹ In April of 1948, Lindsay began publishing *Voice of Healing*, and from the beginning, Bosworth was heavily involved in the work. The magazine was styled an "Inter-evangelical publication of the Branham healing campaigns," signifying both the modesty and ambition of the early *Voice of Healing* machine: to promote only Branham, focused mostly on healing, but also aspiring to reach across denominational boundaries.

To the dismay of many, Branham announced to his coworkers in May of 1948—just as the first issue of *Voice of Healing* was reaching subscribers—that he would have to cease his ministry due to nervous exhaustion. Branham's health and energy had been a concern since the Northwest meetings of the previous fall, and around the beginning of 1948, a rumor even began circulating that the evangelist had died.²² Suffering from bouts of "nervous attack" at least since April, Branham explained that his leave "might be a year or it might be forever."²³ Branham's announcement caused a brief crisis for *Voice of Healing*. Luckily, a number of other ministries—mostly inspired by Branham—had

¹⁹ Stanley Howard Frodsham, "Remarkable Healing Campaigns," *Pentecost*, no. 4 (June 1948): 5.

²⁰ David Edwin Harrell, *All Things Are Possible: The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975), 25, 165; Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, ix.

²¹ Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 47.

²² Lindsay, *William Branham*, 126, 129–130.

²³ Lindsay, "The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part II," 18.

emerged. The magazine quickly enlarged its scope to “the latter-day sign-gift ministries” of an increasingly growing number of healing evangelists, such as William Freeman, Richard Vineyard, and Velmer Gardner. Branham’s health problems did not interrupt the success of the paper that had been created for him: according to Lindsay, within a year of the paper’s inception, it had 100,000 readers, and double that figure within two years.²⁴ While Branham continued his indefinite leave, Bosworth engaged in a reinvigorated ministry, becoming an “associate editor” for *Voice of Healing*.²⁵ By July, he had produced a revised and enlarged seventh edition of *Christ the Healer*, which was advertised in *Voice of Healing* as a “classic.”²⁶ In late October, Bosworth again struck out on his own, conducting meetings in Seattle.²⁷

Branham’s leave of absence would not last a year or forever. In July, Branham briefly joined Bosworth on a lakeside vacation and received spiritual nourishment from the elder evangelist. His five-day visit with Bosworth was, according to their colleague John Sharritt, a turning point on Branham’s road back to wellness. Emboldened by Bosworth’s counsel, Branham “placed his feet firmly on the Word of God and the promises of God” and began to eat regularly, thanks in part to Mrs. Bosworth’s

²⁴ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 147.

²⁵ “Latest News of Rev. Branham Just Received from Bro. John Sharritt,” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 5 (August 1948): 5. Although “associate editor” was something of an honorific title that was later extended to dozens of evangelists, Bosworth was one of just a handful of those labeled as such in the first few years. And Bosworth, with his prior publishing experience, seemed to take a strong hand in developing the paper, as his own writings were frequently printed.

²⁶ *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 10 (January 1949): 6; “Bosworth Book Off Press,” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 4 (July 1948): 6. *Christ the Healer* was chosen as “book of the month” in *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 6 (September 1951): 18.

²⁷ *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 7 (October 1948): 6.

cooking.²⁸ Around this time, Branham also asserted that his faith was encouraged by reading Bosworth's tract on "Christian Confession."²⁹

In August, Branham testified to Lindsay that "the God of heaven met him and a miracle was wrought," although he was not yet to his full strength or weight.³⁰ True to style, Branham's return to full ministry was aided by an angelic visitation, this time giving him a mandate to preach overseas. Branham reentered the itinerant ministry in late October with meetings in Fresno, California, after which he joined Bosworth in Seattle in early November.³¹ With Branham's health restored, he and Bosworth continued working together. In early February of 1949, Bosworth joined Branham's campaign in Miami.³² The next month, the two ministered in Zion, Illinois. Bosworth spent a few days before Branham joined the meetings teaching Zionites and undoubtedly renewing old

²⁸ "Latest News of Rev. Branham Just Received from Bro. John Sharritt," 5.

²⁹ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 206.

³⁰ "Word from Bro. Branham," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 5 (August 1948): 1. In September of 1948, Branham had begun discussing with Gordon his return to the ministry, telling Gordon "the Lord had touched his body." "Editorial," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 6 (September 1948): 6. Around this time, he was also sending anointed cloths to correspondents in need of healing. "God Performs Operation after Anointed Ribbon Is Sent to Minister's Wife," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 8 (November 1948): 12. Throughout this time, Branham continued to be listed as the "publisher" of *Voice of Healing* and to contribute articles. Branham's autobiographical article in *Voice of Healing* signaled that he was not ready to retire into obscurity. William M. Branham, "Life Story of Rev. Wm. Branham," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 7 (October 1948): 1, 13.

³¹ "Flash!," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 7 (October 1948): 1; "Brother Branham on the Field Again," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 8 (November 1948): 1. Bosworth stayed on in Seattle another week after Branham left to continue to minister to those who sought healing. See "Fresno, California, and Seattle, Washington, Visited by Party," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 9 (December 1948): 2; Freligh, "Pastor Reports Continuation of Revival After Campaign Closes."

³² Sam Perry, brother of Mattie Perry, who had healed Bosworth of tuberculosis about fifty years earlier, reported on the meetings. "Branham-Bosworth Reunite for Miami, Florida, Campaign," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 12 (March 1949): 1.

acquaintances.³³ While in Zion, the two evangelists visited the grave of John Alexander Dowie, to whose pioneering healing ministry both owed a great debt.³⁴ Despite his age, Bosworth proved his energy often by praying with the sick after Branham had become exhausted.³⁵

Although Bosworth's ministry during these years was more closely tied to Branham than any other evangelist, Bosworth continued to nourish contacts throughout full gospel circles. In January of 1949, Bosworth lent his approval to Oral Roberts, who began his own successful healing ministry shortly after Branham. At the time, Roberts was conducting meetings in Miami, where he welcomed Bosworth to the platform on a few occasions. Bosworth testified that he was "delighted to see in operation [Roberts's] dare-devil faith...[h]is divinely-given ability to cast out oppressing and possessing demons...[h]is spirit of whole-hearted devotion to the Lord and deep compassion."³⁶ It was a ringing endorsement, and Roberts returned the favor by speaking kindly of Bosworth, rehearsing Bosworth's fabled ministry successes. Of course, what was most important for Roberts was that fact that Bosworth "said that he was thrilled beyond words to see the marvelous healing and discernment gift in my humble life."³⁷

³³ "Special Notice to Illinois Subscribers," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 12 (March 1948): 16; Thomas H. Nelson, "Dowie's Followers Relive Glorious Days of Past as Branham and Bosworth Minister in Zion," *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 2 (May 1949): 1, 16.

³⁴ "Branham-Bosworth Campaign Successful in Zion, Illinois," *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 1 (April 1949): 2.

³⁵ Nelson, "Dowie's Followers Relive Glorious Days of Past as Branham and Bosworth Minister in Zion," 2.

³⁶ F. F. Bosworth, "F.F. Bosworth Rejoices Over Roberts' Meeting in Miami, Florida," *Healing Waters* 2, no. 3 (February 1949): 4. See details of Branham's visit in "Branham Visits Roberts Campaign," *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 1 (April 1949): 2, 16. Cf. Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 46.

³⁷ Oral Roberts, "Personal Word from Oral Roberts About F.F. Bosworth," *Healing Waters* 2, no. 3 (February 1949): 4.

Around this time, Bosworth’s work with Branham came to the attention of Bosworth’s old coworker Charles Benham. According to Benham, the “supernatural revival of miracle power” evident in the Branham-Bosworth meetings, “can alone successfully meet the world crisis”—by which the ever-political Benham meant communism.³⁸ Benham visited the Zion meetings and even relived old times with Bosworth by leading the congregation in song on his cornet.³⁹ In May of 1949, Bosworth teamed up with Benham and T.L. Osborn for work in Flint and Detroit, Michigan.

Osborn had been inspired to start his deliverance ministry by William Branham in 1947. The following year in Kansas City, Bosworth told the upstart evangelist that “the only way to whip the devil is to move into town and stay until he gives up and leaves.” Osborn followed Bosworth’s advice to great results in a Jamaica campaign in late 1948 and early 1949. Upon hearing of Osborn’s success in Jamaica, Bosworth invited Osborn to fill Branham’s spot in the remaining days of their meetings in Flint. The Michigan meetings coupled with Bosworth’s endorsement brought Osborn into the *Voice of Healing* orbit—with all the publicity that entailed.⁴⁰ According to Branham, Bosworth counseled Osborn when Osborn was struggling with his vocation and considering entering the healing ministry. At Branham’s cabin in Jeffersonville, Indiana, Osborn met with Bosworth, who counseled the young evangelist in “all the techniques of how to use

³⁸ C.O. Benham, “God Answers the Present World Crisis with Miracles of Healing,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 1 (April 1949): 4. S.A. Ackley, another British-Israelist who knew Bosworth personally, endorsed the “Bosworth-Branham campaigns.” See *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 6 (September 1948): 6.

³⁹ “Dr. Charles O. Benham,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 2 (May 1949): 9.

⁴⁰ T. L. Osborn and Daisy Osborn, *Faith Library in 23 Volumes: 20th Century Legacy of Apostolic Evangelism* (Tulsa, OK; Birmingham, U.K.: OSFO International), 1:93, 120–121; “North Michigan Rocked by Mighty Revival,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 3 (June 1949): 1, 15; Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 64; Lindsay, *William Branham*, 25–26.

the Scriptures,” ensuring that Bosworth’s didactic and homiletic approach to divine healing would have a strong advocate in the second half of the century.⁴¹ As Branham put it, “Brother Osborn is a young Brother Bosworth with all the knowledge that Brother Bosworth had of the Word plus.”⁴² Like Bosworth, Osborn claimed no healing gift, but considered himself a proclaimer of divine healing truths.

Bosworth also took part in the first convention of the *Voice of Healing* revivalists, held in Dallas in late 1949. Here Bosworth, the “respected, seasoned warrior,” recalled his own ministry struggles and victory in Dallas over thirty years earlier.⁴³

Houston, 1950: A Harangue and a Halo

In January of 1950, Branham, Bosworth, Lindsay and Jack Moore teamed up for a memorable series of meetings in Houston. Although the meetings started off with small crowds, they eventually drew five thousand nightly and the ire of a local Baptist minister,

⁴¹ William Branham, “Early Spiritual Experiences” (Sermon, Hammond, Indiana, July 13, 1952), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/52-0713A-early-spiritual-experiences>. Accessed September 8, 2014. See also William Branham, “Palmerworm, Locust, Cankerworm and Caterpillar” (Sermon, Connersville, Indiana, June 12, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0612-palmerworm-locust-cankerworm-and-caterpillar>. Accessed September 8, 2014. T. L. Osborn, “God in Flesh Again: Memorial Message for William Branham” (Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, January 26, 1966), <http://www.williambranhamhomepage.org/wbmtos.htm>. Accessed October 3, 2014. Branham also said that Osborn “got a hold on the Word from old Brother Bosworth.” William Branham, “The Basis of Fellowship” (Sermon, Long Beach, California, February 14, 1961), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/61-0214-basis-of-fellowship>. Accessed September 14, 2014. Branham often mentioned Bosworth and Osborn together as teachers of divine healing in distinction from his prophetic style. William Branham, “Expectations and What Love Is” (Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, February 28, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0228A-expectations-and-what-Love-is>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

⁴² William Branham, “A Wedding Supper” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, October 6, 1956), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/56-1006-wedding-supper>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

⁴³ Anna Jeanne Moore, “Historic Conference of Evangelists Conducting Great Healing Campaigns Convened in Dallas December 22-23,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 11 (February 1950): 1–3. See also William Branham, “The Deity of Jesus Christ” (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, December 25, 1949), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/49-1225-Deity-of-Jesus-Christ>. Accessed September 7, 2014.

W.E. Best.⁴⁴ Best challenged the authenticity of Branham's ministry and divine healing in general, requesting a public debate. Bosworth urged Branham to answer the challenge for the sake of the believing public. Branham declined, saying that "God never sent me to debate. He sent me to pray for the sick, and that's what my duty is. I do not argue religion with anyone. It isn't supposed to be argued—it's supposed to be lived." But behind the principled posturing was Branham's insecurity. "I've never seen a debate in my life," Branham told Bosworth, "but what has caused confusion." Besides, Branham told Bosworth, "I can't go down there and debate, for if I do, it throws me all off."⁴⁵ Branham consented, however, for Bosworth to take up the challenge.

Before an audience of eight thousand on January 24, Bosworth and Best faced each other in public debate. This was not the most dignified occasion, as the opponents often talked at the same time, and at least two members of the audience came to blows. Tempers flared to the point that Raymond Richey dramatically removed his seat from the platform so as distance himself from Best.⁴⁶ Best, who apparently had the backing of the Houston Baptist Pastors Conference, denied that Christ bore physical infirmities on the cross and that anyone today had the gift or power of healing as in apostolic times.

⁴⁴ For an indication of the small crowds early in the Houston meetings, see William Branham, "Believest Thou This?" (Sermon, Houston, Texas, January 15, 1950), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0115-believest-thou-this>. Accessed September 8, 2014.

⁴⁵ William Branham, *The William Branham Sermons: How God Called Me to Africa and Other Sermons* (Dallas: Voice of Healing Publishing Company, 1960), 25. See also William Branham, "At Thy Word" (Sermon, Minneapolis, Minnesota, July 14, 1950), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0714-at-Thy-Word>. Accessed September 8, 2014.

⁴⁶ "News Clip: Houston Press, 1950" (Living Word Press, n.d.), 1, 3–5, 30/4/1, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

For all his public defense of divine healing in the past, this was probably the first time Bosworth had debated before an audience.⁴⁷ Although Bosworth quoted his usual scriptures, made his familiar appeal to the “redemptive names” of God, and argued that Christ “bore our sicknesses” on the cross, his more dramatic (and effective) tactic was to call upon audience members who had been healed to stand when Best asserted that the day of miracles was past. In this way, reported one writer for the *Houston Press*, the “suave” Bosworth “used the audience itself to prove that miracles of healing are accomplished every day.”⁴⁸ According to *Voice of Healing*, Best found that “few were in sympathy with his cold denial of the promises of God.”⁴⁹

Although Bosworth ably defended the cause of the supernatural gospel, for most supporters, the challenge to Branham’s ministry “was answered by God himself.”⁵⁰ Best had hired two photographers to capture his performance. After developing the film of numerous shots of Best and one of Branham, the photographers were amazed at the results. In Branham’s picture, a blurry, glowing specter hovered a few inches above Branham’s head. For supporters, the sight could only be described as a halo. And not only was Branham’s photo supernaturally adorned, but all of the shots of Best turned out blank. The metaphor was not subtle: those who opposed the supernatural gospel were as nothing, while those who ministered in the miraculous were assured of God’s powerful

⁴⁷ William Branham, “Testimony” (Sermon, West Palm Beach, Florida, November 29, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1129E-testimony>. Accessed September 9, 2014.

⁴⁸ “News Clip: Houston Press, 1950,” 3. See also “Houston Newspaper Accounts of the Service That Produced the Remarkable Photograph,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 12 (March 1950): 4.

⁴⁹ “God Vindicates Branham in Houston by Most Amazing Photograph Ever Taken,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 12 (March 1950): 1.

⁵⁰ “God Vindicates Branham in Houston by Most Amazing Photograph Ever Taken.”

presence, what Branham here called a “sacred sign.”⁵¹ This was not the first—or last—time a photograph captured a supernatural attendant of Branham’s ministry, but the publicity and charged setting of the debate made this “the most famous relic in the history of the revival.”⁵² Because supporters felt that at this event their supernatural gospel was on trial, they vigorously touted this unambiguous vindication. Bosworth, in arranging and performing in the debate, played a central role in the production of this relic.

At Home and Abroad, 1951-1955

Like most dramatic events in Branham’s life, his “call” to South Africa was an intricate and miraculous series of events. And again, Bosworth played a key role. According to Branham, on the same night during which the famous halo photograph was taken, Bosworth showed Branham a picture of a woman from Durban named Florence Nightingale Shirlaw (perhaps a distant relative of the famous English nurse). Shirlaw was suffering from stomach cancer and reportedly weighed sixty pounds. Branham, with Bosworth’s urging, determined that if God healed Shirlaw, he would take that as a sign that he was to minister in South Africa. As providence would have it, while Branham was in England on his way to Scandinavia shortly after the Houston meetings, he met Shirlaw and prayed for her. Eight months later, she wrote to Branham, testifying to healing and enclosing a picture showing her at a healthy 155 pounds.⁵³

⁵¹ William Branham, “God Revealing Himself to His People” (Sermon, Cleveland, Ohio, August 13, 1950), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0813E-God-revealing-Himself-to-His-people>. Accessed September 8, 2014. See also Branham, “Early Spiritual Experiences.”

⁵² For other supernatural photos, see F. F. Bosworth, “Gifts of Healing Plus,” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 10 (January 1950): C. In 1933, witnesses testified to seeing a heavenly light above Branham during a baptismal service. See Lindsay, *William Branham*, 43, 71. Quote from Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 35.

⁵³ For Branham’s story of his call to South Africa, see Branham, “How God Called Me to Africa, Part I”; Julius Stadskev, *William Branham: A Prophet Visits South Africa* (Minneapolis: Julius Stadskev,

Making good on the vow, Bosworth, Ern Baxter, and Branham traveled to South Africa for an extended series of meetings in the fall of 1951. Bosworth and Baxter arrived a few days before Branham in early October. Despite the disappointment of the crowds who had gathered at the airport to greet Branham, the two began to teach and heal the sick.⁵⁴ The meetings were sponsored in part by the Apostolic Faith Mission—the pentecostal organization that John G. Lake had done so much to build fifty years earlier.⁵⁵ Although the party devoted most of their time to ministering among those of European descent, they made room where they could to work with natives and Indians, with Bosworth even claiming that a Zulu prince endorsed the meetings.⁵⁶ At their first stop in Johannesburg, sixty pentecostal churches cooperated in organizing and supporting the meetings.⁵⁷ The party then went to Klerksdorp, Kimberley, Durban and a total of about a dozen cities, holding over one hundred meetings. During this trip, Baxter usually gave the

1952), 48–50. See also William Branham, “Who Hath Believed Our Report?” (Sermon, Toledo, Ohio, July 19, 1951), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/51-0719-who-hath-believed-our-report>. Accessed September 8, 2014. Some of these details were refuted by Gwilam I. Francis, a minister who was present at the time Branham prayed for Shirlaw, in “Vindication of William Branham of Attack by ‘Prophecy Magazine,’” *Voice of Healing* 7, no. 8 (November 1954): 8. Branham’s first mention of Shirlaw was probably William Branham, “The Works That I Do Bear Witness of Me” (Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, April 13, 1951), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/51-0413-works-that-i-do-bear-witness-of-me>. Accessed September 8, 2014. The first publicized photo of Shirlaw is in *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 7 (October 1951): 8.

⁵⁴ David J. du Plessis, “The International Fellowship Column,” *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 9 (December 1951): 16; Stadslev, *William Branham*, 151–152.

⁵⁵ As Stadslev reminded readers when discussing the “fertile ground in the hearts of the people of South Africa” for the divine healing message, John G. Lake “was profoundly influenced by the ministry of F.F. Bosworth.” Stadslev, *William Branham*, 75.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 142, 153; Fred. F. Bosworth, “God’s Visitation to South Africa,” *Herald of His Coming* 11, no. 2 (n.d.): 1.

⁵⁷ A.J. Schoeman, “Great Revivals in Africa with Branham Party,” *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 10 (January 1952): 8. Cf. Stadslev, *William Branham*, 121.

salvation message while Bosworth, referred to as “a dean of the divine healing ministry,” assumed his usual role of teacher and preparer of the way.⁵⁸ As one report stated,

A great degree of the success of the meetings was the result of the foundation laid by the able ministering of Brother Bosworth in the hearts and minds of the people pertaining to Bible truths of divine healing.⁵⁹

During their ten weeks in South Africa, they ministered to a reported 500,000 people. At one meeting in Durban, the crowd was estimated at forty-five to sixty thousand—the largest crowd Bosworth had ever addressed by far.⁶⁰

Bosworth led a number of services on his own in South Africa, either because Branham had not yet arrived at a certain location, the team temporarily split up, or because Branham was resting.⁶¹ In addition to teaching and preaching, Bosworth prayed for many in South Africa who received healing. Most often, these healings dealt with deafness.⁶² In one meeting among “natives,” Bosworth intentionally resisted praying for many of the sick. Instead, he encouraged them all to grasp the truth of divine healing in the atonement without mediation. This tactic was employed in this case to differentiate

⁵⁸ Stadslev, *William Branham*, 119, 138, 148, 149, 150, 154. Bosworth on occasion preached a traditional salvation message as well. *Ibid.*, 118.

⁵⁹ Julius Stadslev, “Greatest Religious Meetings in History of South Africa Inspired by Wm. Branham,” *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 12 (March 1952): 14.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*; “4,000 Letters from Those Helped by William Branham’s Meetings in South Africa,” *Pentecost*, no. 22 (December 1952): 7. Bosworth elsewhere repeated an estimate of up to 100,000 in one meeting. Bosworth, “God’s Visitation to South Africa.” Clearly, numbers inflation was a common occurrence during these heady days, and all statistics need to be taken with a grain of salt.

⁶¹ Stadslev, *William Branham*, 140, 144.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 94, 130, 136, 142, 172, 176, 192. At least one healing dealt with restoration of vision. *Ibid.*, 111-112.

divine healing by faith from the “old heathen methods” of healing that were common among the native population.⁶³

This work with Branham and others continued to raise Bosworth’s profile. A group in Chicago offered Branham and Bosworth a salaried co-pastorate. After discussing the possibility, the evangelists determined that their call to overseas work was too strong to allow them a settled pastorate.⁶⁴ In early 1953, Bosworth took part in the opening of the Miami chapter of the Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship International. Formed in 1951, the organization was the outgrowth of Oral Roberts’s desire as early as 1949 to secure concerted support from prominent businessmen in the communities of his campaigns.⁶⁵ Demos Shakarian, the organizational genius behind the laymen’s association that significantly raised the cultural profile of pentecostalism, referred to Bosworth as “one of the greatest writers of our time.”⁶⁶

Even in his mid-seventies, Bosworth was willing to conduct overseas missions on his own. In the summer of 1953, Bosworth returned to South Africa for ten months, this time without Branham. “I just had such a taste, such a craving and yearning for those poor souls who had never heard [the gospel],” Bosworth later recalled, “that I just had to

⁶³ “More on the South African Revival with Bros. Branham, Baxter and Bosworth,” *Herald of Faith* 17, no. 6 (June 1952): 9.

⁶⁴ William Branham, “The Faith Once Delivered to the Saints” (Sermon, West Palm Beach, Florida, November 29, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1129A-faith-that-was-once-delivered-to-the-saints>. Accessed September 8, 2014.

⁶⁵ Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 49.

⁶⁶ Demos Shakarian, “Two Chapters Organized in Florida,” *Full Gospel Men’s Voice* 1, no. 1 (February 1953): 10. For the founding and early history of the FGBFI, see Matthew W. Tallman, “Demos Shakarian: The Life, Legacy, and Vision of a Full Gospel Business Man” (Ph.D. diss., Regent University, 2009), 206–256.

go back.”⁶⁷ Bosworth prayed for dozens of cases of cancer each night. “The greatest victories over sin and sickness took place among the non-Europeans; especially the Zulus,” reported an eyewitness for *Voice of Healing*.⁶⁸ In addition to his large meetings, Bosworth intentionally visited the homes of those in poorer regions to bring to them the gospel of the supernatural.⁶⁹ With barely a rest after his South Africa trip, Bosworth traveled to Japan, spending several months ministering in Naraken and affiliating with L.W. Coote, a pioneering pentecostal missionary in Japan.⁷⁰

After Bosworth’s work in Japan, he took on managing duties for Branham’s larger crusades.⁷¹ In January and February of 1955, Bosworth worked with Branham in

⁶⁷ F.F. Bosworth, “Be Ye Doers of the Word” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 22, 1954), <http://www.brothermel.org/audio-video/74>. Accessed September 29, 2014.

⁶⁸ William Laggar, “A Report on Evangelist F.F. Bosworth in Durban, South Africa,” *Voice of Healing* 6, no. 9 (December 1953): 11. See also William Branham, “Jesus Christ the Same Yesterday, Today, and Forever” (Sermon, Jonesboro, Arkansas, May 6, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0506-Jesus-Christ-the-same-yesterday-and-today-and-forever>. Accessed September 8, 2014; William Branham, “Speak to This Rock” (Sermon, Jonesboro, Arkansas, May 12, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0512-speak-to-this-Rock>. Accessed September 8, 2014.

⁶⁹ Bosworth, “Be Ye Doers of the Word.”

⁷⁰ William Branham, “It Is I, Be Not Afraid” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 20, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0720E-it-is-I-be-not-afraid>. Accessed September 10, 2014. This sermon mentions that Bosworth is “fixing to go to Japan right away.” Later Branham said Bosworth left for Japan on July 23, 1954. William Branham, “The Prophet Elisha” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 23, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0723-prophet-Elisha>. Accessed September 10, 2014; *Voice of Healing* (August 1954): 22. For Coote’s story, see Leonard W. Coote, *Impossibilities Become Challenges: A Record of God’s Faithfulness, in Saving, Baptizing with the Holy Spirit, Leading out into Missionary Work and Supplying of Daily Needs*. (Ikoma, Japan: Ikoma Bible College, 1965). At some point, Bosworth also ministered in Cuba, but I have been unable to find any details on this work. T. L. Osborn, “He Prayed Earnestly for Himself,” *Full Gospel Business Men’s Voice* 6, no. 4 (May 1958): 25.

⁷¹ William Branham, “Expectation” (Sermon, Binghamton, New York, December 6, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-1206-expectation>. Accessed November 5, 2014. See also William Branham, “At Thy Word, Lord, I’ll Let Down the Net” (Sermon, Johnson City, New York, December 7, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-1207-at-Thy-Word-Lord-III-let-down-the-net>. Accessed September 10, 2014; William Branham, “How the Angel Came to Me, and His Commission,” (Sermon, January 17, 1955), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/55-0117-how-the-Angel-came-to-me-and-His-commission>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

Lubbock, Texas, and also conducted meetings on his own in cooperation with the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International.⁷² In August of that year, Branham's party—under the direction of the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International—specifically requested Bosworth's presence for meetings in Switzerland and Germany.⁷³

Bosworth continued in his supporting role, but expected miracles in his own ministry:

In order to help raise the faith of the people in the afternoon services for the ministry of Brother Branham in the night healing services, I usually asked God to confirm my messages with two or three miracles such as the healing of totally deaf ears. This he did.⁷⁴

To the flood of testimonies of healing and the inflated statistics of the healing evangelists must be added the voice of the multitude who were not healed or who grew worse after attending Branham and Bosworth's campaigns.⁷⁵ Regardless of empirical results, however, for the postwar healing revival, Bosworth was a living link with the pentecostal past, a doctrinal authority, and a vibrant and dedicated evangelist in his own right.

Bosworth and Branham: Reflections on a Successful Partnership

As Bosworth's success in his final decade of life is inseparable from his ministry relationship with William Branham, an investigation into the contours of that relationship is in order. This relationship was built on mutual admiration and a shared pursuit of the supernatural within the context of admitted differences in style and emphasis.

⁷² "Attention People of All Faiths," *Lubbock Avalanche-Journal*, January 30, 1955; "Lubbock, Texas, Sponsors Branham-Bosworth Meet," *Full Gospel Men's Voice* 2, no. 10 (February 1955): 22.

⁷³ F. F. Bosworth, "Branham Meetings in Germany and Switzerland," *Full Gospel Men's Voice* 3, no. 6 (September 1955): 4. During these meetings, another supernatural photograph was taken of Branham.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 7–8. See also "William Branham in Lausanne," *Pentecost*, no. 34 (December 1955): 7.

⁷⁵ Walter J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1988), 355–356.

Branham saw Bosworth as a living saint, a fount of wisdom in divine healing and a moral example. Branham's respect for Bosworth was unbounded. "[I]f ever [there] was a man that ever represented Pentecost and was a true apostle, it was F.F. Bosworth," Branham commented from the pulpit. For a pentecostal movement that for Branham was hampered by narrow dogmatism, Bosworth "was a man who brought dignity and power to the Pentecostal church."⁷⁶ As with many pentecostals, Branham admired how Bosworth suffered "for preaching the baptism of the Holy Ghost" during his beating in Texas in 1911.⁷⁷ Branham frequently related the story of John Sproul, the famous soldier who had been healed under Bosworth and entered into his own traveling ministry.⁷⁸ To Branham, Bosworth was a living symbol of the truth of divine healing, and any attack on Bosworth's reputation was an attack on the supernatural gospel. When a preacher named A.B. Neums tried to indict divine healing as ineffectual by claiming that the Bosworth brothers had both died young, Branham called Neums to set the record straight.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ William Branham, "Manifested Sons of God (Series, Part 2 of 4)" (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, May 18, 1960), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0518-manifested-sons-of-God>. Accessed September 20, 2014; William Branham, "A Greater than Solomon Is Here" (Sermon, Bloomington, Illinois, April 12, 1961), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/61-0412-Greater-than-Solomon-is-here>. Accessed September 20, 2014. Also: "[I]f there was an old man that ever put the dignity in the Pentecostal move [*sic*], it was Brother Bosworth." William Branham, "The Marriage of the Lamb" (Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, January 21, 1962), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/62-0121E-marriage-of-the-Lamb>. Accessed September 20, 2014.

⁷⁷ William Branham, "Israel at the Red Sea" (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, March 26, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0326-Israel-at-the-Red-Sea-1>. Accessed September 20, 2014.

⁷⁸ William Branham, "By Faith, Moses" (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, July 20, 1958), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/58-0720M-by-faith-Moses>. Accessed September 20, 2014; William Branham, "Jehovah-Jireh" (Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, March 9, 1957), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0309E-Jehovah-Jireh>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

⁷⁹ Bosworth is "a man here at nearly eighty years old, still preaching the Gospel, just returned from Africa," Branham told Neums. William Branham, "Divine Healing" (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, December 19, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-1219M-Divine-healing>. Accessed September 21, 2014.

Bosworth was undoubtedly drawn to Branham because of Branham's dedication to and demonstration of the gospel of the supernatural. The central conviction of Branham's healing ministry was "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever" (Hebrews 13:8).⁸⁰ This scripture and the consequent teaching on the immutability of Christ had historically been a cardinal tenet of pentecostal healing ministries.⁸¹ According to Lindsay, Branham brought "a fresh revelation of the reality of the power of God and the intrinsic truth of the miraculous in the scriptures."⁸² Branham's life and ministry revealed one supernatural occurrence after another. Always given to visions, Branham recorded numerous instances when he had seen beforehand either the demise or the healing of some individual.⁸³ As Bosworth joyfully related, Branham could often see miracles "in advance." Branham even knew when it was unnecessary to pray for some, since he foresaw that they would be healed without prayer.⁸⁴ Branham's gift as a "seer" was also displayed in mundane events. In one instance, Branham "just seemed to know" which hotel to check into without getting any instructions.⁸⁵ In short, as healer and prophet—one who frequently communed with angels, foresaw events, discerned sins, and

⁸⁰ Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 61. This was also the name of the pamphlet that was probably Branham's earliest published writing, dated from about 1940.

⁸¹ For instance, the scripture was on the banner on Raymond Richey's *Full Gospel Advocate* and adorned the facade of Aimee Semple McPherson's Angelus Temple. As a report of T.L. Osborn's work in Kenya put it, this scripture implied "the logical fact that, since Christ is the same today as He was nineteen hundred years ago, then He would obviously be willing and longing to deliver the sick and afflicted today, as He did then." T. L. Osborn, *Healing En Masse* (Tulsa, OK: Osborn, 1958), 98.

⁸² Lindsay, *William Branham*, 12.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 181–206.

⁸⁴ F. F. Bosworth, "Looking at the Unseen," *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 10 (January 1950): 4.

⁸⁵ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 139.

was a vessel for healing—Branham embodied the supernatural gospel in a way that had not been done on such a far-reaching scale since Dowie.

Bosworth was an untiring supporter of Branham. As W. F. Mullan, put it, Bosworth’s “loyalty to the Branham Party won every heart.”⁸⁶ This support probably owed to the way Branham reinvigorated Bosworth’s ministry. As Branham related in 1950, Bosworth said that after their meetings together in Miami, he was “just a kid living in an old house.”⁸⁷ Bosworth fell naturally into the role of Branham’s apologist, insisting that “the message of the angel is verified in Branham’s Meetings nightly, before the eyes of thousands” and confirmed the countless times when Branham correctly identified a person’s ailment without any previous knowledge of his or her condition.⁸⁸ Bosworth told Charles Benham that “in all his long career he had never witnessed such a high percentage of healing miracles.”⁸⁹ Despite Bosworth’s own experience with the miraculous, he claimed of Branham’s ministry, “there has never been anything like it since the time when Christ was here on earth.”⁹⁰ Often when Bosworth taught in the day meetings of Branham’s campaigns, he not only expounded the “truths of Divine Healing”

⁸⁶ Branham, *The William Branham Sermons*, 127.

⁸⁷ William Branham, “To Whom Is the Arm of the Lord Revealed?” (Sermon, Cleveland, Ohio, August 24, 1950), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0824-to-whom-is-the-arm-of-the-Lord-revealed>. Accessed September 8, 2014.

⁸⁸ “Fresno, California, and Seattle, Washington, Visited by Party,” 1, 2. Bosworth’s apology for Branham’s ministry was included in both Lindsay’s biography and Stadskev’s book on the South Africa campaign. Lindsay, *William Branham*, 168–180; Stadskev, *William Branham*, 37–47.

⁸⁹ Benham, “God Answers the Present World Crisis with Miracles of Healing.” Also: “I have never seen or read of anything equal to the healing ministry of William Branham.” Bosworth, “Gifts of Healing Plus,” B.

⁹⁰ Stadskev, *William Branham*, 81. See also *Ibid.*, 88.

but also “explained the gift which God has given to William Branham.”⁹¹ According to Bosworth, Branham’s gift as a “seer” allowed him accurately to describe and quote the surgeons who had operated on the sick who attended his meetings. Seven years after he began working with Branham, Bosworth claimed that Branham’s gift of discernment was “100% correct. Not a single time was he mistaken.”⁹²

Bosworth and Branham shared many qualities that made them good ministry partners. Followers and observers often referred to Branham’s humility and gentleness—qualities that Bosworth’s supporters had also prized.⁹³ Yet both evangelists were excellent showmen. Bosworth had often increased the drama of healings of deaf-mutes by whispering numbers into the ear of the newly healed and requesting the person to repeat the number for the audience.⁹⁴ When Branham healed the blind, he asked them to follow him as the evangelist walked silently up and down the platform.⁹⁵

Although Branham became doctrinally adventurous in his later years, the two evangelists approached theology in much the same way: an insider’s critique of denominational pentecostalism combined with a desire to spread pentecostal blessings to all despite denominational affiliation. Throughout his career, Branham lambasted pentecostalism for its lack of doctrinal stability, its hampering denominational machinery,

⁹¹ Stadskev, “Greatest Religious Meetings in History of South Africa Inspired by Wm. Branham,” 14.

⁹² Bosworth, “Branham Meetings in Germany and Switzerland,” 4.

⁹³ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 12; Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 38, 39; Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 55.

⁹⁴ In fact, Bosworth continued this technique while working with Branham in South Africa. Stadskev, *William Branham*, 92–93.

⁹⁵ Rev. Sitton and Gordon Lindsay, “Branham in Houston; City Sees ‘Something Different,’” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 11 (February 1950): 16.

and its dogmatism on the tongues evidence doctrine.⁹⁶ Like Bosworth, Branham did not hold the initial evidence doctrine, and Branham intentionally deferred to Bosworth on the issue.⁹⁷ Branham preferred to think in terms of gifts rather than evidence: “So if speaking in tongues then is an evidence of the Holy Ghost, all these other things [spiritual gifts listed in 1 Corinthians 12] has to be evidence of the Holy Ghost too.” If forced to speak of “evidence” of the Holy Spirit, Branham pointed to love.⁹⁸ Branham’s meetings—like Bosworth’s—were intentionally interdenominational, with a “conscious avoidance of doctrinal conflict.”⁹⁹ Branham’s early messages as a divine healer stressed “the unity of the body of Christ, and that God intended that all his people should be one.”¹⁰⁰

Like Bosworth, Branham viewed healings, signs, and wonders as supportive for the more important ministry of salvation: healing was the “minor,” while salvation was the “major.” Branham frequently quoted Bosworth in referring to healing ministry was “bait” for conversion.¹⁰¹ Nonetheless, those who supported Branham’s ministry were

⁹⁶ William Branham, “Where I Think Pentecost Failed” (Sermon, San Fernando, California, November 11, 1955), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/55-1111-where-I-think-Pentecost-failed>. Accessed November 5, 2014.

⁹⁷ William Branham, “I Will Restore” (Sermon, Owensboro, Kentucky, November 10, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1110-I-will-restore>. Accessed September 8, 2014; see also Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 115, 134–135. Recounting his spirit-baptism, Branham made no mention of tongues. More important to him was that spirit-baptism imparted spiritual gifts, like healing. Lindsay, *William Branham*, 42.

⁹⁸ William Branham, “Debate on Tongues” (Sermon, Yakima, Washington, August 7, 1960), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0807-debate-on-tongues>. Accessed September 20, 2014.

⁹⁹ Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 52; Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 39, 95.

¹⁰⁰ Lindsay, “The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part I,” 22. See also Lindsay, *William Branham*, 15.

¹⁰¹ Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 47–48, 60, 108; Stadskev, *William Branham*, 134, 149. See also William Branham, “God’s Provided Way” (Sermon, Los Angeles, California, April 15, 1959), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/59-0415A-Gods-Provided-Way>. Accessed September 14, 2014; William Branham, “We Would See Jesus” (Sermon, San Jose, California, April 22, 1959), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/59-0422-we-would-see-Jesus>. Accessed September 14, 2014;

unambiguous in identifying the “MINISTRY OF THE MIRACULOUS” as “a most vital and potent force in the spiritual awakening of the countries of the world.”¹⁰² They also had a similar position on medicine, encouraging those healed to have their miracles verified by physicians.¹⁰³ Bosworth would have agreed with Branham, who said that “doctors are able to assist nature, but they are only men...God is almighty.”¹⁰⁴ Branham possibly laid more stress on the role of demons in the struggle for healing than Bosworth had earlier in his career.¹⁰⁵ Perhaps connected to this, under Branham’s more dynamic (rather than propositional) approach to healing, Bosworth viewed medicine with more suspicion in the last decade of his life.¹⁰⁶

Bosworth was apparently not uncritical of the younger evangelist. Branham’s habit of refusing to sell gospel books on Sunday annoyed Bosworth, who tried to appeal to Branham by reminding him that some might come to salvation by reading such books.¹⁰⁷ Bosworth also tried to expand Branham’s technique to enable Branham to pray

William Branham, “We Would See Jesus” (Sermon, Bloomington, Illinois, April 9, 1961), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/61-0409-we-would-see-Jesus>. Accessed September 14, 2014. Bosworth’s approach was in line with others of his generation, like Raymond Richey, who during the postwar revival spoke of healing as the “dinner bell” bringing sinners to salvation. Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 93.

