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ABSTRACT

From the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement in 1906, Pentecostal meetings were plagued by what they labeled “counterfeit manifestations.” These manifestations were creating negative consequences for the movement and Pentecostals needed a strategy that would identify and eradicate them from their meetings. Because Pentecostalism was in its infancy, it did not have a clear procedure to assist in identifying counterfeit manifestations, to determine how they operated, and/or who or what produced them. Over time they began to form assumptions regarding the operation of counterfeit manifestations and developed several strategies that they hoped would counteract their presence in meetings, one of which was the employment of the gift of discernment. This study identifies the negative consequences counterfeit manifestations brought to the Pentecostal Movement from 1906 to 1941, the strategies Pentecostals employed in conjunction with the gift of discernment in order to counteract the negative effects caused by counterfeit manifestations, and their attempts to articulate a theological understanding of the gift of discernment for early Pentecostalism.
Classical Pentecostal Interpretation of the Gift of Discernment from 1914 to 1941

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School of Theology

Abilene Christian University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Modern and American Christianity

By

Stephanie Rose

December 2015
To my husband, Peter Brooks Rose, and to present and former Pentecostals
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply thankful for all of the time, feedback, and support that Dr. Douglas Foster has so graciously given towards the completion of this project. I am also grateful for the comments and feedback that I received from Dr. Jeff Childers and Dr. Fredrick Aquino who have helped to bring clarity and refinement to this paper.

Kayla Hewitt and her editing team tremendously contributed towards the successful completion of this thesis by combing through the document and making corrections to the grammar and formatting.

I am also extremely grateful for the support that I received from my husband, Brooks Rose. The completion of this thesis required a three-month separation from him, during which time he never complained of my absence. Instead he encouraged me to work hard and he made sure that I had everything that I needed to finish this project successfully.
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................. 1

   Problem Statement ........................................................................................................... 2

   The Purpose of the Study ................................................................................................. 3

   Significance of the Study ................................................................................................. 3

   Methodology ..................................................................................................................... 4

   Organization of the Study ................................................................................................. 6

   The Scope/Delimitations of the Study ............................................................................. 7

   Limitations of the Study ................................................................................................... 8

   Resource Discovery ......................................................................................................... 9

   Terminology ..................................................................................................................... 11

      Baptism in the Holy Spirit ............................................................................................. 11

      Pentecostal/Pentecostal Movement ............................................................................. 13

      Gifts of the Spirit ......................................................................................................... 19

      Manifestation ............................................................................................................... 19

      Counterfeit Manifestations ......................................................................................... 20

      Spiritist/Spiritism ......................................................................................................... 23

      Gift of Discernment ...................................................................................................... 25

   Literature Review ............................................................................................................ 26

   Conclusion ....................................................................................................................... 33
II. THE COUNTERFEIT PROBLEM: CONSEQUENCES AND STRATEGIES ..34

Early Pentecostal Conclusions Regarding Counterfeit Manifestations ..........35

Negative Consequences Resulting from the Presence of Counterfeit Manifestations .................................................................39
  Credibility Questioned .........................................................................................................................40
  Genuine Manifestations Restrained ....................................................................................................50
  Failure to Accurately Identify the Source of a Manifestation .........................................................50

Strategies Implemented to Address the Presence of Counterfeit Manifestations ..56
  Arguments ...........................................................................................................................................57
  Education on “Testing the Spirits” ........................................................................................................59
  Installation and Training of Leadership ...............................................................................................63

Conclusion .............................................................................................................................................65

III. THE GIFT OF DISCERNMENT: PART 1 .................................................................67

Biographies of the Authors ...................................................................................................................67
  Anna C. Reiff (1869-1960) .................................................................................................................67
  Elijah Columbus Clark, Jr. (1889-1950) .........................................................................................71
  Smith Wigglesworth (1859-1947) ....................................................................................................73
  Donald Gee (1891-1966) ...................................................................................................................76
  Harold Horton (1880-1969) ...............................................................................................................79
  Stanley H. Frodsham (1882-1966) ....................................................................................................82
  Alfred Howard Carter (1891-1971) ..................................................................................................84
  Pastor Paul (1853-1931) ....................................................................................................................87

Summary ..............................................................................................................................................89
The Gift of Discernment

