

Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies



“Initial Evidence”

Volume 1, Number 2 (July 1998)

ASPECTS OF INITIAL-EVIDENCE DOGMA:{PRIVATE }
A EUROPEAN-AMERICAN HOLINESS PENTECOSTAL
PERSPECTIVE

Harold D. Hunter

As the sole representative from the Holiness Pentecostal tradition in this special edition, it is impossible to contain all the pertinent information in one article. Therefore, historical data are used to illustrate the complexity of the discussion which I hope to continue at a later date.

1. PENTECOSTAL DOCTRINE: DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

North American classical Pentecostal denominations were formed in and around the turn of the twentieth century. All of these denominations have been influenced in varying degrees by Charles Parham and W. J. Seymour. The general theological heritage of this movement is quite broad and includes distant groups like the Pietists along with recent millenarians and the nineteenth century healing movement. Among the most telling theological roots are the related Holiness and Keswick movements.¹

The story is often told that W. H. Durham introduced schism into the emerging Pentecostal movement with his doctrine of the “finished work.” However, it would appear that almost from the outset there were devotees who would not classify themselves as Holiness Pentecostals or at least not subscribe to prevailing formulas propagated by Holiness-turned-Pentecostal pioneers. By the time the Pentecostal Fellowship of North America (PFNA) was formed in 1948, it became apparent that the Keswick wing of the Pentecostal movement was winning the day on the

¹ For a complaint against Keswick, look at H. Olu Atansuyi, “Gospel and Culture from the Perspective of African Instituted Churches,” in *Consultation with African Instituted Churches: Ogere, Nigeria, 9-14 January 1996: World Council of Churches* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1996), pp. 47ff.

sanctification debate for at least most European-American Pentecostals in the USA.

Holiness Pentecostals have paid much attention to what Spirit baptism accomplishes. Consider the history of a people who laid considerable emphasis on the practical outworkings of Holiness theology and their fixation on the empowerment of the Holy Spirit seems quite natural. For African-American Holiness Pentecostals like W. J. Seymour and C. H. Mason, emphasis was likewise placed on racial reconciliation. After the "temple" is cleansed, it must be filled, reasoned these warriors. Here glossolalia was the initial, physical evidence and empowerment was the prize. Also, it was generally expected that the congregation would accept public manifestations of tongues-speech, particularly the charism of tongues.

The most influential Holiness and Keswick North American classical Pentecostal denominations continue to agree on the basic issue, namely that Spirit baptism is to be understood as a work of the Spirit which is distinct from and (usually) subsequent to regeneration. The most influential version of the Spirit baptism formula in the USA designated speaking in tongues as the initial evidence. Although this logion has been written into many North American Pentecostal denominational creeds, tongues-speech as the initial evidence has never enjoyed complete acceptance in the USA, much less around the world.

When news of the Azusa Street revival came to C. H. Mason and C. P. Jones in 1907, they reacted differently. Jones was uninterested, but Mason traveled to Los Angeles and returned with the Pentecostal experience and doctrine. There was a division at the 1907 annual assembly of the Church of God in Christ, which resulted in presiding elder Jones withdrawing the right hand of fellowship from Mason who assumed the leadership of the church. W. J. Seymour would change the Parham formula. The United Holy Church of America did not adopt it, while the Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA) absorbed various former Pentecostals. T. B. Barrett and George Jeffreys, two important Pentecostal pioneers in Europe, did not insist on tongues-speech as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism. The Mühleim Association of Christian Fellowship not only has rejected tongues as the sole evidence, but has not made the usual distinction between the initial salvific event and Spirit baptism. Howard Carter at one time dissented from initial evidence and Donald Gee used the term "sign."² Leonard Steiner helped launch the Pentecostal World Conference in 1947,

² Ian M. Randall, "Old Time Power: Relationships between Pentecostalism and Evangelical Spirituality in England," *Pneuma* 19 (1997), pp. 60ff., 78.

but did not accept the initial evidence dogma. The imposing Iglesia Metodista Pentecostal in Chile no longer affirms this belief. The further one moves geographically away from North America, the more extensive becomes the list of varying Spirit baptism formulas among those identified as Pentecostal.³

In Australia, the Associated Christian Fellowship advocates conversion which is signified by water baptism, then initial-evidence Spirit baptism, with a third stage that makes one perfect. The perfect will avoid the Great Tribulation, meaning martyrdom for Christians.⁴

Although there is growing interest in house churches in Mainland China, North Americans have paid an unusual amount of attention to Korea. America's obsession with success draws them like a magnet to the world's largest church, the largest Presbyterian church in the world, and the largest Methodist church in the world. Categories used in North America are not applicable because some Korean Presbyterians are more demonstrative in their worship than their Pentecostal counterparts and a wide range of groups that sponsor early morning prayer meetings and all-night prayer meetings have people who speak in tongues. Some Holiness Pentecostals in Korea now have a cordial relationship with the former Pilgrim Holiness Church. Perhaps not a few Korean Pentecostals who are more Calvinistic than Arminian find themselves less interested in initial evidence dogma. Resistance to initial evidence dogma is also known in the Philippines.