¹⁰² Stadslev, *William Branham*, 135. See also Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 58, n. 94; Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 6.

¹⁰³ Stadslev, *William Branham*, 84, 146.

¹⁰⁴ Lindsay, *William Branham*, 78. Again: “I do not come to take the place of your doctor...Doctors are God’s servants and they do all they can for us. But their power and knowledge is limited. God’s power is not limited. If doctors and nurses were not needed, they would not be here. They are a great help to us.” Stadslev, *William Branham*, 60.

¹⁰⁵ Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 62.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 66–67.

¹⁰⁷ William Branham, “The Maniac of Gadara” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 20, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0720A-maniac-of-Gadara>. Accessed September 10, 2014;

for more people.¹⁰⁸ While Bosworth was with Branham in South Africa in 1952, Branham received a word from God warning him not go on to the next stop on their itinerary. Bosworth, along with Baxter and others, told Branham he was mistaken. Bosworth suggested to Branham that Satan could have given him a false vision. Branham responded that Bosworth “was looking at it from the natural, ministerial stand point.” According to Branham, God “permitted” him to go along with Bosworth’s counsel, but insisted that they were outside of God’s will. And the party paid for their disobedience, as many got sick and some of their meetings were cancelled because of storms.¹⁰⁹

A few other differences—although significant—were apparently not strong enough to threaten the bond between the ministers. Branham rejected the doctrine of British-Israelism.¹¹⁰ Branham was also apparently uninterested in Bosworth’s focus on the Lord’s Supper as a conduit of healing power.¹¹¹

William Branham, “Believest Thou This?” (Sermon, Tulsa, Oklahoma, April 2, 1960), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0402-believest-thou-this>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

¹⁰⁸ William Branham, “I Have a Greater Witness than John (How the Angel Came to Me)” (Sermon, Owensboro, Kentucky, November 7, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1107-I-have-a-Greater-Witness-than-John-How-the-Angel-came-to-me>. Accessed September 8, 2014. See also Branham, “Africa Trip Report.”

¹⁰⁹ Branham retold this story often. The narrative here is compiled from Branham, “How God Called Me to Africa, Part I,” 8. See also Branham, “Early Spiritual Experiences”; Branham, “Africa Trip Report”; William Branham, “Faith (Africa Trip Report)” (Sermon, Zion, Illinois, July 25, 1952), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/52-0725-faith-Africa-trip-report>. Accessed September 8, 2014; William Branham, “How Faith Acts (Africa Trip Report)” (Sermon, Battle Creek, Michigan, August 16, 1952), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/52-0816-how-faith-acts-Africa-trip-report>. Accessed September 8, 2014. Bosworth was frequently in the audience when Branham told this story. Either Bosworth accepted that Branham was correct after the fact or Bosworth did not wish to challenge Branham in such public settings.

¹¹⁰ Yet, many of Branham’s ideas seemed compatible with British-Israelism. For instance, Branham was a proponent of pyramidology, the belief that the Great Pyramid at Giza held prophetic information because it was built by some Hebrew patriarch such as Enoch or Noah. British-Israelists were often avid pyramidologists. Michael Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origins of the Christian Identity Movement*, revised edition (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 12–14; William Branham, “The Sign of His Coming” (Sermon, Cleveland, Tennessee, April 7, 1962), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/62-0407-sign-of-His-coming>. Accessed September 18, 2014. Additionally, Branham preached “two-seed-in-the-spirit” soteriology, the belief that Eve gave birth to two

In two main areas, Branham's work impressed Bosworth as different from his own. First, Bosworth never claimed the gift of healing, which he freely ascribed to Branham. As Branham told the story, Bosworth had prayed that someday the gift of healing would be restored to the church, rather than "just somebody preaching Divine Healing."¹¹² This longing was met in Branham's ministry. Second—and relatedly—crowds were large from the outset of Branham's meetings in each new location, and along with the large crowds, miracles and healings usually occurred on the first night of meetings. Bosworth, on the other hand, claimed he often spent many days in a location before a sizeable crowd developed, and he had usually encouraged those seeking healing to attend numerous meetings before coming through the prayer line.

These contrasts, said Bosworth, stemmed from "the difference between the Gift of Healing and the prayer of faith."¹¹³ The evangelists of the postwar healing revival did not see these two paths to healing as contradictory, but complementary. The "prayer of faith" continued to be the route of healing for many, but the increase in the "gift of healing" signaled the nearness of the end times. For Bosworth, the two worked in tandem: as Branham supernaturally detected diseases and hidden sins, such signs "raise the faith of

distinct lines of humanity—one predestined for salvation and one for condemnation. Combined with emerging notions among British-Israelists in the late 1950s that Jews were descendants of the devil, this teaching contributed to the emergence of Christian Identity. Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right*, 160–162; Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 125.

¹¹¹ Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 92. For many who supported the healing revivals, a psychological and sometimes logistic need for physical objects as aids in healing continued to exist. For instance, Oral Roberts systematized the concept of "points of contact," which could be anything from a blessed handkerchief to the radio set from which the needy heard the evangelists' words. T.L. Osborn and Kenneth Hagin echoed Bosworth's view of the Lord's Supper but did not stress it as Bosworth did. See next section.

¹¹² Branham, "Diseases and Afflictions."

¹¹³ "Rev. and Mrs. F.F. Bosworth Work with Branham Party," *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 2 (May 1948): 5.

the afflicted to the level where the ‘gift of healing operates for their deliverance.’”¹¹⁴

Branham described the complementary nature of his differences with Bosworth:

Now, Brother Bosworth, many other ministers, they preach the Word. And through the Word, you believe. And then when I was put in the world, I was given a gift. That gift brings the—brings God in view of everyone. So you can see, you understand, that something supernatural is moving with the people.¹¹⁵

Although Bosworth believed that healing was available to all on the basis of faith in the work of Christ, often his enthusiasm for Branham’s unique ministry placed more emphasis on contact with the prophet than simple faith. When one forlorn father in South Africa approached Bosworth inquiring how “his child might receive the healing which he realized Christ had purchased,” Bosworth advised the father to pray that Branham would receive a vision of the suffering child.¹¹⁶ Still, Bosworth was not willing to concede what the critics of divine healing often charged: that healing evangelists claimed the power to heal in themselves. Bosworth repeated an argument to W.E. Best that he had used decades earlier: the healing evangelist is no more a “healer” than the preacher of salvation is a “savior.”¹¹⁷ Branham’s supporters continued to hold that despite the dynamic abilities of Branham, healing was chiefly a matter of “God’s universal laws.”¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Bosworth, “Gifts of Healing Plus,” B. See also Schoeman, “Great Revivals in Africa with Branham Party”; Bosworth, “Branham Meetings in Germany and Switzerland,” 4.

¹¹⁵ William Branham, “Blind Bartimaeus” (Sermon, Karlsruhe, East Germany, August 18, 1955), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/55-0818-blind-Bartimaeus>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

¹¹⁶ Stadslev, *William Branham*, 86.

¹¹⁷ “News Clip: Houston Press, 1950,” 10.

¹¹⁸ Stadslev, *William Branham*, iv.

Bosworth's Impact on the Postwar Healing Revival and the Word of Faith Movement

Bosworth was among the select revivalists of the 1920s and 1930s who were “the legitimate ancestors of the charismatic revivalists of the post-World War II period.”¹¹⁹ To the younger generation of believers in the gospel of the supernatural, Bosworth was an “Apostle of Faith”¹²⁰ and a “20th century pioneer of the ministry of the miraculous.”¹²¹ But Bosworth was more than a distant and revered ancestor, he was a living conduit of “inspiration and instruction in pentecostal doctrine” for the healing revival.¹²²

Bosworth made his impact felt on a number of the key aspects of these postwar healing evangelists. Branham took over a number of theological ideas that were central to Bosworth’s healing message, such as faith as a sixth sense and the distinction between God’s will and God’s ability.¹²³ Branham also made much of Bosworth’s slogan “faith comes by hearing,” even to the point of turning it into a legalistic requirement.¹²⁴ Bosworth and Branham had a similarly ambivalent attitude toward the relationship of saving faith to healing faith, and Branham’s theology of healing, like Bosworth’s, generally placed the blame on the seeker for lack of faith if healing was not

¹¹⁹ Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 12–13. Along with Bosworth, Harrell includes Raymond T. Richey, Aimee Semple McPherson, Thomas Wyatt, John G. Lake, Maria Woodworth-Etter and Charles Price. For reasons that are not clear, Harrell identifies Charles Price as “the man who probably influenced the healing revivalists of the postwar period most directly.” *Ibid.*, 17. Both Richey and Bosworth have a greater claim to direct influence on the postwar evangelists, since these two worked with the new generation of healers.

¹²⁰ Stadslev, *William Branham*, 130.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 136.

¹²² Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 34.

¹²³ Stadslev, *William Branham*, 54–55, 61.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 126. See also T. L. Osborn, *Frontier Evangelism: God's Indispensable [sic] Method for World Evangelism* (Tulsa, OK: Osborn Foundation, 1955), 34–35.

forthcoming.¹²⁵ Although less refined theologically, Branham echoed Bosworth's claim that healing was on the "same basis" as salvation.¹²⁶

Aside from Branham, T.L. Osborn was the postwar healing evangelist most influenced by Bosworth. Osborn described the five-week 1949 campaign in Detroit with Bosworth as "a practical training school" in divine healing as Bosworth spent long hours coaching Osborn in healing evangelism theology and technique. Bosworth encouraged Osborn to begin writing on divine healing and provided him with his first publisher—J.J. Scruby, who had published Bosworth's biography in 1921 and managed Bosworth's *Exploits of Faith*.¹²⁷ Bosworth's theology clearly rubbed off on the twenty-five-year-old evangelist. Osborn adopted Bosworth's legal language, likening atonement blessings to a bank account. "I have a right to *demand* the money," said Osborn, "because *it is mine*."¹²⁸ Osborn acknowledged that many of his insights in "One Hundred Divine Healing Facts" came directly from Bosworth's *Christ the Healer*.¹²⁹ Osborn's best-known work, *Healing the Sick* (1950), included numerous references to and direct quotations from Bosworth.¹³⁰

¹²⁵ As Weaver says, "Persons did not have to be a Christian to be healed, according to Branham, but had to become Christian to remain healed." Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 66.

¹²⁶ Branham said, "You obtain your healing by the same faith that saves or heals your souls." Stadskev, *William Branham*, 60.

¹²⁷ Osborn and Osborn, *Faith Library in 23 Volumes*, 1:104, 151–154.

¹²⁸ Osborn, *Healing En Masse*, 88. Emphasis in original. Osborn wrote, "The Gospel is God's legal document which declares facts." *Ibid.*, 45. See also T.L. Osborn, *Healing the Sick and Casting out Devils, the Message and Ministry of a Bible Discipline Now Living: Christ's Power of Attorney Exercised Today* (Tulsa, OK, 1950), 39, 61. Branham also spoke in legal terms. See William Branham, "Do You Now Believe?" (Sermon, West Palm Beach, Florida, December 6, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1206-do-you-now-believe>. Accessed September 9, 2014.

¹²⁹ Osborn, *Frontier Evangelism*, 62–78. Particularly bearing Bosworth's stamp is Osborn's discussion of the "curse of the law." *Ibid.*, 57–58.

¹³⁰ Osborn, *Healing the Sick*, 7, 23, 57, 64, 79, 82, 83, 120–122, 145–146, 284.

This book also lifted many of Bosworth's key ideas without attribution, such as the "redemptive names" argument, the Lord's Supper as a focus for healing, and symptoms of disease as "lying vanities."¹³¹

One notable development in the healing revival connected to Bosworth is "healing *en masse*." According to this approach, many could be healed simultaneously if they apprehended God's power and willingness to heal, and such healing required no laying on of hands, prayer cards or prayer lines. Based on the well-worn parallelism of soul-salvation and healing, proponents argued that "if a thousand people wanted to accept Christ and be saved, I would not pray for each one individually; I would teach them all to call on the Lord and to believe at one time...I knew the same method should be followed in ministering to the sick."¹³² This method seemed to solve many practical problems: reaching large numbers with healing during short visits, "demonstrating the Gospel on a mass evangelistic scale," and keeping seekers' focus on God instead of the evangelist.¹³³

Historians generally regard the mass healing technique as an innovation and identify T.L. Osborn as the originator, while recognizing that Bosworth and Branham also came to use the method.¹³⁴ Osborn recalled that while in Flint, Michigan, with

¹³¹ Ibid., 176, 180–186, 191–194. For Kenneth Hagin's view of the Lord's Supper as means to appropriate healing, see Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Key to Scriptural Healing* (Tulsa: Faith Library Publications, 1978), 21–22. For "lying vanities," see Osborn, *Healing the Sick*, 283. See also Osborn, *Healing En Masse*, 75.

¹³² Osborn, *Healing En Masse*, 13.

¹³³ Ibid., 15–16.

¹³⁴ Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 66; Roscoe Barnes, "F.F. Bosworth: A Historical Analysis of the Influential Factors in His Life and Ministry" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria, 2009), 183–184. Barnes claims that Bosworth first applied the principle during his work with Branham in South Africa in 1951 but also speculates that Bosworth witnessed Osborn use this method in Flint, Michigan, in 1949. Barnes further argues that the practice of mass healing was first used by Osborn, while the concept originated with Bosworth. Ibid., 194. See also Stadskev, *William Branham*, 145, 152.

Bosworth in 1949, “like a light from heaven the truths of mass healing suddenly shined into my soul.”¹³⁵ He tested the new revelation by praying at one time for fifty-four deaf people, all of whom were healed by the next day. Emboldened by this success, Osborn put the method into systematic practice while in Puerto Rico shortly after Flint, Michigan. Mass healing became such a cornerstone of Osborn’s ministry that he prided himself on rarely, if ever, praying individually for the sick.¹³⁶

A number of facts complicate Osborn’s rather polished account from 1954. First, Osborn’s “light from heaven” concerning mass healing significantly occurred while working with Bosworth. Osborn listened attentively to Bosworth’s theological musings on how the Israelites were all healed by looking to the serpent, rather than through the individual ministrations of Moses. As Osborn later recalled, “God chose Mr. Bosworth to seed us with these and many other biblical reasons for faith to help multitudes to be healed at the same time.”¹³⁷ In an honest moment, Osborn only claimed to have “pioneered the concept of *Mass-Miracle Evangelism on mission fields*,” that is, taking the “seed” of Bosworth’s theology and applying it in crusades in “heathen” nations.¹³⁸ Second, Osborn’s diary confirms that in May of 1949 he prayed a “mass prayer” for fifty-three deaf people, but at the time he did not seem to regard this as an innovation and

¹³⁵ Osborn, *Healing En Masse*, 11.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 14–22. Osborn had almost a disdain for individual prayer in light of the truth of mass healing: “We do not need to pray for one to be healed at a time any more than a farmer needs to plant one seed at a time.” *Ibid.*, 65.

¹³⁷ Osborn and Osborn, *Faith Library in 23 Volumes*, 1:127–129. Quote on p. 129. Barnes mistakenly cites this quotation as from *Faith Digest*. Barnes, “F.F. Bosworth,” 194.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1:137. Emphasis in original, but duly stresses that Osborn’s innovation was not in the concept mass healing, but in its application for evangelism in non-Christian populations.

continued to use prayer lines in his services.¹³⁹ Third, Bosworth's own discussions of mass healing centered on Branham, not Osborn. Bosworth's earliest mention of the technique was in connection with Branham's early 1950 meetings in Louisville, Kentucky. As Bosworth had hoped, Branham used the technique again in Houston a few days later, and from then it probably became a staple of the Branham meetings.¹⁴⁰

Furthermore, when speaking of mass healing, Bosworth and Osborn may not have been talking about precisely the same thing. While Osborn described mass healing as a simple numerical extension of the basic premise of healing by faith, Bosworth tended to invest greater significance in the "cumulative power of mass faith," suggesting that the power of an individual's faith is supernaturally and exponentially increased when it is combined with that of others.¹⁴¹ This theory necessitated a distinction in "levels" of faith, where a certain level makes healing possible. According to Bosworth in 1950, faith could also "pull" on the gift of healing within a healer like Branham—essentially a spiritual method of tapping the healer on the shoulder. If the healer then noticed and identified the

¹³⁹ Ibid., 1:141–143. In *Healing the Sick*, Osborn's diary is greatly edited, leading to some chronological discrepancies. See Osborn, *Healing the Sick*, 250–252, 254. Osborn admits that after Flint his "traditional mindset persisted," and "We had the right idea, but we were slow to act on it." Osborn and Osborn, *Faith Library in 23 Volumes*, 1:135.

¹⁴⁰ Bosworth, "Gifts of Healing Plus," C; "Profound Confirmation by Catholic Convert of Supernatural Light," *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 12 (March 1950): 4. Both Branham and Bosworth put the technique to use during the South Africa meetings in 1951, where Branham claimed twenty thousand people were healed simultaneously in one meeting. Stadskev, *William Branham*, 92–93, 142. William Branham, "Healing (What Cancer Is)" (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, September 4, 1953), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0904-healing-what-cancer-is>. Accessed September 8, 2014.

¹⁴¹ Osborn, *Healing En Masse*, 33; F.F. Bosworth, "Mass Faith" (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 21, 1954), <http://www.brothermel.org/audio-video/74>. Accessed September 29, 2014. Elsewhere Bosworth described the exponential effect of mass faith as, "one shall chase a thousand, two shall put ten thousand to flight" (Deuteronomy 32:30) and spoke of the "ratio" increasing, because, "the greater the crowd, the more the atmosphere is charged with the very vibrations of faith which heal soul and body." Bosworth, "Be Ye Doers of the Word."

one whose faith “pulled” on his gift, that person’s faith was likely to rise to “healing level” due to the supernatural confirmation.¹⁴²

Historian Roscoe Barnes suggests that Bosworth’s adoption of new techniques and terminology like healing *en masse* “indicate a new phase in Bosworth’s understanding of divine healing.”¹⁴³ Bosworth himself seemed to suggest that the method was novel.¹⁴⁴ But such comments reflect rather the pentecostal penchant for emphasizing ordinary developments as supernatural revelations in order to provide added sanction for one’s ministry. On a basic level, healing *en masse* was a development in magnitude, not kind. Earlier in his career Bosworth had expected those seeking healing to be healed without direct ministerial intervention, simply based on faith in the atonement for healing. His long-held teaching that healing could come through participation in the Lord’s Supper also suggested that those seeking healing needed no human intervention or prayers. Bosworth frequently rejoiced that seekers were healed simply by reading his

¹⁴² Bosworth, “Looking at the Unseen.” More research can be done on the healing leaders’ developing terminology on faith. I speculate that such developments as Bosworth’s notion of “levels” of faith and Oral Roberts’ and Kenneth Hagin’s discussion of “releasing” faith were necessary adjustments to resolve the tension between the evangelists’ utter confidence in faith healing on one hand, and the inevitable cases of failure to be healed on the other hand. Such notions as “levels” of faith or faith being “released” allowed the evangelists to place the burden for failure back on the seeker, postulating a further step that the believer had not taken and therefore was the reason for failure. In essence, to the pastoral query: “If I have faith, why have I not been healed?” the evangelists could reply: “Your faith has not yet risen to the ‘healing level,’” or “You have not yet ‘released’ your faith.” A possibly related later development is the spiritual warfare and territorial spirits theology of the Third Wave of the 1980s. This movement credits demonic powers with hindering the occurrence of miracles and spiritual progress in entire communities. Suggestive for further research, this theology has much in common with Bosworth’s earlier doctrine of “community unbelief” as one reason why healing was sometimes hindered. A connection between the healing evangelists’ “refusing to see that sovereignty shrouds the summit of the Almighty” and the development of spiritual warfare theology is suggested, but not explored in Gary B. McGee, *Miracles, Missions, and American Pentecostalism* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 219–220.

¹⁴³ Barnes, “F.F. Bosworth,” 184.

¹⁴⁴ “Because of the cumulative power of mass faith, it’s much easier for a whole audience, if they need to be healed at one time, than it is the same number one at a time. I wish I’d known that a few years ago.” Bosworth, “Mass Faith.”

writings and believing God’s promises therein. Often Bosworth told the infirm they could be healed during the sermon, and this move was no doubt in part meant to deal with the same logistical problems the postwar healing evangelists faced. In 1948, before any supposed breakthrough in the healing *en masse* approach, Bosworth spoke glowingly of the call for “corporate faith” for healing voiced by the Episcopal Church in Australia.¹⁴⁵ The same year, he gave advice that was quite compatible with the later “level of faith” language and the premise that healing requires no human intervention:

Two saints are instructed in Divine Healing; they study the Scriptures and are equally convinced this truth is for them; one steps out on the promise, is healed and remains so, while the other receives healing only in measure, and has constantly to ask for the prayer of faith again. What is the difference? One received Healing while the other receives *Health*. We receive only in a measure, as we accept and believe.¹⁴⁶

Although other evangelists like Osborn and Branham, working in their prime, developed mass healing as a definite technique and put their own stamp on it, the technique should be seen as a large-scale application of Bosworth’s healing theology and practice.

Another aspect of the healing revival that bears signs of Bosworth’s influence was the growing focus on financial blessings. A.A. Allen was probably the first to make prosperity a central theme in 1953.¹⁴⁷ Soon Roberts was preaching his principle of

¹⁴⁵ F.F. Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 7th edition (Miami Beach, FL, 1948), 177.

¹⁴⁶ F.F. Bosworth, “Hints Regarding Healing,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1776 (May 22, 1948): 4. Emphasis in original.

¹⁴⁷ Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 74, 200. A.A. Allen “published the first popular book on financial miracles.” Kate Bowler, *Blessed: A History of the American Prosperity Gospel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 47.

sevenfold return.¹⁴⁸ Kate Bowler argues that “Bosworth never preached about prosperity,”¹⁴⁹ but Bosworth was already telling the faithful in the 1920s,

Many people do not know that God has laws in regard to financial blessing just the same as he has in regard to spiritual blessings. If they sow money, give it to the Lord, in the right spirit, it will bring a fruitful harvest. Some people say ‘I cannot afford to give.’ They stay poor. Everything you give out will increase. You always reap more than you sow.¹⁵⁰

Also, in a tract in the 1930s, Bosworth detailed many key themes of the financial blessing that would appear with force a few decades later.¹⁵¹ The full bloom of the “prosperity gospel” probably awaited corresponding economic showers, but Bosworth’s theology lent itself to a broader prosperity message. Although no direct evidence yet ties Bosworth to the later wealth theologies, the theological resonance and Bosworth’s definite influence on the postwar healers is suggestive.

The word of faith movement, a theological development integrating pentecostal healing theology with metaphysical thought, arose in the 1960s after the excitement of the postwar healing revival abated. The movement stressed the creative power of faith for healing and material prosperity and identified faith with spoken confession. Kenneth Hagin, often described as the father of the word of faith movement, was clearly

¹⁴⁸ Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 49, 105.

¹⁴⁹ Bowler, *Blessed*, 22.

¹⁵⁰ “Syracuse Revival Promises Big Success, John Sproul Testifies, Three Meetings Held,” *National Labor Tribune*, May 18, 1922, 3.

¹⁵¹ “Since God promises blessings, both spiritual and temporal, through ‘tithing’ and giving, why should not we all take the steps of faith and claim *these* blessings, just as we do for salvation, healing, and all the other blessings which God promises?” F.F. Bosworth, *The Key to the Windows of Heaven, or God’s Financial Plan* (Miami, FL: Bosworth, n.d.), 11–12. This tract was originally published as F.F. Bosworth, “God’s Financial Plan Insures the Prosperity of His People,” *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 5 (May 1929): 7–13. For another early sermon on financial blessing, see F.F. Bosworth, “The Grace of Liberality,” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 2 (February 1930): 1–2. For the importance of the notion of “sowing” for the later prosperity gospel, see Oral Roberts, *Miracle of Seed-Faith* (Tulsa, OK: Roberts, 1970), 27–29.

influenced by Bosworth.¹⁵² An independent-Baptist-turned-pentecostal minister, Hagin came into the *Voice of Healing* orbit around 1953, and although he never achieved national success as an itinerant evangelist, his writings were very popular.¹⁵³ Hagin attended Bosworth's meetings, the last time in 1954, and visited with Bosworth as late as 1956. According to Hagin, Bosworth had a peculiar anointing from God to heal the deaf. Acknowledging his debt to Bosworth—and especially admiring Bosworth for proving his teaching of divine healing by living in health—Hagin taught from *Christ the Healer* in his RHEMA Bible Training Center in Tulsa.¹⁵⁴

Another instance of Bosworth's influence on the Word of Faith movement can be seen in Hagin's son, Kenneth Hagin, Jr. In a detailed analysis of the elder Hagin's "plagiarism" of E.W. Kenyon, D.R. McConnell discovered numerous passages in Hagin's writings that simply reprinted Kenyon with a few words changed. Amazingly, Hagin, Jr., seems to have continued this practice. But whereas his father's choice for plagiarizing was Kenyon, the younger Hagin preferred Bosworth (see Table 1).

¹⁵² Scholars rightly focus on E.W. Kenyon's influence on Hagin. Bowler, *Blessed*, 44; Dale H. Simmons, *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power and Plenty*, *Studies in Evangelicalism*, no. 13 (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1997), x, 298–302; D. R. McConnell, *A Different Gospel: A Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988). But Bosworth should be considered a secondary independent source of Hagin's thought. The additional issue of the relationship between Kenyon and Bosworth and Bosworth's resonance with New Thought are discussed in chapter eight.

¹⁵³ Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis MacNutt in Dialogue*, *Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies*, v. 4 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 25–28.

¹⁵⁴ Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Name of Jesus*, Faith Library Publications (Tulsa, OK: Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 1979), preface; Kenneth E. Hagin, *Understanding the Anointing* (Tulsa, OK: Faith Library Publications, 1983), 41–42; Kenneth E. Hagin, *Prevailing Prayer to Peace: [26 Prayer Lessons]* (Tulsa, Okla.: K. Hagin Evangelistic Association, 1973), 70.

Table 1. Comparison of selections from F.F. Bosworth and Kenneth Hagin, Jr.

Bosworth	Hagin, Jr.
<p>“The opening of the prison” is God’s own figurative illustration of our release from bondage or imprisonment to sin, and sickness and everything else that reached us through the fall. (<i>The Opening of the Prison</i>)</p>	<p>“The opening of the prison” is God’s figurative way of describing that you have been released from the bondage of Satan: from sin, sickness, disease, torment—all that is involved with the prison house of Satan himself. (<i>The Prison Door is Open</i>)</p>
<p>[T]he first thing God requires of man is that he forsake his way and thoughts and accept God’s way and thoughts...Faith requires no evidence but the Word. (<i>The Opening of the Prison</i>)</p>	<p>The first thing God requires is that man forsake his own ways and accept God’s ways...Faith requires evidence. Evidence of feeling and tough? No, evidence of the Word. (<i>The Prison Door is Open</i>)</p>
<p>Hope is <i>expecting</i> a blessing some time in the <i>future</i>; but <i>faith</i> is <i>taking now</i> what God offers. (<i>The Past Tenses of God’s Word</i>)</p>	<p>Hope expects it “sometime.” Faith takes it now. <i>Faith takes what God has already offered us and makes it a reality in our lives.</i> (<i>The Past Tense of God’s Word</i>)</p>
<p>It is important for seekers after the mercies of God to see that appropriating faith is <i>taking</i> and <i>using</i> what God offers to us. (<i>The Past Tenses of God’s Word</i>)</p>	<p>It is important as we seek after the mercies and benefits of God to appropriate them by faith. This means actually taking them. (<i>The Past Tense of God’s Word</i>)</p>

Sources: Kenneth W. Hagin, *The Prison Door Is Open - What Are You Still Doing Inside?* (Faith Library Publications, 2013); Kenneth W. Hagin, *The Past Tense Of God’s Word* (RHEMA Bible Church, 1980); F.F. Bosworth, *The Opening of the Prison: A Message to the Sick* (Miami Beach, FL: Bosworth, n.d.); Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, chap. 8; F.F. Bosworth, *The Past Tenses of God’s Word*, n.d.

The younger Hagin demonstrated by his plagiarism that for some aspects of word of faith theology, no improvement could be made upon Bosworth's teaching.

Historical Assessment of the Postwar Healing Revival

The decade following World War II was a time of religious revival in America. According to contemporary pentecostal observers, Branham and the divine healing revival fit into a larger spiritual awakening that included the salvation focus of Billy Graham and the growth of the pentecostal denominations.¹⁵⁵ The healing revival was also eminently pentecostal, conveying the same gospel of the supernatural that had been the pentecostal core for over half a century and exhibiting the familiar tensions between independent and denominational expressions. And yet, the healing revival was also a pivotal moment in pentecostalism, American religion and world Christianity.

Discontinuities and Continuities

Scholars tend to describe the healing revival as an unexpected and unparalleled era.¹⁵⁶ And due to the unprecedented success of Branham, Roberts, and others, the participants often emphasized their ministries as the “new thing” God was doing. Even Lindsay—who deeply appreciated the debt the healing revival owed to its precursors—touted the revival as a “new era” in pentecostal revivalism. In part, this interpretation was buttressed with the symbolic nature of the deaths of the leading lights of the 1920s: Price,

¹⁵⁵ “A Letter from J. Mattsson Boze,” *Pentecost*, no. 17 (September 1951): 13.

¹⁵⁶ Common terms for the description of the revival are “erupted,” or “explosion.” Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 25.

McPherson, and Smith Wigglesworth.¹⁵⁷ A much-touted prophecy that Price gave in 1945 also fed this interpretation.¹⁵⁸ The need for a new phase of revival was also signaled by American pentecostalism's apparent spiritual drought, so that "ninety per cent of these people who attended the [Branham] meetings [in the fall of 1947] had never previously witnessed a single miracle." To full gospel adherents who had grown up on the old stories of supernatural manifestations but never seen it with their eyes, Branham's ministry must have signaled that they were finally coming into their spiritual inheritance. To those outside the fold of full gospel Christianity, this supernatural display was attractive as a rebuttal of scientific materialism and an antidote to overly-cerebral faith. Either way, after witnessing the miracles of Branham's ministry, the church "began to demand the ministry of the supernatural to be in action in its midst."¹⁵⁹ As Donald Gee noted in 1952, this same sense of spiritual lacking was at the foundation of the Latter Rain revival.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ Lindsay, "The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part I," 4. Lindsay noted that Raymond Richey, who had also been a leader of the 1920s healing revival, was "yet blessing." Curiously, he left Bosworth out of this list. Other healing evangelists echoed Lindsay's identification of the deaths of Price and Wigglesworth as the end of an era. See Velmer Gardner's recollection in Gordon Lindsay, "The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part IV," *World-Wide Revival* 11, no. 3 (June 1958): 18.

¹⁵⁸ *Golden Grain* 20, no. 6 (September 1945): 30; cf. Del Grant, "Is This the Beginning of the Predicted 'Spiritual Explosion That Will Rock the World'?" *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 7 (October 1948): 1, 4–5. The healing revivalists made much of other such prophecies—clearly seeking divine sanction from an earlier honored generation. Branham referred to a prophecy by Dowie. William Branham, "I Was Not Disobedient to the Heavenly Vision" (Sermon, Zion, Illinois, July 18, 1949), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/49-0718-i-was-not-disobedient-to-the-heavenly-vision>. Accessed September 7, 2014.

¹⁵⁹ Lindsay, "The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part II," 17.

¹⁶⁰ "The 'Latter Rain,'" *Pentecost*, no. 20 (June 1952): 17. See also Carl Brumback, *Suddenly ... from Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God* (Gospel Publishing House, 1961), 331. The Latter Rain revival originated among pentecostals in Saskatchewan in 1948 and emphasized the reception of spiritual gifts—especially prophecy—through laying on of hands. The movement recognized the biblical offices such as prophet and apostle and sometimes attempted to exert authoritarian control through these offices. Eschatologically-inspired teachings also distinguished the movement, such as the belief that true believers were the "manifest sons of God" who could achieve immortality on earth and that the "restoration of all things" was at hand, in which believers would go through tribulation but soon rule with Christ. Faupel identifies the victory of World War II, the end of pentecostal isolationism, and increasing concerns about

But as monumental as the postwar healing revival was, its distinctiveness should not overshadow its connection and parallels with earlier pentecostalism, particularly independent ministries focused on healing. According to Gee, the deliverance evangelists of the mid-1950s did not “manifest any essentially new features within the Pentecostal Revival. One has only to recall such names as those of Mrs. Woodworth-Etter, John G. Lake, Smith Wigglesworth, Aimee Semple MacPherson [sic], Charles Price, Stephen Jeffreys, and a host of others.”¹⁶¹ The healing revival fostered an intentional appreciation for earlier pentecostal movements that operated outside the bounds of so-called classical pentecostalism. Bosworth and Raymond Richey were perhaps the most prominent living connections of this pentecostalism in which tongues was a constituent, but not crucial part. Gordon Lindsay, reared in a Dowieite home, converted under Charles Parham, and apprenticed under John Lake, did much to foster an interest in this earlier independent gospel of the supernatural, publishing reprints of Lake’s sermons, Woodworth-Etter’s writings, and a biography of Dowie. As such, he made it a prominent factor of pentecostal self-identity for the second half of the twentieth century.

Tensions between Independent and Denominational Pentecostalism

The Pentecostal denominations early showed cautious approval of both the Latter Rain revival and the divine healing movement. But by 1950, the Assemblies of God and the United Pentecostal Church, Inc., had denounced the excesses of the Latter Rain movement. Widespread disapproval of the healing evangelists took a little longer.

pentecostal apostasy as the context for the rise of the Latter Rain revival. Faupel, “The Everlasting Gospel,” 397.

¹⁶¹ “The ‘Deliverance Campaigns,’” *Pentecost*, no. 37 (June 1956): 17.

Around the time Bosworth's career was revived by Branham, the Assemblies of God again took notice of Bosworth, publishing an article of his and advertising *Christ the Healer* in 1948.¹⁶² In 1952, M.E. Collins, the president of the Assemblies of God Southwestern Bible Institute (Waxahachie, Texas), wrote for *Voice of Healing*, even reminiscing on how he had been brought into the ministry of divine healing while attending Bosworth's meetings at Rader's Tabernacle in Chicago in 1928.¹⁶³ In August of 1952, Branham still claimed that Assemblies of God officials had offered to sponsor a trip for the evangelist to India.¹⁶⁴ Three years later, Bosworth spoke at a Pentecostal holiness camp meeting in Atlanta, where he shared his experiences in South Africa.¹⁶⁵

But this type of cooperation with the denominations dwindled as the revival wore on. Some denominational observers faulted Bosworth for his credulity and the healing evangelists in general for creating followers who "never go further than the excitement of the campaign."¹⁶⁶ Professional jealousies, competition for offerings, and disagreement over the scriptural validity of things like diagnosing diseases were the sorest spots. To the most outspoken revivalists, the denominations' criticism of the independent ministries

¹⁶² Bosworth, "Hints Regarding Healing." For advertisement of *Christ the Healer*, see *Pentecostal Evangel* no. 1779 (June 12, 1948):16. A reprint of a chapter of *Christ the Healer* appeared in early 1947. F.F. B., "The Faith That Takes," *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1707 (January 25, 1947): 6-7.

¹⁶³ M.E. Collins, "Divine Healing in the Bible College, Part V," *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 11 (February 1952): 8. See also M.E. Collins, "How I Learned the Truth About Divine Healing," *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 2129 (February 27, 1955): 3.

¹⁶⁴ William Branham, "The Heathen Believe as Power Is Shown," *Voice of Healing* 5, no. 5 (August 1952): 7.

¹⁶⁵ "Beulah Heights Camp Meeting--1955," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 45, no. 6 (August 1955): 4. This paper also published an excerpt from Bosworth's "Christian Confession," in the same issue (p. 2). Another excerpt from *Christ the Healer* was published in *Bridegroom's Messenger* 46, no. 1 (September-October 1955): 1-2.

¹⁶⁶ Donald Gee, *Wind and Flame: Incorporating the Former Book The Pentecostal Movement, with Additional Chapters* (Croydon, England: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1967), 244-245.

simply showed that the denominations had begun to “fight those who preached signs, wonders and miracles.”¹⁶⁷ This uneasiness also appeared in Bosworth’s relationship with the Christian and Missionary Alliance. In 1947, Bosworth had reestablished his credentials with the Alliance,¹⁶⁸ but four years later he and his wife Florence quietly left their official designation as workers in the Southeastern District.¹⁶⁹ The tensions between an independent and broadcast supernatural gospel and the concerns for order and control of the denominations must have seemed familiar to Bosworth.

The Distinctiveness of the Revival

Despite the familiarity and continuity of the healing revival with its predecessors, at least three factors made this movement distinct. First, the sheer numbers of the attendance at the healers’ meetings—especially overseas—was unprecedented. Although estimates of crowds were probably exaggerated, attendance in some meetings numbered in the hundreds of thousands.¹⁷⁰ Through its contact with large audiences, the healing revival played a major role in introducing the American public to pentecostal beliefs and

¹⁶⁷ Harrell argues that denominational support stopped around 1952. Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 107–116. Quote from A.A. Allen, p. 114. A notice for Branham’s meetings still appears in *Pentecostal Evangel* May 31, 1953, p. 16. A brief report appeared in March 25, 1954, p. 12.

¹⁶⁸ *Annual Report for 1947* (The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1948), 189; *Minutes of the General Council, 1949 and Annual Report for 1948* (The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1949), 219; *Minutes of the General Council, 1950 and Annual Report for 1949* (The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1950), 219.

¹⁶⁹ “Pastoral Personnel,” *Alliance Weekly* 86, no. 48 (December 5, 1951): 13. The last time Bosworth was listed on the Alliance roster published with the annual report was *Annual Report for 1950 and Minutes of the General Council* (The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1951), 242.

¹⁷⁰ As Gordon Lindsay noted, “In some ways these revivals exceeded even those of old, for never before in history have audiences of 50, 100, and even 200 thousand people gathered to hear the Gospel.” Lindsay, “The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part I,” 4.

practices.¹⁷¹ Second, the interdenominational character of the meetings within the pentecostal context not only echoed the meetings held by Bosworth, McPherson, and Price in the 1920s and 1930s, but directly inspired the ecumenical experiment that became the charismatic movement.¹⁷²

Finally, with the exception perhaps of xenolalia in the first years of pentecostalism, the healing revival brought into sharper focus than any earlier effort the place of the supernatural in evangelism and missions—what pentecostal historian Gary McGee called the “radical strategy” of missions.¹⁷³ Beginning with Gordon Lindsay’s work in Mexico in March of 1949 and T.L. Osborn’s campaign in Jamaica the same year, the healing evangelists “saw that from now on we must encourage World-Wide Revival through healing and miracles.”¹⁷⁴ Together they set the tone for a global evangelistic outreach stemming from the healing revival. Lindsay was probably the most articulate in noting that the unprecedented audiences were “drawn together through the demonstration of the ministry of the supernatural.”¹⁷⁵ For Lindsay, the healing revivals were the first

¹⁷¹ “A New Revivalist,” *Life*, May 7, 1951; Henry P. Van Dusen, “The Third Force in Christendom,” *Life*, June 9, 1958.