Identifying the Spirit Behind a Manifestation

Identifying the Spirit Presently Influencing an Individual

Benefits the Gift of Discernment Provided to the Pentecostal Church

Conclusion

IV. THE GIFT OF DISCERNMENT: PART 2

Outcomes of Practicing the Gift of Discernment

Requirements for the Gift of Discernment to Operate in an Individual

How to Identify Someone Who Possessed the Gift of Discernment

Conclusion

V. FINDINGS AND CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Theological Development of Pentecostal Beliefs

Source of Counterfeit Manifestations: Spiritualists

To Whome Does God Grant the Gift of Discernment? Leaders or Laity

The Gift of Discernment in 1941: Beliefs Held

Conclusion

APPENDIX A. U.S. Passport Application for Anna Cassel Reiff

APPENDIX B: Certificate of Death: Elijah Columbus Clark

APPENDIX C: List or Manifest of Alien Passengers for the United States:

R.M.S. "Niagra," October 24, 1928

APPENDIX D: Out-Going Passengers: Moldavia, February 24, 1928

APPENDIX E: England and Wales FreeBMD Birth Index, 1837-1915
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the same year the Pentecostal Movement\(^1\) began (c. 1906), Pentecostal leaders identified counterfeit manifestations\(^2\) operating in their meetings. Over time, Pentecostal members recognized the operation of these manifestations in their meetings as creating negative consequences for the Pentecostal Movement. Because these results were undesirable to members, Pentecostals employed three strategies that they hoped would lessen or negate the operation of these manifestations in their meetings. While these strategies were successful in identifying counterfeit manifestations, they did not identify these manifestations 100% of the time. Therefore, eight Pentecostal writers and teachers – Anna C. Reiff, Elijah C. Clark, Smith Wigglesworth, Donald Gee, Harold Horton, Stanley H. Frodsham, Howard Carter, and Pastor Jonathan Paul – purposed to educate Pentecostal membership on the benefits and proper practice of a fourth strategy that they believed would identify every counterfeit manifestation in a meeting, the gift of

\[\text{The Pentecostal Movement describes a religious sect that began in 1906 with meetings held at 312 Azusa Street, Los Angeles, CA. This Christian group initially distinguished itself from other Christian groups with its belief that the baptism in the Holy Spirit (an experience that brought the Holy Spirit into a person’s being) could be verified with the experience of speaking in a language previously unknown to the speaker. An expanded explanation of this group and its formation is found in this chapter under “Terminology: Pentecostal/Pentecostal Movement.”}

\[\text{Counterfeit manifestations are supernatural manifestations such as glossolalia (speaking in an unknown tongue) and prophecy that do not have their origination with God. Sometimes these manifestations were clearly identifiable as being counterfeit, at other times, they appeared identical to the genuine manifestations received through the Holy Spirit of God. A more complete understanding of this term can be found later on in this chapter under “Terminology: Counterfeit Manifestations.”} \]
discernment. What is interesting about this fourth strategy is that early Pentecostals did not focus on its utilization until 1922, a full sixteen years after counterfeit manifestations were first identified in Pentecostal meetings. This delayed response by Pentecostals demands explanation. This thesis will explain why Pentecostals waited so long to discuss this strategy, the negative consequences they believed resulted from the operation of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings, the actions they were taking to resolve this problem prior to 1922, and the opinions and practices Pentecostals formed to employ this strategy.

Problem Statement

From the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement, Pentecostal leaders had identified several individuals in attendance at Pentecostal meetings who claimed receipt of a genuine gift of the Holy Spirit, but had in fact received a counterfeit manifestation. Pentecostal leaders believed that the presence of these counterfeit manifestations in their meetings harmed the credibility of the movement, prevented the genuine gifts of the Holy Spirit from operating in the meetings, and caused sincere Pentecostals to follow the leadings of counterfeit manifestations. In an attempt to resolve the negative effects that

3. The gift of discernment is a gift of the Holy Spirit mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12:10 where it is defined as the ability to distinguish between spirits. A nuanced definition is found later in this chapter under “Terminology: The Gift of Discernment.”