This introduces the elusive nature of a satisfactory definition of that which is "Pentecostal." In contrast to the sometimes advertised monolithic character of Pentecostalism, it is the considerable diversity that complicates the process of clearly identifying that which is "Pentecostal." The ubiquity of the international Pentecostal-Charismatic movement as it launches into the twenty-first century outdistances current attempts of classification and clarification. The most prominent fabric woven into this tapestry is the doctrine of Spirit baptism and its relationship to tongues-speech.

Attempts at inclusive categories for Pentecostal positions are akin to unearthing "the" Protestant view. Even if the focus were limited to the USA, no single Pentecostal denomination, fellowship, communion, or

³ See the letter written by UK Pastor A. M. Niblock, "A Timely Invitation," *The Upper Room* 2:1 (January 1911), p. 3. George B. Studd, "The Holy Ghost Received," *The Upper Room* 2:4 (January 1911), had to repudiate the view that those without initial-evidence Spirit baptism had not received the Holy Ghost.

⁴ Philip J. Hughes, *The Pentecostals in Australia* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1996).

association can speak authoritatively on behalf of all Pentecostals. Although the Assemblies of God is the most popular typology in current use, the danger of being narrow in scope is illuminated by looking at the Pentecostal Charismatic Churches of North America (PCCNA), the North American Renewal Service Committee (NARSC), the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), and the Society for Pentecostal Studies (SPS). There is also a growing body of independent churches that form various flexible alliances and networks.

Great elasticity is evident when dealing with the Pentecostal World Conference (PWC), Euro-Flame, International Charismatic Consultation on World Evangelization (ICCOWE), European Pentecostal and Charismatic Research Association (EPCRA), European Charismatic Consultation Theological Stream, Pentecostal and Charismatic Research Fellowship, Asia Pentecostal Theological Association (APTA), Asia Charismatic Theological Association (ACTA), Comisión Evangélica Pentecostal Latinoamericana (CEPLA), the Relevant Pentecostals (South Africa), Centre for Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies (Ghana), and the Association of Pentecostal and Charismatic Bible Colleges of Australasia. Pentecostalism is an amorphous mass constantly evolving around the world, which lacks a common confession.

The Theological Stream of Brighton '91 put the diversity of the Pentecostal movement on display. The summer of 1991 saw 150 scholars, most of whom were Pentecostal or Charismatic in full fellowship with their respective communions, from six continents and every prominent tradition, including African Instituted Churches,⁵ convene in Brighton, England. Professor Jürgen Moltmann was the keynote speaker of the gathering, unprecedented in its international and ecumenical character. Established conciliars such as the World Council of Churches, pan-continental organizations serving Pentecostal and Charismatic scholars (EPLA, ACTA, CPCRE, SPS), in addition to other international groups of some notoriety (WEF, Lausanne, PFNA, PWC, EPTA) were amply represented. This conference illustrated why Pentecostalism is not properly classed as a subcategory of (at least North American) Evangelicalism. Concrete evidence of social awareness was demonstrated by the input of the Relevant Pentecostal Witness, exposing self-criticism of their failure to

⁵ Harold D. Hunter and Peter D. Hocken, eds., *All Together In One Place: Theological Papers from the Brighton Conference on World Evangelization* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993). The African Instituted Churches will be included in my forthcoming volume from Scarecrow Press entitled *Historical Dictionary of Global Pentecostalism*. See also Antansuyi, "African Instituted Churches," p. 51.

adequately confront apartheid in South Africa. Orthodox participation evoked the possibility of setting up an Orthodox-Pentecostal Dialogue, an effort now advanced by the ICCOWE conference Prague '97. Professor Jan A. B. Jongeneel told of the eventual formation of an endowed chair for Pentecostalism at Utrecht University and the now occupied slot filled by Martin Parmentier at the Free University of Amsterdam. An EPLA conference that convened in Brazil late in 1992 mentioned joint sponsorship by the WCC and CLAI.

2. ORIGINS OF THE "INITIAL EVIDENCE" DOCTRINE

It is difficult to ascertain when the North American version of the Classical Pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism emerged. Exhaustive research of tongues-speech suggests there may not be a major period of church history without this phenomenon occurring among Christians. "Pentecostal terminology" (baptism in the Spirit, fullness of the Spirit, et al.) became more pronounced after the Reformation, gained momentum in the nineteenth century, and exploded in the twentieth century. While waiting for more study on the Molokans,⁶ many have noticed that the pneumatology formulated by Edward Irving (1793-1834) seems to run parallel to present day Pentecostalism. It has sometimes been argued that Irving understood tongues-speech as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism. However, such a position must reckon with: (1) Irving associating prophecy as well as tongues with the initiation of Spirit baptism; and (2) that Irving himself would not have been a recipient of this pneumatic experience in view of the fact that there is no record of his having spoken in tongues.⁷

⁶ William C. Fletcher, *Soviet Charismatics: The Pentecostals in the USSR* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983), see ch. 2; Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., "A Pentecostal Witness in an Eastern Context," Paper presented to the Theological Stream of the ICCOWE/ECC conference held September 10-14, 1997 in Prague, pp. 11ff.