¹⁷² The best-known pentecostal ecumenist and international promoter of the charismatic movement was David du Plessis, who greatly admired the independent healing ministries of the 1950s. See Joshua R. Ziefle, *David Du Plessis and the Assemblies of God: The Struggle for the Soul of a Movement* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 37, 41. See also Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 5, et passim. The clearest organizational tie between the healing revival and the charismatic movement was the Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship International. See Tallman, “Demos Shakarian,” 257–307.

¹⁷³ Gary B. McGee, “‘Power from on High’: A Historical Perspective on the Radical Strategy in Missions,” in *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, ed. Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, v. 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 317–36.

¹⁷⁴ Lindsay, “The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part II,” 18.

¹⁷⁵ Lindsay, “The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part I,” 4.

necessary step toward world evangelization.¹⁷⁶ Experience confirmed this for Bosworth, who said that “seeing these miracles was breaking,” the hard-hearted Hindus of South Africa.¹⁷⁷ Branham put his personal spin on this concept, declaring that the seven letters (the biblical number of completion) in each of his names signaled that he was chosen as a special end-time minister of the supernatural gospel. This distinguished his ministry from that of Billy Graham, whose last name had six letters.¹⁷⁸ Evangelists like Osborn believed that, “Without world-wide evangelization by miracles, Pentecost has no purpose.”¹⁷⁹ This approach implicated both twentieth-century missions and pentecostal self-understanding.

The supernaturalist mission strategy was, of course, an extension of Bosworth’s own belief that healing was “bait” for the gospel of soul-salvation. But the scope with which this miracle-driven evangelism was promulgated in the postwar healing revival initiated a new phase in the theory and practice of missions. As a witness of T.L. Osborn’s ministry put it, “Who would want to go back to the old traditional missionary methods which for years had proved to be ineffective in winning the masses[?]”¹⁸⁰ In championing their “Bible method” of missions, the healing evangelists were perhaps closer to the methods of early Christianity than they realized. As Ramsey MacMullen argues in *Christianizing the Roman Empire*, for the mass of early converts to Christianity,

¹⁷⁶ “World-Wide Revival Crusade,” *Voice of Healing* 6, no. 4 (July 1953): 2–3. Lindsay also wrote a book on the subject, entitled *World Evangelization Now by Healing and Miracles*.

¹⁷⁷ Bosworth, “God’s Visitation to South Africa.”

¹⁷⁸ Weaver, *The Healer-Prophet*, 130.

¹⁷⁹ Osborn, *Frontier Evangelism*, 24.

¹⁸⁰ Osborn, *Healing En Masse*, 104. And as Osborn put it even more emphatically in his book on signs and wonders in evangelism: “Preachers abroad without miracles are almost wasting their time and the people’s money who support them.” Osborn, *Frontier Evangelism*, 21.

“the only thing believed in was some supernatural power to bestow benefits.”¹⁸¹ And this strategy was a success, strengthening pentecostal work and planting new ministries across the globe. As Harrell observes, “the balance of world religion has been changed” by global ministries stemming from the healing revival.¹⁸²

Failing Health and Death

While in South Africa in 1953, Bosworth had a bout of pain dealing with his prostate that brought him close to death. This was a sign of increasing health problems to come. While doctors advised him to have surgery, Bosworth preferred divine healing and wired a prayer request to Branham in the states. Branham was glad to get the message, but claimed that he had already been supernaturally alerted of Bosworth’s condition a day before the telegram reached him, and according to Branham “the Lord Jesus Christ healed him without any operation.”¹⁸³ In the summer of 1956, Bosworth had another health scare. Bosworth’s wife told Branham that Bosworth, suffering from a blood clot, had “death rattles” in his throat and was unconscious in an oxygen tent. At this time, the Bosworths made it clear that they wanted Branham to preach Bosworth’s funeral.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸¹ Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100-400* (Yale University Press, 1984), 4.

¹⁸² Harrell, *All Things Are Possible*, 228.

¹⁸³ William Branham, “Be of Good Cheer” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 21, 1954), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0721-be-of-good-cheer>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

¹⁸⁴ William Branham, “The Law Having a Shadow” (Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, June 21, 1956), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/56-0621-Law-having-a-shadow>. Accessed September 10, 2014; William Branham, “Divine Love” (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, August 26, 1956), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/56-0826-Divine-Love>. Accessed September 10, 2014.

About a year later, Bosworth was again in dire health. Again Florence called on Branham for prayer. In December, Branham visited Bosworth one last time.¹⁸⁵

On Thursday, January 23, 1958, F.F. Bosworth died at his home in Miami. According to Branham, Bosworth—who had turned eighty-one less than a week earlier—died well, full of faith and hope. In fact, Bosworth did not believe his looming death was due to any sickness but that he was simply “wore out; and I just want to go home.”¹⁸⁶ Branham was unable to preach Bosworth’s funeral, so Osborn took up the duty, commemorating the man who “dedicated himself to preach the Word of faith to his generation to the fullest extent of his strength.” Osborn said that he was always surprised to see how many in his audiences had been converted under Bosworth’s ministry. Such was Bosworth’s legacy that “if we would begin to consider the chain reaction... of his ministry, we would never find the end of it.”¹⁸⁷ As he was faithful in ministry, so he was

¹⁸⁵ William Branham, “Life Is the Healer” (Sermon, Indianapolis, Indiana, June 11, 1957), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0611-Life-is-the-healer>. Accessed September 10, 2014. In August of 1957, Branham said Bosworth was “coming to the end of the road.” William Branham, “The Mighty Conqueror” (Sermon, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, August 8, 1957), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0808-Mighty-Conqueror>. Accessed September 10, 2014. See also “Questions and Answers on Hebrews (Series, Part 2 of 3)” (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, October 2, 1957), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-1002-questions-and-answers-on-Hebrews-2>. Accessed September 10, 2014; William Branham, “Sirs, We Would See Jesus” (Sermon, Newark, New Jersey, December 11, 1957), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-1211-sirs-we-would-see-Jesus>. Accessed September 10, 2014. These statements from Branham cast doubt upon the recollection of Bosworth’s son that “in 1958 Fred Bosworth returned from a year of meetings up and down the mountains of Japan.” F.F. Bosworth, *Christ the Healer* (Grand Rapids, MI: Fleming H. Revell, 2000), 234.

¹⁸⁶ William Branham, “Who Is This?” (Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, May 10, 1959), <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/59-0510E-who-is-this>. Accessed October 3, 2014.

¹⁸⁷ After Bosworth died, Branham expected to preach his funeral, but on the day Bosworth was buried, he was conducting a meeting in Waterloo, Iowa. See Branham, “The Queen of Sheba”; Branham, “Jehovah-Jireh,” June 12, 1957. For Osborn’s funeral sermon, see T. L. Osborn, “Commemoration,” *Faith Digest* 3, no. 3 (March 1958): 17–18.

faithful in death, said Osborn. Bosworth's last words were a testimony to his spiritual fortitude: "Everything is clear! Perfect trust! Nothing but the blood!"¹⁸⁸

Conclusion

After Bosworth's death, his personal Bible was discovered. Tucked inside were thirty prayers Bosworth prayed daily while ministering overseas. As he had his entire life, he prayed that his "preaching be 'in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.'"¹⁸⁹ Such prayers bare testimony to the unchanging core of Bosworth's fifty-year ministry: a gospel that is more than words, but a vivid encounter with the supernatural. During the postwar healing revival, Bosworth's style and language of ministry adapted to new challenges, opportunities, and personalities. In particular, William Branham's strange and exciting prophetic ministry allowed Bosworth to witness and promote first hand such things that he had earlier only prayed for. And the large numbers of people to be reached in their meetings forced a more facilitating approach in the "mass healing" technique. But the center of Bosworth's ministry—and that of popular pentecostalism—never shifted: the exciting experience of supernatural activity in Branham's ministry won Bosworth's loyalty along with that of hundreds of thousands of other full gospel adherents just as the yearning to broadcast that supernatural gospel to as many as possible led to the mass healing approach.

While one can conceive of the postwar healing revival without Bosworth's direct involvement, the revival would be unimaginable without Bosworth's earlier ministry and

¹⁸⁸ T. L. Osborn, "F.F. Bosworth Promoted to Eternal Reward," *Full Gospel Business Men's Voice* 6, no. 3 (April 1958): 25.

¹⁸⁹ Osborn, "He Prayed Earnestly for Himself."

writings. In Bosworth, the new generation of healing evangelists saw a pioneer and someone who laid a foundation, but also a co-laborer in Christ. If Bosworth never rose to the level of stardom in the postwar revival that Braham, Osborn, or Oral Roberts achieved, it was due to the natural limitations of his age. As cultural and religious conditions in America evolved, the healing evangelists—“preach[ing] with F.F. Bosworth’s *Christ the Healer* tucked under their arm”¹⁹⁰—reached more people with the gospel of the supernatural than ever before. In the process, they significantly changed Christianity in America and around the world.

¹⁹⁰ Bowler, *Blessed*, 43.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Theologian of the Supernatural Gospel

Real unadulterated faith is one hundred per cent supernatural.

-F.F. Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith” (1913)¹

Aside from his critique of the tongues evidence doctrine, F.F. Bosworth is most known for his theology of divine healing. Explicitly or implicitly, scholars have frequently taken divine healing to be the center of Bosworth’s thought. But to do so is to mistake prominence for centrality. Divine healing is not the generative center but the logical conclusion of Bosworth’s thought. While space does not permit an exhaustive treatment or a logical, biblical, or theological critique of Bosworth’s thought, the corpus of Bosworth’s writings reveals a broader theme. Bosworth’s central theological conviction was that God continues to engage in human history in identifiable, predictable, and often supernatural ways. Bosworth’s concern for the dependability of divine intervention led him to a theological corollary that stressed the power of faith to appropriate divine acts. This paradigm brings into a cohesive whole Bosworth’s most conspicuous theological positions on spirit-baptism, divine healing, and British-Israelism.

The Miracle-Worker’s Age

Like other full gospel adherents, Bosworth believed that “The Book of Acts...is the only unfinished book of the New Testament” and that the church’s work was to

¹ F.F. Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 9 (June 1913): 11.

continue the supernatural story.² As with the early church, modern Christians could expect the Holy Spirit to empower this work in miraculous and tangible ways. God’s dealings with humanity had not changed since Bible times, and “if you want to know how the Spirit acts now, just read how He *did* act when he had full possession of the Church.”³ Bosworth spoke of dispensations, but whereas fundamentalists used the term to eliminate supernatural activity from the modern world, Bosworth saw in the concept the premier argument for ongoing supernatural activity:

There is but one dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and that one lies between the First and Second Advents of our Lord. It is true that we are living in the Laodicean, or lukewarm, period of the Spirit’s Dispensation. At the beginning of the Age, the Church was in her Spirit-filled period, and we are now in the Laodicean, or lukewarm period; but for one (Thank God there are many others!), I am going to base my teachings and practices on the teachings and practices of the Church in her Spirit-filled period rather than in her lukewarm period. I would rather labor to build the Church up to the Bible standard than to try to make the Bible fit the Church of the Twentieth Century.⁴

As Bosworth understood it, the Holy Spirit was responsible for all miracles in every age, but “entered office” at Pentecost, making miracles and spiritual gifts more common and expected. Furthermore, since this same time period was thought to be “the Dispensation of Grace” by most dispensational thinkers, Bosworth argued that it would be absurd for Christ’s mercies for the sick to be suspended during this time.⁵

² F.F. Bosworth, “Did the Age of Miracles Ever End?,” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 3 (March 1930): 2.

³ F.F. Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 7th edition (Miami Beach, FL, 1948), 176. Italics in original.

⁴ Bosworth, “Did the Age of Miracles Ever End?,” 2. Cf. Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 185–186.

⁵ Bosworth, “Did the Age of Miracles Ever End?,” 2.

Also key to full life in the Spirit's age was spirit-baptism.⁶ So adamant was Bosworth that this experience be dependable and predictable that he attacked any teaching that delayed its reception or caused doubts that it had been received. In critiquing the majority pentecostal position on tongues, Bosworth was not only rejecting the reigning biblical hermeneutic that supported the tongues evidence doctrine; nor was he only publicizing a pastoral response to the disparity he witnessed between doctrine and practice. Bosworth was also placing spirit-baptism on a different theological footing than many of his pentecostal peers.

Bosworth insisted that believers could expect a spirit-baptism experience essentially similar to that of the apostles. In this he did not differ from other pentecostals. But Bosworth asserted different grounds for believers to claim the pentecostal experience. While most other pentecostals saw this through the narrow lens of tongues, for Bosworth, the pentecostal experience meant that, "not only the manifestations of tongues and healing, but all the other signs that accompanied the first outpouring of the Spirit, have been more or less in evidence."⁷ And while other pentecostals insisted on some essential link between tongues and spirit-baptism, eventually to the point that believers were discouraged from claiming spirit-baptism until they had spoken in tongues, Bosworth argued that faith alone is the ground for the experience and serves as its own verification:

Nothing short of real faith can satisfy the heart and put the soul at rest. The word 'evidence' in the Scriptures is never used in connections with a spiritual gift, or

⁶ Bosworth's theology of the relationship of tongues to spirit-baptism is detailed in chapter four.

⁷ Eunice N. Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story* (Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921), 54.

manifestation, making faith dependent upon any sign or physical manifestation, but the Apostle distinctly states that *‘faith is the evidence.’*⁸

This stress on faith meant for Bosworth that spirit-baptism did not have to wait for any confirming evidence. And in this way, an experience of supernatural encounter was not only more likely, it was assured. “Proper instruction followed by consecration and prayer will, in every instance, bring down the Baptism in the Holy Spirit, but it will not always bring down the manifestation of tongues.”⁹

Faith: Putting God to Work

The faith that could claim spirit-baptism was the key tool in bringing all the Spirit’s supernatural power to fruition. Simple doctrine did not suffice, as Bosworth urged seekers to “take a general truth and make it our own by personal faith.”¹⁰ True faith meant for Bosworth, “importunity” in prayer, or praying with “purpose of heart,” which was the same as getting “in tune with God.” When this was done, supernatural results were guaranteed, whether the prayer was for salvation, healing, spirit-baptism, or revival. All worked according to divine law. “God’s law for revivals,” said Bosworth, “is just as workable and dependable as the law of gravitation.”¹¹ The rational confidence of this language echoed Charles Finney’s claim that revivals are the predictable result of the “right use of constituted means.” But Bosworth’s approach evinces an important

⁸ Ibid., 67. Italics in original.

⁹ Ibid., 69.

¹⁰ F.F. Bosworth, *Meditations on the Ninety-First Psalm* (Miami Beach, FL: Bosworth, n.d.), 11.

¹¹ F.F. Bosworth, “Nothing Can Hinder a Revival,” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 135 (April 15, 1916): 6. For the phrase “in proper tune with the infinite,” see “Anointments for Night Reach 100,” *Altoona Mirror*, May 18, 1927, 1. Such phrases strongly suggest Bosworth’s familiarity with New Thought as popularized by Ralph Waldo Trine’s *In Tune with the Infinite* (1897). Bosworth’s one-time coworker Cyrus Fockler published a similarly-titled book: Cyrus B. Fockler, *Tuning In with the Infinite* (Milwaukee, n.d.).

distinction, for while Bosworth *likened* God's laws for revivals to the laws of nature, Finney believed revivals were the *result* of natural laws. Both revivalists spoke of "laws" as divine guarantees, but they had markedly different conceptions of the natural and the supernatural, the mundane and the miraculous.¹² Bosworth believed that because Jesus had taught that those who believe shall receive (Mark 11:24), "It is faith that releases the power of God... Since God's power is at our disposal we are as responsible for its exercise, through our faith, as though we possessed the power ourselves."¹³ According to Bosworth, faith was not just powerful, but omnipotent, because through faith the divine nature was imparted to humans. "Our power to act in the name of Jesus," said Bosworth, "depends upon the measure of the divine nature within us. To ask in the *name* of Jesus is to ask in the nature or Spirit of Jesus."¹⁴ Bosworth's former coworker John Lake would be well-known for the doctrine of "God-men," but Bosworth also spoke on occasion of the "manifestation of the sons of God" that was effected by faith. Such musings were as inspired by the mystical tradition as by New Thought.¹⁵

Of course, faith in God's word was often challenged by sense experience, for which reason Bosworth said, "It honors God to believe Him while every sense contradicts

¹² For Bosworth, salvation was the "greatest miracle," while for Finney, "when mankind become religious, they are not enabled to put forth exertions which they were unable to put forth." F.F. Bosworth, *The Christian Confession; Or, How to Obtain All Redemptive Blessings* (Miami, FL: Bosworth, n.d.), 29; Charles Grandison Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (Leavitt, Lord & Company, 1835), 12.

¹³ "Clergymen Impressed by Revivals in City," *National Labor Tribune*, September 25, 1924, 4. Cf. Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 136.

¹⁴ F.F. Bosworth, "The Wonders of Faith," *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 9 (June 1913): 6–7. Bosworth showed a mystical strain as he said, "We partake of the divine nature as our thoughts dwell on God and the attributes that belong to Him." F.F. Bosworth, "The Practice of the Presence of God," *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 5 (February 1915): 8. Here Bosworth admits he is influenced by the seventeenth-century Carmelite Brother Lawrence (p. 6).

¹⁵ "Great Outpouring at Last Meeting," *Altoona Mirror*, July 25, 1927, 22.

Him!”¹⁶ Bosworth in fact defined faith as “believing what God says in the face of contrary evidence of the sense.”¹⁷ As early as 1913, Bosworth used Jonah as the scriptural example of this counterfactual confession: “Jonah did not wait until he got out of the fish before thanking God, but he thanked Him before he got out. Anybody could thank Him afterwards.” This resulted in a straightforward admonition: “take your eyes off the symptoms and put them on the Lamb and praise God for your deliverance.”¹⁸

Bosworth did not deny the reality of sense experience (a stance he criticized as Christian Science), but insisted on a higher truth: “Symptoms are real, but God’s word is true, and by means of God’s word symptoms can be made to disappear. But if you try to feel right first and then have faith, that’s doing it backward.”¹⁹ To thank and praise God for a blessing before it materializes “always puts God to work.”²⁰

Bosworth’s early insistence on praising God for deliverance despite sense experience later translated into a focus on the power of words. Bosworth criticized those who “insist on looking at their bites, pains and aches, on talking about and nursing them.”²¹ The fear that acknowledging symptoms was detrimental to faith and therefore granted legitimacy to sickness led Bosworth to exhort, “Talking health will hasten recovery, while allowing the mind to rest on disease and talking about disease will cause

¹⁶ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 118.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 142.

¹⁸ Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith,” June 1913, 9.

¹⁹ “Evang. Bosworth Preaches Strong Sunday Message,” *National Labor Tribune*, March 1, 1923, 3. Also: “Faith means that we have left the sense realm.” Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 142.

²⁰ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 145.

²¹ F.F. Bosworth, “Hints Regarding Healing,” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1776 (May 22, 1948): 4.

doubts to arise in ourselves and in others; as doubt is the opposite of faith, healing is hindered.”²² Bosworth did not advise believers to say they were healed before healing was “fully manifested.” In such situations, he urged people to say “I’m standing on the Word of God.” For Bosworth, words did not have a magical power, but were able to feed or deplete faith. But that made right words no less important, for “Wrong confession shuts the Father out and lets Satan in.”²³

To deny sense experience was essentially an act of obedience. Such “yieldedness” to God was a constituent part of faith for Bosworth, who, in the vein of New School Presbyterianism (Finney was one of his favorite theologians), believed that “Salvation [is] the work of God and man.”²⁴ “Everyone who meets His conditions can be healed,” said Bosworth.²⁵ Faith also often required corresponding acts—what Bosworth called a “visible expression of faith,” which were intentional behaviors that specifically denied sense experience and could imply forgoing medicine.²⁶ “Make your dead faith walk and it

²² Ibid., 13. Also: “Never talk about your symptoms with others after being ministered to... Pray with your neighbor who is sick, and except in the way of instruction, say little to him about his sickness.” Ibid., 4.

²³ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 150. The parallels between Bosworth’s faith theology and the nineteenth century holiness theology are striking. Bosworth even used the popular holiness hymn “Standing on the Promises” as an illustration of his message. Ibid., 165.

²⁴ “Thousands Come to Hear Bosworth’s Final Message; Many Unable to Get In; The Arena Too Small,” *National Labor Tribune*, May 4, 1922, 3. For obedience and yieldedness, see Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith,” June 1913, 7, 8. On the related soteriological issue of imputed and imparted righteousness, Bosworth tried to walk a middle ground: “There are some who are preaching ‘grace’ too far. Too many who are claiming ‘imputed righteousness’ without ‘imparted’ righteousness. Righteousness is not imputed to the disobedient.” “Profess to Be Healed at Tabernacle Service,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 2, 1924, 4.

²⁵ F.F. Bosworth, “Discerning the Lord’s Body,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 2.

²⁶ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 193. See also Bosworth, *Meditations on the Ninety-First Psalm*, 18. Denial of sense experience by word and deed was common among nineteenth-century advocates of divine healing. But it also functioned somewhat differently. While Bosworth was concerned chiefly with the relationship between deeds and faith, for earlier advocates the paradoxical language of “acting faith” permitted them to navigate questions of divine will and human

will live,” urged Bosworth.²⁷ “Attempting the seeming impossible opens the channel though which the supernatural current flows,” claimed Bosworth, “and healing is the result.”²⁸ This determination to “act faith” led on multiple occasions to Bosworth’s own victories in health.²⁹

Why Some are Not Healed: A Theology for Failure

Bosworth usually explained lack of healing by lack of faith or failure to meet conditions; God was cleared of any failures.³⁰ Yet his approach was also pastoral and sympathetic. Those who did not have sufficient faith were not to be faulted, but were simply ignorant of the Gospel, which was to be remedied by preaching and teaching.³¹ “If a person did not know what God’s word taught he had no basis for his faith.”³² Bosworth

agency, distinguish faith cure from metaphysical healing, and transcend gender limitations while rhetorically consenting to them. See Heather D. Curtis, *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 81–108.

²⁷ Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith,” June 1913, 10. Bosworth’s followers took this advice to heart: “I believed God’s word without any manifestation, and praise Jesus, sometime between Sunday and Monday evening He performed a miracle and every rupture disappeared, not a sign of rupture left.” “Testimonials,” *National Labor Tribune*, January 27, 1921.

²⁸ Bosworth, “Hints Regarding Healing,” 13.

²⁹ “Some of you know what it means to walk around with a high fever. My stomach rolled and I felt as sick as death, but as I began to praise God for the fact that Jesus bore my sickness, both times the sickness instantly passed off and I was well.” Bosworth, “Discerning the Lord’s Body,” 4.

³⁰ “Your prayers will avail you little as long as there is a single sin that you do not confess and repent.” “Bosworth Tabernacle Too Small to Meet Crowds,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 27, 1921, 3; Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 133. Bosworth admitted that God sometimes permitted sickness as a “halter” by which God led people into his will. This still seems to indict humans for failure, since Bosworth directs these comments to “those who are unwilling to be led into the glorious center of God’s will.” *Ibid.*, 191–192. In a similar vein, Bosworth said God’s faithfulness may be manifested “in permitting His children to be afflicted when it is essential for their good.” “Blessings More Abundantly,” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 29 (September 1922): 458.

³¹ “Woman Tells of Cure Wrought Through Faith,” *Syracuse Herald*, May 23, 1922, 22.

³² “Evangelist Bosworth Hands Out One to Skeptics and Critics,” *National Labor Tribune*, November 17, 1921, 4.

also claimed that “Community unbelief is a great hindrance to people being healed.”³³ This apparently meant that if a particular area had a preponderance of doubt or outright opposition to the gospel of healing, God would not perform miracles there, as happened with Christ in Mark 6:5. According to Bosworth, widespread unbelief was usually the result of the “traditions of men,” such as “the days of miracles are past,” or that “God is the author of disease.”³⁴

Bosworth also turned to demonology to explain healing failures. “Sometimes people are not healed because their affliction is not a sickness but an evil spirit.”³⁵ To be sure, Bosworth believed—like John Alexander Dowie—that all sickness was the work of the devil, but he also believed that God sometimes allowed sickness for the sake of a person’s soul.³⁶ Sometimes demonic influence was more acute, however, and dealing with evil spirits presumably called for different techniques, and faith alone was not enough.³⁷ Bosworth did not want believers to underestimate the demonic threat. “The devil has always hidden his identity,” warned Bosworth, “and most Christians fail to

³³ “Why Are Not All Who Are Prayed For Healed?,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 26, 1922, 3.

³⁴ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 183–184.

³⁵ “Why Are Not All Who Are Prayed For Healed?,” 3. This section should nuance Hejzlar’s claim that “demonology is not a prominent feature of Bosworth’s doctrine of divine healing.” Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis MacNutt in Dialogue*, *Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies*, v. 4 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 200.

³⁶ F.F. Bosworth, “For This Cause Was the Son of God Manifest That He Might Destroy the Works of the Devil,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 13, no. 8 (July 1921): 6.

³⁷ “Not to yield to God opens the soul to demon possession. There are thousands in our asylums, called insane, whose trouble is that they have resisted God and a demon has entered into and taken possession of their beings. There is no remedy for them except to cast out the demon and that is just what would happen if the church fully believed and obeyed the command of God to yield to Him and let the Holy Spirit have possession of them.” “The Final Meetings of the Bosworth Brothers at Detroit, Mich., Soul-Inspiring--Many Saved, Cured and Baptized,” *National Labor Tribune*, July 6, 1922, 3.

realize that the real spiritual battle is against the devil and the hosts of darkness. The devil has put on a program of sin, sickness and demon possession period.”³⁸ Encountering demonic forces was not a rare occurrence for true believers. “There are just as many demons in the world today as there were in Christ’s day,” he told an audience in Erie, Pennsylvania, “and they have had almost two thousand years of experience in dealing with human beings.”³⁹ Bosworth’s musings on demonic powers led him to a suggestive, yet undeveloped theology of territorial spirits:

We may have to get victories over the prince of Ottawa, for just as there was a prince of Persia there is undoubtedly a prince of Ottawa. There is a great difference in the spiritual atmosphere in various localities. Why? Because there is a spiritual conflict in progress and the victory is won in some places while it is not in others, on the part of God’s people.⁴⁰

Bosworth saw Satan at work in general opposition to God’s message of healing. “[The devil’s hosts] control the policies of men and such instrumentalities as newspapers and other means of making the work of God known.”⁴¹ No matter how much human opposition or resistance to the supernatural gospel Bosworth encountered, he determined to see the devil behind it rather than individuals.⁴²

³⁸ “Bosworth Party Opens in Canada,” *National Labor Tribune*, April 5, 1923, 4.

³⁹ “Erie Revival Campaign Increases in Power,” *National Labor Tribune*, April 27, 1922, 3. Also: “Do you suppose that there are any less demons in the world today than there were in the time of Christ? Every one that was in the world when Christ was here is still here.” “Bosworth Revival Grows--Nyack Boys Help Out--M.E. Pastor Preaches--Tears Wounds Wide Open,” *National Labor Tribune*, October 19, 1922, 3.

⁴⁰ F.F. Bosworth, “Triumphant Faith,” *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 27 (July 4, 1925): 459.

⁴¹ “Paul Rader Issues Warning Against the Anvil Chorus and Knockers Brigade,” *National Labor Tribune*, June 7, 1923, 3.

⁴² “This is not a conflict with flesh and blood, nor with men who oppose us...but with the Devil and with his demons and with men whom he can blind to the truth which God would have proclaimed.” “Evangelistic Campaign, Bosworth Brothers Opens in Brooklyn on February 11th,” *National Labor Tribune*, February 15, 1923, 3.

Atonement: The Purchase of Blessings for Spirit, Soul, and Body

Faith could only appropriate those things that God had promised, because—as Bosworth never tired of saying—“faith comes by hearing.” In fact, Bosworth seemed almost to limit God’s sovereignty when he said, “God’s way of doing everything is by making promises and then by fulfilling them wherever they produce faith.”⁴³ The central promises were those associated with Christ’s redemptive work. Bosworth preached that “We cannot have any spiritual blessings except those we get through Calvary.”⁴⁴ As earlier divine healing advocates had explained, salvation and healing were both “in the atonement,” since Christ’s work restored all that was lost through the fall. The “past tense” nature of Christ’s work meant that the believer could be certain that as far as God was concerned, healing is a done deal.⁴⁵ Healing was for Bosworth unqualifiedly a promise stemming from the atonement and therefore was always God’s will. For this reason, Bosworth frequently railed against the prayer for healing that was couched in “if it be thy will” as destructive of faith.⁴⁶

Bosworth’s doctrine of healing in the atonement rested on many proof-texts, but two passage-pairs were particularly central. First, from Isaiah 53:4—interpreted through Matthew 8:16-17—Bosworth argued that human sickness was vicariously laid on Christ. Second, Bosworth believed on the basis of Galatians 3:13—interpreted through Deuteronomy 28:22—that Christ redeemed believers from the sicknesses that are part of

⁴³ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 113.

⁴⁴ “The Bosworth Campaign; Interest Growing in the Bosworth Revival and Healing Campaign; Prominent People Attend,” *National Labor Tribune*, December 29, 1921, 3.

⁴⁵ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 135.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 15.

the “curse of the law.”⁴⁷ Bosworth, considering the Old Covenant always to be a shadow of the New, frequently appealed to the healing of the Israelites in Numbers 21 as a type for Christian healing. The key was that although all Israelites were afflicted, all were healed by looking to the brazen serpent (cf. John 3:14), rather than their symptoms.⁴⁸

The New Covenant provisions of the atonement meant that healing was even more certain, leading Bosworth toward a mechanical or transactional view in his doctrine of healing. As early as 1921, Bosworth said believers were to “claim” healing, since it was included in the atonement.⁴⁹ He therefore stressed the legal nature of God’s work in Christ, likening Christ’s death to a will and stressing that on the basis of this will, faith “sees the health and strength bequeathed to us as already belonging to us because of the death of the Testator.”⁵⁰ Such legal understanding of healing was common among divine healing advocates from many backgrounds, from pentecostal to Episcopal to New Thought and Christian Science.⁵¹ In Bosworth’s words, “Learn to realize your birthright, that you belong to the Kingdom of God and are under its supernatural laws.”⁵²

⁴⁷ These passages occur frequently in Bosworth’s writings, but the arguments associated with both passage-pairs is concisely laid out in Bosworth, “For This Cause Was the Son of God Manifest That He Might Destroy the Works of the Devil,” 7. As discussed in chapter one, earlier expositions on divine healing, like that of R.A. Torrey, focused on James 5:16-17. Bosworth claimed—with some justification—that he never used James 5 or Mark 16 as the basis of his teachings. (The issue with Mark 16 was its textual unreliability.) In general, Bosworth saw James 5 as a commandment and a blueprint rather than a theological argument for healing. “3000 Hear Bosworth Reply to Dr. Lott,” *National Labor Tribune*, September 3, 1925, 4. Still, the standard critique of divine healing in the 1920s centered on James 5: Gaebelein called it the “star text for all ‘divine healers.’” Arno Clemens Gaebelein, *The Healing Question: An Examination of the Claims of Faith-Healing and Divine Healing Systems in the Light of the Scriptures and History* (New York: Publication Office “Our Hope,” 1925), 49.

⁴⁸ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 52.

⁴⁹ Bosworth, “For This Cause Was the Son of God Manifest That He Might Destroy the Works of the Devil,” 7.

⁵⁰ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 137.

⁵¹ According to William T. Walsh, rector at St. Luke’s Episcopal Church in New York and leader of Society of Nazarene prayer cell group, divine healing “is in accordance with the laws of the universe as

The blessings provided by Calvary surpassed salvation, spirit-baptism, or healing. “The Atonement,” said Bosworth, “is the only ground for any benefit to fallen man.”⁵³ Bosworth told an audience in the early 1920s that “Calvary insures for us our clothes and our food just as surely as it does our salvation.”⁵⁴ According to Bosworth, “In His substitutionary work for us He anticipated every possible need of Adam’s race, and opened the way for mercy to reach every phase of human need.” Bosworth’s doctrine of the redemptive names of God indicated that through the atonement God was “provider” as well as “righteousness” and “physician” for those with faith.⁵⁵

Bosworth’s view of Christ’s atonement combined penal substitution with a type of *Christus Victor* approach: “When the Devil drove the nails into the hands of Jesus Christ he was defeating himself and he was conquered. You and I now have the right to come and ask for all that God has ever done in the way of showing His love and mercy and to be avenged of our adversary.”⁵⁶ Faith in the precise benefits of the atonement explains Bosworth’s focus on the Lord’s Supper as a conduit of divine healing. Christ’s blood effected soul salvation while Christ’s body effected bodily healing. The believer appropriated these benefits not through an *ex opera operato* reception of the sacrament, but by “discerning” what the elements bestowed (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:29-30).

exact as the law of gravity.” Mabel Potter Daggett, “Are There Modern Miracles?,” *Ladies’ Home Journal*, June 1923, 165.

⁵² Bosworth, “Hints Regarding Healing,” 13.

⁵³ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 29.

⁵⁴ B.F. Armstrong, “Bosworth Evangelistic Campaign,” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 41 (December 8, 1923): 674.

⁵⁵ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 85–86.

⁵⁶ “Bosworth Campaign in Toronto,” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 9 (April 28, 1923): 152.

The Same in Any Age: Divine Love and Divine Immutability

Historian Douglas Jacobsen argues that “Bosworth’s theology revolved around the conviction that God is love.” Jacobsen is correct to identify divine love as indispensable in Bosworth’s thought, but to see it as the central conviction overstates the case. Most importantly, divine love does not help the historian or theologian fully appreciate Bosworth’s distinct approach to spirit-baptism or his adoption of British-Israelism.⁵⁷ As has been argued, Bosworth’s central conviction was the ongoing supernatural activity of God. Divine love was a key element in the argument for this supernatural gospel, but functioned more as support than foundation.

Bosworth wanted to correct an imbalance he saw in the Christianity of his day that emphasized God’s power rather than God’s love. To this end, he stressed that the Bible clearly states that “God is love” and argued that “benevolence is the great attribute of God.”⁵⁸ Bosworth wanted believers to picture God’s love as if an ocean were set above humanity, pressured by gravity “to find an outlet through which it might pour its ocean-tides over all the earth.”⁵⁹ God’s love was depicted most clearly in the gospels, which

⁵⁷ Douglas Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 294. Jacobsen does not sustain the argument for the centrality of divine love in Bosworth’s thought, and he is more accurate when he argues a bit further on that “Bosworth’s great desire—the core of his ministry and message—was to tell Christians, and indeed all people, how to appropriate God’s blessings, and how to do so without any delay.” *Ibid.*, 300. On the issue of Spirit-baptism, Jacobsen rightly argues that for Bosworth, the purpose of Spirit-baptism was “to make the recipient more like God—more loving and more able to demonstrate that love for others in powerful and effective ministry.” *Ibid.*, 308. But this would not have been disputed by other pentecostals and so sheds little light on Bosworth’s attack on the tongues evidence doctrine. Bosworth did feel that the tongues evidence teaching sometimes distracted seekers from this more important function of the experience, but this is not the same as saying that Bosworth believed the tongues evidence teaching was contradictory to the missional import of Spirit-baptism. The teaching did, however, contradict Bosworth’s understanding of how faith ensures the experience of the continual supernatural activity of God. On the issue of Bosworth’s British-Israelism, Jacobsen is silent.

⁵⁸ Bosworth, *Christ the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 72.

⁵⁹ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 73.

record Jesus healing many solely out of compassion. Likewise, recognition of God's faithfulness and experience of its affects should bring the believer into "a state of rapture." "Love is an emotion," said Bosworth, "and Divine love is the most exquisite emotion possible to the human heart."⁶⁰

But for Bosworth, the divine-human love relationship was not an end in itself. Rather, God's love signaled most of all God's continuing willingness to save and heal and thus was inextricably bound up with Bosworth's insistence that Christ did not change.⁶¹ As Bosworth often assured his audiences, "Christ's compassion for them is just as great as it was for those in Apostolic days." God offered healing in every age, said Bosworth, but now, through the atonement "His provisions for this work to be done today are perfect."⁶² Bosworth preferred to work with logical rather than emotional categories, and even God's love was subsumed under the larger theme of "principles": "All that God does is done in faithfulness to principles of love and mercy acting under varying circumstances so far as we are concerned; but unchanging as to His own attitude."⁶³ "God is the most reasonable being in the universe,"⁶⁴ proclaimed Bosworth, and the

⁶⁰ "Blessings More Abundantly," *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 29 (September 1922): 458.

⁶¹ The first sentence of the chapter that Jacobsen bases so much of his argument on is: "In the study of the Lord's compassion, we have, to my mind, a complete revelation of the Lord's willingness to heal." Bosworth, *Christ the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 70. Furthermore, that Bosworth believed God's love and immutability were inextricably bound together is shown in how he perceived the threat to the supernatural gospel: "[Satan] has broadcasted the unscriptural, illogical and worn-out statement, that the age of miracles is past, until he has almost succeeded in eclipsing the compassion of God from the eyes of the world." Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 71. Or again: "Every man who teaches that healing is not for all who need it today, as it was in the past, is virtually teaching that Christ's compassion toward the sick has been modified since His exaltation." *Ibid.*, 82.

⁶² "Bridgeport People Attend Brooklyn Meeting to Hear Evang. Bosworth," *National Labor Tribune*, February 22, 1923, 3; Bosworth, "The Wonders of Faith," June 1913, 6.

⁶³ "Blessings More Abundantly."

⁶⁴ Bosworth, "Triumphant Faith," 459.

central plank of God's reasonableness was his "immutability."⁶⁵ Since Christ's promises were essentially his nature, "the results of fulfilment of divine promises are the same in any age."⁶⁶ Furthermore, knowing what God in his compassion willed to do in the present tense created faith, the ever-important link between what God has provided and its reception. "It is not what God *can* do," said Bosworth, "but what we know He *yearns* to do, that inspires faith."⁶⁷ For this reason, Bosworth stated, "I would rather doubt God's power than his willingness to meet our needs."⁶⁸ Bosworth could see no reason to withhold supernatural blessings for God's people. "Since God wants to pour out His blessings, and His riches upon us in profusion, why not give Him a chance? Why not say 'I am going to come into the possession in this life, of all the eternal riches I can enjoy.'"⁶⁹ In Bosworth's concern for the dependability of healing and other atonement blessings, God's love met God's reliable promise.

Bosworth and E.W. Kenyon

In discussions of the prosperity gospel movement, scholars tend to emphasize Bosworth's importance as a conduit of E.W. Kenyon's theology and have assumed that any meeting between the two ministers resulted in Bosworth being influenced by

⁶⁵ Bosworth frequently preached on "The Unchangeableness of Christ," contrasting Christ's immutability with the mutability of all other things. "Many Converts Crowd Forward," *National Labor Tribune*, November 3, 1921, 3; "Bosworth Brothers Winning Many Hearts in Sunny Southland," *National Labor Tribune*, February 16, 1922, 3; "Bosworths in Miami," *National Labor Tribune*, March 2, 1922, 3. "Bosworth Bros. Broadcasted---Detroit Free Press Pull Enterprising Stunt--Thousands Hear the Message," *National Labor Tribune*, June 15, 1922, 3.

⁶⁶ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 176.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 71. Emphasis in original.

⁶⁸ "Bosworths in Miami," 3.

⁶⁹ "Soldier Boy's Testimony Makes Hit with Soldiers," *National Labor Tribune*, November 29, 1923, 8.