4. This statement is made based on the fact that the majority of printed Pentecostal materials addressing the gift of discernment do not appear until 1922. It is possible that Pentecostals were addressing this matter through sermons that were not recorded, but since recording of sermons was in practice by 1908 with Pentecostal publications like Confidence and The Latter Rain Evangel, the lack of written material published between 1906 and 1922 points to a lack of emphasis on the employment of this gift. It is recognized that isolated attempts were made in 1911 (See Seeley D. Kinne, Spirituals: Gifts, Graces, Operations, Ministries, Demonstrations, and Various Phases of the Spirit Kingdom), 1914, (Paul’s short treatment at the 1914 Sunderland Convention), and 1918 (Charles Mellis’ tract Spiritual Discernment); but the Pentecostal Movement does not seem to push for an understanding of discernment until Wigglesworth’s sermon on November 3, 1922, which was published in The Latter Rain Evangel’s December 1922 issue. This was then followed by two articles in 1923, two treatments in 1928, and finally Frosham’s article in 1935.
counterfeit manifestations were bringing to the Pentecostal Movement, Pentecostals employed three strategies to counteract counterfeit activity in their meetings.⁵ Even with these strategies in place to resolve the counterfeit manifestation problem, false manifestations were still operating in Pentecostal churches and causing negative consequences for the Pentecostal Movement.

**The Purpose of the Study**

This thesis seeks to explain the seemingly sudden interest in the function and benefits of the gift of discernment that is evident in the publications of major Pentecostal figures between 1922 and 1941. The analysis illuminates influential Pentecostal opinions regarding the expected outcomes of the exercise of discernment, the requirements necessary for the operation of the gift, and the scriptural bases of these conclusions as found in nine treatments published on the gift of discernment between 1914 and 1941.

**Significance of the Study**

Little scholarly research has focused on Pentecostal beliefs about the gift of discernment or on situating those beliefs in a historical framework. This study informs of the negative consequences Pentecostals were experiencing from the operation of counterfeit manifestations from 1906 to 1941, the strategies they employed to counteract their operation, provides a reason for the sudden focus by Pentecostals on the gift of discernment from 1922 to 1941, details the opinions and practices Pentecostals held from 1914 to 1941 regarding the gift of discernment, and identifies two developments in Pentecostal theology on the gift of discernment during this time.

---

⁵ These strategies will be identified and explained in Chapter Two.
Methodology

Since this is the first time that a history of the gift of discernment has been attempted for classical Pentecostalism during its formative years, the research methods I used to complete this study relied predominantly upon primary sources. Secondary sources were used, whenever possible, in order to clarify issues brought up in the primary sources. The primary sources are Pentecostal magazine articles and books written by eight early Pentecostals. These sources contain both published sermons as well as doctrinal discussions about the gift of discernment. Secondary sources include dictionaries, encyclopedias, books, journal articles, internet sources, and other publications pertinent to the subject of this study. The authors of the primary and many of the secondary sources are believing practitioners of Pentecostalism.

In order to accomplish the aims of this thesis, the following steps were taken. First, I examined the articles and chapters published on the gift of discernment in order to locate information that would help me explain the reasons why the gift of discernment was being discussed, i.e. problems that were occurring in early Pentecostalism seen to be due to a perceived lack of discernment. Second, I located and reviewed Pentecostal articles that mention the term “discernment” to see if these writings mentioned similar problems as those addressed by other Pentecostal writers or speakers. I also reviewed these articles to determine if other problems existed that were not specially mentioned in the articles and chapters written on the gift of discernment. Third, I read and analyzed

6. Researchers have studied this subject, but their research has been based on current classical Pentecostal or Charismatic practices of discernment. There have been no studies to date that have explored classical Pentecostals beliefs and teachings about the gift of discernment during the early years of the Pentecostal Movement.

7. While only seven articles (one is a reprint of an earlier article) discuss the gift of discernment in detail from 1908 to 1941, the Consortium of Pentecostal Archives located 292 additional articles that
the articles and chapters written on the gift of discernment and recorded the opinions of their authors regarding this gift. Fourth, I examined the theological opinions early Pentecostals held regarding justification, sanctification, and baptism in the Holy Spirit to contextualize the conclusions Pentecostal authors reached regarding the gift of discernment. Fifth, I documented what appears to be the practice of discernment in 1941 since it is the final year Pentecostals published an article specifically on the gift of discernment until 1970.8