⁷ Edward Irving, "On the Gifts of the Holy Ghost," in *The Collected Writings of Edward Irving*, vol. 5, ed. Caryle (London: Alexander Strahan, 1866), pp. 524, 539, 544-46, 559; Edward Irving, "The Sealing Virtue of Baptism," *Homilies on Baptism 2, Writings*, II, pp. 277f.; A. L. Drummond, *Edward Irving and His Circle* (London: James Clark, 1871), p. 164. G. F. Atter, *The Third Force* (Peterborough: College Press, 1970), p. 35, says that Irvingites who came to Canada in the nineteenth century exercised Charismatic phenomena but did not teach Spirit baptism as subsequent to conversion nor tongues as initial evidence.

The term "Spirit baptism" as it is frequently employed by Classical Pentecostals in North America has often been traced back to Charles Fox Parham's Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas. Mrs. Parham's account, entitled simply *Charles Fox Parham*,⁸ perpetuates the story that the theology was agreed upon before Miss Agnes Ozman's experience. Mrs. Goss, the wife of a minister friend of Mr. Parham, passes on much of the same story uncritically in her *The Winds of God*.⁹ Miss Ozman's personal account, published under the title *What God Hath Wrought*,¹⁰ and released earlier than these works, may confirm such a process. Entitled "Baptism with the Holy Ghost and the Gift of Tongues and Seal of the Church and Bride," Charles Parham's 1902 article published November 1906 in conjunction with W. F. Carother's pamphlet titled *The Baptism with the Holy Ghost and the Speaking in Tongues* sounds a cautious note on prior teaching. Dr. G. B. Cutten, Baptist pastor and later professor at Yale University, wrote in 1908 that the Apostolic Faith Movement started in Kansas in 1900 and declares "that speaking with tongues is the only Bible evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit."¹¹ B. F. Lawrence's *The Apostolic Faith Restored*,¹² first published in 1916, suggests that study by the Bethel students plus the experience of Miss Ozman cemented tongues as "the evidence." The cryptic account in the first published Azusa St. version of Topeka entitled "Pentecost Has Come," published September 1906 in Seymour's inaugural *The Apostolic Faith*, acknowledges study, but then points to Miss Ozman as exemplifying the erasing of the Holiness equation of Spirit baptism and sanctification.

Writing in 1911, J. C. Vanzandt claimed to have heard Parham in 1891 espouse Holy Spirit baptism with other tongues "as evidence."¹³ Yet,

⁸ Sarah E. Parham, *The Life of Charles F. Parham: Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement* (Joplin, MO: Tri-State, 1930).

⁹ Ethel E. Goss, *The Winds of God: The Story of the Early Pentecostal Movement (1901-1914) in the Life of Howard A. Goss*, rev. and ed. by Ruth Nortje Goss (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame, 1958, 1977).

¹⁰ Agnes N. O. LaBerge, *What God Hath Wrought: Life and Work of Mrs. Agnes N.O. LaBerge, Nee Miss Agnes N. Ozman* (Chicago: Herald, 1921).

¹¹ G. B. Cutten, *The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity* (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1908), p. 57. Cutten interacted with S. A. Manwell's "Speaking With Tongues," published in *The Wesleyan Methodist* (February 20, 1907), pp. 8f. This periodical ran a series of articles on the subject by Manwell and P. B. Campbell up through an issue dated March 1907.

¹² (St. Louis: Gospel Publishing House, 1916).

¹³ J. C. Vanzandt, *Speaking in Tongues* (Portland, OR: J. C. Vanzandt [1911]

it is also possible that Parham's exposure to tongues at Frank Sandford's Shiloh helped to ferment such a concept. What has yet to be adequately researched is whether the Doughty connection from Sandford to the Gift Adventists to a Doughty patriarch actually shifts the search to a different location. This research project looks also at B. H. Irwin and a short-lived community in Bradley County, Tennessee once known as Beniah.¹⁴

James Goff argues that the Frank Sandford exposure, absorbed by the B. H. Irwin theory, produced in Parham the concept of missionary tongues as the reason for a distinct baptism of the Spirit. The only thing left, says Goff, was moving Bethel students squarely into his camp.¹⁵

Writing during the glow of the Azusa Street revival, V. P. Simmons claimed personal exposure of 42 years to those who spoke in tongues. Published in 1907 by *Bridegroom's Messenger* and circulated as a tract, Simmons began with Irenaeus and went on to introduce a troop from New England whom he personally observed as they drank from a spiritual baptism and manifested tongues-speech.¹⁶ Various identified as Gift People or Gift Adventists, they were widely known for their involvement with spectacular charisms. Early Pentecostal periodicals reported that tongues-speech was known among them since the latter part of the nineteenth century. Some of their audiences were said to number in the thousands.¹⁷

1926), p. 31.

¹⁴ See Harold D. Hunter, "Beniah at the Apostolic Crossroads: Little Noticed Crosscurrents of Irwin, Sandford, Parham, and Tomlinson," in *Memory and Hope*, ed. Grant Wacker (Wycliffe College, Toronto: Society for Pentecostal Studies, March 8, 1996). This article is available in the *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* (www.pctii.org/cybertab.html).

¹⁵ James R. Goff, "Initial Tongues in the Theology of Charles Fox Parham," in *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, ed. Gary B. McGee (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), p. 64; James R. Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), pp. 74f.