Kenyon.⁷⁰ This perspective has, in part, been used to support the broader argument that the word of faith theology does not arise organically out of the pentecostal mindset but is a foreign implantation of cultic metaphysical thought.⁷¹ Unfortunately, these arguments have been made with limited appreciation for the scope of Bosworth's thought. Previously unrecognized sources from Bosworth's works add more precise chronological details and nuance claims of Bosworth's dependence on Kenyon.

Assertions of any supposed meeting between Bosworth and Kenyon are tenuous. Based on recollections of Kenyon's daughter in an interview, Dale Simmons claims that Bosworth met Kenyon sometime before 1910 in Chicago.⁷² The first definite date showing Bosworth's knowledge of Kenyon comes from the reprint of Kenyon's "The New Kind of Love" published in *Exploits of Faith* October 1928.⁷³

Aside from Bosworth's admission in the 1948 edition of *Christ the Healer* that he drew on Kenyon's concept of "confession," nothing compels the historian to argue that when Bosworth and Kenyon interacted, influence flowed only in one direction. Around

⁷⁰ McConnell claims "Bosworth took much of his doctrine from Kenyon." D. R. McConnell, *A Different Gospel: A Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 68. See also Dale H. Simmons, *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power and Plenty*, Studies in Evangelicalism, no. 13 (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1997), 294–296; James M. Kinnebrew, "The Charismatic Doctrine of Positive Confession: A Historical, Exegetical, and Theological Critique" (Th.D. diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988), 132. The exception is McIntyre, who accepts the basic claim that Bosworth and Kenyon met before 1910 but who, in an effort to refute McConnell and place Kenyon in the orthodox holiness and pentecostal stream, speculates that Bosworth "may...have influenced Kenyon positively about tongues." Joe McIntyre, *E.W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story* (Orlando, FL: Charisma House, 1997), 131.

⁷¹ McConnell, *A Different Gospel*, xviii, 16, 22–24.

⁷² Simmons, *E.W. Kenyon*, 295. See also McIntyre, *E.W. Kenyon*, 68, 132, 325–326 n. 17.

⁷³ E.W. Kenyon, "The New Kind of Love," *Exploits of Faith* 1, no. 10 (October 1928): 15–16. Bosworth also may have interacted with Kenyon in the summer of 1929 when he vacationed in Pasadena with the Richeys. John David Foxworth, "Raymond T. Richey: An Interpretive Biography" (Ph.D. diss., Regent University, 2011), 159. For Bosworth's time in California, see "Evangelist and Mrs. Bosworth Enjoy Vacation," *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 8 (August 1929): 8.

the same time in 1912, both evangelists began testing more specific legal language to describe the believer's authority—Bosworth with the phrase “power of attorney” and Kenyon speaking of the “right of attorney.”⁷⁴ Although Kenyon put his slogan in print about seven months before Bosworth, Kenyon did not use the more familiar “power of attorney” phrase in print until 1914.⁷⁵ The ambiguity is sufficient to suggest that, if Bosworth and Kenyon had interacted, influence could have been mutual. If they had not yet interacted, they could have come to these insights independently or from contact with a common third source.

Regardless of chronology or any proposed chart of dependence, Bosworth, in endorsing Kenyon, did not offer a theology that was fundamentally different from his own as reconstructed from the earliest sources. Like Bosworth, Kenyon spoke in tongues but critiqued pentecostals of being overly dependent on manifestations rather than having faith in the plain word of God.⁷⁶ In particular, the legal language for which Kenyon would be so notorious was an early staple of Bosworth's message of certainty in God's continuing supernatural activity:

Do you ever stop to think that the Bible is a legal document, the Old Testament and New Testament legal terms? God treated the devil rightly. He defeated the

⁷⁴ F.F. Bosworth, “Pentecostal Outpouring in Dallas, Texas,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 4, no. 11 (August 1912): 11. See also Bosworth, “The Wonders of Faith,” June 1913, 6. E.W. Kenyon, “Prayer,” *Reality* 7, no. 5 (January 1912): 74; E.W. Kenyon, “The Heart,” *Reality* 7, no. 6 (February 1912): 93; E.W. Kenyon, “Deferred Answers,” *Reality* 8, no. 9 (May 1912): 147–48. Kenyon's sudden and repeated use of the phrase in early 1912 suggests that this was new language for him at the time, meaning that he may not have been using the phrase before 1910, when he supposedly met Bosworth. Kenyon recalls the moment when the notion of believers' rights as “power of attorney” came to him while holding meetings in Tennessee, but he does not give a date for this event. Essek William Kenyon, *The Wonderful Name of Jesus* (Seattle: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1964), 4. If Kenyon's account is credible, this event may have occurred in spring 1906. See *Reality* 3, no. 4 (May 1906): 78.

⁷⁵ E.W. Kenyon, “Legal Authority,” *Reality* 9, no. 1 (January 1914): 2.

⁷⁶ Simmons, *E.W. Kenyon*, 43. See also McConnell, *A Different Gospel*, 28; Geir Lie, *E.W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister?* (Oslo: Refleks Publishing, 2003), 15.

adversary on legal grounds and Satan has no legal authority over the new creation. The Church has legal authority over demons of all ranks and kinds.”⁷⁷

This statement can be compared with a typical passage from Kenyon: “You have been delivered out of the authority of Satan. Satan has no authority or legal right to reign over you. You are the absolute master of satanic forces in the name of Jesus.”⁷⁸ Although Bosworth did later espouse Kenyon’s language of “confession,” this represents a refinement of Bosworth’s earlier thought rather than the adoption of a new theology. As Kate Bowler hints, Bosworth’s earlier theology of “appropriating faith” through praise was fully congruent with the later “confession” theology.⁷⁹ Kenyon’s thought led Bosworth into more precise language but did not alter his basic theology, which suggests that the “metaphysical” doctrines of the word of faith movement can be seen as logical extensions of pentecostal divine healing theology.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Bosworth, “Triumphant Faith,” 460.

⁷⁸ McIntyre, *E.W. Kenyon*, 265.

⁷⁹ Kate Bowler, *Blessed: A History of the American Prosperity Gospel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 21. Bosworth’s urging (under Kenyon’s influence) “to believe and say what God says about our sins, our sickness, and everything else included in our redemption” was not far removed from his admonition in 1915 to “think [God’s] thoughts.” Bosworth, “The Practice of the Presence of God,” 6. In fact, much of Bosworth’s chapter on “confession” in the 1948 edition of *Christ the Healer* is actually about right thinking. See Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 151.

⁸⁰ By distancing Bosworth from Kenyon, I do not wish to imply that Kenyon represented surreptitious New Thought while Bosworth represented “orthodox” pentecostalism. On the contrary, I wish to show the boundaries more permeable than often appreciated while arguing also that word of faith theology does not need a smoking-gun connection to New Thought to arrive at essentially the same conclusions (contra McConnell, *A Different Gospel*, 24–56.) The argument presented here should be seen as compatible with Simmons’s thesis that Kenyon’s “prosperity” message has roots in the orthodox higher life movement. See Simmons, *E.W. Kenyon*, 304–306, et passim. Also in agreement with Simmons (with more explicitly theological concerns) is Lie, *E.W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister?*, 14. Additionally, the interest in Kenyon’s theology by other pentecostals such as Carrie Judd Montgomery and John Lake suggests affinity of thought. Connections between John Lake and E.W. Kenyon are suggested by McIntyre, *E.W. Kenyon*, 145; William Atkinson, *The “Spiritual Death” of Jesus: A Pentecostal Investigation* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 84.

Categorizing Bosworth: Scholarly Paradigms of Divine Healing

In tracing the history and theology of modern divine healing, scholars have suggested a number of interpretive categories. These categories have varying merit for helping interpret Bosworth's thought and his role in the divine healing story.

Faithfulness and Freedom

In an essay that marked an important step in the serious theological study of the topic, Henry Knight situates charismatic healing theologies on a spectrum between the “two poles of God's faithfulness and God's freedom.”⁸¹ Not surprisingly, Knight identifies the “faith confession” movement—exemplified by Hagin and implicating Bosworth—as a prime example of “emphasiz[ing] God's faithfulness at the expense of God's freedom.”⁸² Toward the other end are those—like Kathryn Kuhlman—who emphasize God's freedom, while the Catholic Francis MacNutt and the “third wave” charismatic John Wimber occupy the middle ground. Knight's work is mainly descriptive and theologically constructive and betrays little interest in historical origins.⁸³ The usefulness of Knight's paradigm lies in its ability to account for all healing theologies without cumbersome qualifications and its promise for discovering patterns that only become apparent when healing theologies are located on the faithfulness/freedom spectrum.

⁸¹ Henry H. Knight III, “God's Faithfulness and God's Freedom: A Comparison of Contemporary Theologies of Healing,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, no. 2 (1993): 65, 66. Knight also addresses the implications for understanding faith in these two poles: whether faith is necessary, whether faith is in scriptures or in Christ, and whose faith is most important, healer or seeker.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 69. Knight recognizes other styles are also found at this end of the pole. Agnes Sanford is also close to the faithfulness pole, although with marked differences from the word of faith movement. *Ibid.*, 71–72.

⁸³ Knight, “God's Faithfulness and God's Freedom,” 69.

Wesleyan and Finished Work

Kimberly Alexander might be said to be working broadly within the paradigm established by Knight, but with specific attention to early pentecostalism and the soteriological origins of healing theologies. According to Alexander, those pentecostals identified with the “finished work” teaching on sanctification (which presumably includes Bosworth) place themselves in a strand of divine healing thought that differs significantly from advocates in the Wesleyan stream. Wesleyan advocates, working from a broad trinitarian perspective, stressed divine freedom, understood faith as “faithfulness,” and viewed healing as a proleptic sign of future complete restoration. Finished work pentecostals, more narrowly christological, adhered to a “positional” model that put a premium on God’s faithfulness, understood faith as “reckoning,” and insisted that redemption—including healing—was an accomplished fact.⁸⁴ Alexander ably demonstrates that the practice and theology of early pentecostal healing was far from monolithic.⁸⁵ In descriptive terms, Alexander’s finished work school seems to fit Bosworth. But as a historical-theological explanation of the “positional” model of divine

⁸⁴ Kimberly Ervin Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice* (Blandford Forum: Deo, 2006), 230–242. Although in general Alexander handles her sources fairly and presents a balanced account of the two streams, Miskov rightly argues that Alexander’s own Wesleyan pentecostal background led her to present the Wesleyan stream more favorably and in some ways misconstrue the finished work stream. See Jennifer A. Miskov, *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery, 1858-1946* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2012), Kindle location 14083.

⁸⁵ For instance, in Grant Wacker’s otherwise excellent summary and analysis of pentecostal healing, he intimates that pentecostalism’s distinctiveness in its approach to healing was that it “transformed the healing covenant into a healing contract,” à la Bosworth. But as Alexander shows, this reflects only the positional model. Grant Wacker, “The Pentecostal Tradition,” in *Caring and Curing: Health and Medicine in the Western Religious Traditions*, ed. Ronald L. Numbers and Darrel W. Amundsen (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 522.

healing that stresses Durham's soteriological "paradigm shift" in 1910, Alexander's categories are less helpful.⁸⁶

For a number of reasons, the theological connections between Durham's "finished work" theology and the "positional" approach to healing are not as simple as they might appear. First, as Alexander admits, William Durham never applied the principles of his theology of sanctification to divine healing—an omission that requires explanation if one wishes to contend that Durham "chang[ed] the face of pentecostalism," including its healing theology.⁸⁷ Second, not all who fit Alexander's description of the finished work healing model showed concern—or even awareness—of the finished work theology of sanctification. Therefore, putting such thinkers in the "finished work" camp can be misleading. As a case in point, for Bosworth the issue of sanctification was peripheral, and when he did discuss it, he preferred the non-Durhamite terminology of "consecration."⁸⁸ In other words, Bosworth was not in any significant theological sense a follower of Durham. Finally (and related to the previous point), the concept of "finished work" in radical evangelical rhetoric was highly idiosyncratic, and scholarly discussions

⁸⁶ Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing*, 196. I find Alexander's argument concerning Durham's role hard to pinpoint. At times she implies that Durham's theology was crucial to the split in divine healing models. As she writes, "the 1910 division over sanctification as a second definite work and the introduction of Finished Work soteriology into Pentecostalism produced an understanding of the provision of healing quite different from the way healing had been and continued to be perceived in the Wesleyan-Pentecostal soteriology." *Ibid.*, 230, see also 6, 150. However, she is also clear that Durham neither invented the teaching nor was the first pentecostal to adhere to it, an honor she gives to Carrie Judd Montgomery. *Ibid.*, 45-46, 151, 160, 227.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 46, 70, 211. Alexander offers no argument or speculation on this matter.

⁸⁸ For Durham, "consecration" refers to dedication to service rather than sanctification in the soteriological sense. William Durham, "Some Other Phases of Sanctification," *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 2 (May 1912): 7-9. Designating Bosworth as "finished work" may work from an institutional perspective, since he was a founding member of the Assemblies of God. But such affiliations may have had as much to do with personal relationships and geography as theological positions. For Durham's claim that "the second work theory has never been introduced" in Bosworth's work in Texas, see "A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas," *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (1911): 14. Note that this is not the same as saying Bosworth endorsed or promoted Durham's finished work teaching.

have often not been sufficiently nuanced.⁸⁹ By lumping many thinkers together under a slogan-banner of “finished work,” scholars do a disservice to these leaders’ individuality of thought and cloud further investigation into the positional approach to healing. For example, the two chief candidates for a pre-Durham “finished work” theology—E.W. Kenyon and Carrie Judd Montgomery—were also proponents of the positional approach to healing; yet they did not speak of sanctification in precisely the same way as Durham.⁹⁰ This suggests that rather than extrapolating from a theological “finished work” core on sanctification, these leaders arrived at their positions on divine healing in response to other common concerns.

Ironically, Alexander provides the material for the strongest refutation of her argument by arguing that Carrie Judd Montgomery’s theology of “finished work” as

⁸⁹ Perhaps Alexander’s appeal to “models” in her methodological approach absolves her somewhat of this charge. Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing*, 197. But the loss of the individual shades of meaning given to “finished work” are at least equal to the gains achieved through her “integrative approach.”

⁹⁰ For Kenyon’s finished work teaching pre-dating Durham, see Simmons, *E.W. Kenyon*, xi–x, 28–29, 292–296. Kenyon used the concept of “finished work” in a very broad sense, as a foundational proposition for justification, sanctification, and “legal authority” over demonic powers. E. W. Kenyon, *The Father and His Family, the Story of Man’s Redemption* (Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, 1964), 195. Furthermore, Kenyon more specifically expressed his doctrine of sanctification as the “vital part” of “new birth” in which we “receive the nature of God.” Ibid. 159. See also E.W. Kenyon, “Dying to Self,” *Reality* 7, no. 8 (April 1912): 120–22; E.W. Kenyon, “The New Birth,” *Reality* 7, no. 12 (November 1912): 181–83. Kenyon out-finished Durham’s finished work teaching by going so far as to say personal appropriation of death to sin does not need be repeated. “The believer does not live a ‘crucified life,’” said Kenyon, “neither is he continually reckoning himself to be ‘dead unto sin.’ That was done once for all when Christ died.” E.W. Kenyon, “One Secret Victory,” *Reality* 7, no. 5 (January 1912): 71. Compare Durham: “Living faith brings us into Christ, and the same living faith enables us to reckon ourselves to be ‘dead indeed’ and to abide in Christ. It is a sad mistake to believe that any one, or even two experiences, as such, can ever remove the necessity of maintaining a helpless continual dependence on Jesus Christ, and bearing our daily cross, and living the overcoming life.” William Durham, “Sanctification: The Bible Does Not Teach It as a Second Definite Work of Grace,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (July 1911): 2.

For Montgomery’s finished work teaching pre-dating Durham, see Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing*, 45, 151, 160, 227, 230. Yet the similarities here are also superficial, since Montgomery’s teaching generally focused on healing rather than sanctification. And while Durham understood sanctification as qualitatively different from Spirit-baptism, for Montgomery “Spirit baptism [was] a fuller measure of something that has already been given in small portions (sanctification being one of these.)” Miskov, *Life on Wings*, Kindle location 7247.

related to healing was forged under the influence of Phoebe Palmer.⁹¹ This suggests that the pentecostal tradition did not need Durham (or anyone else) to introduce a Reformed “finished work” soteriology in order to give rise to a strong positional theology of healing in the movement.⁹² Rather, the desire to stress the dependability of God’s blessings and grounds for faith led rationally-oriented leaders like Palmer to her “shorter way” for sanctification just as it led Bosworth to the categorical “healing in the atonement” doctrine. Alexander rightly points to a correlation between the positional model and the practice of itinerant healing evangelism, while the Wesleyan model fostered the healing ministry within the framework of long-term congregational support.⁹³ But Alexander possibly inverts the cause and effect; ministers like Bosworth may have been led to embrace the positional model as a result of their style of ministry. Unable to spend long hours with those seeking healing and less confronted on a personal pastoral level with the many cases of long-term failures of healing due to the itinerant nature of his ministry, Bosworth stressed the immediate availability and certainty of healing and sought theological and scriptural support for this view. In connection to this, it is probably significant that Bosworth came to his “revelation” about the universality of healing in the

⁹¹ Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing*, 12.

⁹² One could, of course, consider Palmer a sort of proto-finished work adherent, which Alexander seems almost to suggest. *Ibid.*, 213. But to do so undercuts the broader argument that the finished work theology was born of Reformed/Baptist thought. *Ibid.*, 196. Without accepting Alexander’s theological judgment that Palmer’s influence has had “a tremendously negative effect on pentecostal theology,” I agree with her argument that Palmer’s emphasis on the “faith claim” influenced the Health and Wealth Gospel. *Ibid.*, 238.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 207, 213–214. Alexander also misunderstands the relationship Bosworth and others in his school saw between faith and sacramental acts. According to Alexander, an inconsistency existed between these adherents’ belief that healing was through faith alone and their frequent recourse to laying on of hands, anointing with oil, and other “sacramental acts.” As Bosworth’s theology of the Lord’s Supper demonstrates, however, sacramental acts work in tandem with the argument that healing is by faith, since such “points of contact” (to borrow Oral Roberts’s phrase) remind one of God’s promises and thereby increase faith.

atonement when he was on the cusp of a career-altering success in traveling revivalism in 1920. Although Bosworth had always argued for universal healing, he chose to emphasize this in conjunction with his new identity as a successful itinerant evangelist. This also would explain why an evangelist like Oral Roberts, although reared in the Wesleyan pentecostal tradition, increasingly embraced a positional model as his traveling ministry expanded. The soteriological consequences of this approach clearly diverge from Wesleyan “crisis-process,” but this need not implicate Durham’s finished work theology.⁹⁴

Healing Evangelists and Pastoral Healing Ministers

Pavel Hejzlar offers a categorization that takes into account pentecostal and charismatic approaches to divine healing. Hejzlar identifies two broad “paradigms” for the healing ministry: “healing evangelism,” exemplified by Bosworth and Kenneth Hagin; and “pastorally oriented healing ministry,” exemplified by Episcopalian Agnes Sandford and Francis MacNutt. According to Hejzlar, the healing evangelists are characterized by the doctrine of healing in the atonement, the sufficiency of individual faith, the immediacy of healing, and a demeaning of medical science (if only implicitly). In reaction to this approach, the pastoral healing ministers emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit (rather than the cross) in healing, laid less stress on individual faith, allowed

⁹⁴ For “crisis-process,” see *Ibid.*, 205. One should also note that an absolute distinction cannot be maintained between Wesleyan and finished work approaches. Helpful nuance to Alexander’s categories are provided by Miskov, *Life on Wings*, Kindle location 6201, 14084. Neither does the dichotomy of Wesleyan/Finished Work seem to account for all pentecostal approaches to healing. Maria Woodworth-Etter’s emphasis on “power” is a good example. Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing*, 214.

for more complexity with regard to the cause and cure of sickness, and viewed medical science more positively.⁹⁵

As a basic schema of generalization, Hejzlar's categories are useful. Although, as he admits, on some issues, such as the necessity of faith, a neat line cannot be drawn between representatives of the two paradigms. Hejzlar recognizes that representatives in both camps have affinity with the word of faith movement and direct links to its New Thought origins. Yet Hejzlar also tries to distance Bosworth from the word of faith movement, arguing that Bosworth "processed what he read [in Kenyon] and chose not to follow Kenyon's distinctives that have become part of the unique genetic make-up of the Word of Faith Movement."⁹⁶ For example, Hejzlar claims that Bosworth did not copy Kenyon's terms of "sense knowledge" and "revelation knowledge." While Hejzlar rightly acknowledges that Bosworth read Kenyon with discernment and that Bosworth did not take over these terms literally, the same dichotomy of "sense" and "revelation" is implied in Bosworth's argument that faith is a "sixth sense" by which only can believers "see, take, and hold on to the blessings God offers to us until they are fully manifested."⁹⁷ Furthermore, Kenyon's theology of "confession"—which Bosworth endorsed— should

⁹⁵ Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing*, 11.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 109.

⁹⁷ Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 143. Similar dichotomies are present in Bosworth's language of "world of spirit," and "world of sense," "seen/temporal" and "unseen/eternal." Furthermore, Bosworth even seems to echo Kenyon when he says, "The thing which is eternal is Revelation (the contact of the Divine mind with the human mind), the impartation of heaven's high purposes; the revelation and the impartation of the nature of God." F.F. Bosworth, *Looking at the Unseen: Or, The Mental Habit of Faith* (Miami Beach, FL: F.F. Bosworth, n.d.), 38, et passim. Hejzlar is correct, however, in noting that Bosworth did not adopt Kenyon's more speculative "spiritual death of Jesus" teaching or his disparagement of mind or soul. Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing*, 189.

certainly be considered a conspicuous (if not “unique”) part of the genetic make-up of the word of faith movement.

Although recognizing Alexander’s categories, Hejzlar prefers to treat Bosworth and Hagin more basically as “Wesleyan” because “their doctrine of healing is characterized by perfectionism.”⁹⁸ By this Hejzlar means that their doctrine of healing in the atonement was the result of late nineteenth-century Wesleyan “perfectionism, applied to deliverance from sickness.”⁹⁹ The fact that Bosworth was not a proponent of Wesleyan sanctification therefore forces Hejzlar to conclude that Bosworth was “inconsistent” since he “drop[ped] the Wesleyan perfectionism that gave birth to the healing in the atonement doctrine.”¹⁰⁰ But Hejzlar has confused historical dependence with theological consistency. One can reach a theological commitment without necessarily endorsing all the propositions that historically led to it. Early Christian orthodoxy, for example, owed a great debt to Origen’s theology of the trinity but also repudiated the subordinationism implied in his thought. If one considers the pursuit of the supernatural the more fundamental motive for theologies of sanctification, spirit-baptism, healing, and the like, full gospel thinkers are allowed the peculiar emphases that arise from their own personal story, historical context, and theological leanings without being charged with inconsistency.

⁹⁸ Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing*, 62. Hejzlar deals with this issue in pp. 110-113.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 81, see also 110, 256–257. Bosworth still saw a connection between salvation from sin and salvation from disease, but rather than drawing the parallel between sanctification and healing, Bosworth likened forgiveness and healing. Bosworth, *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*, 28, 29.

Gifted Healers, Facilitators, Heroes, and Victors

In a socio-historical rather than theological approach, Jonathan Baer identifies four categories of divine healing leaders.¹⁰¹ “Gifted” healers, who flourished in the first burst of divine healing just before and after the Civil War, stressed the importance of their own spiritual endowment and faith in effecting healing for their patients.¹⁰² Although dramatic, this style of healing left many seekers unsettled, since they had to rely on the healer and “impressions, leadings, and personal promises.”¹⁰³ In the 1870s, the “facilitating” healing style arose to meet these uncertainties and corresponded to an increase in the popularity of divine healing and its transfer into middle class Protestantism. Facilitating healers like Charles Cullis and most of the Higher Life proponents of the 1870s and 1880s attempted to nourish healing faith in the patient “through teaching, encouragement, and prayer.” According to Baer, for the facilitating healers, “individual faith, not any gift or degree of assurance within the healer, elicited the power of God for healing.”¹⁰⁴

The growing visibility and confidence of divine healing in the 1880s made it a target of criticism, which led some to soften their stance and others to become more radical. One radical approach Baer labels “heroic,” which combined elements of the

¹⁰¹ According to Baer, “the vast majority of healers and patients embraced divine healing not for its theological persuasiveness, but because it promised a transformative personal experience.” Jonathan R. Baer, “Perfectly Empowered Bodies Divine Healing in Modernizing America” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2002), 2.

¹⁰² For gifted healers like Ethan O. Allen, “the central transaction occurred between [the healer] and God, who controlled healing power which [he] then appropriated and directed on behalf of the patient.” Ibid., 42.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 50.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 55. During this period, healing ministers came to stress the universal availability of healing through the atonement.

gifted and facilitating styles. Gaining momentum in the late 1890s, the heroic approach represents “incipient pentecostalism” with its notorious practitioners Charles Parham, John Alexander Dowie, Frank Sandford, and Maria Woodworth-Etter.¹⁰⁵ While the personality cults of the heroic healers could not be sustained, much of their methods lived on in the “victorious” healing of early pentecostalism. According to Baer, victorious healers like John G. Lake and Smith Wigglesworth differed only in that they traded the eschatological focus on divinely-appointed messengers for the end-times imperative to spread the pentecostal experience.¹⁰⁶ But by the 1920s the facilitating approach again ascended, reflecting American affluence and a reaction to the “confrontational tone of victorious healing.”¹⁰⁷ Baer locates Bosworth’s ministry in this renewed facilitating approach, which saw its role mainly as helping seekers understand God’s will to heal so that they could appropriate healing through their own faith.

Helpfully emphasizing the importance of cultural factors for the development of divine healing, Baer’s analysis has great explanatory power. Healing, while a substantive phenomenon in itself, can be seen as something of a metaphor for believers’ relation to their surrounding culture. The facilitating approach with broader cultural appeal ruled during periods of abundance like the 1880s and 1920s, while a more confrontational and isolated approach dominated during less affluent times. Simply put, where healing advocates felt embattled by the world around them, healing took on a tone of triumph, but

¹⁰⁵ These healers “required faithful consent from the ill, but their special appeal lay in their divine gifts.” Responding to the growing threats to traditional evangelicalism, these healers offered an aggressive and “manly” approach to healing that invited followers to share vicariously in their triumph over hostile powers. *Ibid.*, 202, 203. Among Wesleyan groups of this time, the gifted healing ministry resurged in the work of leaders like Daniel S. Warner and Martin Wells Knapp.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 263.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 289–290.

where they saw themselves in greater harmony with their culture, they stressed the theme of abundance.¹⁰⁸ This helps explain Bosworth's emphases and the context of his success in the 1920s. But Bosworth's career also seems to blur Baer's categories. In particular, Bosworth's enthusiastic embrace of "heroic" healers like Maria Woodworth-Etter and William Branham shows the compatibility of different approaches and suggests that personality may have played just as large a role in a minister's approach.¹⁰⁹ Neither does Baer's analysis explain the significant differences between the facilitating approach of 1870s, with its Victorian domesticity and patient counseling, and that of Bosworth and McPherson in the 1920s, with its mass meetings and fast-moving prayer lines.

Summary

Each of these scholarly paradigms sheds light on Bosworth's thought, but none fully accounts for the complexities of his theology and career. Not feeling himself to have the certainty afforded by a healing gift and operating within the fast-paced and impersonal framework of itinerant evangelism, Bosworth sought to guarantee, experience, and share the supernatural work of God through a positional theological

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 327–330.

¹⁰⁹ In part, Baer may not recognize this because he claims that divine healing was not prominent in Bosworth's ministry in the 1910s. *Ibid.*, 291. Baer, like most scholars, takes Bosworth at his word that the 1920 Lima, Ohio, meeting marked a drastic change in his approach to divine healing. To support this, Baer refers to Bosworth's early statement that "healing was worth a penny next to the million-dollar value of a saved soul." But Bosworth maintained this position throughout his career. Bosworth's work with Woodworth-Etter and Branham also challenges Ronald Kydd's categories. Kydd does not directly address Bosworth, but Bosworth would seem to fit best in Kydd's "soteriological," or atonement-based approach. Yet, again, Branham occupies a different category, the "revelational"—that is, healing ministry centered on prophetic identity. Kydd's essentialist understanding of divine healing models brings out interesting points of comparison but is of limited use to those looking for patterns of historical causation. R.A.N. Kydd, "Healing in the Christian Church," in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley M. Burgess and Ed M. Van der Maas (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 699. This article is a condensation of Ronald A. N. Kydd, *Healing through the Centuries: Models for Understanding* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1995).

model that emphasized God's faithfulness over God's freedom. But because the pursuit of the supernatural was the center of Bosworth's thought, he also could easily work alongside and heartily endorse those whose practice and theological foundation for divine healing were remarkably different than his.

British-Israelism: Reflections on Historicism and the Supernatural

As demonstrated in chapter one, the gospel of the supernatural often expressed itself in particular eschatological systems. These eschatologies could vary widely, as suggested by the transition from postmillennialism to premillennialism within the nineteenth century holiness movement. But this is not to say that the supernaturalist impulse is equally comfortable in all eschatological systems. In fact, historically, a correlation exists between a historicist approach (or at least a rejection of a strict futurist approach) and an expectant supernaturalist faith. As a British-Israelist, Bosworth championed a historicist view of biblical prophecy that complemented his foundational pursuit of the supernatural.¹¹⁰

The classic example of the eschatological-supernaturalist correlation in the modern church comes from England in the 1830s. The well-known eschatological futurist John N. Darby was vociferously opposed to the idea of the continuance of the spiritual gifts and other miracles. Darby in many ways wanted God out of history, so much so that he viewed the entire Christian era as a parenthesis. In the twentieth century, Darby's heirs, known as fundamentalists, continued the attack on the supernatural gospel, as seen in the exchanges between Bosworth and his opponents in the 1920s. On the other hand,

¹¹⁰ The details of Bosworth's British-Israelism are explored in chapter six.

Darby's British rival, Edward Irving, argued for a historicist approach to prophecy and embraced a supernatural gospel replete with spiritual gifts such as healing and tongues.¹¹¹

British-Israelists like Bosworth, although promulgating a very different kind of historicism than Irving, have always placed the supernatural at the center of their message. As George Southwick, a pentecostal British-Israelist who revered Bosworth greatly, told one researcher, "I am talking about a supernatural God; a supernatural Book; a supernatural Creator; redemption, providence."¹¹² Gordon Lindsay, who worked closely with Bosworth during the *Voice of Healing* years, advocated his peculiar form of British-Israelism—which he called "Bible Chronology"—as a "link which bridges the gap between the Bible and modern times":

We are given a vision of the scope, uniformity, and progressive manifestation of Divine Providence in the affairs of man. History becomes but a continuation of the Bible narrative; ever, there is divine continuity.¹¹³

Lindsay considered his "Bible Chronology" a way to harmonize the futurist and historicist schools of interpretation. If he continued to hold these views during the time he worked with Bosworth, this may explain why Bosworth and Lindsay did not make an

¹¹¹ Columba Graham Flegg, *"Gathered under Apostles": A Study of the Catholic Apostolic Church* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 423–436; Tim Grass, *Lord's Watchman: A Life of Edward Irving (1792-1834)* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012), 149–173, 302. Irving's supernaturalism was motivated by his eschatology and ecclesiology, as well as his christology, which held Christ to partake of sinful flesh, with the implication that Christ's miracles are achievable by the rest of sinful humanity as well through the power of the Spirit. See James Robinson, *Divine Healing: The Formative Years, 1830-1890: Theological Roots in the Transatlantic World* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011), 15–16. See also Larry E. Dixon, "Have the 'Jewels of the Church' Been Found Again: The Irving-Darby Debate on Miraculous Gifts," *Evangelical Journal* 5, no. 2 (Fall 1987): 78–92.

¹¹² "George W. Southwick to Michael Barkun," September 5, 1991, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

¹¹³ Gordon Lindsay, *Wonders of Bible Chronology*, Blueprints of God, Volume I, Abridged (Portland, OR: Cosbys Printers, 1940), 35.

issue of British-Israelism when they began working with others—like Branham—who did not hold to the teaching.¹¹⁴

While most pentecostals adopted a modified futurist dispensational eschatology, a number of the most intensely supernatural groups rejected the majority position. For example, the British pentecostal William Hutchinson and his Apostolic Faith Church, the Latter Rain movement in North America in the late 1940s, and the later charismatic Kingdom Now theology all combined a refutation of futurism with an uncompromising expectation of supernatural experience.¹¹⁵ Like Bosworth, these movements recognized (sometimes more intuitively than critically) that futurism contradicts the full gospel. In response, they offered a more integrated eschatological view that celebrated God's supernatural activity throughout human history, refusing to cordon God and the important

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 2–4, 33.

¹¹⁵ William Hutchinson adopted British-Israelism around 1919, and his eschatology steadily progressed from premillennialism to post-millennialism to a fully realized eschatology. Hutchinson's Apostolic Faith Church also held an extreme view on the supernatural elements of pentecostal practice, particularly spoken prophecies. Malcolm R. Hathaway, "The Role of William Oliver Hutchinson and the Apostolic Faith Church in the Formation of British Pentecostal Churches," *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 16 (January 1, 1996): 40–57. For Hutchinson's British-Israelism and eschatology, see pp. 46–49. The Latter Rain movement, which broke from the mainstream of pentecostalism in the early 1950s, also rejected some of the tenets of Darbyism, such as the notion that Christians would escape the Great Tribulation. Latter Rain adherents also blurred the prophetic lines demarcating the eschaton from the victorious Christian life. Their doctrine of the "manifested sons of God" is a clear example of another pentecostal realized eschatology. For them, God was "ushering out the Dispensation of Grace" through the emergence of a new kind of believer—one who had overcome mortality in this life. In other words, the great drama of prophetic history was not a future occurrence, but a present reality made personal in a perfected body not bound by natural law. D. William Faupel, "The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought" (Ph.D. diss., Department of Theology, University of Birmingham, 1989), 450–454. The Latter Rain movement helped birth Kingdom Now theology, the socially-oriented charismatic ideology that denies the dispensationalists' rapture and "[views] Revelation as a message of Christians' victory—on earth as well as at the end of time—in the cosmic battle of good and evil." Like the Latter Rain movement, Kingdom Now puts a premium on the gift of prophecy and openness to new spiritual truth. Bruce A. Barron, "Rechristianizing America: The Reconstruction and Kingdom Now Movements in American Evangelical Christianity" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1991), 53–79. Quote on p. 53. As Barron puts it, Kingdom Now leaders argue "that the logical development of classical Pentecostal theology, with its emphasis on the gospel's present-day power, would have had socially active implications from the beginning had the theological liberals' monopoly of the social gospel in the early twentieth century not scared the Pentecostals away from that area." Ibid., 67.

end-time events to a time outside of time. Although generally rebuffed by the pentecostal establishment, such ideologies are perhaps more consistently supernaturalist than that of the pentecostal denominations.

Conclusion

In his pursuit of the supernatural, Bosworth taught that Christ's atonement purchased God's blessings while faith appropriated them on a personal level. He also looked for God's ongoing activity in human history, corroborated by biblical prophecies. According to Bosworth, believers had no excuse not to be living in full victory over sin, disease, and want, since God's love ensured his desire to bestow redemption blessings and God's immutability made his promises more dependable evidence than anything perceived by the five senses. Bosworth's theology would not always align neatly with that of the pentecostal denominations, but the same motivations were at its root. Pentecostals, distinguished in American religion for their pursuit of the supernatural, gravitated to theologies like Bosworth's that provided some type of guarantee that God's direct intervention could be immediately experienced.

CHAPTER NINE

Conclusion

F.F. Bosworth is a provocative lens through which to view the phenomenon of American pentecostalism from its beginnings in the late-nineteenth century holiness movement to its rise as a major cultural force in the decade after World War II. Although his story is unique, the chronological span and rare success of his ministry justifies the claim that he epitomizes and brings to the fore some dominant and often overlooked themes in the pentecostal story.

No significant pentecostal leader other than Bosworth serves as a true living link between the stirring supernatural gospel of the 1890s and the high profile miracle ministries of the 1950s.¹ Healed under the ministry of the holiness evangelist Mattie Perry toward the end of the nineteenth century and occupying a position of leadership in the utopian project of divine healing demagogue John Alexander Dowie, Bosworth has as good a claim as any to have been nourished in the crosscurrents of the full gospel that gave rise to pentecostalism. His spirit-baptism under the ministry of Charles Parham substantively connects him to the “theological founder” of the new pentecostal

¹ Carrie Judd Montgomery has often been identified as a unique connection between the late-nineteenth century holiness movement and the postwar healing revival. Kimberly Ervin Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice* (Blandford Forum: Deo, 2006), 25; Paul Gale Chappell, “The Divine Healing Movement in America” (Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1983), 229; Jennifer A. Miskov, *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery, 1858-1946* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2012), Kindle location 14513. While Montgomery was more thoroughly involved in the leadership of the pre-pentecostal movement, she died in July of 1946, just as William Branham was beginning his epochal itinerant ministry. The significance of Bosworth’s chronological span is suggested, but downplayed by Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis MacNutt in Dialogue*, *Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies*, v. 4 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 8.

movement.² As an early itinerant pentecostal evangelist and later settled pastor in Dallas who helped foster the greatest extended pentecostal revival in the decade after Azusa Street, Bosworth made an important contribution to early pentecostal religious culture, reminding believers that the pursuit of the supernatural, rather than doctrinal exactitude was its *raison d'être*. As a founding delegate of the Assemblies of God, Bosworth represented the work of coalescence and the drive toward organization in the new movement. The fact that Bosworth's development as an influential early pentecostal leader can be told virtually without mention of Azusa Street helps challenge the notion that the famed Los Angeles revival is the central point of origin for worldwide pentecostalism. Bosworth's success in itinerant divine healing ministry in the 1920s attests to his ongoing influence and pentecostalism's broader impact on American culture. His career quieted in the 1930s and 1940s, but he remained an authoritative and inspirational voice for many in the full gospel subculture while also presaging the later pentecostal attraction to broadcast media with his long-running radio program. His reappearance on the national and international scene after World War II provided the emerging healing revivalists with a live connection to the origins of the movement. This continuity could not be better portrayed than in the remarkable photograph of the aging Bosworth, standing next to Branham in his prime, as the two visited Dowie's grave. In content, this continuity consisted of the pursuit of the supernatural, which was articulated and experienced in a variety of ways. Being of a rational bent, not believing himself to be endowed with the gift of healing, having little appreciation for traditional Wesleyan concerns of crisis or the testimony of the Spirit, and pursuing a type of ministry that

² Jonathan R. Baer, "Perfectly Empowered Bodies Divine Healing in Modernizing America" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2002), 232.

necessitated quick results, Bosworth centered his theology on propositions that seemingly guaranteed God's supernatural intervention.