I did double check my search using the Assemblies of God archive Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center which houses Assemblies of God Heritage (1981-Present), Confidence (1908-1926), Latter Rain Evangel (1908-1939), The Pentecost (1908-1910), Pentecostal Evangel (1913-2002), and Word and Witness (1912-1915). I contacted the International Pentecostal Holiness Church about their searchable DVD of the International Pentecostal Holiness Advocate to see if the DVD searched terminology. I did not receive a response. I contacted The Church of God of Prophecy for information on an archive for their magazine White Wing Messenger. There was no response. Finally, I contacted the Pentecostal Church of God regarding an archive for their magazine Pentecostal Messenger. They responded that an archive has not been established yet and what they do have is in storage. Additionally, I searched The University of Southern California’s Pentecostal and Charismatic Research Archive for articles and books on discernment. This archive revealed the 1970 article “Discerning of Spirits” by Gerald Chamberlain and the short section on discernment in Seeley D. Kinne’s Spirituals: Gifts, Graces, Operations, Ministries, Demonstrations, and Various Phases of the Spirit Kingdom (1911).
For the purpose of this study, in order for a stated viewpoint to be defined as a belief held in 1941 on the gift of discernment, the viewpoint had to meet the following criteria. First, it had to be mentioned by at least two discernment writers. Second, the stated idea had to be present in a Pentecostal article published between 1928 and 1941.9 This time frame incorporates five treatments on the gift of discernment – Elijah Clark’s chapter, Donald Gee’s article, Harold Horton’s chapter, Stanley Frodsham’s article, and Howard Carter’s chapter.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One covers the problem statement, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, methodology, the organization of the study, scope and delimitations of the study, limitations of the study, resource discovery, terminology, and literature review. Chapter Two discusses conclusions that early Pentecostals formed about counterfeit manifestations, the negative consequences these manifestations created for the Pentecostal Movement, and the strategies employed by Pentecostals to counteract them. Chapter Three provides brief biographies of the eight individuals who authored treatments on the gift of discernment from 1914 to 1941 and what these writers decided were the functions and benefits of the gift of discernment. Utilizing the nine treatments of discernment written by these eight authors, Chapter Four explains the opinions these writers held regarding the gift of discernment, including the outcomes they expected would result from knowledge received through the gift of discernment, the requirements for the gift of discernment to operate in an individual, and

---

9. This time frame was selected because of the major developments in Pentecostal theology that took place around the year 1928. Including theological beliefs that only appear early on in Pentecostal history of the gift of discernment, i.e. 1914-1923, would incorporate beliefs that might not actually have been present in 1941.
how to identify a person who had been granted the genuine gift of discernment. Chapter Five identifies two developments in Pentecostal theology regarding the gift of discernment, seeks to offer explanations as to why these theological developments take place, defines the apparent practice of discernment in 1941, and provides a final conclusion of the findings from this study.

**The Scope/Delimitations of the Study**

This thesis will utilize the nine published treatments of the gift of discernment from 1914 to 1941 to determine why Pentecostals suddenly focused on educating their members on the gift of discernment during this time and to determine early Pentecostal viewpoints on the function, benefits, and practice of the gift of discernment for this period of time in Pentecostal history. Other Pentecostal articles written between 1906 and 1941 will also be considered when they add understanding to the context in which the articles on the gift of discernment were written.

Materials not examined in the thesis include first a section in Seeley D. Kinne’s 1911 book *Spirituals: Gifts, Graces, Operations, Ministries, Demonstrations, and Various Phases of the Spirit Kingdom* entitled “Discernment.” This section is not included because it does not clearly distinguish beliefs regarding the gift of discernment from natural discernment. Second is a short piece found in *The Pentecostal Evangel’s* September 1, 1928 issue entitled “The Gift of Discernment,” which is an excerpt from *The Latter Rain Evangel’s* September 1923 issue entitled “In the Supernatural Realm.”10 The last section of *The Latter Rain Evangel* article was excerpted and re-titled in *The...*  

---

Pentecostal Evangel publication. This article contains two examples of the gift of discernment in practice along with a paragraph at the end encouraging the practice of the gift of discernment in the church and a warning to practice it with love and tenderness. Because this article is not a treatment of the subject, it is not being considered a main source of information. Third, because the idea of “testing the spirits” is not considered equal to the gift of discerning of spirits in Pentecostal theology, articles specifically focused on “testing the spirits” were not deemed valid additions to the discussion about how the gift of discernment operated early in the Pentecostal Movement. Finally, Charles J. Mellis’ tract for the Foursquare Gospel Church in 1918 on the gift of discernment is out of print, and I was unable to locate a copy. Therefore, its contents could not be utilized in this study.

Limitations of the Study

The nine treatments written on the gift of discernment between 1914 and 1941 come from three magazines and three books that were written in English and circulated in the United States and England. Contributors of these treatments were from the United States, England, and Germany. Because all the contributors viewed the issue from a background of Pentecostalism in the West, this thesis will reflect a more Western Christian view of the gift of discernment in Pentecostalism than may be found among Pentecostals who have a Southern or Eastern Christian worldview.