¹⁶ V. P. Simmons, "History of Tongues," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 1:3 (December 1907), p. 2; idem, *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2:34 (March 15, 1902), p. 2; idem, *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2:46 (September 15, 1909), p. 2. Simmons, while exempting Schaff and Bushnell, appropriately entitled one entry, "Historians Dodging Tongues," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2:39 (June 1, 1909), p. 2.

¹⁷ *The Apostolic Faith* [Los Angeles] 1:4 (1906), p. 3; V. P. Simmons, "History of Tongues," *Bridegroom's Messenger* 1:3 (December 1907), p. 2; *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2:34 (March 15, 1909), p. 2; *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2:46

Counted among that number was William M. Doughty who, by 1855, had spoken in tongues while in Maine. Elder Doughty moved to Providence, Rhode Island in 1873 and assumed leadership among those exercising the “gifts of the Spirit.”¹⁸ Doughty’s mantle was passed on to Elder R. B. Swan who, reacting to the Azusa Street revival, wrote a letter saying that the Gift People in Rhode Island had experienced speaking in tongues as far back as 1874-1875. F. B. Lawrence followed Swan’s letter with an independent account of a woman who spoke in tongues in New York, perhaps prior to 1874, as a result of contact with the Gift People.¹⁹

Stanley H. Frodsham quotes pastor Swan as claiming to have spoken in tongues in 1875. Swan speaks of great crowds drawn from five states and specifically mentions his wife, Amanda Doughty, and an invalid hunchback who was “instantly healed” among those who spoke in tongues during this time.²⁰

Simmons, speaking of Swan’s group, said that their self-description, applied after the advent of the Pentecostal Movement was The Latter Rain. Their activities extended throughout the New England states—especially Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Connecticut—with the 1910 Latter Rain Convention held October 14-16 in Quakertown, Connecticut.²¹

(September 15, 1909), p. 2; B. F. Lawrence, *The Apostolic Faith*, pp. 39-43; Charles Shumway, “A Critical History of Glossolalia,” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Boston University, 1919), p. 109; *The Apostolic Faith* [Baxter Springs] 2:6 (June 1926), pp. 1-7.

¹⁸ V. P. Simmons in *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2:34 (March 15, 1909), p. 2. V. P. Simmons, “Forbid Not To Speak With Tongues,” *Bridegroom’s Messenger* 3:51 (Dec 1, 1909), p. 4, refers to a Rhode Island camp meeting run by Elder W. M. Doughty “many years ago” that featured “much talking in tongues.”

¹⁹ The letter, reproduced in Lawrence, *Apostolic Faith Restored*, pp. 38ff., concluded:

A large number have [already] received their baptism and fillings, and on April 9, 1906, when the Holy Spirit fell at Los Angeles, we were holding a convention on the same day and God’s blessing was present, one assembly was on the Pacific coast and the other on the Atlantic coast.

²⁰ Stanley H. Frodsham, *With Signs Following* (Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1946), pp. 10-11.

²¹ V. P. Simmons in *The Bridegroom’s Messenger* 2:34 (March 15, 1909), p. 2; *Word and Work* 32:11 (November, 1910), pp. 338-39; Lawrence, *Apostolic Faith Restored*, p. 39. It was specifically noted that the group in Rhode Island included African Caribbeans.

Frank Bartleman frequently referred to joint-speaking engagements with Swan, specifically recounting a 1907 tour that included a convention in Providence where he spoke 18 times.²²

Previously overlooked in related investigations is whether the Doughty family counted among the Gift People overlap with the Doughty who traveled with Frank Sandford. Lawrence attests that Swan's circle included William M. Doughty's daughter-in-law, Amanda Doughty, and her unnamed husband, an elder in the Providence congregation.²³ V. P. Simmons says that William Doughty had two sons; the oldest, named Frank, was ordained.²⁴

Could the unnamed brother of Frank be Edward Doughty, who at the end of the nineteenth century was part of Sandford's entourage?²⁵ This seems to be the case.²⁶

3. EARLY REACTION

At a convention and short-term Bible school conducted in Waco, Texas, in February, 1907, several questions respecting doctrine were raised, among them the matter of the evidence of Spirit baptism. Brother A. G. Canada suggested that any of the gifts could be the immediate, empirical evidence. Contending on the opposing side, W. F. Carothers argued so conclusively for the "orthodox Pentecostal position" that the question was settled for most of those present once and for all.

It was determined that a test case should be made. San Antonio had not yet received the Pentecostal testimony. Workers who went to San Antonio agreed not to mention anything about evidential tongues. Although seekers for the baptism in the Spirit at San Antonio, therefore,

²² Frank Bartleman, *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles* (Los Angeles: 1925, second edition), pp. 126, 101, 105f.

²³ Lawrence, *Apostolic Faith Restored*, p. 39.

²⁴ V. P. Simmons in *Bridegroom's Messenger* 2:34 (March 15, 1909), p. 2.