As a product of American revivalism, pentecostalism could not resist the tendency toward organization and forming denominations. Yet it also exhibited another characteristic of American revivalism, the independent minister who, although embodying the ethos of the organized movement, is not beholden to it. Perhaps more than most forms of American revivalism, pentecostalism—due to its focus on supernatural guidance—embraces independence of thought and leadership. Pentecostalism was born in an expectation of the restoration of forgotten teachings and practices and the unfolding of new revelation. Such pursuits by definition required thinking outside of the inherited theological box. Only pentecostalism could have produced a well-regarded denominational leader who argued that, “We need the extremist to start things moving, but we need the balanced teacher to keep them moving in the right direction.”³ Bosworth embodies this independence, finding only transitory affinity with pentecostal and full gospel denominations. Yet his success on the national and later global stage suggests that leaving the denominations does not signal a falling out with the main impulses of popular pentecostalism. Like Maria Woodworth-Etter, Raymond Richey, Aimee Semple McPherson, and Oral Roberts, Bosworth operated outside of the pentecostal establishment while sitting squarely in its popular stream.

In two main areas, Bosworth demonstrated the pentecostal penchant for independence of thought—his rejection of the majority tongues evidence doctrine and his

³ Donald Gee, “Extremes Are Sometimes Necessary,” *Voice of Healing* 6, no. 1 (April 1953): 9. Cited in David Edwin Harrell, *All Things Are Possible: The Healing & Charismatic Revivals in Modern America* (Indiana University Press, 1975), 109.

adoption of British-Israelism. Although these were minority positions for pentecostalism, both positions testify to the underlying pursuit of the supernatural that was at the heart the pentecostal movement as a whole. According to Bosworth, the tongues evidence doctrine detracts from the centrality of faith as the efficient cause and validation of supernatural activity. Bosworth observed that waiting on tongues to verify the experience of spirit-baptism had the effect of delaying or in some cases arresting altogether the supernatural experience. In the same way, Bosworth could not square the dominant dispensational eschatology with his desire to discern God's activity throughout history. British-Israelism provided an eschatological alternative that preserved the "any moment" expectation of premillennialism without sacrificing the church age as a supernaturally-devoid "parenthesis."

Bosworth is rightly well-known for his ministry of divine healing. Although healing was not the center of his thought, it was the spotlight for his public profile. In this respect, Bosworth embodies a distinctive that rivals tongues in its centrality to pentecostal practice and identity.⁴ That Bosworth did not endorse the tongues evidence doctrine hardly mattered to opponents and supporters alike, for whom his ministry of healing was the preeminent claim for the supernatural gospel. The key role of divine healing in the postwar pentecostal revival demonstrates that throughout his career, Bosworth was championing that which was the crucial element to pentecostalism's broad cultural impact and appeal. Seekers did not fill auditoriums and arenas holding ten, twenty, or fifty thousand to receive tongues, but to receive healing. Filling these

⁴ Grant Wacker, "The Pentecostal Tradition," in *Caring and Curing: Health and Medicine in the Western Religious Traditions*, ed. Ronald L. Numbers and Darrel W. Amundsen (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 515.

auditoriums were those harboring the radical evangelical desire for supernatural experiences that would “prove” their faith against encroaching scientific materialism sitting alongside those desperate for supernatural intervention for their broken bodies who might otherwise look askance at the pentecostals. The story of twentieth-century pentecostalism is the story of how this supernatural gospel was nurtured in local assemblies and broadcast for the masses alike.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

William H. Durham and Early Pentecostalism: A Multifaceted Reassessment

For one who was involved in the pentecostal movement for only five years, William H. Durham casts an exceedingly long theological shadow. Commentators unanimously identify Durham as the first thinker within pentecostalism to promote a non-Wesleyan theology of sanctification that rent the early pentecostal movement, played a major role in bringing like-minded independent pentecostals into organization in 1914, and set the theological trajectory that developed into Oneness pentecostalism. Because of these grand claims, his work and thought deserve careful analysis, which they have occasionally received.¹ Yet the shape of his thought and his historical significance remain

¹ The original scholarly interpretation of Durham was that he articulated the concerns of an increasing number of Reformed pentecostals. William W. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God* (Gospel Publishing House, 1971), 75–77; Edith Lydia Waldvogel, “The ‘Overcoming Life’: A Study in the Reformed Evangelical Origins of Pentecostalism” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1977), 183–189; Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1992), 166–175. Allen Clayton critiqued this interpretation, arguing that Durham’s importance lay in his recovery of christocentrism within the pneumatocentric pentecostal context. Allen L. Clayton, “The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography,” *Pneuma* 1, no. 2 (September 1, 1979): 27–42. Further detailed studies include David W. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 10 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 229–270, which analyzes Durham’s theological breakthrough in terms of a theological crisis connected with his spirit-baptism; David A. Reed, “*In Jesus’ Name*”: *The History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 31 (Dorset, UK: Deo, 2008), 77–107, which highlights Durham’s thought as setting the course for the development of Oneness pentecostalism; Thomas George Farkas, “William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy in Early American Pentecostalism, 1906-1916” (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993), which compares Durham’s theology of sanctification to other major theological streams, labeling Durham’s position “radicalized Wesleyanism,”; Edith L. Blumhofer, “William H. Durham: Years of Creativity, Years of Dissent,” in *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders*, ed. James R. Goff and Grant Wacker (University of Arkansas Press, 2002), 123–30, which contributed to our knowledge of Durham’s pre-pentecostal years, and the possibility that at least the slogan “finished work” could be traced to his involvement with the World’s Faith Missionary Association; Douglas G. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 136–164, which offers a broader and more contextualized reading of Durham’s theology beyond the narrow focus of sanctification; and Bruce E. Rosdahl, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Assemblies of God” (Ph.D.

largely clouded in misunderstanding and unsubstantiated assertions. Durham scholars have made misjudgments in three main areas of investigation. First, a number of unwarranted assumptions have led to a faulty timeline that gives Durham an unjustified pride of place in introducing an anti-Wesleyan theology of sanctification into the pentecostal movement. Second, because of the errors in chronology, scholars have overlooked the work of A.S. Copley, who constructed a similar but distinct theology of sanctification that attacked Wesleyan assumptions. Third, a Durham-centered interpretation of the origins of Oneness pentecostalism has led to an overestimation of the christological theme in his thought.

Chronological Issues

The notion that Durham unveiled his attack on Wesleyan sanctification in a famous sermon entitled “The Finished Work of Calvary” at the Stone Church convention in May of 1910 seems to be an aggregate of unverified information. The earliest source, which is neither a firsthand account nor based on historical research, gives us the germ of these claims, saying that “three or four years” after the initial outpouring at Azusa Street,

There was a certain pastor who had done some splendid work. He was revered and honored by all who heard him. He was invited to address an important gathering of Pentecostal people in the Middle West. At this meeting, where all was unity and blessing and all were melted together in love—this beloved pastor made an address that has been mightily important to the Pentecostal Movement. In fact, it caused the first great schism in the hitherto unified ranks of the Pentecostal Movement. He PREACHED A SERMON TO NULLIFY THE BLESSING OF SANCTIFICATION AS A SECOND DEFINITE WORK OF GRACE.”²

diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2008), which argues that the Assemblies of God theology of sanctification should also be classified as Wesleyan rather than Keswick-Reformed.

² “History of Pentecost,” *Faithful Standard*, November 1922, 8.

This account is vague and hardly objective, coming as it does from a publication of the Wesleyan pentecostal organization the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee). Wanting to seem above the fray, the writer (probably editor A.J. Tomlinson) does not name the person referred to, but William Durham is undoubtedly intended. Tomlinson had a vested interest in portraying Durham as a firebrand who single-handedly, unexpectedly, and uncaringly disrupted the unity of the early pentecostal movement. Although Durham was not the only—and probably not the first, as this essay argues—to preach against the Wesleyan sanctification scheme from within pentecostalism, he was the most well-known and actively cultivated an image of being the pioneer of this theory. For Durham and his disciples, this image marked the man as a courageous prophet; for his opponents, this image marked him as a theological innovator hungry for notoriety. Both sides of the controversy had reasons for establishing a “lone gunman” theory of the origin of the finished work teaching.

Upon Tomlinson’s sparse account (which gave no year, date, location, or specific occasion), historians have added one unverified detail upon another. The dating of Durham’s sermon to 1910 was likely introduced in Carl Brumback’s 1961 history of the Assemblies of God and seems to have begun without proper historical accountability.³ William Menzies’s denominational history a decade later gave the same year while also adding that the convention was in Chicago.⁴ In his 1979 article, Allen Clayton repeated this year, adding that the title of Durham’s sermon was “The Finished Work of Calvary.”⁵

³ Carl Brumback, *Suddenly ... from Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), 98.

⁴ Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 75.

⁵ Clayton, “The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography,” 1–2.

David W. Faupel's 1989 dissertation accepted these details and further claimed that the sermon had been preached in May at the Stone Church Convention—a conglomerate of details that has been followed by a handful of influential scholars.⁶ One scholar claims that Durham preached this sermon on May 10 and even quotes from the supposed sermon as if it were extant.⁷ These unverified details have reinforced the notion that the finished-work dispute “can be traced to one person: William H. Durham.”⁸

Setting aside the issue of inadequate citation, a number of facts seem to contradict the narrative that has developed. First, the July 1, 1910, edition of Durham's *Pentecostal Testimony* makes no mention of the finished work teaching or even addresses sanctification in a substantial way. If Durham really preached what historians—misquoting A.J. Tomlinson—call “a shot heard round the world” in May, that Durham unthinkingly omitted reference to it weeks later seems unlikely.⁹ Second, none of the

⁶ David W. Faupel, “The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought” (Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham [United Kingdom], 1989), 280. The claim is repeated without primary source citation in Farkas, “William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy,” 135; Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 237; Robin Johnston, *Howard A. Goss: A Pentecostal Life* (Word Aflame Press, 2010), 83; Rosdahl, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Assemblies of God,” 29.

⁷ Reed, *In Jesus' Name*, 87, 101. That the sermon was preached on May 10 seems quite unlikely, since the convention began on May 15. See W.H. Cossum, “A Glorious Convention,” *Latter Rain Evangel* 2, no. 9 (June 1910): 2–5.

⁸ Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 136.

⁹ Tomlinson called it a “shout heard round the world.” Emphasis added. “History of Pentecost,” 8. Cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 237; Reed, *In Jesus' Name*, 87; Farkas, “William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy,” 135. Douglas Jacobsen claims that the article “The Great Crisis” from a collection of undated pieces by Durham is the same as that mentioned in the July 1910 issue of *Pentecostal Testimony*, putting its date sometime between December of 1909 and July of 1910. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 144, 379, n.16; William H. Durham, *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham Taken from Pentecostal Testimony*, n.d., 29–35; William H. Durham, “The Great Crisis Number Two,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 5 (July 1910): 2. In this article, Durham criticizes the “error that sanctification was a definite, second work of grace, thus divorcing it from the Cross of Jesus Christ.” Durham, *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham*, 30. If this is the same article that is referred to in the July 1910 issue, then Durham was clearly taking his stand against holiness sanctification earlier than July. Yet the question remains why Durham was silent on the issue of sanctification in the July issue if he had already begun his

reports of the convention in the Stone Church's *Latter Rain Evangel* mention Durham's participation. Third, Durham himself never mentions this supposed address. Fourth, the synopsis of Durham's career in *Pentecostal Testimony* immediately following his death (July 1912) stated that "eighteen months ago God led him to fearlessly proclaim the great truth, the finished work of Calvary." This would put Durham's public stand for the teaching in early 1911.¹⁰ This corresponds to Durham's own account, which notes the article "Identification with Christ" from issue number six (which was published sometime between August 1910 and February 1911, since the July issue is number five) as the first of his publications that "had stirred up considerable opposition."¹¹

The claim that Durham took his public stand for the finished work teaching at the May convention needlessly posits a dramatic "gauntlet" scenario that may not have happened and has led scholars to misconstrue subsequent events in Durham's ministry. Specifically, numerous writers have claimed that Howard Goss invited Durham to "defend his views" at a camp meeting in Malvern, Arkansas, in September of 1910.¹² Bruce Rosdahl claims that Durham was a "keynote speaker" at the Malvern convention.¹³

attack months earlier. William H. Durham, "Editorial," *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 5 (July 1910): 1. Not only did he *not* attack holiness theology in the July issue, but he even commended Methodists for "thundering forth the truth concerning sanctification." Durham, "The Great Crisis Number Two," 2. Also, Durham published at least three articles carrying the title "The Great Crisis," and the version in the undated collection lacks the subtitle ("What is the Plan of God?") that is attributed to the article in the July 1910 reference. The article in question was more likely that which was republished in in *Word and Work* in March, for this article carried the subtitle as Durham referenced it. This article makes no particular argument about sanctification, holiness theology, or the finished work of Calvary. See William H. Durham, "The Great Crisis: What Is the Plan of God?," *Word and Work* 32, no. 3 (March 1910): 80–82.

¹⁰ "In Memoriam," *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 3 (July 1912): 2.

¹¹ William H. Durham, "The Gospel of Christ," *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 1 (January 1912): 9.

¹² Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 166; Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 240, 242.

¹³ Rosdahl, "The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Assemblies of God," 30.

This is possible, but the sources only indicate that he was one of a number of preachers.¹⁴

The main source for Durham's participation in the Malvern meeting is Howard Goss's memoir, which also does not ascribe to Durham a central role:

Many leaders came for this Camp. There were Brothers Canada and Jackson who at that time worked together as an evangelistic team; S.D. Kinne of St. Louis, who did a large part of the day teaching; D.C.O. Opperman, and Brother Durham from Chicago also helped with the preaching.¹⁵

Even more important is how Goss described the discussion of sanctification that occurred at the camp meeting. Far from giving an impression that Durham came to "defend his views," Goss paints a picture of a robust discussion without identifying any person as a particular lobbyist for one side or another:

As there were so many ministers in attendance, and all [were] interested, the "Finished work of Calvary" vs. "The Second Work of Grace" was officially discussed. In the controversy that ensued, as I watched both sides impartially, I soon saw that the doctrine of the "Finished work of Calvary" was right.¹⁶

While Durham was possibly an advocate for the finished work teaching by this time, nothing in this body of evidence necessitates this claim or the central role scholars give to him at this point.

A.S. Copley: Forgotten Theologian of the Finished Work

These leaps in historical detail would remain matters of bare historical veracity had they not led to a larger historiographical problem: failure to see A.S. Copley as a co-architect of the teaching. Faupel mentions that Copley became an advocate of the

¹⁴ A.J. Benson, "Reports," *Evening Light and Church of God Evangel* 1, no. 17 (November 1, 1910): 6.

¹⁵ Howard Archibald Goss, *The Winds of God: The Story of the Early Pentecostal Days (1901-1914) in the Life of Howard A. Goss* (New York: Cornet Press Books, 1958), 126.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 126–127.

teaching after hearing Durham's sermon at the Stone Church convention, subsequently publishing his own explication of it in June of 1910. Faupel fails to notice, however, that Copley published this article earlier in the May 1 issue of the *Pentecost*.¹⁷ This means that either (1) Durham unveiled his finished work teaching earlier than the May 1910 Stone Church convention, providing a foundation for Copley's exposition, or (2) Copley beat Durham to the punch by at least two weeks. A brief comparison of the theologies of Durham and Copley can establish that Copley's thought should be included in the story of the origins of finished work pentecostalism, even if it cannot entirely solve the chronological problems.¹⁸

William Durham's thought was guided by a rejection of the need for a second definite work of grace—the center of Wesleyan holiness theology.¹⁹ Durham centered his theology of holiness on what he called “identification” with Christ. Through faith, the old sinful creature is crucified and a new righteous creature rises; and all this is dramatically represented in believer's baptism. While the reigning holiness theology separated the negative aspect of salvation (pardon) from its positive aspect (holiness) into two distinct works of grace, Durham saw that scripture incorporated both aspects as the outcomes of dying and rising with Christ. Durham summarized his position in the slogan “finished

¹⁷ Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 268. A.S. Copley, “Pauline Sanctification,” *Pentecost* 2, no. 6 (May 1, 1910): 5–8. Rosdahl places Copley's article in his bibliography (citing the May 1 edition), but does not explore either its theological or historical significance. Rosdahl, “The Doctrine of Sanctification in the Assemblies of God,” 244.

¹⁸ The comparison of Durham and Copley presented here, while hopefully suggestive of further avenues of research, is intended only to establish that Copley had a similar theology of sanctification with distinct emphases.

¹⁹ The basic contours of Durham's theology of sanctification can be found in William H. Durham, “Sanctification: The Bible Does Not Teach It as a Second Definite Work of Grace,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (July 1911): 1–3; William H. Durham, “Second Work of Grace People Answered,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (July 1911): 7–9.

work of Calvary,” emphasizing Christ’s redemptive work as a historical fact appropriated once and for all by faith and thus requiring no post-conversion experience of grace.

Albert Sidney Copley came into contact with pentecostalism in 1906 and experienced spirit-baptism in Warren, Ohio, in early 1907. An experienced minister by the time he joined the pentecostals, Copley had worked with the Evangelical United Brethren and spent over a decade with the Christian and Missionary Alliance. As a pentecostal, he worked briefly alongside J.R. Flower in Indianapolis.²⁰ In late 1908, he began work in Kansas City, Missouri, eventually becoming pastor of the pentecostal Christian Assembly. He took on the role of teacher, printing intricate Bible studies in the *Pentecost*, which he edited with Flower. In the May 1, 1910 issue of the *Pentecost*, Copley took his stand against holiness theology.

In “Pauline Sanctification,” Copley argued that holiness sanctification theology resulted from “a mistaken, or an incomplete view of the work of Calvary.”²¹ Copley said that holiness theology was “Jewish,” meaning that it understood sanctification in Old Testament terms as cleansing. On the other hand, “Christian” sanctification is understood as “crucifixion.” He went on to detail other discrepancies. While the holiness conception hoped for a subsequent blessing, “Christian sanctification believes a fact, viz; our death with Christ.” The holiness method relies, in part, on human works, aiming at imitation of Christ, while Christian sanctification is “wholly by grace” which “is a reproduction of Christ.” The holiness approach seeks to “repair the old creation,” while Christian

²⁰ “On the Home Stretch,” *Christian and Missionary Alliance* 25, no. 23 (June 16, 1906): 11; “Convention in Flushing, Ohio,” *Christian and Missionary Alliance* 25, no. 24 (June 23, 1906): 13–14; A.S. Copley, “Pentecost in Toronto,” *Apostolic Faith*, (Los Angeles), 1, no. 5 (January 1907): 4; A.S. Copley, “In My New Coat,” *Pentecost* 2, no. 4 (March 1, 1910): 5–6.

²¹ Copley, “Pauline Sanctification,” 6.

sanctification reckoned the old man dead. According to Copley, holiness thought limited Christ's death to vicarious atonement, while Christian sanctification rightly understood Christ's death "as a substitute...But much more." The crucifixion means "identification" with Christ: believers have "died to sin in Him and are alive unto God in Him forever." As an antidote to harmful introspection and self-righteousness bred in holiness circles, Copley insisted that "We no longer expect any good from ourselves and are not disappointed, or surprised at our own failures," and likewise, "We do right, but his indwelling causes to do it. God will not leave room for a whit of self glory."²²

Emphasizing the past tense in scripture's references to Christ's work, Copley argued that scripture's grammar "tell[s] us of the finished work of Christ." "So there remains nothing more for us to do but to believe what God says." While essentially forensic, "This reckoning becomes actually real in us by the power of the Holy Spirit as we continue to believe God." Copley faulted holiness people in their attempts to "die" to one sin or another, instead of simply believing "that our death, burial and resurrection with Christ is an accomplished fact."²³

Copley's theology echoed Reformation thought more than the dominant holiness-pentecostal heritage. In an attempt to balance the movement's theological dependence on Luke-Acts, Copley suggested that "we need to study Pentecost in the light of Pauline Christianity."²⁴ Like Luther and Calvin, Copley had a very theocentric understanding of salvation; yet he could not escape the appeal to the agency of human will that even

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., 7.

²⁴ A.S. Copley, "The Pauline Gospel," *Pentecost* 2, no. 6 (May 1910): 4.

Luther's protégé Philip Melancthon stressed. "Certainly, there is a surrender of the will else we could not believe."²⁵ Copley did not deny a progression in the Christian life, but he insisted that such obedience or yielding to God "does not sanctify us," but allows God to "develop the graces of the Sprit in us and use us to his glory."²⁶ Growth in the Christian life, according to Copley, was utilitarian rather than salvific.

Copley's attack on holiness theology was in many ways similar to Durham's teaching. Like Durham, Copley used the phrase "finished work" to emphasize that Christ has accomplished sanctification already for believers and "identification" as shorthand for how believers are made holy. But Copley's work bears the stamp of original thought. While Copley attacked the holiness position, his theology was more exegetically-based than Durham's, which, Durham admitted, was founded on revelation as well as scripture proofs. Copley was more systematic, resisting Durham's digressions into personal attacks and anecdotes.²⁷ Copley was more pointed than Durham in his attack on the Wesleyan doctrine of eradication, deliberately juxtaposing the theory of eradication with crucifixion in the Pauline sense: "the old man, or carnal mind is never eradicated. He is judicially crucified with Christ on Calvary and is held in the death state as we count on this fact."²⁸

²⁵ Copley, "Pauline Sanctification," 8.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Durham, "Sanctification: The Bible Does Not Teach It as a Second Definite Work of Grace," 1.

²⁸ Copley, "Pauline Sanctification," 5. Scholars disagree whether Durham intended a type of eradication. Reed argues that Durham "was not implying a form of eradication" (*In Jesus' Name*, 89, cf. 99), while Farkas argues that Durham's doctrine of crucifixion was "the same as eradication" ("William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy," 238). At least for Copley, a crucial distinction seemed to exist between eradication and crucifixion. As Copley stresses, something that is crucified still exists, though dead and impotent. But that which is eradicated is in a state of non-being. The crucifixion motif helps explain how sin can reemerge after sanctification, while the eradication label left people doubting their sanctification experience. Durham's stress on returning to first grace through repentance suggests that he chose the crucifixion terminology over eradication for just this reason. This is the essential flaw in Farkas's

Whether developed independently or in conversation with Durham and others, the timing of Copley's writing and the level of sophistication and distinctiveness strongly suggest that he was not simply elaborating on Durham's theme.²⁹ This brief exploration into Copley's earliest explication of sanctification should also lay to rest the claim that Durham was the sole "author" of the finished work teaching or that he "was the one original theologian of the American Pentecostal movement" until the 1970s.³⁰

On the weight of all this evidence, I propose a different timeline for the launch of the finished work teaching. By the spring of 1910 (or earlier), some pentecostal circles had begun debating the merits of the Wesleyan second work of grace doctrine.³¹ In May, Copley published his attack on holiness sanctification teaching. The discussion continued through the summer of 1910, as evidenced by reprints of Copley's article in *A Call to Faith* (June) and *Confidence* (July). Based on *Confidence* editor A.A. Boddy's remarks,

designation of Durham's sanctification theology as "radicalized Wesleyanism," for his interpretation rests on identifying eradication and crucifixion in Durham's thought (259).

²⁹ Contra Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 268. While hardly conclusive, it is also worth noting that Copley nowhere admits indebtedness to Durham.

³⁰ Reed, *In Jesus' Name*, 83; Walter J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972), 25.

³¹ Mary Lindley, "The Beginning of Days for Me," *Pentecost* 2, no. 2 (January 1, 1910): 1, 3. This article is not a direct attack on second work of grace theology, but carries the themes of dying with Christ, reckoning one's self as dead and simple faith that would appear more polemically in Copley and Durham. As some scholars argue, E.W. Kenyon's teaching on the "finished work" of Christ may have influenced Durham. Kenyon's teaching is peripheral to the present discussion, though, because (1) Kenyon did not actively propagate his teaching among pentecostals; and (2) Kenyon put the slogan to such different use. Rather than sanctification, Kenyon was concerned with the legal rights to spiritual authority. E. W. Kenyon, *The Father and His Family, the Story of Man's Redemption* (Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1964), 195. Too many scholars assume that Durham and Kenyon meant the same thing when they used phrases like "finished work" and "identification with Christ." For example, Reed, *In Jesus' Name*, 102–103; Dale H. Simmons, *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty*, *Studies in Evangelicalism*, No. 13 (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1997), xi–x, 28–29, 292–296. Kimberly Alexander makes similar claims about Carrie Judd Montgomery's finished work teaching. Yet the similarities here are also superficial, since Montgomery's teaching generally focused on healing rather than sanctification. Kimberly Ervin Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series* v. 29 (Blandford Forum: Deo, 2006), 45–46, 70, 151, 160, 211, 227.

however, some found the designation of holiness theology as “Jewish” too abrasive.³² But Copley’s theology had found a ready audience, as the new teaching became a major topic of discussion at the Malvern, Arkansas, camp meeting in September. Around this time and perhaps as a result of the Malvern debate, Durham began to formulate his own explication of the teaching and sometime toward the end of the year (but perhaps as early as the Malvern meeting), he gave prominence to the slogan “the finished work of Calvary” to summarize the position and rally support.³³ Then, going into print between August 1910 and January 1911 and combining this with his travels to spread his ideas, Durham became the spokesperson for the new theology. Durham quickly outpaced Copley in his outspoken advocacy for the teaching and leadership of the finished work movement, but this should not overshadow Copley’s contribution. While this proposed chronology is circumstantial, its plausibility should cause scholars to rethink the picture they have constructed.

Durham and Oneness Theology

In addition to Durham’s priority in the origins of the finished work teaching, scholars have argued that his thought unintentionally “set the stage” and “forged the internal logic” for the development of Oneness pentecostalism.³⁴ This is not to say that Durham’s thought inevitably led to Oneness pentecostalism or that Durham was its sole

³² A.S. Copley, “Sanctification--’Jewish’ and Christian,” *Confidence* 3, no. 7 (July 1910): 168–69. Boddy’s disclaimer on Copley’s terminology: “The Editor of ‘Confidence’ feels that a better designator might have been found than the word ‘Jewish.’ He would have perhaps used the term ‘mixed’ as contrasted with ‘pure.’” (168).

³³ Goss claimed that the Malvern meeting discussed “the finished work of Calvary,” but this terminology could have been an anachronism. Goss, *The Winds of God*, 126.

³⁴ Reed, *In Jesus’ Name*, 79, 135.

source. As Reed argues well, non-pentecostal evangelical speculation on the harmony of biblical baptismal formulas and the theological import of Jesus' name were crucial to later Oneness doctrine. Rather, Durham's finished work teaching was the "immediate Pentecostal context."³⁵ Nevertheless, the Durham-centered thesis of Oneness origins is potentially problematic in two ways. First, this thesis downplays evidence of embryonic Oneness tendencies developing independently of Durham. Most historical accounts of the origins of Oneness pentecostalism begin with the events of the 1913 Arroyo Secco gathering, with a nod to Charles Parham's earlier teaching about baptism in Jesus' name. According to the standard story, Durham's thought provided the seed that grew into the revelation that occurred in 1913.³⁶ But in 1912, Durham was refuting a number of "false doctrines" that bore remarkable correspondence to later Oneness doctrine. Specifically, Durham denounced the belief that those who receive Christ simultaneously receive the Holy Spirit (spirit-baptism), the concern that those who separate salvation from spirit-baptism are "dividing the Trinity," and the practice of baptizing in Jesus' name only.³⁷ While it is far from certain that such practices would have created a full-fledged Oneness movement on their own, such stirrings should be given more consideration in the movement's origins. Durham's impassioned opposition to these teachings must also be better accounted for if Durham be held as the immediate backdrop of Oneness pentecostalism.

³⁵ Ibid., 3.

³⁶ Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 176–177; Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 281–282; Reed, *In Jesus' Name*, 67, 138.

³⁷ "False Doctrines," *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 2 (May 1912): 6–7.

Durham's Soteriological Center

The second concern deals with the interpretation of Durham's thought. Noting that Durham's theology of sanctification was distorted by early pentecostals, but wanting to maintain his central role, most scholars argue that Durham's chief contribution was not a specific theology of sanctification *per se*, but a christological emphasis that had been lacking in early holiness-pentecostalism.³⁸ This reemphasized christology is said to be the "organic connection" between finished work and Oneness theology.³⁹ But identifying christology as the link between Durham and Oneness thought tends to impose a teleological reading on Durham, distorting the theological core of his writings. A fresh investigation of Durham's theology on its own terms reveals that his central concern was soteriological. While this message had christological implications, such effects should not be allowed to overshadow his soteriological framework.

Durham's theology stemmed from a rejection of the Wesleyan *ordo salutis*, which rested on a peculiar distinction between justification and sanctification.⁴⁰ In what was

³⁸ Stated most forthrightly in Reed, *In Jesus' Name*, 362. Clayton, "The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography," 39; Farkas, "William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy," 186. Farkas notes that "for all practical purposes, the original Finished Work doctrine and its unique trajectory died with Durham," (286) but does not connect this to developments in Oneness pentecostalism. Ewart mistook Durham's theology as a "gradual advancement that one made after having received the baptism of the Holy Ghost." But Durham consistently taught that sin after conversion is dealt with not by seeking a subsequent infusion of grace (whether instantaneous or gradual) but in "return[ing] to their first state of grace." Frank J. Ewart, *The Phenomenon of Pentecost* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975), 100; Durham, "Sanctification: The Bible Does Not Teach It as a Second Definite Work of Grace," 2.

³⁹ However, Aaron Freisen helpfully argues that Durham's greatest contribution is more likely the simplification of complex experience-based theologies. Aaron T. Friesen, *Norming the Abnormal: The Development and Function of the Doctrine of Initial Evidence in Classical Pentecostalism* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 89–94.

⁴⁰ Although Durham was raised a Baptist, he indicated "that from my conversion...I have continually associated with holiness people; and that for years, in my preaching, I referred to sanctification as a second work of grace." Durham, *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham*, 15. Therefore, his theology was more a rejection of Wesleyanism from inside than a refutation of holiness theology from outside.

probably Durham's first unequivocal printed attack on holiness theology, he forthrightly said, "the misunderstanding seems to be as to what justification really is."⁴¹

Soteriology—from a Pauline perspective—was both theologically prior in Durham's theology and chronologically prior in the development of his thought.⁴² For Durham, justification and sanctification were linked—one could not have one without the other. While Wesleyan theology distinguished "outward iniquities" from "inbred sin," saying that conversion dealt with the former and sanctification as a separate experience dealt with the latter, Durham taught that conversion bestows both.⁴³ "God never saves a man from outward sins that He does not save him from inward sin at the same time."⁴⁴ Rather, Christ is "a complete Savior to all that believe, as soon as they believe."⁴⁵ While holiness adherents placed sanctification subsequent to justification, Durham proclaimed that "the only foundation for our justification is that our old man was crucified with Christ." Sin does not remain in those who are in Christ, since "God has put our old man into Christ, and nailed him to the Cross." Durham's term for this was "identification," which is

⁴¹ Ibid., 27. For approximate dating of this article and Durham's admission that it was the first of his writings to stir opposition, see Durham, "The Great Battle of Nineteen Eleven," 6.

⁴² Faupel's interpretation that for Durham "the narrative of Acts provided the key to understanding the whole plan of redemption, while the Epistles elaborated on that plan" is, in part, based on an erroneous attribution to Durham of a July 1910 article in *Word and Work*. Without the confusion created by this misattribution, one can see that Durham's theological center is Pauline soteriology, for which Durham found a helpful shorthand in the book of Acts. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 305, 306.

⁴³ William H. Durham, "The Two Great Experiences or Gifts," *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (1911): 6.

⁴⁴ William H. Durham, "The Finished Work of Calvary: Identification with Jesus Christ Saves and Sanctifies," *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 1 (January 1912): 2.

⁴⁵ Durham, "The Great Battle of Nineteen Eleven," 6.

appropriated to the believer by faith.⁴⁶ Thus, the conversion experience was the only Christian experience that dealt with sin: “When one really comes into Christ [in conversion] he is as much in Christ as he will ever be.”⁴⁷

Durham saw a danger of works-righteousness in Wesleyan anthropocentrism. “It is a sad mistake,” Durham opined, “to believe that any one, or even two experiences, as such, can ever remove the necessity of maintaining a helpless continual dependence on Jesus Christ.”⁴⁸ An experience of sanctification is no escape from one’s daily cross, for “it requires just as much faith to keep right with God as it did to get right in the first place.”⁴⁹ If a believer feels to have strayed, what she needs is not a sanctification experience, but what Durham preferred to call “reclamation”—repentance and return to original grace.⁵⁰ This is remarkably similar to how one scholar describes Luther’s theology of sanctification as “constantly apprehending anew justification.”⁵¹ Durham also urged those who had no immediate need for repentance just as urgently to “abide in [Christ] in living, continual faith.”⁵²

⁴⁶ Durham, “The Finished Work of Calvary: Identification with Jesus Christ Saves and Sanctifies,” 2.

⁴⁷ Durham, “Sanctification: The Bible Does Not Teach It as a Second Definite Work of Grace,” 2.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Charles P. Arand, *That I May Be His Own: An Overview of Luther’s Catechisms* (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Academic Press, 2000), 141. Citing Albrecht Peters, “Die Theologie Der Katechismen Luthers Anhand Der Zuordnung Ihrer Hauptstücke,” *Lutherjahrbuch* 43 (7-35): 25. Scholars have debated whether Durham’s theology is in some way Lutheran. For a review of arguments, see Farkas, “William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy,” 199–207.

⁵² Durham, “The Great Battle of Nineteen Eleven,” 2.

Durham anticipated that many would think his soteriology was merely “judicial.” He said these critics did not understand the power of faith, for such salvation is “an actual experience to all who have exercised living faith in Christ.”⁵³ In this sense, Durham’s soteriology relies on an eschatological distinction— “eschatological” meaning the “end” of the sinner and the birth of a new righteous creature. “A converted person is to reckon himself dead,” said Durham, “Such a one is exhorted to present himself to God as alive from the dead.”⁵⁴ Anything less “lowers the standard of justification.”⁵⁵

Although constant “reckoning” of one’s self as dead to sin and alive in Christ through faith was all that was necessary for salvation (both justification and sanctification), Durham taught that Spirit-baptism enables the holy life separated unto God. Here Durham borders on contradicting himself with regard to the soteriological import of spirit-baptism as an experience distinct from conversion. “A sinner is in the flesh,” said Durham, “and a believer is in the Spirit; and God makes conversion the dividing line between the two states. In the old life, the old creation in Adam...rules. The new life in Christ is supposed to be lived entirely in the Spirit.”⁵⁶ Durham felt that ideally the Christian should be water baptized immediately after conversion and spirit-baptized “when we come up out of the water,” in order to be “Sealed in the Spirit as proof of His finished salvation.”⁵⁷ Durham’s Pauline focus may have led him into theological terrain

⁵³ Durham, “The Finished Work of Calvary: Identification with Jesus Christ Saves and Sanctifies,” 2.

⁵⁴ Durham, “Sanctification: The Bible Does Not Teach It as a Second Definite Work of Grace,” 2.

⁵⁵ Durham, *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham*, 27–28.

⁵⁶ Durham, “The Finished Work of Calvary: Identification with Jesus Christ Saves and Sanctifies,” 3.

⁵⁷ Durham, “The Gospel of Christ,” 9, 10.

he was not prepared to traverse. Since Paul assumes that those who are justified “live by the Spirit,” Durham added the modifier “supposed” to give room for a reception of the Spirit subsequent to and distinct from conversion: “So we being dead, and raised from the dead in Christ, one time, are supposed to live unto God in the Spirit.”⁵⁸ Durham could not assume, as the Pauline epistles seem to, that justification is organically linked to life in the Spirit.

Reed ponders the irony that Durham’s intense christology and baptismal emphasis “did not also lead him to adopt the christocentric baptismal name” that later became central to Oneness pentecostalism.⁵⁹ Similarly, Faupel remarks that “the surprise is that so many Finished Work advocates did not [identify with the name of Jesus in the waters baptism.]”⁶⁰ But if one recognizes that Durham’s theology is focused on soteriology rather than christology, the irony—or surprise—dissolves.⁶¹ Durham viewed baptism as a representation of his eschatological understanding of justification (death and rebirth), not as an expression of Jesus-centered piety. Durham was not contending against a loss of christological focus, but against the experiential timeline of and hamartiological basis of holiness theology.⁶² Opposing the teaching that salvation “takes more than one work,”

⁵⁸ Ibid., 9. Durham expresses similar sentiments in Durham, *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham*, 28.

⁵⁹ Reed, *In Jesus’ Name*, 93.

⁶⁰ Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, 1996, 306.

⁶¹ That Durham’s battle was for “salvation itself” has been mentioned by Farkas, as he comments on Frank Bartleman’s observations. But Farkas does not draw out the implications of this insight. Farkas, “William H. Durham and the Sanctification Controversy,” 163–164 (n. 131), 172.

⁶² Critiquing holiness theology as lacking in christological emphasis is too broad a generalization to be useful. Holiness exponents frequently used christocentric language to describe the second of work grace: “entire sanctification wrought in an instant by a divine act conditioned alone upon a specific act of sanctifying faith in the Blood of Christ.” See John G. Lake, “Sanctification and Holy Living,” *Pentecost* 1, no. 7 (June 1909): 8.

Durham emphasized the completed historical, past tense, nature of redemption. While historians have emphasized “Calvary” in Durham’s slogan, the more appropriate emphasis should be on “finished work.”

Oneness Debt to Durham: Some Observations

Reed claims that the “Finished Work doctrine remained undeveloped” at Durham’s untimely death in 1912.⁶³ Durham did not live to harness his influence into an organized movement, and some tensions existed in his thought, but a careful reading of his theology does not suggest incompleteness or that it was “frozen in its infancy...leaving many themes like loose threads waiting to be woven into a tapestry of doctrine and practice” by Oneness theology.⁶⁴ Although Durham was not primarily concerned with christocentric piety, Oneness theology was indebted to the christological implications of his teaching. Just as important for Oneness origins, however, were Durham’s tendencies that reflected broader pentecostal culture, such as biblical restorationism, supernatural revelation, and doctrinal confirmation through spiritual blessings.⁶⁵

Oneness thinkers were concerned with reestablishing the “Bible plan” of salvation. They took this theme of restoration farther than other pentecostals, even to the

⁶³ Reed, *In Jesus’ Name*, 106.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 135.

⁶⁵ Historians have not ignored these elements, but given the present reassessment of Durham’s thought, they deserve renewed attention. *Ibid.*, 116–135. Interestingly, before Clayton’s article influenced Reed toward a more christocentric and Durham-centered thesis on Oneness origins, he pointed to three very similar elements within pentecostalism “that were conducive to the emergence” of Oneness pentecostalism: reliance upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit, hunger for new ideas, and the centrality of the book of Acts. David Reed, “Aspects of the Origins of Oneness Pentecostalism,” in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan (Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1975), 157–158.

point of rejecting the classical doctrine of the Trinity. Like Durham, Oneness pentecostals were worried that human theories distorted biblical truth. As Durham put it, the finished work teaching “rules out all the confusing theories of men.”⁶⁶ Durham and Oneness leaders longed for what they called the “simple Gospel” evident also in an emphasis on Acts 2:38.⁶⁷ The simplicity of the gospel was dramatized in baptism, which both spoke of as “identification” with Christ. But careful distinctions should be made. As important as baptism was for Durham’s theology, it remained a “symbol” of the identification with Christ that occurred in faith, whereas Oneness pentecostals gave it first order salvific significance.⁶⁸

Durham felt that his epiphany on the finished work teaching was an eschatological signifier, as it hastened the “Great Crisis.”⁶⁹ Durham believed that God was working to restore “the portions of truth,” such as the finished work teaching, that had been neglected by most Christians.⁷⁰ Although confirmed by his search of the scriptures, Durham testified that his initial understanding of the doctrine was by

⁶⁶ Durham, “The Great Battle of Nineteen Eleven,” 6.