12. A search was completed using the Consortium of Pentecostal Archives for articles written in Spanish and German. The Spanish and German equivalents of the term “discernment” were used in the search. Not one article was returned on the search.
Because this is the first attempt to understand the theological beliefs of Pentecostals regarding the gift of discernment between 1914 and 1941, information regarding the theological beliefs and biographical information regarding the authors was difficult to find. As a result, this study is dependent on my interpretation of primary sources and the few existing dissertations and books that explain the theological beliefs of the authors. I also had to piece together biographical histories of some authors by reviewing early Pentecostal magazines reports on the individuals and comparing the information to identities of individuals located on Ancestry.com.13 When possible, entries associated with the authors found in The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements were utilized for information, but at times this source did not provide the adequate detail needed for this study. Materials produced by Pentecostals treating the gift of discernment are limited; furthermore, I could locate no non-Pentecostal scholars who have either studied this subject or the authors who wrote on the subject between 1914 and 1941.

**Resource Discovery**

In order to find information regarding early Pentecostals viewpoints on the gift of discernment, I took the following steps. First, I searched “Pentecostal discernment” on WorldCat to locate books and articles that discuss discernment. This search returned a single book, Stephen E. Parker’s, *Led by the Spirit: Toward a Practical Theology of Pentecostal Discernment and Decision Making* (1996). Parker’s book is based on a study that he completed of his home church, an International Pentecostal Holiness Church. He details his understanding of the current discernment process of classical Pentecostals.

13. Ancestry.com is a subscription service that requires a paid account to access its materials. Because of this, supporting documentation that was accessed through this site has been added to the appendix of this thesis.
today and focuses on providing a justification for its current operation. Parker’s book does not offer a history of Pentecostal beliefs concerning the gift of discernment and so contributes nothing significant to this study. Second, I searched “Pentecostal discernment” in the EBSCO and Digital Dissertations and Theses databases, with the result that nothing related to this topic could be located. Third, my search of “discernment” in Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center’s archive of various Assemblies of God publications provided the six articles treating the gift of discernment. An additional search was made utilizing the Consortium of Pentecostal Archives, and no additional articles were located.

Finally, I located five chapter treatments on the gift of discernment, three of which were not reprinted articles from a magazine published earlier. These chapter-length treatments appear in the following books: Smith Wigglesworth’s *Ever Increasing Faith* (1924), Elijah C. Clark’s *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost “And More,”* (1928), Donald


Gee’s *Concerning Spiritual Gifts* (1928),¹⁶ Howard Carter’s *Questions & Answers On Spiritual Gifts* (1934),¹⁷ and Harold Horton’s *Gifts of the Spirit* (1941).¹⁸

### Terminology

This section defines terms and categories that will be used throughout this thesis. Contextualizing the terms historically is necessary in order to appreciate their special meaning in historic Pentecostalism.

#### Baptism in the Holy Spirit

The Pentecostal use of the phrase, “baptism in the Holy Spirit,” can be traced to British Methodist John Fletcher (1729-1785), who used the phrase, “baptism of fire” to describe “entire sanctification,” an experience he believed burned away sin and purified the inner being.¹⁹ By the late 1800s, Presbyterian minister Albert B. Simpson (1843-1919) had formed the two-step model for Christian initiation. The first step was “regeneration” or salvation. The second step was baptism in the Holy Spirit. Simpson kept the idea that baptism of the Holy Spirit occurred simultaneously with sanctification. He called this the

---


“second blessing,” and described this “second blessing” as “a moment of ‘consecration’ or ‘complete surrender’ that resulted in a ‘personal indwelling of Jesus.’”

Holiness preacher Benjamin H. Irwin (b. 1854) studied Fletcher’s beliefs about the “baptism of fire” in the late 1890s and concluded that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was a separate experience that came after entire sanctification. In October 1895, he received this “baptism of fire,” in which he said he felt like he was actually on fire. Followers of Irwin reported similar experiences. When people experienced this “baptism of fire,” they “would often shout, scream, speak in tongues, fall into trances, receive the holy dance and holy laugh, and even get the ‘jerks.’” Irwin believed that the point of this experience was to give a person power. The majority of people in the Holiness Movement rejected Irwin’s idea of a “third blessing,” denouncing it as heresy. But, when the Pentecostal Movement emerged, many members embraced the idea that sanctification was a separate experience from the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

With the understanding that sanctification is a separate experience from the baptism in the Holy Spirit, being baptized in the Holy Spirit took on the meaning of being “immersed” in the Holy Spirit. Just as one is completely covered with water in the act