²⁵ See, *Tongues of Fire* 4:21 (Nov 1, 1898), p. 168; Frank S. Murray, *The Sublimity of Faith* (Amherst: Kingdom Press, 1981), pp. 232, 247; William Hiss, "Shiloh, Frank W. Sandford, and the Kingdom" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tufts University, 1978), p. 247; Goff, *Fields With Unto Harvest*, p. 57. Murray counts Edward Doughty among "the seventy."

²⁶ Edward and his wife Amanda moved to a remote island near Portland, Maine. Telephone exchange with Donna Doughty (2-3-93). Shirley Nelson provided (11-12-92) a familial connection that put this piece of the puzzle in place.

were “not looking for tongues;” when the outpouring came, seekers burst forth in other tongues, just as had happened elsewhere in the Great Revival.²⁷ This logic is as compelling as those responses to F. F. Bosworth’s *Do All Speak With Tongues?*, which cited examples of God the Father (Daniel 5:25), as well as Jesus (Matthew 27:46), speaking in tongues! This story is echoed in the angry exchange between A. J. Tomlinson and John B. Goins.²⁸

During the Azusa Street revival it was Bartleman’s 1906 reports in Pike’s *Way of Faith* which enabled A. B. Crumpler, founder of the Pentecostal Holiness Church (PHC), to learn of the Pentecostal mission. A North Carolina Holiness preacher in Crumpler’s church, Gaston Barnabas Cashwell, traveled to Los Angeles and obtained the Pentecostal experience first-hand.

After a hasty return to his hometown of Dunn, North Carolina, Cashwell rented a large tobacco warehouse and announced plans for a new year’s eve revival. Along with many laypersons, almost all of the ministers of the PHC, the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church (FBHC), and the Free-Will Baptist Church, sought and accepted the Pentecostal experience. Cashwell preached Seymour’s doctrine, but Crumpler made his opposition to Cashwell clear. Through his paper, the PHC leader insisted instead that tongues-speech was just one of many gifts of the Spirit that could accompany a spiritual baptism. But Crumpler was fighting a losing battle. In the same May 15, 1907, issue of the *Holiness Advocate* in which he unconditionally attacked the new doctrine, over a dozen testimonies from holiness people who had obtained or hoped soon to receive the tongues experience appeared, including one that scolded Crumpler for helping Satan and hurting God’s work by denying the essentiality of tongues.

Two parties developed in the church: Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal. This was an issue in the 1907 annual meeting in which Crumpler, the president, led the attack against the Pentecostal faction, and vice-president A. H. Butler defended them. Crumpler and Butler were both re-elected and the issue was put off for another year. The climactic battle occurred at the 1908 convention in the Holiness Tabernacle in Dunn, NC on November 26, 1908. Crumpler, who had been unanimously re-elected, finally brought the matter to a head by

²⁷ William M. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve* (Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1971), pp. 125f.

²⁸ Harold D. Hunter, “Spirit Baptism and the 1896 Revival in Cherokee County, North Carolina,” *Pneuma* 5:2 (1983), p. 10.

walking out of the convention. Only a small portion of the church supported him. He was soon back in the Methodist church in Clinton, North Carolina where he lived the rest of his days as a layperson, occasionally speaking out for the cause of prohibition but never again in the cause of holiness.²⁹

The convention ended with A. H. Butler as the president and the church totally in the hands of the Pentecostal preacher. A Pentecostal view of Spirit baptism was incorporated into the Articles of Faith in 1908.

While visiting Canada, J. H. King,³⁰ general overseer of the FBHC, learned about the Azusa Street revival from a friend, Rev. A. H. Argue. Argue told him about the revival and gave him a copy of Seymour's *The Apostolic Faith*. King put it away for later reading. The Fire-Baptized reaction was mixed. Many Fire-Baptized were excited to hear Cashwell. Several members from King's Toccoa, Georgia congregation went to Dunn where they, along with several more Fire-Baptized people, received the Pentecostal experience.

King did not go to the meeting, but at some point in January spent ten days fasting for divine guidance. Apparently some in his congregation had already accepted the initial-evidence doctrine before he returned to his church or at least spoke favorably of it, and it was not tongues-speech itself but the initial-evidence doctrine that troubled him. King withstood Cashwell in private, as well as publicly, during his first three days at Toccoa. King felt that he had bested the new doctrine at each confrontation.³¹

King put together an issue of *Live Coals* prior to Cashwell's arrival at Toccoa which included an article written by J. Hudson Ballard that refuted the initial-evidence doctrine. Attention was drawn to the fact that while some passages in Acts refer to tongues in connection with Spirit baptism, other passages do not. Further, the article noted that tongues is not mentioned as an evidence in the epistles. Tongues could not be the

²⁹ Vinson Synan, *Old-Time Power: A History of the Pentecostal Holiness Church* (Franklin Springs: Advocate, 1973), p. 119; Joseph E. Campbell, *The Pentecostal Holiness Church: 1898-1948* (Franklin Springs: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951), p. 245.

³⁰ J. H. King, "My Experience"; J. H. King, and Blanche L. King, *Yet Speaketh: Memoirs of the Late Bishop Joseph H. King* (Franklin Springs, GA: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1949), p. 112; Synan, *Old-Time Power*, p. 112.