⁶⁷ William H. Durham, “An Open Letter to My Brother Ministers In and Out of the Pentecostal Movement,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (July 1911): 13. For Oneness use of the phrase, see Reed, *In Jesus’ Name*, 128.

⁶⁸ Contra Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 156. Jacobsen claims that for Durham “the act of water baptism actually played some role in effecting” justification and sanctification. But see Durham, “The Finished Work of Calvary: Identification with Jesus Christ Saves and Sanctifies,” 3; Durham, “The Two Great Experiences or Gifts,” 5. As much as Durham stressed Acts 2:38 as a summation of salvation, he always interpreted this through a Pauline lens, especially Romans 6. See Durham, “The Finished Work of Calvary: Identification with Jesus Christ Saves and Sanctifies,” 3, which after mentioning Acts 2:38 as the “scriptural order,” turns to a fuller discussion of death and resurrection appropriated in identification with Christ. In general, Reed gives Acts 2:38 too much consideration in his interpretation of Durham, although at certain points, Durham came close to giving soteriological significance to each of the three events of conversion, water baptism, and spirit-baptism. See Durham, “The Gospel of Christ,” 9.

⁶⁹ William H. Durham, “The Great Crisis: The Finished Work Is Hastening It,” *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 2 (May 1912): 4–6.

⁷⁰ Durham, *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham*, 47.

revelation.⁷¹ Durham could not have given later Oneness pentecostals a better justification for their “new” teachings than when he said, “We are living in a wonderful day. God is moving rapidly indeed. The revelation of one precious truth follows another so closely that only those who are in very close touch with the Lord seem able to grasp these precious truths as fast as they are revealed.”⁷² Oneness pentecostals like Frank Ewart wrote of their teaching’s place in this scheme: “The last great crisis is now upon us. God is moving for the complete restoration of His Holy Church... What He commanded in the beginning of the church is true at the end of the church age.”⁷³ These preferences for biblical restorationism and revelation were, of course, the substance of the “evening light” and “latter rain” hermeneutic that all pentecostals accepted. But Oneness pentecostals seemed to take this to the extreme, and in many ways they were faithful Durhamites in this regard. Ewart interpreted Durham’s teaching as the first in series of end times revelations that would “get this movement back in doctrinal fellowship with the apostles.”⁷⁴ If interpreters are looking for reasons why the Oneness movement emerged from the finished work camp of pentecostalism, this thirst for new revelation may be a powerful clue.⁷⁵ Having rejected the “new” teaching of Durham, Wesleyan pentecostals established themselves as preservers of heritage, even within the innovative

⁷¹ Durham, “An Open Letter to My Brother Ministers In and Out of the Pentecostal Movement,” 13.

⁷² Ibid., 12; Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 151.

⁷³ Frank J. Ewart, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.), 34.

⁷⁴ Cited in Clayton, “The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography,” 39, n.2.

⁷⁵ Clayton critiques Reed’s 1975 analysis for being unable to account for the fact that Oneness emerged in the finished work camp. Ibid., 40.

pentecostal community. For those in the finished work camp who had accepted Durham's teaching as an end times revelation, a precedent of openness to new doctrine was established, making them more receptive to the Oneness message.

Durham and his followers believed that his message was confirmed by the renewed spiritual blessings it engendered. According to Frank Bartleman, when Durham began preaching at Azusa Street in early 1911, "the fire fell at old Azusa as at the beginning," but with William Seymour's rejection of Durham's message, "'Azusa' became deserted."⁷⁶ Durham concurred: "we have not seen anything like a revival among those who oppose the 'Finished Work' and stand for the second work theory."⁷⁷ In the same way, God seemed to set a seal of approval upon the Oneness message. When Durham declared that "When [the Holy Ghost] reveals truth we must accept it, or we will lose out. When He exposes error we must drop it, or we will go into darkness and confusion," Oneness adherents could easily apply this logic to accepting the revelation of Jesus' name and rejecting the traditional teaching on the Trinity.⁷⁸ E.N. Bell reported of his work in the embryonic Oneness movement that he had, "never seen the power of God fall and the candidates as a whole get so happy"⁷⁹ The implication was clear: resisting such messages was tantamount to resisting God and missing out on latter day blessings.

One cannot doubt that the prominent Oneness thinkers were influenced by William Durham. But this is not the same as saying that Oneness theology is the end of a

⁷⁶ Frank Bartleman, *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As It Was in the Beginning* (Los Angeles: F. Bartleman, 1925), 145, 146.

⁷⁷ Durham, "The Finished Work of Calvary--It Makes Plain the Great Work of Redemption," 4.

⁷⁸ Durham, "An Open Letter to My Brother Ministers In and Out of the Pentecostal Movement," 12.

⁷⁹ E.N. Bell, "Davis City Camp-Meeting Report," *Weekly Evangel*, no. 105 (August 28, 1915): 2.

“chain reaction” set off by Durham.⁸⁰ Much less can his christology—for Durham a contingent theological point—be given privileged status in the story of Oneness origins. If Durham’s thought was a major source of Oneness pentecostalism, it was largely in that Durham was the immediate conveyor of ideas that were cherished by all pentecostals.

Conclusion

The original historiographical debate on Durham, resting on the assumption that he was the author of the finished work teaching, centered on whether or not his theology of sanctification represented a larger reaction from the Reformed element in early pentecostalism. Noting that few early pentecostals comprehended or agreed on what Durham’s theology of sanctification was, scholars began looking elsewhere for the theme in Durham’s thought that was so successful in banding independent pentecostals. They found this in Durham’s supposed christological piety, which could be seen as a “correction” of Wesleyan pneumatocentrism. But this assumption and conclusion can be called into question on a number of accounts. The timeline of the unveiling of the finished work teaching is not as tidy as scholars have often presented it. This coupled with evidence that A.S. Copley was just as important in the teaching’s earliest stages means that it is no longer so clear that Durham was the first to publicize the finished work teaching on sanctification from within the pentecostal camp. This lends support and sophistication to the original thesis that Durham was a spokesperson for a wider subset of pentecostals who were unhappy with the Wesleyan understanding of sanctification. Furthermore, the “christological correction” theory has led historians to exaggerate the importance of christology in Durham’s thought, especially as seed for Oneness

⁸⁰ Reed, *In Jesus’ Name*, 362.

pentecostalism. A more attentive read of Durham's theology reveals that his guiding concern was not a Jesus-centered piety, but a Pauline soteriology. On the other hand, the more pervasive themes of biblical restorationism, doctrinal revelation, and supernatural confirmation of doctrine are equally important arenas of continuity between Durham and Oneness thought.

APPENDIX B

Bosworth's Evangelistic Ministry, 1919-1932

Table B.1. Timeline of F.F. Bosworth's evangelistic ministry, 1919-1932

Date	Event
1919	
April 20	Baptismal service at the new Alliance Tabernacle in Dallas
Spring	Appointed as Assistant Superintendent for the southern district of the Alliance
May 15-21	Attended and preached at Christian and Missionary Alliance Council in Toccoa, Georgia
November 6	Wife Estelle died
1920	
March	Meetings in Louisville, Kentucky
Summer	Meetings in Chicago
August 12-September 19	Meetings in Lima, Ohio, where Bosworth made the decision to make diving healing central in his evangelism
September 26-October 10	Meetings in Fort Worth, Texas
October 17-December 13	Meetings in Pittsburgh; began relationship with <i>National Labor Tribune</i>
1921	
January	Resigned as superintendent of southwestern district of Alliance; appointed as field evangelist
January 2-February 13	Meetings in Detroit; began relationship with Eunice Perkins; challenged by Detroit Board of Health officer John Roehl
February 20	Preached at Stone Church, Chicago
February 27-April 3	Meetings in St. Paul, Minnesota, during which Paul Rader's daughter Pauline was converted and baptized

Sources: Alliance Weekly, National Labor Tribune, and Exploits of Faith.

Table B.1 (continued)

Date	Event
April 17-May 22	Meetings in Toronto; endorsed by J.G. Inkster of Knox Presbyterian Church and P.S. Campbell of McMaster University; Mrs. S.A. Wright healed of kidney cancer and experienced miraculous regrowth of removed kidney
May 29-June 2	Spoke at annual Alliance general council in Nyack
June 12-19	Assisted with camp meeting for healing in Anderson, Indiana, led by E.E. Byrum
June 19-August 22	Meetings in Chicago, where Bosworth's friends and supporters helped him relocate to Chicago Preached and published <i>For this Cause</i> , a widely-read tract on divine healing
September 4-25	Meetings in Toledo, Ohio, where Alice Baker was healed of lip cancer, and a committee investigated reports of healings Publication of songbook <i>Revival Flame</i>
October 7-16	Participated in New York Alliance convention
October 16-November 13	Meetings in Sheridan (Pittsburgh), where former soldier John Sproul was healed Received nickname "Joybringer"
November 28-December 19	Meetings in Flint, Michigan
1922	
January 1-22	Meetings in Chicago, Humboldt Park Tabernacle
February 8-March 6	Meetings in Miami, Florida, where Bosworth filled in at William Jennings Bryan's Sunday school; opposed by R.V. Bingham
Mid-March	Assisted work in Fort Worth, Texas
April 2-May 1	Meetings in Erie, Pennsylvania
Early May	Brief meetings in Toronto
May 7-May 29	Meetings in Syracuse, New York
June 11-July 3	Meetings in Detroit, where Bosworth preached over the radio probably for the first time; endorsed by local Ku Klux Klan
August 6-September 18	Meetings in Brooklyn, New York, during which May Wyburn Fitch began working with Bosworth party
September 20	One-day meeting in Philadelphia
October 1-30	Meetings in Jersey City
October 15-22	Attended New York Alliance convention
October 30	Married Florence Valentine

Table B.1 (continued)

Date	Event
November 1-3	Meetings with Paul Rader in Boston
November 12-December 17	Meetings in New York City
1923	
December 31 (1922)-February 5	Meetings in Bridgeport, Connecticut
February 11-March 5	Meetings in Brooklyn, hosted by Rev. Charles McKoy of Greene Avenue Baptist Church; opposed by local Baptist clergy, including I.M. Haldeman
March	One week instructing students at Nyack, New York
April 2-May 6	Meetings in Toronto
May 17-23	Alliance annual council in Chicago?
June 3-July 30	Meetings in Chicago in cooperation with Paul Rader
August 19-September 17	Meetings in Atlanta, where Bosworth preached on the radio and held services at the Federal Penitentiary
September 19-29	Meetings in Toccoa Falls, Georgia
October 28-December 3	Meetings in Williamsport, Pennsylvania
1924	
December 30(1923)-January 28	Meetings in Orlando Meetings in Miami, attended by S.D. Gordon and H.C. Morrison
April 6-May 26	Meetings in Ottawa, Ontario, where single-meeting attendance was around 7,000, "the largest crowd ever assembled in Ottawa under one roof at a religious service," and reported conversions around 12,000
June 1-15	Meetings in Pittsburgh, assisted by the Cleveland Quintet
Late June-mid-August	Vacationed in Chicago area; worked on <i>Christ the Healer</i>
Late August	Meetings in Zion City, Illinois
September 7-October ?	Meetings in Binghamton, New York Rest in Chicago
November	Published <i>Christ the Healer</i>
November 9-December 22	Meetings in Indianapolis
1925	
January 11-?	Meetings in St. Petersburg, Florida
February ?-20	Meetings in Atlanta

Table B.1 (continued)

Date	Event
March 1-30	Meetings in Indianapolis
April 10-May 17	Meetings in Ottawa, Ontario
May 27-June 3	Attended Alliance convention in St. Paul, Minnesota
June 14-August 11	Meetings in Scranton, Pennsylvania, where Bosworth was publically opposed by Methodist Episcopal minister F.E. Lott
August 16- ?	Meetings in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania
October 4-November 9	Meetings in St. Paul, Minnesota
November 23-December 29	Meetings in Reading, Pennsylvania
1926	
January 4-April 5	Meetings in Bethlehem, and Allentown, Pennsylvania; at Allentown, a tabernacle was constructed for Bosworth's meetings while the party was at work there
Summer	Meetings in Chicago with Paul Rader
May 3-August ?	Meetings in Philadelphia, coinciding with celebration of sesquicentennial
November	Meetings in Camden, New Jersey
1927	
January 10-April 5	Meetings in DuBois, Pennsylvania
April	Rest in River Forest
May 9-July 25	Meetings in Altoona, Pennsylvania, where Eunice Perkins met with Bosworth to update his biography
August	Rest in New Jersey
September 19- ?	Meetings in Lima, Ohio B.B. Bosworth begins his own campaign
1928	
January	Began publishing <i>Exploits of Faith</i>
January 4-May 28	Meetings at Paul Rader's Chicago Gospel Tabernacle
August 19-November ?	Meetings in Washington, D.C.
1929	
January-February 11	Meetings in Minneapolis at Luke Rader's tabernacle
March 10-July 15	Meetings in Anderson, Indiana, where Bosworth's work was endorsed by the Mayor
March 16	Meeting in Indianapolis

Table B.1 (continued)

Date	Event
June 23-July 14	Meeting in Indianapolis
July 16-25	Rest in River Forest
July 25- ?	Vacation in Pasadena, California, with Raymond Richey
September 8-October 29	Meetings in Springfield, Missouri (Gospel Tabernacle, Church of God)
November 7-December 16	Meetings in Houston with Raymond Richey
1930	
December 31 (1929)-January 27	Meetings in Houston with Raymond Richey Began more regular radio broadcasts with "Sunshine Hour"
January 28	Meeting in San Antonio, Roberts' Tabernacle
February 2-March 17	Meetings in Corpus Christi, Texas
March 28-April 19	Rest in River Forest
April 20-June 9	Meetings in Bloomington, Illinois
June 29-December 16	Meetings in Joliet, Illinois
Late August	Began Bosworth Evangelistic Prayer League
1931	
December 31 (1930)-February 18	Meetings resumed in Joliet, Illinois
Late February-March	Vacation in Atlantic City, New Jersey
March 1	Preached in Philadelphia
April 5-20	Returned for final meetings in Joliet, Illinois
April 26-June 13	Meetings in Blue Island, Illinois
July 18-December 14	Meetings in Chicago (Englewood)
1932	
December 31 (1931)-January 19	Resumed Meetings in Englewood
January 23- ?	Rest in Miami

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- “4,000 Letters from Those Helped by William Branham’s Meetings in South Africa.” *Pentecost*, no. 22 (December 1952): 7.
- Abrams, Minnie F. “The Object of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 3, no. 8 (May 1911): 8–11.
- Ackley, S.A. “Chicago Branch Activities.” *Destiny* 7, no. 4 (April 1936): 3.
- . “Detroit Convention.” *Destiny* 7, no. 4 (April 1936): 7.
- “Additional Testimonies to God’s Response to Faith.” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 48 (February 26, 1921): 764.
- “A Great Revival in Dallas, Texas.” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (1911): 14.
- “A Letter from J. Mattsson Boze.” *Pentecost*, no. 17 (September 1951): 13.
- Allen, J. H. *Judah’s Sceptre and Joseph’s Birthright: An Analysis of the Prophecies of Scripture in Regard to the Regard to The Royal Family of Judah and the Many Nations of Israel*. 18th ed. 1902; repr., Merrimac, MA: Destiny Publishers, n.d.
- . *The National Number and Heraldry of the United States of America*. Boston, A.A. Beaumont, 1919.
- . “What We Saw at Westminster [sic] Abbey.” *Apostolic Faith* 2, no. 11 (November 1926).
- . “What We Saw at Windsor Castle.” *Apostolic Faith* 2, no. 11 (November 1926).
- “All Night with God in Zion.” *Leaves of Healing* 16, no. 12 (January 7, 1905): 372.
- “A Man Born Blind Now Sees.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 19–21.
- “A Migration Register.” *Alliance Weekly* 74, no. 1 (January 7, 1934): 2–3.
- “A Miracle of Healing.” *Leaves of Healing* 1, no. 9, 10, 11 (1891): 220–222.

- “A Miracle of Healing of a Gassed Soldier.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 15, no. 4 (January 1922): 22–23.
- “A New Revivalist.” *Life*, May 7, 1951.
- “Anglo-Saxon Federation Detroit Convention.” *Destiny* 7, no. 5 (May 1936): 6.
- Angstead, Ruth. “A Grand Experience.” *Pentecost* 1, no. 2 (September 1908): 1–2.
- Annual Report for 1947*. The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1948.
- Annual Report for 1950 and Minutes of the General Council*. The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1951.
- “Apostolic Faith World-Wide Camp Meeting.” *Triumphs of Faith* 33, no. 2 (February 1913): 45–46.
- “Apostolic Faith World-Wide Camp Meeting.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 6, no. 129 (March 15, 1913): 2.
- “A Refutation.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 8 (May 1915): 14–15.
- Argue, Zelma. “Chosen of God: The Story of Mrs. Robert A. Brown, Chapter One.” *Christ’s Ambassadors Herald* 13, no. 6 (June 1940): 3, 12.
- Armstrong, B.F. “Bosworth Evangelistic Campaign.” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 41 (December 8, 1923): 674.
- Armstrong, Edward. “The Newark Convention.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 88 (May 1, 1915): 4.
- Assembly, Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene General, Phineas Franklin Bresee, Robert Pierce, and Holiness Church of Christ. *Manual of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, [1908]*. Los Angeles: Nazarene Publishing Company, 1908.
- “A Strange Fire.” *Our Hope* 28, no. 2 (August 1921): 83–85.
- “At Headquarters.” *Destiny* 7, no. 4 (April 1936): 10.
- “A Visit From Evangelist F.F. Bosworth.” *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 10 (June 1922): 1053.
- “Balmy Weather in Corpus Christi, Texas As the Meetings Close.” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 4 (April 1930): 8–9.

- Barratt, Thomas B. *Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Fire: What Is the Scriptural Evidence?*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.
- Barth, Hattie. "The Dallas Revival." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 5, no. 119 (October 15, 1912): 1.
- Beecher, Lyman. *A Plea for the West*. Cincinnati: Truman & Smith, 1835.
- Bell, E.N. "Bible Order Versus Fanaticism." *Word and Witness* 10, no. 3 (March 20, 1914): 2–3.
- . "Editor's Field Report." *Weekly Evangel*, no. 101 (July 31, 1915): 1.
- . "The Coming Great Council." *Christian Evangel*, no. 250–251 (August 10, 1918): 1, 4.
- . "What Is the Evidence of the Baptism in the Spirit." *Word and Witness* 9, no. 6 (June 20, 1913): 7.
- Benham, Charles O. "Joseph Is Yet Alive." In *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, edited by Charles A. Jennings, 284–90. Owasso, OK: Truth in History, 2010.
- . "God Answers the Present World Crisis with Miracles of Healing." *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 1 (April 1949): 4.
- Bernard, W. "The Gift of Tongues and the Pentecostal Movement." *Weekly Evangel*, no. 142 (June 3, 1916): 4–6.
- "Beulah Heights Camp Meeting--1955." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 45, no. 6 (August 1955): 4.
- Bingham, Rowland V. *The Bible and the Body: Healing in the Scriptures*. 4th ed. 1921; repr., Toronto: Evangelical Publishers, 1952.
- . *The Bible and the Body, Or, Healing in the Scriptures*. Toronto: Evangelical Publishers, 1921.
- . "The Healing Movement in Crisis." *Evangelical Christian* 18, no. 2 (February 1922): 39–40.
- . "Touching the Ark." *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 4 (December 1921): 714.

Birdsall, Elias G. "Revival News in Home Land: Dallas, Texas." *Word and Witness* 9, no. 11 (November 20, 1913): 1.

———. "Application Blank for Ordination Certificate," 1916. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

"Blessings More Abundantly." *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 29 (September 1922): 458.

Boardman, William Edwin. *Record of the International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness Held at the Agricultural Hall, London ... 1885*. London: J. Snow & Co., 1885.

Boddy, A.A. "A Visit to Rev. A.B. Simpson." *Confidence* 2, no. 9 (September 1909): 199.

———. "The Conference in Germany." *Confidence* 2, no. 1 (January 1909): 5–6.

———. "The Pentecostal Movement." *Confidence* 3, no. 8 (August 1910): 194–197.

"Book Reviews." *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 21 (May 23, 1925): 346.

"Bosworth Book Off Press." *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 4 (July 1948): 6.

"Bosworth Bros., in New York." *Word and Work* 44, no. 12 (December 1922): 16.

Bosworth, Burton B. "Application Blank for Ordination Certificate," March 23, 1917. 30/2/8. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

———. "B.B. Bosworth to J.W. Welch," March 23, 1917. 30/2/8. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

———. "B.B. Bosworth to J.W. Welch," October 13, 1918. 30/2/8. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

"Bosworth Campaign in Chicago." *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 31 (October 15, 1921): 490.

"Bosworth Campaign in Jersey." *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 36 (November 18, 1922): 570.

"Bosworth Campaign in Scranton, Penna." *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 31 (August 1, 1925): 535.

"Bosworth Campaign in St. Petersburg, Florida." *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 9 (February 28, 1925): 143.

"Bosworth Campaign in Toronto." *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 9 (April 28, 1923): 151–152.

- “Bosworth Campaign, New York City.” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 25 (September 2, 1922): 394, 399.
- “Bosworth Campaign Stirs Toronto.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 11 (May 28, 1921): 171–172.
- “Bosworth Evangelistic Campaign, Indianapolis, Indiana.” *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 3 (January 17, 1925): 42.
- Bosworth, F.F. “A Continuous Revival in Dallas, Texas.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 145 (June 24, 1916): 8.
- . “A Wonderful Revival.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 5, no. 118 (September 15, 1912): 1.
- . “Beating in Texas Follows Ministry to Blacks: F.F. Bosworth’s 1911 Letter to His Mother.” *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6 (June 1, 1986): 5, 14.
- . “Be Ye Doers of the Word.” Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 22, 1954.
<http://www.brothermel.org/audio-video/74>.
- . *Bosworth’s Life Story: The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth, as Told by Himself in the Alliance Tabernacle, Toronto*. Toronto: Alliance Book Room, n.d.
- . “Branham Meetings in Germany and Switzerland.” *Full Gospel Men’s Voice* 3, no. 6 (September 1955): 3–11.
- . “Brother Bosworth’s Minneapolis and St. Paul Meetings.” *Word and Witness*, (Pangburn, Arkansas), 3, no. 2 (January 15, 1922): 3.
- . “Brother F.F. Bosworth About the Dallas Revival.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 5, no. 119 (October 15, 1912): 1.
- . *Christ the Healer*. Grand Rapids, MI: Fleming H. Revell, 2000.
- . *Christ, the Healer: Messages on Divine Healing*. 7th edition. Miami Beach, FL, 1948.
- . *Christ the Healer: Sermons on Divine Healing*. Chicago, 1924.
- . “Clay in the Hands of the Potter.” *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 11 (November 1915): 254–259.
- . “Confirming the Word By Signs Following.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 3 (December 1908): 7–8.

- . “Correspondence--Re: Death of First Wife,” November 20, 1919. 3/8/5. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.
- . “Dallas and Bridgeport, Texas.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 81 (March 13, 1915): 1.
- . “Did the Age of Miracles Ever End?” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 3 (March 1930): 1–5.
- . “Discerning the Lord’s Body.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 9 (June 1914): 2–7.
- . “Do All Speak with Tongues?” *Word and Witness*, (Pangburn, Arkansas), 3, no. 2 (January 15, 1922): 1, 4.
- . “Do All Speak with Tongues?” *Truth and Liberty*, September 1972, 23–31.
- . *Do All Speak with Tongues? An Open Letter to the Ministers and Saints of the Pentecostal Movement*. Dallas, TX: Williams Printery, n.d.
- . “Faint-Hearted Get Go-By; Ask, Stand Pat and Watch; Beg Big Things and Run; Golden Chance Awaiting.” *National Labor Tribune*, February 17, 1921.
- . “F.F. Bosworth Rejoices Over Roberts’ Meeting in Miami, Florida.” *Healing Waters* 2, no. 3 (February 1949): 4.
- . “F.F. Bosworth to J.W. Welch,” July 24, 1918. 30/4/1. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.
- . *For This Cause: Or Why Many Are Weak and Sickly and Why Many Die Prematurely*. New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, n.d.
- . “For This Cause Was the Son of God Manifest That He Might Destroy the Works of the Devil.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 13, no. 8 (July 1921): 6–9.
- . “From Farm to Pulpit.” *Bread of Life* 29, no. 6 (June 1980): 5–6, 8, 11.
- . “Gifts of Healing Plus.” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 10 (January 1950): B – C.
- . “God’s Financial Plan Insures the Prosperity of His People.” *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 5 (May 1929): 7–13.
- . “God’s Visitation to South Africa.” *Herald of His Coming* 11, no. 2 (n.d.): 1.
- . “Healing in the Atonement.” *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 10 (October 1915): 226–231.

- . “Hints Regarding Healing.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1776 (May 22, 1948): 4, 13.
- . “How To Appropriate the Redemptive and Covenant Blessing of Bodily Healing.” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 23 (December 6, 1924): 397, 401.
- . “Is God the Author of Disease?” *Herald of Our Race* 2, no. 4 (April 1938): 9.
- . “Is Healing for All?” *Kingdom Digest*, September 1949, 18–21.
- . *Judah vs. Israel*. Kingdom Study Course, Advanced Series: Lesson No. 4, n.d.
- . “Letter from Dallas, Texas.” *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 3 (March 1914): 72.
- . “Living Faith in the Power of God.” *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 2 (February 1915): 29–33.
- . “Looking at the Unseen.” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 10 (January 1950): 4–5.
- . *Looking at the Unseen: Or, The Mental Habit of Faith*. Miami Beach, FL: F.F. Bosworth, n.d.
- . “Mass Faith.” Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 21, 1954.
<http://www.brothermel.org/audio-video/74>.
- . *Meditations on the Ninety-First Psalm*. Miami Beach, FL: Bosworth, n.d.
- . “Miracles in Texas.” *Triumphs of Faith* 32, no. 9 (September 1912): 202–205.
- . “New Covenant Obedience.” *Destiny* 7, no. 12 (December 1936): 4–5, 12.
- . “Nothing Can Hinder a Revival.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 135 (April 15, 1916): 6–8.
- . “Pentecostal Outpouring in Dallas, Texas.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 4, no. 11 (August 1912): 10–11.
- . “Power in the Holy Ghost.” *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 11 (November 1914): 244–247.
- . “Readers of Tribune Request Prayer for Healing.” *National Labor Tribune*, November 11, 1920.
- . “Recipe for Healing.” *Kingdom Digest*, August 1950, 33–37.

- . “Revival News in Home Land.” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 9 (September 20, 1913): 3.
- . “Revival News in Home Land: Bro. Bosworth, Texas.” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 12 (December 20, 1913): 3.
- . “Sin and Repentance.” *Word and Witness* 10, no. 5 (May 20, 1914): 2.
- . “Sister Bosworth with the Lord.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 316–317 (November 29, 1919): 10.
- . *The Bible Distinction Between the House of Israel and the House of Judah*. Owasso, OK: Truth in History Ministries, 2002.
- . “The Call to Love.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 218 (December 8, 1917): 2.
- . *The Christian Confession; Or, How to Obtain All Redemptive Blessings*. Miami, FL: Bosworth, n.d.
- . “The Enthronement of Self the Great Sin.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 11 (August 1915): 2–6.
- . “The God of All the Earth Working at Dallas.” *Word and Witness* 8, no. 10 (December 20, 1912): 1.
- . “The Grace of Liberality.” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 2 (February 1930): 1–2.
- . “The Greatest Revival in Dallas.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 143 (June 10, 1916): 7.
- . “The Greatest Sin; Or, the Sin of Omission.” *Truth and Liberty*, October 1956.
- . “The Faith That Takes.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1707 (January 25, 1947): 6–7.
- . “The Holy Spirit.” *Pentecostal Herald* 3, no. 12 (April 1918): 1.
- . *The Key to the Windows of Heaven, or God’s Financial Plan*. Miami, FL: Bosworth, n.d.
- . “The Lame Man at Lystra.” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 6 (June 1930): 1–4.
- . “The Ministry of Intercession.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 8 (May 1913): 2–5.
- . *The Opening of the Prison: A Message to the Sick*. Miami Beach, FL: Bosworth, n.d.
- . *The Past Tenses of God’s Word*, n.d.

- . “The Potter and the Clay.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 13, no. 10 (September 1921): 20–23.
- . “The Practice of the Presence of God.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 5 (February 1915): 5–8.
- . “The Practice of the Presence of God.” *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 3 (March 1915): 51–55.
- . “The Promise of the Father.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 8, no. 5 (February 1916): 2–7.
- . “The Prophecy of Daniel’s ‘Seventy Weeks.’” *Destiny* 11, no. 10 (October 1940): 16–22.
- . “The Revival at Dallas, Tex.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 6, no. 123 (December 1912): 2.
- . “The Sinfulness of Procrastination.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 11 (August 1914): 7–11.
- . “The Will of God Boiled Down into Five Words. ‘Be Filled with the Spirit.’” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 229 (March 2, 1918): 1.
- . “The Windows of Heaven.” *Kingdom Digest*, January 1948, 14–17.
- . “The Wonders of Faith.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 9 (June 1913): 5–11.
- . “The Wonders of God in Dallas.” *Word and Witness* 8, no. 6 (August 20, 1912): 3.
- . “They Rehearsed All That God Had Done with Them.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 13, no. 6 (March 1921): 5–10.
- . “Tide Still Rising in Dallas, Texas.” *Christian Evangel* 2, no. 19 (May 9, 1914): 6.
- . “Triumphant Faith.” *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 27 (July 4, 1925): 459–460.
- “Bosworth Meeting in Indianapolis.” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 26 (December 27, 1924): 450.

Bradford, Jesse F. *Are Anglo-Saxons Israelites? The Greatest Religious Question of the Day Discussed from a Bible Standpoint and Identifies the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel as the English Speaking Race, and God’s Appointed Servants*. Dallas: Bradford Printing Company, 1932.

- Bradway, Dorothea Ann. "Dorothea Ann Bradway's Miraculous, Instantaneous Healing." *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 6 (June 1930): 12–14.
- "Branham-Bosworth Campaign Successful in Zion, Illinois." *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 1 (April 1949): 2.
- "Branham-Bosworth Reunite for Miami, Florida, Campaign." *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 12 (March 1949): 1–2.
- "Branham Visits Roberts Campaign." *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 1 (April 1949): 2, 16.
- Branham, William. "Africa Trip Report." Sermon, Owensboro, Kentucky, November 9, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1109-Africa-trip-report>.
- . "A Greater than Solomon Is Here." Sermon, Bloomington, Illinois, April 12, 1961. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/61-0412-Greater-than-Solomon-is-here>.
- . "At Thy Word." Sermon, Minneapolis, Minnesota, July 14, 1950. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0714-at-Thy-Word>.
- . "At Thy Word, Lord, I'll Let Down the Net." Sermon, Johnson City, New York, December 7, 1954. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-1207-at-Thy-Word-Lord-III-let-down-the-net>.
- . "A Wedding Supper." Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, October 6, 1956. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/56-1006-wedding-supper>.
- . "Believest Though This?" Sermon, Tulsa, Oklahoma, April 2, 1960. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0402-believest-thou-this>.
- . "Believest Thou This?" Sermon, Houston, Texas, January 15, 1950. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0115-believest-thou-this>.
- . "Be of Good Cheer." Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 21, 1954. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0721-be-of-good-cheer>.
- . "Blind Bartimaeus." Sermon, Karlsruhe, East Germany, August 18, 1955. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/55-0818-blind-Bartimaeus>.
- . "By Faith, Moses." Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, July 20, 1958. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/58-0720M-by-faith-Moses>.
- . "Debate on Tongues." Sermon, Yakima, Washington, August 7, 1960. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0807-debate-on-tongues>.

- . “Diseases and Afflictions.” Sermon, Louisville, Kentucky, January 1950.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0100-diseases-and-afflictions>.
- . “Divine Healing.” Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, December 19, 1954.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-1219M-Divine-healing>.
- . “Divine Love.” Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, August 26, 1956.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/56-0826-Divine-Love>.
- . “Do You Now Believe?” Sermon, West Palm Beach, Florida, December 6, 1953.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1206-do-you-now-believe>.
- . “Early Spiritual Experiences.” Sermon, Hammond, Indiana, July 13, 1952.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/52-0713A-early-spiritual-experiences>.
- . “Expectation.” Sermon, Binghamton, New York, December 6, 1954.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-1206-expectation>.
- . “Expectations and What Love Is.” Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, February 28, 1954. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0228A-expectations-and-what-Love-is>.
- . “Faith (Africa Trip Report).” Sermon, Zion, Illinois, July 25, 1952.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/52-0725-faith-Africa-trip-report>.
- . “God Revealing Himself to His People.” Sermon, Cleveland, Ohio, August 13, 1950. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0813E-God-revealing-Himself-to-His-people>.
- . “God’s Provided Way.” Sermon, Los Angeles, California, April 15, 1959.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/59-0415A-Gods-Provided-Way>.
- . “Healing (What Cancer Is).” Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, September 4, 1953.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0904-healing-what-cancer-is>.
- . “How Faith Acts (Africa Trip Report).” Sermon, Battle Creek, Michigan, August 16, 1952. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/52-0816-how-faith-acts-Africa-trip-report>.
- . “How God Called Me to Africa, Part I.” *Voice of Healing* 5, no. 4 (July 1952): 5, 8.
- . “How the Angel Came to Me, and His Commission.” Sermon, January 17, 1955.
<http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/55-0117-how-the-Angel-came-to-me-and-His-commission>.

- . “I Have a Greater Witness than John (How the Angel Came to Me).” Sermon, Owensboro, Kentucky, November 7, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1107-I-have-a-Greater-Witness-than-John-How-the-Angel-came-to-me>.
- . “Israel at the Red Sea.” Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, March 26, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0326-Israel-at-the-Red-Sea-1>.
- . “It Is I, Be Not Afraid.” Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 20, 1954. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0720E-it-is-I-be-not-afraid>.
- . “I Was Not Disobedient to the Heavenly Vision.” Sermon, Zion, Illinois, July 18, 1949. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/49-0718-i-was-not-disobedient-to-the-heavenly-vision>.
- . “I Will Restore.” Sermon, Owensboro, Kentucky, November 10, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1110-I-will-restore>.
- . “Jehovah-Jireh.” Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, March 9, 1957. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0309E-Jehovah-Jireh>.
- . “Jehovah-Jireh.” Sermon, Indianapolis, Indiana, June 12, 1957. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0612-Jehovah-Jireh>.
- . “Jesus Christ the Same Yesterday, Today, and Forever.” Sermon, Jonesboro, Arkansas, May 6, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0506-Jesus-Christ-the-same-yesterday-and-today-and-forever>.
- . “Life Is the Healer.” Sermon, Indianapolis, Indiana, June 11, 1957. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0611-Life-is-the-healer>.
- . “Life Story of Rev. Wm. Branham.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 7 (October 1948): 1, 13.
- . “Manifested Sons of God (Series, Part 2 of 4).” Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, May 18, 1960. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0518-manifested-sons-of-God>.
- . “Mary’s Belief.” Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, March 11, 1960. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/60-0311-Marys-belief>.
- . “Our Hope Is in God.” Sermon, New York, September 29, 1951. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/51-0929-our-hope-is-in-God>.

- . “Palmerworm, Locust, Cankerworm and Caterpillar.” Sermon, Connersville, Indiana, June 12, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0612-palmerworm-locust-cankerworm-and-caterpillar>.
- . “Sirs, We Would See Jesus.” Sermon, Newark, New Jersey, December 11, 1957. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-1211-sirs-we-would-see-Jesus>.
- . “Speak to This Rock.” Sermon, Jonesboro, Arkansas, May 12, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-0512-speak-to-this-Rock>.
- . “Testimony.” Sermon, West Palm Beach, Florida, November 29, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1129E-testimony>.
- . “The Basis of Fellowship.” Sermon, Long Beach, California, February 14, 1961. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/61-0214-basis-of-fellowship>.
- . “The Deity of Jesus Christ.” Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, December 25, 1949. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/49-1225-Deity-of-Jesus-Christ>.
- . “The Faith Once Delivered to the Saints.” Sermon, West Palm Beach, Florida, November 29, 1953. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/53-1129A-faith-that-was-once-delivered-to-the-saints>.
- . “The Heathen Believe as Power Is Shown.” *Voice of Healing* 5, no. 5 (August 1952): 6–7, 18.
- . “The Law Having a Shadow.” Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, June 21, 1956. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/56-0621-Law-having-a-shadow>.
- . “The Maniac of Gadara.” Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 20, 1954. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0720A-maniac-of-Gadara>.
- . “The Marriage of the Lamb.” Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, January 21, 1962. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/62-0121E-marriage-of-the-Lamb>.
- . “The Mighty Conqueror.” Sermon, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, August 8, 1957. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-0808-Mighty-Conqueror>.
- . “The Prophet Elisha.” Sermon, Chicago, Illinois, July 23, 1954. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/54-0723-prophet-Elisha>.
- . “Questions and Answers on Hebrews (Series, Part 2 of 3).” Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, October 2, 1957. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/57-1002-questions-and-answers-on-Hebrews-2>.

- . “The Queen of Sheba.” Sermon, Waterloo, Iowa, January 25, 1958. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/58-0125-Queen-of-Sheba>.
- . “The Sign of His Coming.” Sermon, Cleveland, Tennessee, April 7, 1962. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/62-0407-sign-of-His-coming>.
- . *The William Branham Sermons: How God Called Me to Africa and Other Sermons*. Dallas: Voice of Healing Publishing Company, 1960.
- . “The Works That I Do Bear Witness of Me.” Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, April 13, 1951. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/51-0413-works-that-I-do-bear-witness-of-me>.
- . “To Whom Is the Arm of the Lord Revealed?” Sermon, Cleveland, Ohio, August 24, 1950. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/50-0824-to-whom-is-the-arm-of-the-Lord-revealed>.
- . “We Would See Jesus.” Sermon, San Jose, California, April 22, 1959. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/59-0422-we-would-see-Jesus>.
- . “We Would See Jesus.” Sermon, Bloomington, Illinois, April 9, 1961. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/61-0409-we-would-see-Jesus>.
- . “Where I Think Pentecost Failed.” Sermon, San Fernando, California, November 11, 1955. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/55-1111-where-I-think-Pentecost-failed>.
- . “Who Hath Believed Our Report?” Sermon, Toledo, Ohio, July 19, 1951. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/51-0719-who-hath-believed-our-report>.
- . “Who Is This?” Sermon, Jeffersonville, Indiana, May 10, 1959. <http://churchages.com/en/sermon/branham/59-0510E-who-is-this>.
- “British Israelism or Anglo Israelism.” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 19 (November 8, 1924): 315.
- “Bro. Bosworth at Houston, Tex.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 206 (September 8, 1917): 11.
- “Brooklyn, N.Y.” *Word and Work* 44, no. 10 (October 1922): 15.
- “Brother Branham on the Field Again.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 8 (November 1948): 1.
- Bryant, Daniel. “Baptism of Holy Spirit.” *Zion City Independent*, December 13, 1907.
- . “Shiloh and Messiah.” *Zion City News*, December 24, 1909.