---


23. J. Rodman Williams, “Baptism in the Holy Spirit,” The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 355-63. There is some discrepancy among Classical Pentecostals regarding when sanctification occurs. Some believe that sanctification occurs after conversion, in a threestep process, as Irwin believed; others believe that sanctification occurs at the moment of conversion, a view the Assemblies of God and Foursquare denominations embraced.

of water baptism, so is one spiritually covered with the Holy Spirit in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Some describe this experience as being “filled.” This term “points to an inner penetration or pervasion” of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{25} The image is one of being covered by the Holy Spirit, and of every internal part of the body being completely filled with God. Pentecostals believe that God wants to encompass a person fully through this spiritual baptism.

\textbf{Pentecostal/Pentecostal Movement}

Some argue that the Pentecostal Movement officially began on January 1, 1901, when Agnes Ozman received the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial evidence of speaking in unknown tongues.\textsuperscript{26} Others contend that the Pentecostal Movement began in 1896 during a summer revival held by the Christian Union in Cherokee County, NC. During this time, 130 attendants were “enraptured by the Holy Spirit and spoke in unknown tongues.”\textsuperscript{27} However, these experiences were short-lived and did not create the same level of recognition or bring as much attention to the Pentecostal message as the Azusa Street Revival. As a result, most Pentecostals associate the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement with the Azusa Street Revival, which began in 1906.

On February 22, 1906, William Joseph Seymour (1870-1922) arrived in Los Angeles to teach at a small African American Holiness church.\textsuperscript{28} Prior to his arrival, he

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{26} James R. Goff, Jr., “Parham, Charles Fox,” \textit{The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements}, 956-57.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Charles W. Conn, “Church of God (Cleveland, TN),” \textit{The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements}, 530-34.
\end{itemize}
had been under the tutelage of Charles F. Parham (1873-1929), who promoted the idea that the baptism in the Holy Spirit should be proven with xenolalia. Seymour brought Parham’s teachings to his new congregation, but they were not well received. After only a week of teaching there, he found himself locked out of the church. Seymour was then invited to lead a small Bible study at the home of Richard and Ruth Asberry where he continued to teach Parham’s views on the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Soon several members of the group received the Baptism in the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues. News of these experiences spread and piqued the interest of several people who wanted to find out more about the Pentecostal teaching on the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The interest was so great that Seymour moved the meeting into an empty building at 312 Azusa Street, Los Angeles, CA, which became known as the Azusa Street Mission. It was here that the teachings of Parham gained national and international attention and support. Curious people visited the Azusa Street Mission, received the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and then took both the teaching and their personal experiences back home.

29. “Glossolalia” is the general term used to describe the phenomenon of speaking in a language that a person has not previously learned. “Xenolalia” is a more specific term used to describe glossolalia when the language being spoken is an identifiable language actually spoken in the world.


31. The Azusa Street Mission was officially called the Apostolic Faith Mission, but it was better known as the Azusa Street Mission. Robeck, *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival*, 5. Parham called his message “apostolic faith,” and he formed many Apostolic Faith churches in Texas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. Edith L. Blumhofer, “Apostolic Faith Movement, Origins,” *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, 327-29. Seymour’s affiliation with Parham’s Apostolic Faith Movement in Texas most likely led to Seymour’s choice in naming both the Azusa Street Mission and its corresponding paper “Apostolic Faith.” The Azusa Street Revival’s strong association with Parham’s movement is most likely the reason Parham later corrected actions that he felt were unbiblical in the Azusa Street Mission and openly denounced what was happening there.

32. This occurred despite Parham’s rejection of the conditions at the Azusa Street Mission. He was horrified at the intermingling of whites and blacks in worship and at the demonstrations of fanaticism. When “he attempted to take over the mission and stop the work of those Seymour had recognized as leaders,” he was removed from the mission by two elders, one of whom Parham’s wife Sarah reported was
When these people returned to their churches, they often found they were not welcomed to practice the gifts of the Spirit there. As a result, many adherents to the teachings of Seymour and Parham left their churches to form or join a Pentecostal denomination. Additionally, denominations that were already organized began to associate themselves with the beliefs and practices of the Azusa Street Mission and became Pentecostal. One example was the Christian Union, which later became known as the Church of God (Cleveland, TN).