³¹ King, "My Experience," p. 13.

exclusive evidence since this would exclude an untold number of Christians throughout church history from the blessing. The article pointed out that the group mentioned most in connection with tongues, the Corinthians, were barely saved, and certainly unsanctified. Lastly, if the gift were for all Christians, it would have been included in the lists of spiritual gifts in Rom 12:6 and Eph 4:11. The study concluded that tongues should be used privately, that the church needs unction for evangelism instead of tongues, and that love is the chief evidence of the grace of God.³²

On February 14, King made a study of key Greek words in the New Testament and to his surprise, found that his anti-initial-evidence arguments were not supported by either Acts or the best commentators that he had at hand, especially Dean Alford's *Critical Notes on the New Testament* and Adam Clarke's *Commentary*. He was particularly impressed with the thought that when Acts 8 says Simon Magus "saw," the Greek term *idōn* can also mean "hear." On this basis he concluded that Simon Magus must have heard speaking in tongues. Although Dean Alford would not support the idea of initial-evidence Spirit baptism (especially involving permanent xenolalia), he did argue that both the Ephesian Pentecost and this episode in Samaria included speaking in tongues. With his arguments now brushed aside, that night (February 15, 1907) King sought for and received the Pentecostal baptism and spoke with other tongues.³³ In April, 1908 in Anderson, South Carolina at a meeting of the FBHC, the denomination changed the Basis of Union to incorporate the doctrine of Pentecost "according to its scriptural aspect."

4. EARLY REVISIONS OF THE "INITIAL EVIDENCE" DOCTRINE

Although this is not much publicized, the North American formula has undergone various revisions of substance. Charles Fox Parham's original version of Spirit baptism insisted that initial-evidence tongues were to be xenolalic rather than glossolalic. Parham's position had the threefold

³² J. H. Ballard, "Spiritual Gifts with Special Reference to the Gift of Tongues," *Live Coals* (Feb 13, 1907), pp. 2, 6.

³³ Synan, *Old-Time Power*, pp. 112f. G. F. Taylor, *The Spirit and the Bride* (Falcon, NC: 1907), noting that King quoted Dean Alford in *The Apostolic Evangel*, goes on to point out that Alford was "not trying to prove" initial-evidence Spirit baptism.

advantage of: 1) promoting missionary expansion, 2) offering potentially undisputed evidence of the miraculous, and 3) reproducing the original day of Pentecost. Pentecostalism at large dropped this part of Parham's theory within a decade because it was fatally flawed.

The list of variations on Parham's original formula seems endless. Among the issues raised is whether speaking in tongues is simply a prayer language. Are charisms manifest in the believer prior to the spiritual baptism?³⁴ The Pentecostal Assemblies of the World and the United Pentecostal Church International link repentance, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and initial-evidence Spirit baptism to conversion.³⁵ I choose to illustrate the diversity of teachings by singling out Parham's emphasis on permanent xenolalia which may again show the fingerprints of Frank Sandford among others.

It is noteworthy that Miss Ozman's initial experience in Topeka was said to have involved speaking in Chinese. Parham never modified the understanding that tongues-speech was to be xenolalic, neither have his theological heirs in the Apostolic Church.³⁶ The 1901 Topeka and the 1906 Azusa St. revivals included reports of xenolalia. Among other leaders, the claim of xenolalia in the initial experience of Spirit baptism was made by Florence Crawford, T. B. Barrett, and A. J. Tomlinson. Also, many new Pentecostals went outside the USA with the expectation of being supernaturally endowed with the appropriate language. Similar reports marked the early years of both the Protestant Charismatic movement and the Roman Catholic Charismatic movement.

The first issue of *The Apostolic Faith* 1:1 (Sept 1906), refers to "esquimaux" as a language for deaf-mutes. By contrast, the early PHC magazine, *The Holiness Advocate* 7:3 (May 15, 1906), reports on deaf-mutes who were Spirit baptized but did not speak in tongues. Yet, G. F. Taylor firmly stated that deaf and dumb believers must speak in tongues to be certifiably baptized in the Spirit.³⁷ *The Apostolic Evangel* 1:1 (Feb 15,

³⁴ Anthony D. Palma, "The Gifts and Fruit of the Spirit," in *Conference on the Holy Spirit Digest*, ed. Gwen Jones (Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1983), I, p. 94. He introduced this concept in his presidential address delivered to the Society for Pentecostal Studies at Valley Forge, November 30-December 1, 1978.

³⁵ J. L. Hall, "A Oneness Pentecostal Looks at Initial Evidence," in *Initial Evidence*, p. 170.

³⁶ Article 7 of the By Laws of the Apostolic Faith Bible College, Inc., as published in *Apostolic Faith Report* 38:4-6 (April-June 1992), p. 12, depicts Spirit baptism as "evidenced by the speaking in other languages."

³⁷ Taylor, *The Spirit and the Bride*, p. 50. Taylor was reacting to a story run in the

1909) carried a report from *Confidence* that claimed a deaf and dumb woman “began to speak under the power of the Spirit. She began to speak in Hindustani and testified to Mohammedians. Afterwards she lost Hindustani and got the Telegu, her native language.”