- Bundy, David. "Spiritual Advice to a Seeker: Letters to T B Barratt from Azusa Street, 1906." *Pneuma* 14, no. 2 (September 1, 1992): 159–170.
- "Bureau of Information." *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 1.
- Bushnell, Horace. *Nature and the Supernatural: As Together Constituting the One System of God*. London: R. D. Dickinson, 1880.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008.
- Campbell, P.S. "How God Worked in Toronto." *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 16 (July 2, 1921): 250.
- . "The Bosworth Campaign in the Alliance Tabernacle, Toronto." *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 15 (June 9, 1923): 247.
- "Camp Meeting Notes." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2, no. 40 (June 15, 1909): 3.
- "Campmeetings." *Latter Rain Evangel* 2, no. 9 (June 1910): 9.
- "Campmeetings." *Latter Rain Evangel* 3, no. 9 (June 1911): 12.
- "Campmeetings and Conventions." *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 6 (March 1913): 16.
- Carothers, W. F. "The Baptism of the Spirit and Speaking with Tongues." *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 5 (January 1922): 761–762.
- . "The Baptism with the Holy Ghost." *Apostolic Faith*, (Baxter Springs), 1, no. 9 (May 1906): 14–15.
- . *The Baptism with the Holy Ghost and Speaking in Tongues*. Houston, TX; Zion City, IL, 1906.
- Cather, Willa. *The Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy and the History of Christian Science*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993.
- Chapman, Katherine Elise. "'Times of Refreshing': The Bosworth Revival Campaign in Detroit." *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 23 (August 19, 1922): 361, 367.
- "Cheering Words from Zion's Guests." *Leaves of Healing* 4, no. 15 (February 5, 1898): 295.
- "Chicago Convention." *Word and Witness* 9, no. 6 (June 20, 1913): 5.

- “Chicago’s Visitation of Miracles of Healing.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 20, no. 5 (February 1928): 14–17.
- “Citizens’ Mid-Week Rally.” *Leaves of Healing* 16, no. 22 (March 18, 1905): 701.
- “Closing Service of the Feast.” *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 18 (August 22, 1903): 576.
- Cody, Sadie. “A Miracle of Healing.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 3, no. 8 (May 1911): 19–22.
- . “Report from Los Angeles Convention.” *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 11 (November 1914): 262–63.
- Cole, May A. “Claims Thousands Neglected Rare Opportunity.” *National Labor Tribune*, May 28, 1925.
- . “The End Is Not Yet---More Healings Reported.” *National Labor Tribune*, June 19, 1924.
- Collins, M.E. “Divine Healing in the Bible College, Part V.” *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 11 (February 1952): 8.
- . “How I Learned the Truth About Divine Healing.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 2129 (February 27, 1955): 3.
- Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1914*. St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1914.
- Constitution and By-Laws of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...Minutes 1929 with List of Ministers and Missionaries*. Springfield, MO: General Council of the Assemblies of God, 1929.
- “Controversy Languishes--Evangelism Spreading.” *Christian Evangel*, no. 193 (June 9, 1917): 7, 9.
- “Convention at Osborne, Kans.” *Weekly Evangel*, February 12, 1916, 14.
- “Convention Program.” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 66 (June 1935): 7.
- “Convention Story.” *Destiny* 7, no. 7 (July 1936): 3.
- “Conversations with F.F. Bosworth.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 1 (April 1948): 4.
- “Conway, S.C.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 44 (August 15, 1909): 2.
- Cook, C.R. “At Headquarters.” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 66 (June 1935): 5.

- . “At Headquarters.” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 71 (November 1935): 7.
- Coote, Leonard W. *Impossibilities Become Challenges: A Record of God’s Faithfulness, in Saving, Baptizing with the Holy Spirit, Leading out into Missionary Work and Supplying of Daily Needs*. Ikoma, Japan: Ikoma Bible College, 1965.
- Copley, A.S. *The Holy Spirit, The One Baptism, The Anointing--Personal and Practical*. Accessed April 7, 2014.
http://www.gracegod.com/pamphlet_and_articles/pamphlets/The%20Holy%20Spirit%20-%20The%20One%20Baptism%20and%20the%20Anointing.pdf.
- Cossum, W.H. “Mountain Peaks of Prophecy and Sacred History: Prophecy Fulfilled and Unfulfilled.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 2, no. 6 (March 1910): 3–7.
- “Criticisms Answered.” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 5 (July 1, 1910): 11.
- Daggett, Mabel Potter. “Are There Modern Miracles?” *Ladies’ Home Journal*, June 1923.
- “Dallas, Texas.” *Alliance Weekly* 52, no. 26 (September 20, 1919): 414.
- Darms, Anton. *The Delusion of British-Israelism: A Comprehensive Treatise*. New York: Publication Office “Our Hope,” 1938.
- . “The Fallacy of the British-Israel Delusion.” *Our Hope* 45, no. 5 (November 1938): 321–327.
- “Declaration, International Pentecostal Consultative Council.” *Confidence* 5, no. 12 (December 1912): 277.
- Delaney, Maude M. “God’s Mighty Power.” *Word and Witness* 8, no. 8 (October 20, 1912): 3.
- . “More About the Revival in Dallas, Texas.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 5, no. 120 (November 1, 1912): 2.
- “Did You Know?” *Herald of Our Race* 4, no. 8 (August 1940): 3.
- “Directory of The Ordained Officers of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion.” *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 20 (March 5, 1904): 618.
- “Doctrine of the Pentecostal Movement.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 37 (May 1, 1909): 1.

- Dowie, John Alexander. *Doctors, Drugs and Devils; Or, The Foes of Christ the Healer. A Sermon Delivered in The Auditorium, Chicago, March 29, 1896*. Chicago: Zion Publishing House, 1897.
- “Dr. Charles O. Benham.” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 2 (May 1949): 9.
- Du Plessis, David J. “A Faithful Pioneer Passes.” *World-wide Revival* 11, no.1 (April 1958): 10.
- . “The International Fellowship Column.” *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 9 (December 1951): 16.
- Durham, William. “Some Other Phases of Sanctification.” *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 2 (May 1912): 7–9.
- Durham, William H. *Articles Written by Pastor W.H. Durham Taken from Pentecostal Testimony*, n.d.
- . “Speaking in Tongues Is the Evidence of Spirit Baptism.” *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 2 (May 1912): 9–12.
- . “The Great Battle of Nineteen Eleven.” *Pentecostal Testimony* 2, no. 1 (January 1912): 6–8.
- . “The Pentecostal Revival at Azusa Street--How It Began and How It Ended.” *Pentecostal Testimony* 1, no. 8 (1911): 3–4.
- “Early Morning Sacrifice of Praise and Prayer.” *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 1 (October 24, 1903): 14.
- “Early Morning Sacrifice of Praise and Prayer.” *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 16 (August 6, 1904): 515.
- Eddy, Mary Baker. *Retrospection and Introspection*. Boston: Joseph Armstrong, 1892.
- . *Science and Health: With Key to the Scriptures*. Boston: A. V. Stewart, 1906.
- “Editorial.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 6 (September 1948): 6.
- “Editorials.” *Alliance Weekly* 53, no. 9 (November 22, 1919): 130.
- “Elgin, Ill., Unable to Accommodate Crowds Attending Meeting.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 3 (June 1948): 1–2, 12.
- “Encouraging Endorsements.” *Our Hope* 32, no. 7 (January 1926): 400–401.

- Entzminger, Louis. *The Modern "Divine Healing" Racket: Are Bible Miracles to Be Performed by the People of God Today?*. Houston: L. Entzminger, 1938.
- "Evangelism and Bodily Healing." *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 24, no. 12 (August 1924): 593–95.
- "Evangelist and Mrs. Bosworth Enjoy Vacation." *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 8 (August 1929): 8.
- "Evangelist Bosworth's Great Meeting at Lima, Ohio." *Word and Witness*, (Pangburn, Arkansas), 3, no. 2 (January 15, 1922): 1, 3.
- "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks." *National Labor Tribune*, July 24, 1924.
- "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks." *National Labor Tribune*, July 31, 1924.
- "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks." *National Labor Tribune*, August 7, 1924.
- "Evangelist F.F. Bosworth Answers Multitudes of Anxious Folks." *National Labor Tribune*, August 14, 1924.
- Ewing, Curtis Clair. *The Anglo-Israel Belief: Is It a Cult?*. Pasadena, CA, n.d.
- . *The Distinction between Judah and Israel as Shown by the Weight of Scholarship*. Chicago: Curtis Clair Ewing, n.d.
- Excell, J.G. "Notes of Thanksgiving from the Whole World." *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 26 (April 18, 1903): 827.
- Executive Presbytery of the General Council of the Assemblies of God. "Certificate of Ordination, Fred F. Bosworth," 1916. 30/4/1. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.
- "Extracts from a Very Important Letter from Bro. J.G. Lake." *Confidence* 2, no. 3 (March 1909): 74–75.
- "Extreme Sensationalism." *Our Hope* 28, no. 8 (February 1922): 466–467.
- "Faith Cure Miracle Bubble Is Bursting." *Our Hope* 28, no. 12 (June 1922): 760–763.
- "F.F. Bosworth, Raymond T. Richey, and B.B. Bosworth at Evangelistic Temple." *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 2 (February 1930): 8–10.

“F.F. Bosworth to His Mother,” August 11, 1911. 3/8/5. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

“Fifteen Days with God.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 9 (June 1915): 13.

Finestone, Daniel. “Anglo-Israelism -- Fact or Fancy?” *Latter Rain Evangel*, May 1936, 13–15.

Finney, Charles G. *Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney*. New York: Barnes & Co., 1876.

———. *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*. Leavitt, Lord & Company, 1835.

———. *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*. New York : F.H. Revell, 1868.

Fitch, C.C. “Bloomington, (Ills.) Campaign Began on Easter Sunday.” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 5 (May 1930): 5–7.

———. “Bosworth Campaign in Toledo.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 34 (November 5, 1921): 538.

———. “Campaign in Detroit.” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 18 (July 15, 1922): 282.

———. “Great Rush for Baptism; Presbyterians in Line; Candidates Rejoice; Hundreds Join In.” *National Labor Tribune*, October 18, 1921.

———. “More ‘Good News’ from Joliet, Illinois, Meetings.” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 10 (October 1930): 13–18.

———. “Report of the Joliet, Ills., Campaign.” *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 3 (March 1931): 7–10.

———. “Report of the Joliet, Ills., Campaign.” *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 4 (April 1931): 6–13.

———. “The 1929 Campaign in ‘The Twin Cities.’” *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 2 (February 1929): 6–8, 12.

———. “The Battle at Joliet, Illinois.” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 8 (August 1930): 15–17.

———. “The Bosworth Meetings in Anderson, Indiana.” *Exploits of Faith* 2, no. 3 (March 1929): 10–14, 16.

———. “The Bosworth’s Open a Strenuous Month’s Campaign in Brooklyn, N.Y.” *National Labor Tribune*, August 10, 1922.

“Flash!” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 7 (October 1948): 1.

- Flexner, Abraham. *Medical Education in the United States and Canada: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910.
- Flower, J. Roswell. "Evidence of the Baptism." *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 336–337 (April 17, 1920): 4.
- . "God Honors Faith." *Pentecost* 2, no. 3 (February 1, 1910): 1.
- . "How I Received the Baptism in the Holy Spirit [Part 1]." *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 982 (January 21, 1933): 2–3.
- . "How I Received the Baptism in the Holy Spirit [Part 2]." *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 983 (January 28, 1933): 6–7.
- Fockler, Cyrus B. "A Message to Seekers: How I Sought and Received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost." *Good News* 17, no. 12 (December 1926): 16–17.
- . "Big Meeting in Milwaukee, Wis." *Weekly Evangel*, no. 96 (June 26, 1915): 2.
- . *Overcomers*. Milwaukee, 1933.
- . "The Church at Milwaukee." *Weekly Evangel*, no. 146 (July 1, 1916): 11.
- . *Tuning in with the Infinite*. Milwaukee: Gospel Tabernacle, 1925.
- "Foursquare Leaders Deny Members a Fuller Gospel." *Kingdom Voice* 2, no. 5 (March 10, 1940): 1–2.
- Fowler, Clifton L. "Anti-Dispensationalism." *Grace and Truth* 6, no. 11 (November 1928): 329–30..
- Frelich, Paul E. "Pastor Reports Continuation of Revival After Campaign Closes." *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 9 (December 1948): 1, 5.
- "Fresno, California, and Seattle, Washington, Visited by Party." *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 9 (December 1948): 1–2.
- Frodsham, Stanley. "Did Our Lord By His Death on the Cross Atone for Bodily Sickness and Disease? Yes! Praise the Lord!!" *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 496 (May 12, 1923): 8–9.
- . "Did Our Lord By His Death on the Cross Atone for Bodily Sickness and Disease? Yes! Praise the Lord!!" *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 497 (May 19, 1923): 10.

- . “Glorious Victories of God in Dallas, Texas.” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 1 (January 20, 1913): 1.
- . “The 1918 General Council.” *Christian Evangel*, no. 256–257 (October 5, 1918): 2–3.
- . “Our Distinctive Testimony.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 320–321 (December 27, 1919): 8–9.
- . “Remarkable Healing Campaigns.” *Pentecost*, no. 4 (June 1948): 5.
- . *“With Signs Following”: The Story of the Latter-Day Pentecostal Revival*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1928.
- “From Africa.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2, no. 33 (March 1, 1909): 1.
- “From Headquarters.” *Destiny* 8, no. 3 (March 1937): 7.
- Froom, LeRoy E. *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*. 4 vols. Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1946.
- Gaebelein, Arno Clemens. “A Divine Healing Suicide.” *Our Hope* 32, no. 2 (August 1925): 81–82.
- . “Anglo-Israelism Once More.” *Our Hope* 38, no. 7 (January 1932): 421–424.
- . “Christianity vs. Modern Cults.” *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* 22, no. 3 (March 1922): 858–62.
- . “The Anglo-Israel Delusion.” *Our Hope* 34, no. 8 (February 1928): 476–480.
- . “The British-Israel Invention.” *Our Hope* 27, no. 7 (February 1921): 463–468.
- . *The Healing Question: An Examination of the Claims of Faith-Healing and Divine Healing Systems in the Light of the Scriptures and History*. New York: Publication Office “Our Hope,” 1925.
- Gaebelein, Frank E. “Book Reviews.” *Our Hope* 34, no. 8 (February 1928): 512.
- Garr, A.G. “Tongues: The Bible Evidence to the Baptism with the Holy Ghost.” *Pentecostal Power*, March 1907, 2–6.
- Gaston, W.T. “Sister Bosworth’s Funeral.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 316–317 (November 29, 1919): 10.

- . “The Baptism of the Holy Ghost According to Acts 2: Some Objections Answered.” *Christian Evangel*, no. 302–303 (August 23, 1919): 3.
- Gee, Donald. “Extremes Are Sometimes Necessary.” *Voice of Healing* 6, no. 1 (April 1953): 9.
- . *Wind and Flame: Incorporating the Former Book The Pentecostal Movement, with Additional Chapters*. Croydon, England: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1967.
- “General Convention of Pentecostal Saints and Churches of God in Christ.” *Word and Witness* 10, no. 1 (January 20, 1914): 4.
- “General Convention of Pentecostal Saints and Churches of God in Christ.” *Word and Witness* 10, no. 3 (March 20, 1914): 1.
- General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917*. St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1917.
- “George W. Southwick to Michael Barkun,” September 5, 1991. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.
- “Given the Right Hand of Fellowship.” *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 16 (August 6, 1904): 523.
- “God Honors Faith in Bosworth Meetings.” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 5 (April 15, 1922): 75.
- “God Performs Operation after Anointed Ribbon Is Sent to Minister’s Wife.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 8 (November 1948): 12.
- “God’s Witnesses to Divine Healing.” *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 26 (April 16, 1904): 745–747.
- “God’s Witness to Divine Healing.” *Leaves of Healing* 3, no. 39 (July 24, 1897): 609–611, 621.
- “God’s Witness to Divine Healing.” *Leaves of Healing* 9, no. 8 (June 15, 1901): 225–228.
- “God Vindicates Branham in Houston by Most Amazing Photograph Ever Taken.” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 12 (March 1950): 1.
- “Good Tidings from Marion, N.C.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 1, no. 4 (December 15, 1907): 1.

- Gordon, Adoniram Judson. *The Ministry of Healing: Miracles of Cure In All Ages*. Kessinger Publishing, LLC, 2006.
- Goss, Howard A. "Jehovah Still Working at Hot Springs, Ark." *Word and Witness* 9, no. 11 (November 20, 1913): 1.
- . *The Winds of God: The Story of the Early Pentecostal Days (1901-1914) in the Life of Howard A. Goss*. New York: Cornet Press Books, 1958.
- Grant, Del. "Is This the Beginning of the Predicted 'Spiritual Explosion That Will Rock the World'?" *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 7 (October 1948): 1, 4–5.
- Graves, Fred A. "Prayer for Persecutors." *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6 (June 14, 1986): 5.
- Hagin, Kenneth E. *Prevailing Prayer to Peace: [26 Prayer Lessons]*. Tulsa, Okla.: K. Hagin Evangelistic Association, 1973.
- . *The Key to Scriptural Healing*. Tulsa: Faith Library Publications, 1978.
- . *The Name of Jesus*. Faith Library Publications. Tulsa, OK: Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 1979.
- . *Understanding the Anointing*. Tulsa, OK: Faith Library Publications, 1983.
- Hagin, Kenneth W. *The Past Tense Of God's Word*. RHEMA Bible Church, 1980.
- . *The Prison Door Is Open - What Are You Still Doing Inside?*. Faith Library Publications, 2013.
- Haldeman, I.M. "Did Our Lord By His Death on the Cross Atone for Bodily Sickness and Disease No! Never!!" *Our Hope* 29, no. 8 (February 1923): 484–503.
- Harlan, Rolvix. "John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1906.
- "Has Pentecost Come to Johannesburg?" *Confidence* 2, no. 2 (February 1909): 27–31.
- Hawtin, George. *The Abrahamic Covenant*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Artisan Sales, 1988.
- "Healed at the Bosworth Meetings." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 14, no. 232 (September 1921): 2.
- "Healed of Fever." *Leaves of Healing* 16, no. 22 (March 18, 1905): 709.
- "Healed of Gallstones." *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 673 (November 20, 1926): 8, 17.

- “Healed of Total Deafness, Running Ear and Curvature of the Spine.” *Exploits of Faith*, Special Healing Number, n.d., 23–26.
- “Healing in the Atonement.” *Evangelical Christian* 17, no. 6 (June 1921): 164.
- Hines, R.P. “Tongues Are for a Sign.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 85 (April 10, 1915): 2.
- “History of Pentecost.” *Faithful Standard*, November 1922, 8, 14.
- “Hot Springs Assembly: God’s Glory Present.” *Word and Witness* 10, no. 4 (April 20, 1914): 1.
- “Houston Meetings Close; Bosworth Party Opens at Corpus Christi.” *Exploits of Faith* 3, no. 3 (March 1930): 9–11.
- “Houston Newspaper Accounts of the Service That Produced the Remarkable Photograph.” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 12 (March 1950): 4.
- Hugh, Freda. “Divinely Healed of Tuberculosis: How the Lord Used the Printed Page.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 1 (October 1926): 16–22.
- In Loving Memory, Marie Estelle Brown Founder and Pastor Glad Tidings Tabernacle, New York City, 1907-1971*. New York: Glad Tidings Tabernacle, 1971.
- “Israel vs. Judah.” *Kingdom Digest*, May 1947, 7–10.
- “Is This of God?” *Our* 28, no. 7 (January 1922): 404–407.
- Jamieson, S.A. “God Still in Dallas.” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 2 (February 20, 1913): 2.
- . “How a Presbyterian Preacher Received the Baptism.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 883 (January 31, 1931): 2–3.
- . “Revival on at Dallas, Texas.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 141 (May 27, 1916): 14.
- Jeffreys, George. “The Israel Question.” In *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, edited by Charles A. Jennings, 301–5. Owasso, OK: Truth in History, 2010.
- Jennings, F.C. “Is Bodily Healing the Work of God That Characterizes Our Day?” *Our Hope* 28, no. 4 (October 1921): 233–247.
- . “Is Bodily Healing the Work of God That Characterizes Our Day?” *Our Hope* 28, no. 5 (November 1921): 286–302.

- Johnson, Floyd B. "Bosworth Evangelistic Campaign, Lima, Ohio." *World-Wide Christian Courier* 2, no. 10 (October 1927): 13–14.
- Judd, Carrie. "The Work and the Workers." *Triumphs of Faith* 10, no. 1 (January 1890): 19–22.
- . "The Work and the Workers." *Triumphs of Faith* 10, no. 9 (September 1890): 212–215.
- Judd Montgomery, Carrie. "Special Meetings in Oakland." *Triumphs of Faith* 35, no. 9 (September 1915): 216.
- . "The Mighty Power of God at Dallas, Texas." *Triumphs of Faith* 32, no. 12 (December 1912): 267–270.
- . "The Promise of the Father: A Personal Testimony." *Triumphs of Faith* 28, no. 7 (July 1908): 145–149.
- Kellogg, Jay. C. "The United States in Prophecy." *Bible Standard Overcomer* 15, no. 9 (September 1934): 3–4, 13–14.
- Kenyon, Essek William. *The Wonderful Name of Jesus*. Seattle: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1964.
- . "Deferred Answers." *Reality* 8, no. 9 (May 1912): 147–148.
- . "Dying to Self." *Reality* 7, no. 8 (April 1912): 120–122.
- . "Legal Authority." *Reality* 9, no. 1 (January 1914): 1–5.
- . "Legal Authority." *Triumphs of Faith* 34, no. 12 (December 1914): 281–285.
- . "One Secret Victory." *Reality* 7, no. 5 (January 1912): 70–73.
- . "Prayer." *Reality* 7, no. 5 (January 1912): 73–76.
- . *The Father and His Family, the Story of Man's Redemption*. Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1964.
- . "The Heart." *Reality* 7, no. 6 (February 1912): 93.
- . "The New Birth." *Reality* 7, no. 12 (November 1912): 181–183.
- . "The New Kind of Love." *Exploits of Faith* 1, no. 10 (October 1928): 15–16.

- Kerr, D.W. "Do All Speak in Tongues?" *Christian Evangel*, no. 270–271 (January 11, 1919): 7.
- . "Paul's Interpretation of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost." *Christian Evangel*, no. 252–253 (August 24, 1918): 6.
- . "The Basis of Our Distinctive Testimony." *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 460–461 (September 2, 1922): 4.
- . "The Bible Evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost." *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 509 (August 11, 1923): 2–3.
- Kinne, Seeley D. "Open Letter to Elder F.F. Bosworth." *Pentecostal Herald* 4, no. 6 (October 1918): 3.
- Klink, Otto J. "The Jew." *Latter Rain Evangel* 26, no. 7 (March 1935): 6–9.
- Knapp, Martin Wells. *Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies: Or, Devices of the Devil Unmasked*. Cincinnati: Office of the Revivalist, 1898.
- Laggar, William. "A Report on Evangelist F.F. Bosworth in Durban, South Africa." *Voice of Healing* 6, no. 9 (December 1953): 11.
- Lake, John G. *John G. Lake: The Complete Collection of His Life Teachings*. Edited by Roberts Liardon. Tulsa, OK: Albury Publishing, 1999.
- . "South Africa." *Confidence* 2, no. 8 (August 1909): 185.
- Lake, John G., and Talbert Morgan. *John G. Lake's Life & Diary*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2006.
- "Latest News of Rev. Branham Just Receive from Bro. John Sharritt." *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 5 (August 1948): 5, 7.
- Lawrence, Bennett Freeman. *The Apostolic Faith Restored*. St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1916.
- Lee, Bernice C. "A Holy Jubilee." *Bread of Life* 5, no. 11 (November 1956): 3–4, 9–10.
- . "Be Not Anxious for the Morrow." *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 5 (February 1909): 8.
- . "I Will Be Within Thee a Well of Water." *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 7 (April 1909): 20–21.

“Letter from F.F. Bosworth: Zion’s Former Well Known Band Leader Writes to News.”
Zion City News, August 21, 1908.

“Let Us Go Up to Zion.” *Leaves of Healing* 8, no. 16 (February 9, 1901): 498–501.

Lindsay, Gordon. “Cycles of Canada.” *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 5 (May 1, 1940): 3–5,
15.

———. “Cycles of the ‘Sign Woman’ - Israel.” *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 3 (April 1,
1940): 9–12.

———. *John G. Lake, Apostle to Africa*. Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, 1978.

———. *Sketches from the Life and Ministry of John G. Lake*. Shreveport, LA: Voice of
Healing Publishing Company, 1952.

———. *The Blueprints of God: Wonders of Bible Chronology*. Vol. 1. Portland, OR:
Cosbys Printers, 1940.

———. *The Life of John Alexander Dowie, Whose Trials, Tragedies, and Triumphs Are
the Most Fascinating Object Lesson of Christian History*. Shreveport, LA: Voice
of Healing Publishing Co., 1951.

———. “The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part I.” *World-Wide Revival* 10, no.
12 (March 1958): 4–5, 22.

———. “The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part II.” *World-Wide Revival* 11,
no. 1 (April 1958): 4, 17–18.

———. “The Story of the Great Restoration Revival, Part IV.” *World-Wide Revival* 11,
no. 3 (June 1958): 4, 18–19.

———. “The Thirteen Cycles of the United States.” *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 3 (March
1, 1940): 4–5, 12.

———. “The Wonders of Bible Chronology.” *Anglo-Saxon World* 2, no. 2 (February 1,
1940): 3–4, 7.

———. *William Branham: A Man Sent from God*. Jeffersonville, IN: William Branham,
1950.

———. *Wonders of Bible Chronology*. Blueprints of God , Volume I, Abridged.
Portland, OR: Cosbys Printers, 1940.

Lockhart, G.D. *Weekly Evangel*, no. 185 (April 14, 1917): 11.

- “Lost Tribes.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1175 (November 14, 1936): 10.
- “Lubbock, Texas, Sponsors Branham-Bosworth Meet.” *Full Gospel Men’s Voice* 2, no. 10 (February 1955): 22.
- Luther, Martin. “Commentary on Galatians.” In *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, edited by John Dillenberger. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1962.
- Mackenzie, Kenneth. “Are There Modern Miracles?” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 31 (September 29, 1923): 492–493.
- . “Book Review.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 32 (October 22, 1921): 506.
- . “Book Reviews: Dr. Torrey’s ‘Divine Healing.’” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 17 (October 25, 1924): 276.
- . “Jesus and Our Mortal Flesh.” *Alliance Weekly* 56, no. 9 (May 13, 1922): 132–133.
- . “Rev. Kenneth MacKenzie Replies to the Attack Made Upon Evangelist Fred Francis Bosworth by Rev. I.M. Haldeman, D.D.” *National Labor Tribune*, July 5, 1923, 3.
- MacLennan, Stewart P. “Anglo-Israelism.” *Our Hope* 38, no. 2 (August 1931): 105–114.
- MacMillan, J.A. “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy.” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 35 (September 1, 1934): 548–549.
- . “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy.” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 37 (September 15, 1934): 580–581.
- . “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy.” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 38 (September 22, 1934): 596–97, 602.
- . “British-Israelism--A Latter-Time Heresy.” *Alliance Weekly* 69, no. 39 (September 29, 1934): 612–613.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100-400*. Yale University Press, 1984.
- Mahan, Asa. *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection: With Other Kindred Subjects, Illustrated and Confirmed in a Series of Discourses Designed to Throw Light on the Way of Holiness*. D.S. King, 1839.
- “Mansfield, Ohio.” *Leaves of Healing* 7, no. 12 (July 14, 1900): 371.

Manual of the Pilgrim Holiness Church: Containing Form of Government and Ritual for Churches; Also Location of Ministers. Etcetera... Easton, MD: Easton Publishing Company, 1922.

“Marked Movements of God in Healing.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 12 (June 4, 1921): 186.

McAlister, R.E. *The Pentecostal Movement: What It Is and What It Stands For*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.

McCrossan, T.J. *Bodily Healing and the Atonement*. Seattle, WA: McCrossan, 1930.

McPherson, Aimee Semple. *This Is That: Personal Experiences, Sermons and Writings of Aimee Semple McPherson, Evangelist*. Los Angeles: Bridal Call Publishing House, 1919.

McWhirter, James. *Britain and Palestine in Prophecy*. London, Methuen & Co., 1937.

“Messages of the Moment.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 162 (October 28, 1916): 8.

Meyer, Rose. “Child Healed of Sarcoma Cancer.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 10 (July 1927): 21–22.

———. “Moving Pictures in God’s Kaleidoscope.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 12 (September 1927): 18–21.

———. “When the Good Samaritan Came to Altoona.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 19, no. 9 (June 1927): 5–8.

“Midwinter Pentecostal Convention.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 164 (November 11, 1916): 11.

Miller, B.C. “The Fundamentalist and Divine Healing.” *Golden Grain* 1, no. 5 (July 1926): 5–8.

Miller, F.B. “A Revival of Divine Healing.” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 30 (October 23, 1920): 473–474.

“Minister Is Healed as Brother Bosworth Prays.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 4 (July 1948): 10.

“Minutes of the Executive Presbytery.” General Council of the Assemblies of God, November 25, 1914. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.

Minutes of the General Council, 1949 and Annual Report for 1948. The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1949.

- Minutes of the General Council, 1950 and Annual Report for 1949.* The Christian and Missionary Alliance, 1950.
- Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1915.* n.p., 1915.
- Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1916.* St. Louis, MO, 1916.
- Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1917.* St. Louis, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1917.
- Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the General Council of the Assemblies of God...1918.* Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1918.
- “Miracles.” *Our Hope* 28, no. 4 (October 1921): 207–9.
- “Miracles of Healing in Dallas.” *Latter Rain Evangel*, October 1912, 13–14.
- “Missionaries to Johannesburg, South Africa.” *Apostolic Faith*, (Los Angeles), 11, no. 13 (May 1908): 4.
- Mitchell, Hardy. “Milwaukee, Wis.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 103 (August 14, 1915): 1.
- Moomau, Antoinette. “China Missionary Receives Pentecost.” *Apostolic Faith*, (Los Angeles), 1, no. 11 (January 1908): 3.
- Moon, R.H. “When God Visited Lima, Ohio.” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 26 (September 25, 1920): 414.
- Moore, Anna Jeanne. “Historic Conference of Evangelists Conducting Great Healing Campaigns Convened in Dallas December 22-23.” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 11 (February 1950): 1–3.
- Moorehead, Max Wood. “A Personal Testimony.” *Cloud of Witnesses to Pentecost in India*, no. 2 (September 1907): 36–38.
- “More on the South African Revival with Bros. Branham, Baxter and Bosworth.” *Herald of Faith* 17, no. 6 (June 1952): 9–10.
- “Mother and Sons Have a Wonderful Story.” *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 4 (April 1931): 15–16.
- Mueller, Rose. “The Blind See, the Deaf Hear, Cancers Healed.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 15, no. 7 (April 1922): 20–21.
- Myland, D. Wesley. *The Latter Rain Covenant and Pentecostal Power*. Springfield, MO: Temple Press, 1910.

- Nelson, Thomas H. "Dowie's Followers Relive Glorious Days of Past as Branham and Bosworth Minister in Zion." *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 2 (May 1949): 1, 16.
- "New Branch Organizations." *Bulletin of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America* 2, no. 23 (November 1931): 87.
- "News Clip: Houston Press, 1950." Living Word Press, n.d. 30/4/1. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.
- "New Tracts." *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 10 (July 1914): 11.
- "New Year's Tabernacle Camp Meeting." *World-Wide Christian Courier* 3, no. 1 (January 1928): 5.
- "New York Visitation of Elijah the Restorer and Zion Restoration Host." *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 5 (November 21, 1903): 139–50.
- "North Michigan Rocked by Mighty Revival." *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 3 (June 1949): 1, 15.
- "Notes." *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 11 (August 1914): 12.
- "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field." *Leaves of Healing* 7, no. 13 (July 21, 1900): 410.
- "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field." *Leaves of Healing* 8, no. 10 (December 29, 1900): 314.
- "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field." *Leaves of Healing* 8, no. 23 (March 30, 1901): 713.
- "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field." *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 24 (April 4, 1903): 760.
- "Notes from Zion's Harvest Field." *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 23 (March 26, 1904): 693.
- "Notes: Holding the Truth in Love." *Latter Rain Evangel* 2, no. 5 (February 1910): 12.
- "Not I But Christ: Fourth Annual Convention in the Stone Church." *Latter Rain Evangel* 4, no. 9 (June 1912): 2–6.
- "Notice." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2, no. 44 (August 15, 1909): 2.
- "Obeying God in Baptism." *Leaves of Healing* 11, no. 17 (August 16, 1902): 576.
- "Obeying God in Baptism." *Leaves of Healing* 11, no. 19 (August 30, 1902): 644.
- "Obeying God in Baptism." *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 2 (November 1, 1902): 60.

- “Obeying God in Baptism.” *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 15 (August 1, 1903): 487.
- “Obeying God in Baptism.” *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 15 (August 1, 1903): 486.
- “Obeying God in Baptism.” *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 23 (September 26, 1903): 742.
- “Obeying God in Baptism.” *Leaves of Healing* 14, no. 1 (October 24, 1903): 29.
- “Obeying God in Baptism.” *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 4 (May 14, 1904): 111.
- “Obeying God in Baptism.” *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 15 (July 30, 1904): 490, 491.
- O’Connor, Edward. “Pentecost and Catholicism.” *Ecumenist* 6, no. 5 (August 1968): 161–64.
- Official List of Ministers and Missionaries of the General Council Assemblies of God, Revised November 1, 1930.* Springfield, MO: General Council Assemblies of God, 1930.
- O’Neal, Thomas J. “Announcement.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 231 (March 16, 1918): 15.
- “Opening of Blue Island (Ills.) Campaign.” *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 6 (June 1931): 6–9.
- Opperman, Daniel C.O. “Our Lord Is Giving the Victory.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 4, no. 84 (April 15, 1911): 3.
- . “God Stretching Out His Hand to Heal.” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 1.
- “Ordained Elders, Pastors, Ministers, Evangelists and Missionaries of the Churches of God in Christ with Their Stations for 1914.” *Word and Witness*, December 20, 1913, 4.
- “Ordained Ministers of the Churches of God in Christ with Their Locations,” August 1, 1912.
- “Ordained Ministers of the Churches of God in Christ with Their Locations (revised),” February 1, 1913.
- Osborn, T. L. “Commemoration.” *Faith Digest* 3, no. 3 (March 1958): 17–18.
- Osborn, T. L. “F.F. Bosworth Promoted to Eternal Reward.” *Full Gospel Business Men’s Voice* 6, no. 3 (April 1958): 25.
- . *Frontier Evangelism: God’s Indispensable [sic] Method for World Evangelism.* Tulsa, OK: Osborn Foundation, 1955.

- . “God in Flesh Again: Memorial Message for William Branham.” Sermon, Phoenix, Arizona, January 26, 1966.
<http://www.williambranhamhomepage.org/wbmtos.htm>.
- . *Healing En Masse*. Tulsa, OK: Osborn, 1958.
- . *Healing the Sick and Casting out Devils, the Message and Ministry of a Bible Discipline Now Living. Christ’s Power of Attorney Exercised Today*,. Tulsa, OK, 1950.
- . “He Prayed Earnestly for Himself.” *Full Gospel Business Men’s Voice* 6, no. 4 (May 1958): 25–26.
- Osborn, T. L, and Daisy Osborn. *Faith Library in 23 Volumes: 20th Century Legacy of Apostolic Evangelism*. Tulsa, OK; Birmingham, U.K.: OSFO International.
- “Our Hearts Have Been Thrilled and Blessed.” *Exploits of Faith* 10, no. 7 (July 1937): 11.
- “Our Summer Meetings.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 11 (September 1913): 12–13.
- “Our Trip East.” *Apostolic Faith*, (Baxter Springs, KS), 3, no. 3 (March 1927): 7.
- Oxonian (Walter Metcalfe H. Milner). *Israel’s Wanderings; Or, The Sciiths, the Saxons, and the Kymry*, 1885.
- Oyer, Amos. “Healed of Spinal Trouble After Years of Suffering.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 20, no. 3 (December 1927): 22–23.
- Ozman, Agnes. “Where the Latter Rain First Fell.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 4 (January 1909): 2.
- Palmer, Phoebe. *Phoebe Palmer: Selected Writings*. Edited by Thomas Oden. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Panton, D.M. “British Israelism or Anglo Israelism,” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 19 (November 8, 1924): 315.
- . “Anglo-Israelism,” *Alliance Weekly* 68, no. 32 (August 12, 1933): 500–501, 506.
- Parham, Charles F. “A Pleasurable Meeting.” *Apostolic Faith* 2, no. 4 (April 1926): 11.
- . *The Sermons of Charles F. Parham*. Edited by Donald W. Dayton. The Higher Christian Life. New York: Garland Pub., 1985.
- . “The Ten Lost Tribes.” *Apostolic Faith* 4, no. 2 (February 1928): 10–11.

- Parham, Sarah E. *The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement*. Baxter Springs, KS, 1930.
- “Pastoral Personnel.” *Alliance Weekly* 86, no. 48 (December 5, 1951): 13.
- “Paulding and Oceola, Ohio.” *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 15 (January 31, 1903): 477.
- Perkins, Eunice May. *Fred Francis Bosworth (the Joybringer)*. River Forest, IL: F.F. Bosworth, 1927.
- . *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story*. Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921.
- Perkins, Jonathan Ellsworth. *The Baptism of the Holy Spirit*. Los Angeles: B.N. Robertson, 1945.
- Perry, Mattie E. “A Call to Prayer.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 12, no. 5 (February 1920): 8–9.
- . *Christ and Answered Prayer*. Nashville: Benson Printing Company, 1939.
- “Personal Testimony of Pastor Durham.” *Pentecostal Testimony*, March 1909, 7.
- Pinson, M.M. “A Statement from Bro. Pinson.” *Christian Evangel*, no. 280–281 (March 22, 1919): 9.
- . “Trip to the Southwest.” *Word and Witness* 8, no. 6 (August 20, 1912): 1.
- Piper, William H. “Long Weary Months of Spiritual Drought.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 1 (October 1908): 3–6.
- . “Manifestations and ‘Demonstrations’ of the Spirit.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 1, no. 1 (October 1908): 16–20.
- “Plan 2 Regional Conventions.” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 68 (August 1935): 6.
- Pope, W.H. “Great Times of Refreshing at Pawhuska, Oklahoma.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 171 (January 6, 1917): 16.
- . “Why I Believe All Who Receive the Full Baptism Will Speak in Other Tongues.” *Christian Evangel*, no. 244–245 (June 15, 1918): 6–7.
- “Preliminary Statement Concerning the Principles Involved in the New Issue.” *Word and Witness* 12, no. 6 (June 1915): 1.
- “Profound Confirmation by Catholic Convert of Supernatural Light.” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 12 (March 1950): 4.