Since the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement, three identifiable developments have occurred within the movement. Scholars have classified these developments and the people associated with them into three categories – Classical Pentecostal, Charismatic, and Neo-Pentecostal. “Classical” Pentecostal defines any person who joined the Pentecostal Movement from 1906 to about 1960. After 1960, classical Pentecostals are

---


36. Conn, “Church of God (Cleveland, TN),” *NIDPCM* 530-34.
defined as those who belong to a Pentecostal denomination. Defined as those who belong to a Pentecostal denomination. Examples of denominations formed specifically for Pentecostals or that chose to become Pentecostal are the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), associated with Pentecostalism in 1906; the International Pentecostal Holiness Church, associated with Pentecostalism in 1908; the Church of God in Christ, formed in 1907; the Assemblies of God, formed in 1914; and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, founded in 1923.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, members of mainline Protestant denominations and the Roman Catholic Church began to participate in Pentecostal practices, and they were able to remain a part of their church instead of joining a Pentecostal denomination.


38. The Church of God (Cleveland, TN) reports having experienced the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of tongues as early as 1896, but members believed that this was a one-time event. Therefore, they did not preach that others could have such an experience until the Azusa Street Revival in 1906. See Conn, “Church of God (Cleveland, TN),” NIDPCM 531.

39. This denomination was a merger of three Wesleyan Holiness groups—the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, the Holiness Church of North Carolina, and the Tabernacle Pentecostal Church—who embraced Pentecostalism as a result of the Azusa Street Revival. The merger of the churches was not accomplished until 1911. The Tabernacle Pentecostal Church, later named Pentecostal Holiness Church, formally identified with Pentecostalism in 1908. Since this is the church from which the International Pentecostal Holiness Church derives its name, the date of its formal association has been used. See Synan, “International Pentecostal Holiness Church,” NIDPCM 800.

40. The original founding of this church was in 1896, but when the leaders of the church visited Azusa Street in 1907, the church argued over whether Pentecostal practice would be embraced. One of the leaders, who embraced the Pentecostal doctrine of speaking in tongues, left the church and then sued for the rights to the name of the denomination. He won the suit in 1909 and the founding of the church was adjusted to 1907. Dupree, “Church of God in Christ,” NIDPCM 535.


42. It is recognized that the stirring for the Charismatic Movement began before the 1960s, but the story of Dennis Bennett is usually referred to as the moment that defined the beginning of the Charismatic Movement. Bennett was an Episcopalian priest at St. Mark’s in Van Nuys, CA. On April 3, 1960, he confessed to his parish that he believed in the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of glossolalia and that he himself was an active participant of this practice. As a result he was forced to resign his position but was soon after welcomed to the position of vicar at an Episcopalian parish in Washington. See Peter D.
This acceptance of Pentecostal practice into mainline denominational life is called the Charismatic Movement. Therefore, a “Charismatic” is one accepts Pentecostal beliefs concerning baptism in the Holy Spirit and the supernatural gifts of the Spirit, but belongs to a Protestant denomination or to the Roman Catholic Church.43

“Neo-Pentecostals” are the most difficult to define. These Christians have their roots in Pentecostalism but may not identify themselves as Pentecostal or Charismatic. They believe and practice the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but they do not usually recognize the baptism in the Holy Spirit as a separate conversion experience.44 This group may also include practices that classical Pentecostals or Charismatics may not embrace, such as positive confession,45 spiritual mapping,46 and indigenous practices.47 The leaders of this group generally “lack seminary training or [any] other formal theological education.”48


44. Ibid., 291, 296.

45. Positive confession is the belief that one can “bring into existence what [he or she] state[s] with [his or her] mouth.” See Leonard Lovett, “Positive Confession Theology,” The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 992-94. Those who adhere to positive confession believe that if they say or command something to happen, then it will happen. If they claim that they will be healed of an illness, they will be healed. If they claim monetary prosperity, they will be wealthy.

46. Spiritual mapping is the practice of identifying spirits that have been assigned to a geographical location, such as a city or nation; an institution, such as, a church or business; a particular vice, such as, abortion or homosexuality; a material object, such as, a building or chair; a nonmaterial object, such as, music or rituals; and the image of an ancestor. See Charles Kraft, “Spiritual Warfare: A Neocharismatic Perspective,” The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 1094-95.

47. Donald E. Miller and Tetsunao Yamamori have removed indigenous churches from this category and have created a fourth category of Pentecostalism. See Donald E. Miller and Tetsunao Yamamori, Global Pentecostalism: The New Face of Christian Social Engagement (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007), 26-7. While this is most likely a better distinction, most scholars only recognize three categories of Pentecostals. Therefore, the dominant categories will be used in this thesis.