PHC leaders such as Cashwell and Taylor encouraged potential missionaries to trust God to provide the necessary languages. Cashwell wrote that if Pentecostals had to learn foreign languages in colleges, it would take too long and Jesus “will not come soon.” Taylor ridiculed “scholarly clergymen and high-steeple officials” who wondered how to spread the gospel for being “nineteen centuries behind the times.” So even as they struggled to spread their message throughout the Southeast, Pentecostal churches and periodicals solicited collections for foreign missions, and almost immediately after the Dunn revival a few laypeople and leaders like J. H. King and PHC minister T. J. McIntosh set out for places such as China, Japan, and India.³⁸

Pentecostal missionaries soon made the painful discovery that there was a difference between xenolalia and glossolalia. Reports that McIntosh and others were unable to communicate to people in their own languages caused considerable discomfort for Pentecostals and also elicited a new round of criticism from their opponents. McIntosh had left for China immediately after speaking in tongues in what he believed was Chinese, at the Dunn revival. In a subsequent report to the *Bridegroom's Messenger*, he lamented, “Oh! How we would love to speak to these poor people. Of course, God speaks with our tongues, but not their language.”³⁹

The teaching on Spirit baptism is modified in Cashwell's inaugural issue of *The Bridegroom's Messenger* 1:1 (October 1, 1907), where he specifically contrasts xenolalia to learning languages at colleges for the sake of evangelizing the world. He goes on to call the 1 Corinthians 12 “gift of tongues” xenolalic in contrast to initial-evidence tongues.⁴⁰

Cashwell argued that those like McIntosh who thought they had the gift of tongues were mistaken, but pure in their motives. He criticized the

Way of Faith which was repeated in *The Holiness Advocate* 6:5 (June 1, 1906), p. 4 and 7:3 (May 15, 1907), p. 1.

³⁸ *Bridegroom's Messenger* 1:1 (Oct 1, 1907), p. 1; Taylor, *Spirit and the Bride*, p. 104; Campbell, *PHC*, pp. 238-48, 344-48.

³⁹ The A. G. Garrs left the Azusa Street revival for China. The *Bridegroom's Messenger* ran stories of the Garrs and McIntoshs working together in China. Such stories can be multiplied.

⁴⁰ “Colleges vs. Gifts of the Spirit,” *The Bridegroom's Messenger* 1:1 (October 1, 1907), p. 1.

disunity that these failures were causing, and called on Pentecostals to pray for those abroad to attain the necessary gift. As for himself, Cashwell admitted that he realized in retrospect that he had only obtained manifestations of tongues, but he was “expecting the gift of tongues just as much as I expect to see Jesus.” The PHC continued and greatly escalated its missionary outreach in subsequent years, but also made concessions by adopting more stringent requirements for its missionaries, utilizing translators, and sponsoring a more traditional approach to acquiring foreign languages.⁴¹

5. FROM HERE, WHERE?

To date no scholarly monograph has been devoted to the subject of tongues-speech as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism. An entry in the *Dictionary of the Pentecostal Charismatic Movements* has been eclipsed by a volume entitled *Initial Evidence*, edited by Gary B. McGee. In a paper presented by Gordon D. Fee to the 1972 SPS meeting, it was argued that material from canonical history is subservient to material from the didactic parts of scripture. Since the doctrine of tongues-speech as the initial evidence is found in Acts and not the Epistles, such a doctrine cannot be viewed as normative for all Christians. By 1984, Fee would present a paper to SPS affirming the Pentecostal experience, but denying a Spirit baptism that was “subsequent and separable.” In 1982, the SPS replaced the 1970 charter statement taken from the Pentecostal Fellowship of North America. In the interest of ecumenism and research, the society instead affirmed its allegiance to the statement of purpose drawn up by the World Pentecostal Fellowship. The result has been that the executive committee moved beyond Holiness and Keswick classical Pentecostals from North American to include a Oneness Pentecostal, Protestant and Roman Catholic Charismatics, a Wesleyan and an Episcopalian.⁴² The same kind of concerns was conceded when Pentecostals from outside the USA were selected as paper presenters to the annual conferences.⁴³

⁴¹ *Bridegroom's Messenger* 1:8 (Feb 15, 1908), pp. 1, 4; 1:11, April 1, 1908, p. 1; 1:12, April 15, 1908, p. 1; Campbell, *The Pentecostal Holiness Church*, pp. 347-59.

⁴² I submitted the constitutional change to the 1982 session of the society meeting at Fuller Theological Seminary simply because the time had come.

⁴³ This was especially clear in 1988 when Jean-Daniel Plüss read a paper at the meeting. See his groundbreaking *Therapeutic and Prophetic Narratives in Worship* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988).