- Putnam, Charles Elsworth. *Modern Religio-Healing, Man Theories Or God's Word?*. Chicago: C.E. Putnam, 1924.
- Rader, Luke. "Is British-Israelism a Dangerous Fallacy?" *Sunshine News*, An Excerpt from the Sunshine News, July 16, 1936.
- Rader, Paul. *The Man of Mercy*. Chicago Gospel Tabernacle, Chapel Book Stall, 1928.
- Rand, Howard B. "Convention Declared Success." *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 67 (July 1935): 1, 7.
- Reiff, Anna C. "The Day of Chicago's Visitation." *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 10 (August 1913): 2–11.
- "Report of Meeting: Newton, N.C., July 18, 1910." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 3, no. 67 (August 1, 1910): 4.
- "Reports of God's Working." *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 2 (March 26, 1921): 26.
- "Rev. and Mrs. F.F. Bosworth Work with Branham Party." *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 2 (May 1948): 1, 5.
- "Revival Fires." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 14, no. 227 (February 1921): 1.
- "Revivals in Atlanta, GA." *Bridegroom's Messenger* 16, no. 246 (August 1923): 2.
- Richards, E.J. "Annual Report of Secretary of Home Department." *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 17 (July 9, 1921): 261.
- Richey, Raymond T. "A Telegram from Houston, Texas." *Weekly Evangel*, no. 225 (February 2, 1918): 3.
- . "Work Amongst the Soldiers." *Weekly Evangel*, no. 220 (December 22, 1917): 10.
- Riley, W.B. *Divine Healing, Or, Does God Hear Prayer for the Sick?*. Minneapolis: L.W. Camp, n.d.
- Roadhouse, W.F. "Anglo-Israelism." *Alliance Weekly* 62, no. 36 (September 4, 1937): 563–565.
- . "Anglo-Israelism." *Alliance Weekly* 62, no. 37 (September 11, 1937): 581–583.
- Roberts, Oral. *Miracle of Seed-Faith*. Tulsa, OK: Roberts, 1970.

- . “Personal Word from Oral Roberts About F.F. Bosworth.” *Healing Waters* 2, no. 3 (February 1949): 4.
- “Rominger a Parhamite!!!” *Zion Herald*, October 25, 1907.
- Salvation Army. *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers of the Salvation Army*. London: Headquarters of the Salvation Army, 1891.
- Sandford, Frank. “Who God’s Ancient People Are.” In *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, edited by Charles A. Jennings. Owasso, OK: Truth in History, 2010.
- Schoeman, A.J. “Great Revivals in Africa with Branham Party.” *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 10 (January 1952): 8.
- “Second Special Conference of Ordained Officers of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion.” *Leaves of Healing* 15, no. 21 (September 10, 1904): 740.
- “Self-Deception and Fraud.” *Our Hope* 28, no. 3 (September 1921): 140–42.
- “Seventh Anniversary of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion.” *Leaves of Healing* 12, no. 19 (February 28, 1903): 593.
- Sexton, E.A. “Sanctification the Necessary Preparation for the Pentecostal Baptism.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 3, no. 65 (July 1, 1910): 1.
- Shakarian, Demos. “Two Chapters Organized in Florida.” *Full Gospel Men’s Voice* 1, no. 1 (February 1953): 6–11.
- “Signs Following in Milwaukee.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 7, no. 11 (August 1915): 14–15.
- Simpson, Albert B. *The Gospel of Healing*. Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications, 1915.
- Simpson, Albert Benjamin. *Days of Heaven upon Earth*. Nyack, NY: Christian Alliance Publishing Co., 1897.
- “Sinus Trouble Cured.” *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 2 (February 1931): 9.
- Sisson, Elizabeth. “A Series of Baptisms.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 8 (May 1914): 10–11.
- . “Four Years’ Continuous Revival.” *Confidence* 8, no. 4 (April 1915): 69, 71–72.
- . “Healing a Man Born Blind: The Power of the Word in Dallas, Texas.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 6, no. 7 (April 1914): 2–4.

- . “The Council and Missionary Conference.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 208 (September 29, 1917): 4.
- “Sister Etter Now in St. Louis.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 96 (June 26, 1915): 1.
- Sitton, Rev., and Gordon Lindsay. “Branham in Houston; City Sees ‘Something Different.’” *Voice of Healing* 2, no. 11 (February 1950): 3, 16.
- Smith, Oswald J. “British Israelism, A Dangerous Fallacy.” *Defender*, July 1936, 16–19, 21.
- . *The Great Physician*. Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1927.
- . *Who Are the False Prophets?*. Toronto: Peoples Press, 1953.
- “Southern District Organized.” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 19 (August 7, 1920): 299.
- Southwick, George W. “Controversy in Zion: For the Benefit of Our Pentecostal Brethren.” In *Who Hath Believed Our Report?: A Biblical-Historical Defense of the Anglo-Israel Message Through the Lives, Testimonies, and Ministries of Many Outstanding Men of God!*, edited by Charles A. Jennings, 191–99. Owasso, OK: Truth in History Ministries, 2010.
- “Special Notice to Illinois Subscribers.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 12 (March 1948): 16.
- Spitz, Lewis William, ed. “The Geneva Confession.” In *The Protestant Reformation: Major Documents*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997.
- Stadsklev, Julius. “Greatest Religious Meetings in History of South Africa Inspired by Wm. Branham.” *Voice of Healing* 4, no. 12 (March 1952): 14–15.
- . *William Branham: A Prophet Visits South Africa*. Minneapolis: Julius Stadsklev, 1952.
- Stephens, John W. “Our Chicago Convention.” *Bulletin of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America* 2, no. 22 (October 1931): 75–76.
- “Stone Church Meetings.” *Latter Rain Evangel*, April 1913, 12.
- “St. Paul, Minn.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 1 (March 19, 1921): 14.
- “Suffered for Five Years.” *Exploits of Faith* 4, no. 3 (March 1931): 15.
- “Testimonies from Toronto.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 37 (November 26, 1921): 586.

- “Testimonies to Divine Healing from the Bosworth Meetings.” *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 45 (February 5, 1920): 716.
- “Testimonies Under Oath.” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 1.
- “The Anglo-Israel Error.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1392 (January 11, 1941): 12.
- “The Anglo-Israel Movement.” *Bible Standard* 7, no. 2 (1926): 7–8.
- “The Anglo-Israel Theory.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, January 16, 1943, 10.
- “The Believer’s Body.” *Our Hope* 28, no. 3 (September 1921): 142–144.
- “The Bosworth Campaign in Toronto.” *Evangelical Christian* 17, no. 7 (July 1921): 199–200, 218.
- “The Bosworth Meetings.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 386–387 (April 2, 1921): 7.
- “The Bosworth Party in Atlanta, Georgia.” *Alliance Weekly* 60, no. 10 (March 7, 1925): 167.
- “The Bosworth Revival Campaign in Houston, Texas.” *Weekly Evangel*, no. 213 (November 3, 1917): 14.
- “The British-Israel Delusion.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1357 (May 11, 1940): 7.
- “The Cloud of His Glory Upon Us.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 9 (June 1913): 2–5.
- “The Convention Program.” *Messenger of the Covenant* 6, no. 65 (May 1935): 2.
- “The Council at St. Louis.” *Christian Evangel*, no. 210 (October 13, 1917): 2–3.
- “The Critics Answered by Evangelist F.F. Bosworth.” *Alliance Weekly* 59, no. 5 (August 2, 1924): 77–78.
- “The ‘Deliverance Campaigns.’” *Pentecost*, no. 37 (June 1956): 17.
- “The Distinction Between Israel and Judah.” *Kingdom Digest*, June 1952.
- “The Editor’s Meetings.” *Evangelical Christian* 18, no. 4 (April 1922): 116.
- “The Healing Craze.” *Our Hope* 28, no. 3 (September 1921): 139–40.
- “The Kingdom of God Is Come.” *Leaves of Healing* 7, no. 14 (July 28, 1900): 427–35.
- “The ‘Latter Rain.’” *Pentecost*, no. 20 (June 1952): 17.

- “The ‘Latter Rain’ in Zion City.” *Apostolic Faith*, (Los Angeles), 1, no. 9 (September 1907): 1.
- “The Montwait Meeting: Testimonies Under Oath.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 8, no. 142 (October 15, 1913): 4.
- “The Revival Campaign in Toronto: Services Marked by Simplicity.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 8 (May 6, 1921): 122.
- “These Two Letters Speak for Themselves.” *Sunshine News*, An Excerpt from the *Sunshine News*, July 16, 1936.
- “The Story of Zion’s Victory Over the Devil and the Pig in Minnesota.” *Leaves of Healing* 5, no. 41 (August 5, 1899): 792–99.
- “The Value of Speaking in Tongues.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 1, no. 12 (April 15, 1908): 4.
- “The Wonderful Works of God.” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 14, no. 229 (April 1921): 2.
- “Third Anniversary of the Consecration of the Zion Temple Site.” *Leaves of Healing* 13, no. 14 (July 25, 1903): 426.
- Thomas, Rupert C. *The Coming of Christ and Israel-Britain’s Identity*. London: The Covenant Publishing Company, 1935.
- Thomas, W.H. Griffith. “Divine Healing: A Criticism of ‘Our Physical Heritage in Christ’ by Kenneth MacKenzie.” *Our Hope* 31, no. 7 (January 1925): 418–22.
- Thomsen, N.P. “Anglo-Israelism, Under the Searchlight of God’s Word.” *Latter Rain Evangel* 26, no. 8 (May 1934): 3–6.
- “To Preachers.” *Word and Witness* 9, no. 10 (October 20, 1913): 4.
- Torrey, R. A. *Divine Healing; Does God Perform Miracles Today?*. 1924; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1974.
- “Trance Evangelism.” *Leaves of Healing*, (First Series), 1, no. 5, 6, 7 (December 1890): 98–100.
- Twenty-Ninth Annual Report of the Christian and Missionary Alliance for the Year 1925*. New York, 1926.
- Van Arsdale, Chas. N. “The Sheridan Campaign.” *Alliance Weekly* 55, no. 44 (January 14, 1922): 698.

- Van Dusen, Henry P. "The Third Force in Christendom." *Life*, June 9, 1958.
- Varley, Frank. "Is Britain Israel?" *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 1551 (January 29, 1944): 3.
- "Vindication of William Branham of Attack by 'Prophecy Magazine.'" *Voice of Healing* 7, no. 8 (November 1954): 8.
- Walthall, W. Jethro. "Do All Speak in Tongues Who Receive the Baptism?" *Christian Evangel*, no. 248–248 (July 27, 1918): 6.
- "Warren Collins Non-Council Files," n.d. 30/2/8. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center.
- Welch, J.W. "A Visit Among the Saints in Oklahoma, California and Texas." *Weekly Evangel*, no. 173 (January 20, 1917): 8.
- Wesley, John. *The Works of John Wesley*. 3rd ed., complete and unabridged. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1978.
- "What Power Is It?" *Our Hope* 28, no. 5 (November 1921): 268–271.
- Whiteside, E.D. "An Apostolic Revival." *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 39 (December 25, 1920): 616.
- "William Branham in Lausanne." *Pentecost*, no. 34 (December 1955): 7.
- Wilson, Everett. "Wonderful Signs: Soon Coming Christ." *Bible Standard* 3, no. 3 (1922): 4.
- "Witnesses to the Power of God." *Alliance Weekly* 54, no. 49 (March 5, 1921): 780.
- Wittich, Philip. "Answering the Objections in the Book of Jonah." *Latter Rain Evangel*, March 1926, 5–8.
- "Woman Completely Healed While Bro. Bosworth Is Preaching." *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 8 (November 1948): 12.
- Woodworth-Etter, Maria Beulah. *Signs and Wonders God Wrought in the Ministry for Forty Years*. Indianapolis, IN: [Mrs. M.B.W. Etter], 1916.
- Woodworth-Etter, Maria Beulah Underwood Woodworth. *Acts of the Holy Ghost: Or The Life, Work, and Experience of Mrs. M. B. Woodworth-Etter, Evangelist*. Dallas, TX: John F. Worley Printing Company, 1912.
- Woodworth-Etter, M.B. "Neglect Not the Gift That Is In Thee." *Latter Rain Evangel* 5, no. 10 (August 1913): 13–17.

“Woodworth-Etter Meetings in Dallas (Texas).” *Confidence* 5, no. 11 (November 1912): 258–59.

“Word from Bro. Branham.” *Voice of Healing* 1, no. 5 (August 1948): 1.

“World-Wide Revival Crusade.” *Voice of Healing* 6, no. 4 (July 1953): 2–3.

Wyburn Fitch, May. “Bosworth Campaign in Atlanta.” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 28 (September 8, 1923): 450.

———. “The Healing Delusion.” *Our Hope* 33, no. 11 (May 1927): 687–90.

———. *The Healing Delusion: Dealing with the Doctrine, the Methods Prevailing and the Claims Made in the Present-Day Healing Campaigns*. New York: Loizeaux Bros., Bible Truth Depot, n.d.

———. “Williamsport Campaign.” *Alliance Weekly* 57, no. 47 (January 19, 1924): 760.

Wyburn, Susie May Patterson. “*But, until Seventy Times Seven*”: *Jeremiah, Samuel, John*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1936.

Yeomans, Lilian B. *Healing from Heaven*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1973.

Yeomans, Lillian B. “Out of the Depths: A Testimony.” *Christian and Missionary Alliance* 29, no. 20 (February 15, 1908): 330–331.

———. “This Is the Rest...and This Is the Refreshing.” *Pentecostal Evangel*, no. 845 (April 26, 1930): 1.

“Zion City, Ill.” *Christian Evangel*, August 10, 1913, 8.

“Zion City Subscribers.” *Household of God* 4, no. 12 (December 1908): 8.

Newspapers

Altoona (PA) Mirror

Belvidere (IL) Daily Republican

Chester (PA) Times

Chicago Daily Herald

Chicago Daily News

Chicago Heights Star

Dallas Morning News

Daily Gleaner (Kingston, Jamaica)

Freeport (IL) Journal Standard

Houston Chronicle

Los Angeles Times

Lubbock-Avalanche Journal (Lubbock, TX)

Madison Wisconsin State Journal

National Labor Tribune (Pittsburgh, PA)

New York Times

Oak Park (IL) Leaves

Ottawa Citizen

Pottstown (PA) Mercury

Southtown Economist (Chicago)

Syracuse (NY) Herald

Waukegan (IL) Daily Sun

Williamsport (PA) Sun Gazette

Zion Banner (Zion City, IL)

Zion City (IL) Independent

Zion City (IL) News

Zion Herald (Zion City, IL)

Secondary Sources

- Alexander, Thomas G. "Wilford Woodruff and the Changing Nature of Mormon Religious Experience." *Church History* 45, no. 1 (March 1, 1976): 56–69.
- Althouse, Peter. *Spirit of the Last Days: Pentecostal Eschatology in Conversation with Jürgen Moltmann*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, 25. London, New York: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Anderson, Allan. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Anderson, Robert Mapes. *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1992.
- Atkinson, William. *The "Spiritual Death" of Jesus: A Pentecostal Investigation*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Baer, Jonathan R. "Perfectly Empowered Bodies Divine Healing in Modernizing America." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2002.
- Barkun, Michael. *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origins of the Christian Identity Movement*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Barnes, Roscoe. "F.F. Bosworth: A Historical Analysis of the Influential Factors in His Life and Ministry." Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria, 2009.
- . *F.F. Bosworth: The Man Behind "Christ the Healer"*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.
- . "Why F.F. Bosworth and His Family Moved to Fitzgerald, Ga." Accessed November 6, 2013.
http://www.academia.edu/2281739/Why_F._F._Bosworth_and_His_Family_Moved_to_Fitzgerald_Ga.
- Barron, Bruce A. "Rechristianizing America: The Reconstruction and Kingdom Now Movements in American Evangelical Christianity." Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1991.
- Bassett, Paul. "The Theological Identity of the North American Holiness Movement." In *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, edited by Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston, 72–108. Univ. of Tennessee Press, 2001.
- Ben-Dor Benite, Zvi. *The Ten Lost Tribes: A World History*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

- Berger, Peter L. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism." *Social Research* 21, no. 4 (December 1, 1954): 467–85.
- Blomgren, Jr., Oscar. "Man of God: Fred F. Bosworth, Part VII: The National Radio Revival." *Herald of Faith*, May 1964, 14–15.
- Blumhofer, Edith L. "A Pentecostal Branch Grows in Dowie's Zion: Charles F. Parham's 1906 Invasion." *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6 (September 1, 1986): 3–5.
- . "A Woman Used by the Spirit." *Paraclete* 21, no. 3 (June 1, 1987): 5–9.
- . "The Christian Catholic Apostolic Church and the Apostolic Faith: A Study in the 1906 Pentecostal Revival." In *Charismatic Experiences in History*, edited by Cecil M. Robeck, 126–46. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1985.
- Blumhofer, Edith Waldvogel. *Aimee Semple McPherson: Everybody's Sister*. Library of Religious Biography. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- . *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- . *The Assemblies of God: A Chapter in the Story of American Pentecostalism*. Vol. 1. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1989.
- Bonk, Jon. *Between Past and Future: Evangelical Mission Entering the Twenty-First Century*. William Carey Library, 2003.
- Bowler, Kate. *Blessed: A History of the American Prosperity Gospel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Brown, Kenneth O. *Inskip, McDonald, Fowler: "Wholly and Forever Thine": Early Leadership in the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness*. Hazleton, PA: Holiness Archives, 1999.
- Brumbach, Carl. *Suddenly ... from Heaven: A History of the Assemblies of God*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1961.
- Burpeau, Kemp Pendleton. *God's Showman: A Historical Study of John G. Lake and South African/American Pentecostalism*. Oslo: Refleks, 2004.
- Cartwright, Desmond W. *The Great Evangelists: The Lives of George and Stephen Jeffreys*. Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986.
- Chappell, Paul Gale. "The Divine Healing Movement in America." Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1983.

- Cho, Kyu-Hyung. "The Move to Independence from Anglican Leadership: An Examination of the Relationship between Alexander Alfred Boddy and the Early Leaders of the British Pentecostal Denominations (1907-1930)." Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham (United Kingdom), 2009.
- Clemmons, Ithiel C. *Bishop C.H. Mason and the Roots of the Church of God in Christ*. Bakersfield, CA: Pneuma Life Publishing, 1996.
- Cook, Philip L. *Zion City, Illinois: Twentieth-Century Utopia*. Syracuse University Press, 1996.
- Cox, Harvey Gallagher. *Fire from Heaven the Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2001.
- Creech, Joe. "Visions of Glory: The Place of the Azusa Street Revival in Pentecostal History." *Church History* 65, no. 3 (September 1, 1996): 405–24.
- Cunningham, Raymond J. "From Holiness to Healing : The Faith Cure in America 1872-1892." *Church History* 43, no. 4 (December 1, 1974): 499–513.
- Curtis, Heather D. "A Sane Gospel: Radical Evangelicals, Psychology, and Pentecostal Revival in the Early Twentieth Century." *Religion and American Culture* 21, no. 2 (June 1, 2011): 195–226.
- . *Faith in the Great Physician: Suffering and Divine Healing in American Culture, 1860-1900*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- . "'God Is Not Affected by the Depression': Pentecostal Missions during the 1930s." *Church History* 80, no. 3 (September 1, 2011): 579–589.
- Dayton, Donald W. "Asa Mahan and the Development of American Holiness Theology." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 9 (March 1, 1974): 60–69.
- . "From Christian Perfection to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost.'" In *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, 39–54. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1975.
- . *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Studies in Evangelicalism, No. 5. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987.
- Dieter, Melvin E. *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1996.
- . "The Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal Movements: Commonalities, Confrontation, and Dialogue." *Pneuma* 12, no. 1 (March 1, 1990): 4–13.

- Dixon, Larry E. "Have the 'Jewels of the Church' Been Found Again: The Irving-Darby Debate on Miraculous Gifts." *Evangelical Journal* 5, no. 2 (Fall 1987): 78–92.
- Dorsett, Lyle W. *A Passion for God: The Spiritual Journey of A.W. Tozer*. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2008.
- Duyzer, Peter. *Heterodox Tsunami: The Theology of William Branham, Scriptural or Heretical?*. Delta, BC: Peter Duyzer, 2004.
- Edsor, Albert W. *Set Your House in Order: God's Call to George Jeffreys as the Founder of the Elim Pentecostal Movement*. Chichester, West Sussex: New Wine Press, 1989.
- Eskridge, Larry K. "Only Believe: Paul Rader and the Chicago Gospel Tabernacle, 1922-1933." M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1985.
- Faupel, David W. *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 10. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Faupel, D. William. "The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought." Ph.D. diss., Department of Theology, University of Birmingham, 1989.
- . "The Function of 'Models' in the Interpretation of Pentecostal Thought." *Pneuma* 2, no. 1 (March 1, 1980): 51–71.
- Flegg, Columba Graham. *"Gathered under Apostles": A Study of the Catholic Apostolic Church*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Foxworth, John David. "Raymond T. Richey: An Interpretive Biography." Ph.D. diss., Regent University, 2011.
- Friesen, Aaron T. *Norming the Abnormal: The Development and Function of the Doctrine of Initial Evidence in Classical Pentecostalism*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013.
- Fudge, Thomas. *Daniel Warner and the Paradox of Religious Democracy in Nineteenth-Century America*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998.
- Gardiner, Gordon. "A Herald of Glad Tidings: Part One." *Bread of Life* 3, no. 5 (May 1954): 3–4, 8–10.
- . "Herald of Glad Tidings: Part Two." *Bread of Life* 3, no. 6 (June 1954): 5–6, 9–10.

- . “Herald of Glad Tidings: Part Three.” *Bread of Life* 3, no. 7 (July 1954): 9–10.
- . “Herald of Glad Tidings: Part Four.” *Bread of Life* 3, no. 8 (August 1954): 5–6.
- . “The Apostle of Divine Healing.” *Bread of Life*, 6, no. 3 (March 1957): 3–9, 11–15.
- . *Out of Zion into All the World*. Shippensburg, PA: Companion Press, 1990.
- Gill, Gillian. *Mary Baker Eddy*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books, 1998.
- Goff, James R. *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988.
- Gonen, Rivka. *To the Ends of the Earth: The Quest for the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 2002.
- Grass, Tim. *Lord’s Watchman: A Life of Edward Irving (1792-1834)*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012.
- Gregory, Chester W. *The History of the United Holy Church of America, Inc., 1886-2000*. Baltimore, MD: Gateway Press, 2000.
- Guelzo, Allen C. “Oberlin Perfectionism and Its Edwardsian Origins, 1835-1870.” In *Jonathan Edwards’s Writings: Text, Context, Interpretation*, edited by Stephen J. Stein, 159–74. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- Haines, Michael R. “Selected Population Characteristics – Median Age, Sex Ratio, Annual Growth Rate, and Number, by Race, Urban Residence, and Nativity: 1790–2000, Table Aa22-35.” In *Historical Statistics of the United States, Earliest Times to the Present: Millennial Edition*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, and et al. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/ISBN-9780511132971.Aa1-10910.1017/ISBN-9780511132971.Aa1-109>.
- Hardesty, Nancy. *Faith Cure: Divine Healing in the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003.
- Harrell, David Edwin. *All Things Are Possible: The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.
- Hathaway, Malcolm R. “The Role of William Oliver Hutchinson and the Apostolic Faith Church in the Formation of British Pentecostal Churches.” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 16 (January 1, 1996): 40–57.

- Heath, Elaine A. *Naked Faith: The Mystical Theology of Phoebe Palmer*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series, 108. Eugene, Or.: Pickwick Publications, 2009.
- Hejzlar, Pavel. *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis Macnutt in Dialogue*. Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies, 4. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Hindmarsh, D. Bruce. *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Hollenweger, Walter J. *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- . “Pentecostals and the Charismatic Movement.” In *The Study of Spirituality*, edited by Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, 549–54. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- . *The Pentecostals*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Incorporated, 1988.
- . *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972.
- Hudson, David Neil. “A Schism and Its Aftermath: An Historical Analysis of Denominational Disruption in the Elim Pentecostal Church, 1939-1940.” Ph.D. diss., King’s College London (University of London), 1999.
- . “Dealing with the Fire: Early Pentecostal Responses to the Practices of Speaking in Tongues and Spoken Prophecy.” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 28, no. 2 (January 1, 2008): 145–157.
- . “The Earliest Days of British Pentecostalism.” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 21 (January 1, 2001): 49–67.
- Jacobsen, Douglas. *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003.
- Johnston, Robin. *Howard A. Goss: A Pentecostal Life*. Word Aflame Press, 2010.
- Jones, Charles Edwin. *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism, 1867-1936*. ATLA Monograph Series, No. 5. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974.
- King, Gerald W. *Disfellowshipped: Pentecostal Responses to Fundamentalism in the United States, 1906-1943*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2011.

- . “Streams of Convergence: The Pentecostal-Fundamentalist Response to Modernism.” *PentecoStudies* 7, no. 2 (2008): 64–84.
- King, Paul L. *Genuine Gold: The Cautiously Charismatic Story of the Early Christian and Missionary Alliance*. Tulsa, OK: Word and Spirit Press, 2006.
- Kinnebrew, James M. “The Charismatic Doctrine of Positive Confession: A Historical, Exegetical, and Theological Critique.” Th.D. diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988.
- Kline-Walczak, Kenneth Richard. *Testimonies of Signs and Wonders: Evangelistic Crusade of Maria Buelah Woodworth-Etter in Moline, Rock Island, Illinois and Davenport, Iowa in the Years 1902 - 1903 - 1907: Or Redigging the Wells of Holy Spirit Renewal: Our Forgotten Heritage in the Quad Cities*. Kenneth Richard Kline-Walczak, 2006.
- Knight, Henry H., III. “God’s Faithfulness and God’s Freedom: A Comparison of Contemporary Theologies of Healing.” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, no. 2 (1993): 65–89.
- Kostlevy, William. *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progressive Era America*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Kydd, R.A.N. “Healing in the Christian Church.” In *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, edited by Stanley M. Burgess and Ed M. Van der Maas, 698-711. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.
- Kydd, Ronald A. N. *Healing through the Centuries: Models for Understanding*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1995.
- Laan, Cornelis van der. “The Proceedings of the Leaders’ Meetings (1908-1911) and of the International Pentecostal Council (1912-1914).” *Pneuma* 10, no. 1 (March 1, 1988): 36–49.
- Land, Steven J. *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010.
- Liardon, Roberts. *God’s Generals: The Healing Evangelists*. New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 2011.
- Lie, Geir. *E.W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister?*. Oslo: Refleks Publishing, 2003.
- Loftis, Carrie Frances Wagliardo. *A History of First Assembly of God; Dallas, Texas, 1912-1992, 80 Years*. Dallas, TX: First Assembly of God, 1992.

- Lovett, L. "Black Holiness Pentecostalism." In *New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, edited by Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard M. Van Der Mass, 419-428. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.
- Lowery, Kevin T. "A Fork in the Wesleyan Road: Phoebe Palmer and the Appropriation of Christian Perfection." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 36, no. 2 (September 1, 2001): 187-222.
- Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- McConnell, D. R. *A Different Gospel: A Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988.
- McDonnell, Kilian. "Holy Spirit and Pentecostalism." *Commonweal*, November 8, 1968.
- McGee, Gary B. "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East: Early-Twentieth-Century Pentecostalism in India and the Debate over Speaking in Tongues." *Church History* 68, no. 3 (September 1, 1999): 648-665.
- . *Miracles, Missions, and American Pentecostalism*. American Society of Missiology Series, No. 45. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010.
- . "Popular Expositions of Initial Evidence in Pentecostalism." In *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, edited by Gary B. McGee, 119-30. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- . "'Power from on High': A Historical Perspective on the Radical Strategy in Missions." In *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, edited by Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies, 317-36. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, v. 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- . "'The Lord's Pentecostal Missionary Movement': The Restorationist Impulse of a Modern Mission Movement." *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 8, no. 1 (January 1, 2005): 49-65.
- McGee, G.B., and S.M. Burgess. "India." In *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, edited by Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard M. Van Der Mass, 118-126. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003.
- McIntyre, Joe. *E.W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story*. Orlando, FL: Charisma House, 1997.

- McKenzie, Brian Alexander. *Fundamentalism, Christian Unity, and Premillennialism in the Thought of Rowland Victor Bingham, 1872-1942 a Study of Anti-Modernism in Canada*. Canadian Theses = Thèses Canadiennes. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1987.
- McMullen, Joshua J. "Maria B Woodworth-Etter: Bridging the Wesleyan-Pentecostal Divide." In *From Aldersgate to Azusa Street*, edited by Henry H. Knight, 185–93. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.
- Melton, J. Gordon. *Melton's Encyclopedia of American Religions*. 8th ed. Detroit: Gale Cengage Learning, 2009.
- Menzies, Glen W. "Tongues as 'The Initial Physical Sign' of Spirit Baptism in the Thought of D W Kerr." *Pneuma* 20, no. 2 (September 1, 1998): 175–89.
- Menzies, William W. *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1971.
- Miskov, Jennifer A. *Life on Wings: The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery, 1858-1946*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2012.
- Moon, Tony G. "J. H. King on Initial Evidence: Did He Change?" *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 14, no. 2 (April 1, 2006): 261–286.
- Morton, Barry. "'The Devil Who Heals': Fraud and Falsification in the Evangelical Career of John G. Lake, Missionary to South Africa 1908-1913." *African Historical Review* 44, no. 2 (2012): 98–118.
- Mullin, Robert Bruce. *Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Murray, Frank S. *The Sublimity of Faith: The Life and Work of Frank W. Sandford*. Amherst, NH: Kingdom Press, 1981.
- Niklaus, Robert L., John S. Sawin, and Samuel J. Stoesz. *All for Jesus: God at Work in the Christian and Missionary Alliance, 125th Anniversary Edition*. Colorado Springs, CO: Christian & Missionary Alliance, 2013.
- Oliverio, Jr., L. William. *Theological Hermeneutics in the Classical Pentecostal Tradition: A Typological Account*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Opp, James. "Balm of Gilead: Faith, Healing, and Medicine in the Life of Dr. Lilian B. Yeomans." Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1997.
- . *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine, and Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880-1930*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.

- Parfitt, Tudor. *The Lost Tribes of Israel: The History of a Myth*. London: Phoenix, 2003.
- Patterson, James Oglethorpe, and Church of God in Christ. *History and Formative Years of the Church of God in Christ; with Excerpts from the Life and Works of Its Founder, Bishop C.H. Mason*. Memphis, TN: Church of God in Christ Publishing House, 1969.
- Peters, John Leland. *Christian Perfection and American Methodism*. New York; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- Pierard, Richard V. "The Contribution of British-Israelism to Antisemitism within Conservative Protestantism." In *Holocaust and Church Struggle: Religion, Power and the Politics of Resistance*, edited by Hubert G. Locke and Marcia Sachs Littell, 45–68. Studies in the Shoah. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996.
- Poloma, Margaret M. "Old Wine, New Wineskins: The Rise of Healing Rooms in Revival Pentecostalism." *Pneuma* 28, no. 1 (March 1, 2006): 59–71.
- Raser, Harold E. *Phoebe Palmer: Her Life and Thought*. Studies in Women and Religion, v. 22. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1987.
- Reed, David A. "In Jesus' Name": *The History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, No. 31. Dorset, UK: Deo, 2008.
- Reynolds, Lindsay. *Rebirth: The Redevelopment of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada*. Willowdale, Ontario: Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada, 1992.
- Richmann, Christopher. "Blaspheming in Tongues: Demons, Glossolalia, and the Christian and Missionary Alliance." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 139–155.
- . "Evangelical Unity in the Pentecostal Theology of Alexander A. Boddy." Springfield, MO, 2014.
- . "Prophecy and Politics: British-Israelism in American Pentecostalism." *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 22 (January 2013).
- Robeck, Cecil M. "An Emerging Magisterium? The Case of the Assemblies of God." *Pneuma* 25, no. 2 (September 1, 2003): 164–215.
- . "McDonnell, Kilian." In *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, edited by Stanley M. Burgess and Van der Maas, 853. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 2002.

- . “The Assemblies of God and Ecumenical Cooperation: 1920-1965.” In *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, edited by Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies, 107–50. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008.
- . *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement*. Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2006.
- . “William J. Seymour and the ‘Bible Evidence.’” In *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, edited by Gary B. McGee, 72-95. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- Robinson, James. *Divine Healing: The Formative Years, 1830-1890: Theological Roots in the Transatlantic World*. Pickwick Publications, 2011.
- . *Divine Healing: The Holiness-Pentecostal Transition Years, 1890-1906: Theological Transpositions in the Transatlantic World*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2013.
- . *Divine Healing: The Years of Expansion, 1906-1930 -- Theological Variation in the Transatlantic World*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014.
- . *Pentecostal Origins: Early Pentecostalism in Ireland in the Context of the British Isles*. Studies in Evangelical History and Thought. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005.
- Robins, R. G. A. *J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Modernist*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Rodgers, Darrin J. “The Assemblies of God and the Long Journey toward Racial Reconciliation.” *Assemblies of God Heritage* 28 (January 1, 2008): 50–61.
- Sandeen, Ernest Robert. *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Schmidgall, Paul. *European Pentecostalism: Its Origins, Development, and Future*. CPT Press, 2013.
- Sepulveda, Juan. “Another Way of Being Pentecostal.” In *Pentecostal Power: Expressions, Impact and Faith of Latin American Pentecostalism*, edited by Calvin Smith, 37–62. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. “Pentecostals and the Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism : The Anatomy of an Uneasy Relationship.” *Pneuma* 6, no. 2 (September 1, 1984): 5–33.

- Simmons, Dale H. E. *W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power and Plenty*. Studies in Evangelicalism, no. 13. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1997.
- Simpson, Carl. "Jonathan Paul and the German Pentecostal Movement: The First Seven Years, 1907-1914." *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 28, no. 2 (January 1, 2008): 169–82.
- Smith, C. Calvin. "The Houston Riot of 1917, Revisited." *Houston Review* 13 (1991): 85–102.
- Smith, Timothy L. "Doctrine of the Sanctifying Spirit : Charles G. Finney's Synthesis of Wesleyan and Covenant Theology." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 13 (March 1, 1978): 92–113.
- Smith, Timothy Lawrence. *Called Unto Holiness; the Story of the Nazarenes: The Formative Years*. Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Pub. House, 1962.
- . *Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Starr, Paul. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Stephens, Michael S. "'Who Healeth All Thy Diseases': Health, Healing, and Holiness in the Church of God Reformation Movement, 1880-1925." Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 2004.
- Stephens, Randall J. *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Stewart, Adam. "A Canadian Azusa? The Implications of the Hebden Mission for Pentecostal Historiography." In *Winds from the North*, edited by Michael Wilkinson and Peter Althouse, 17–37. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Sumrall, Lester. *Pioneers of Faith*. Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1995.
- Sutton, Matthew Avery. *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Resurrection of Christian America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- . "'Between the Refrigerator and the Wildfire': Aimee Semple McPherson, Pentecostalism, and the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy." *Church History* 72, no. 1 (March 1, 2003): 159–188.
- Synan, Vinson. *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997.

- . “The Role of Tongues as Initial Evidence.” In *Spirit and Renewal: Essays in Honor of J. Rodman Williams*, edited by Mark W. Wilson, 67–82. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Tallman, Matthew W. “Demos Shakarian: The Life, Legacy, and Vision of a Full Gospel Business Man.” Ph.D. diss., Regent University, 2009.
- Tan, May Ling. “A Response to Frank Macchia’s ‘Groans Too Deep for Words: Towards a Theology of Tongues as Initial Evidence.’” *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 1, no. 2 (July 1, 1998): 175–183.
- Taves, Ann. *Fits, Trances, & Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Thompson, Matthew K. *Kingdom Come: Revisioning Pentecostal Eschatology*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series, 37. Blandford Forum, Dorset, U.K.: Deo Publishing, 2010.
- Trimble, Michael R. “Functional Diseases.” *British Medical Journal (Clinical Research Edition)* 285, no. 6357 (December 18, 1982): 1768–1770.
- Turner, William Clair. *The United Holy Church of America: A Study in Black Holiness-Pentecostalism*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press LLC, 2006.
- Van De Walle, Bernie A. *The Heart of the Gospel: A. B. Simpson, the Fourfold Gospel, and Late Nineteenth-Century Evangelical Theology*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series, 106. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009.
- Wacker, Grant. “Are the Golden Oldies Still Worth Playing : Reflections on History Writing among Early Pentecostals.” *Pneuma* 8, no. 2 (September 1, 1986): 81–100.
- . *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- . “Marching to Zion: Religion in a Modern Utopian Community.” *Church History* 54, no. 4 (December 1, 1985): 496–511.
- . “The Pentecostal Tradition.” In *Caring and Curing: Health and Medicine in the Western Religious Traditions*, edited by Ronald L. Numbers and Darrel W. Amundsen, 514–38. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- . “Travail of a Broken Family: Radical Evangelical Responses to the Emergence of Pentecostalism in America, 1906-16.” In *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism*, edited by Edith L. Blumhofer, Russell P. Spittler, and Grant Wacker, 23–49. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.

- Wacker, Grant, Chris R. Armstrong, and Jay S.F. Blossom. "John Alexander Dowie: Harbinger of Pentecostal Power." In *Portraits of a Generation: Early Pentecostal Leaders*, edited by Grant Wacker and James R. Goff, 3–19. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2002.
- Wakefield, Gavin. *Alexander Boddy: Pentecostal Anglican Pioneer*. London; Colorado Springs: Authentic Paternoster Press, 2007.
- Waldvogel, Edith Lydia. "The 'Overcoming Life': A Study in the Reformed Evangelical Origins of Pentecostalism." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1977.
- Walters, Orville S. "Concept of Attainment in John Wesley's Christian Perfection." *Methodist History* 10, no. 3 (April 1, 1972): 12–29.
- Ware, Steven L. *Restorationism in the Holiness Movement in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.
- Warner, Wayne. *For Such a Time As This: Maria Woodworth-Etter Her Healing and Evangelizing Ministry*. Gainesville, FL: Bridge Logos Foundation, 2005.
- . *The Woman Evangelist: The Life and Times of Charismatic Evangelist Maria B. Woodworth-Etter*. Studies in Evangelicalism No. 8. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1986.
- Weaver, C. Douglas. *The Healer-Prophet, William Marrion Branham: A Study of the Prophetic in American Pentecostalism*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- . "Baptists and Holiness in the Nineteenth Century: A Story Rarely Told." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 49, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 156–174.
- Weber, Timothy P. *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- . "The Two-Edged Sword: The Fundamentalist Use of the Bible." In *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, edited by Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll, 101–20. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- White, Charles Edward. *The Beauty of Holiness: Phoebe Palmer as Theologian, Revivalist, Feminist, and Humanitarian*. Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press, 1986.
- . "The Beauty of Holiness : The Career of Phoebe Palmer." *Fides et Historia* 19, no. 1 (February 1, 1987): 22–34.

- . “What the Holy Spirit Can and Cannot Do: The Ambiguities of Phoebe Palmer’s Theology of Experience.” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 20, no. 1 (March 1, 1985): 108–121.
- Whorton, James C. *Nature Cures: The History of Alternative Medicine in America*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Williams, Joseph W. *Spirit Cure: A History of Pentecostal Healing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Wilson, Bryan R. *Sects and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.
- Wilson, Ernest Gerald. “The Christian and Missionary Alliance: Developments and Modifications of Its Original Objectives.” Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1984.
- Wood, Laurence W. “The Origin, Development, and Consistency of John Wesley’s Theology of Holiness.” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 43, no. 2 (September 1, 2008): 33–55.
- Ziefle, Joshua R. *David Du Plessis and the Assemblies of God: The Struggle for the Soul of a Movement*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.