Preoccupation with initial-evidence dogma presupposes the glossocentrism of the movement. Globally, this is not an accurate representation.⁴⁴ Moreover, a distinctive emphasis does not define a movement. Furthermore, many denominations have a majority of members who have never spoken in tongues and, of those who have, it is often not a part of their ongoing spirituality. A Gallop-*Christianity Today* poll in the 1970s counted a little over 30% who actually spoke in tongues. The 1993 General Council of Assemblies of God, USA (AG) conceded that at least 50% of AG members had not been Spirit baptized and there was a 14.5% decline in Spirit baptisms between 1986-1991.⁴⁵ Although initial-evidence tongues are required of all ministers, the ranks are swelling with those like PHC Bishop J. H. King⁴⁶ who apparently spoke in tongues only once. Pentecostals with Reformed roots like those in Korea and South Africa may easily move away from initial evidence. Even Joel Edwards of the New Testament Church of God says that initial evidence is no longer a doctrine for which one “dies.”⁴⁷

A glossocentric definition would put first generation Charismatics ahead of classical Pentecostals. Ironically, while most early leaders of the Charismatic movements distanced themselves from the older Pentecostal formula, some Protestant Charismatics are reversing this judgment. The writings of J. Rodman Williams serve as a good example. A comparison of his *The Pentecostal Reality*, written in 1972, with his 1985 SPS Presidential Address reveals that Williams has become increasingly sympathetic towards the connection of tongues-speech to pneumatic experience. With the release of *Renewal Theology* in 1990, he now uses the term “initial evidence.”⁴⁸ Further, although Charismatic theologians who

⁴⁴ Jerisdan H. Jehu-Appiah, “An Overview of Indigenous African Churches in Britain: An Approach Through Historical Survey of African Pentecostalism,” in *Report on the Proceedings of the Consultation between the World Council of Churches and African and African-Caribbean Church Leaders in Britain at the New Testament Church of God, Harehills, Leeds, England, 30 November - 2 December 1995* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1996), p. 62.

⁴⁵ Peter K. Johnson, “AG Leaders Call for New Pentecost,” *Charisma* (October 1993), p. 84. The numbers would be similar for the Church of God of Prophecy.

⁴⁶ O. Talmadge Spence, *Pentecostalism: Purity or Peril?* (Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1989), p. 18. Much the same is said about PHC Bishop Melton (p. 6).

⁴⁷ Joel Edwards, “African-Caribbean Pentecostalism in Britain,” *The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 17 (1997), p. 47.

⁴⁸ Williams’ address entitled “A Pentecostal Theology” may be found in *Distinctiveness of Pentecostal-Charismatic Theology*, ed. Peter Hocken

are Roman Catholic have been the most emphatic in their denial of this “Pentecostal baggage,” many of their prayer groups have fostered more pressure for devotees to speak in tongues than found in classical Pentecostal churches.

Observers of Pentecostalism should note that cardinal doctrines are subject to redefinition when narrow sectarian interests are significantly challenged. Consider the World Council of Church’s document entitled *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM)*. *BEM* and the official responses to it show maneuvering by major traditions in areas previously thought stationary. The earliest Pentecostals had neither the will nor the need to carefully paint a masterpiece. The formula simply put spiritual gifts as inoperative in the Pentecostal believer until initiated by an initial-evidence Spirit baptism. Since these same believers identified “spiritual gifts” exclusively with the nine charisms listed in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10, this is less problematic than critics have claimed. Further developments through the decades showed pragmatic accommodation to the spiritual reality of giftedness by those prior to and outside the movement. Pentecostals accepted a variety of phenomena that could be at one and the same time likened to yet separated from the nine charisms. Again, the primary emphasis for the Holiness sector was not in this area; rather, they emphasized that the Spirit baptized believer was endowed with “power for service.” In light of the imminence-oriented eschatology that characterized the earliest days of the Pentecostal revival, it is not surprising that this “power for service” was often thought to manifest itself in gospel evangelism. When zealous evangelism decayed into stark proselytism, the lack of theological clarity in the Pentecostal formula became increasingly problematic.⁴⁹

The Pentecostal Movement’s universal predilection for oral narrative and praxis is not incidentally related to the belief that pneumatic experience

(Gaithersburg: Society for Pentecostal Studies, November 14-16, 1985); Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology*, II, pp. 210-12. A Baptist, Howard Ervin, *Spirit Baptism* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987), p. 82, says: “It bears repeating here that of all the Spirit’s supernatural gifts, tongues appeared first in order at Pentecost. There is no convincing evidence that this order has been changed.” Consider also Dennis Bennett.

⁴⁹ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982); Michael Kinnamon, *Truth and Community* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1988), ch. 3; Peter Hocken, “The Meaning and Purpose of ‘Baptism in the Spirit,’” *Pneuma* 7:2 (1985), pp. 125-34.

subject to extensive analysis can become entombed in layers of theological formulas which do not stimulate the faithful.⁵⁰

Studies in the Hebrew canon which have emphasized the power of the spoken word are relevant. For the Pentecostal masses, it is evident that the spoken word effects action.

Enrique Dussel argues that the 1492 discovery of Amerindia moved Europe from being a periphery of the East to the center of the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea. Dussel's "trans-modernity" finds the Other not only diachronically, but also synchronically. Tensions between Pentecostalism and modernity have given rise to labels such as "pre-critical" and "sub-modern." With the advent of postmodernity, we can celebrate this as an accomplishment, not an embarrassment. However, Pentecostalism has unwittingly been radically influenced by Gutenberg's invention (1440), making possible the world-wide parade of Bibles, along with the proliferation of defiant commentators, spawned in part, by Luther's idea of direct access to God.

⁵⁰ Consider R. Andrew Chesnut, *Born Again in Brazil: The Pentecostal Boom and the Pathogens of Poverty* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997).