48. Miller and Yamamori, Global Pentecostalism, 27.
Because of the great number of diverse practices in this group, members are referred to by a variety of names including Neocharismatic, Independent (Pentecostal/Charismatic), Post-denominationalist, Restorationist, Radical, Neo-Apostolic, and Indigenous Pentecostal.\textsuperscript{49}

Regardless of the form, every Pentecostal believes that the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Holy Spirit are granted by God to the present-day church.\textsuperscript{50} Because other Christian groups throughout history also held similar convictions, these beliefs do not distinguish Pentecostal groups from other Christian groups. Instead, the distinguishing characteristic that set Pentecostals apart was their belief that there should be proof that one has experienced the baptism of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{51} Charles Fox Parham (1873-1929) and William Joseph Seymour (1870-1922), Pentecostalism’s earliest promoters, believed that this proof was evidenced by the person speaking in a language previously unknown to the speaker, also referred to as glossolalia. As the message of Pentecostalism spread, people who became connected with Pentecostal activities began to believe that any gift of the Spirit could be considered proof of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, since the gifts could not operate in people who had not experienced Spirit baptism.\textsuperscript{52} It is not necessary that one have the experience of the baptism of the Holy

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49} Burgess and Van Der Maas, “Global Statistics,” \textit{NIDPCM} 291 and Miller and Yamamori, \textit{Global Pentecostalism}, 26.
\item \textsuperscript{50} These gifts of the Spirit are found in 1 Corinthians 12:7-10—messages of wisdom or knowledge, faith, prophecy, miracles, healing, interpretation, and discerning of spirits.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Today, not every Pentecostal believes in this idea, but they are still associated with this type of Christianity because of other beliefs that are more closely associated with Pentecostalism than with other modern Christian groups.
\end{itemize}
Spirit with evidence in order to be called a Pentecostal. This designation is assigned to the belief rather than the experience.  

Gifts of the Spirit

The “gifts of the Spirit” are simply “talents or abilities given by the Holy Spirit” to a person. In early Pentecostalism, the gifts of the Spirit were considered those found in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10 – message of wisdom, message of knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, discernment of spirits, unknown tongues, and interpretation. Early Pentecostals believed that these gifts could only become operational in a person’s life after he or she received the baptism in the Holy Spirit. These gifts were not considered to be permanent, but momentary gifts that God granted an individual at a specific time for a specific purpose.

Manifestation

The word “manifestation” in early Pentecostalism can be described as anything that appears to be a gift of the Spirit as listed in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10 or anything that humans could not accomplish by their own strength, in other words “supernatural.” Examples of supernatural manifestations not listed in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10 include

53. For example, William J. Seymour, who held the most famous Pentecostal meetings at the Azusa Street Mission, had not received the experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of tongues until after he embraced the teaching and taught this message to others. Robeck, “Seymour,” NIDPCM, 1055.


55. Throughout Pentecostal journals, these are the gifts of the Spirit that are referenced.

56. Burgess and Van Der Maas “Global Statistics,” NIDPCM, 291.

writing in an unknown tongue, visitations with dead relatives or friends, and fortune
telling.\textsuperscript{58} Though Pentecostals recognized these activities as supernatural manifestations,
they did not necessarily believe them to be from God.

Counterfeit Manifestations

Pentecostals believed that supernatural manifestations that did not originate with God
were counterfeit. Sometimes this type of manifestation was difficult to identify because it
presented itself in the same manner as a genuine manifestation. For example, someone
who counterfeited speaking in an unknown tongue appeared the same as an individual
speaking in an unknown tongue from God. At other times the difference between the two
were more easily identified. Pastor Archibald P. Collins described the identification of
counterfeit tongues in his sermon, “The Faith that Counts with God: Discernment, a
Much Needed Gift”:

Dr. Torrey himself told me of an incident that happened in his church in Los
Angeles. A man got up and attempted to speak in tongues, and Dr. Torrey said he
repeated identically the same word a number of times, when another got up to
give the interpretation it was a succession of well-rounded sentences. Mr. Torrey
knew, and anybody who knew anything about philology would have known that it
wasn’t the interpretation.\textsuperscript{59}

There were also times when counterfeit manifestations were completely different
from the supernatural manifestations listed in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10 and judged to be
counterfeit because their practice was either not recognized or clearly forbidden in the
Scriptures. After William Seymour “could find nothing in Scripture to justify the practice

\textsuperscript{58} Announcements, \textit{The Apostolic Faith} 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 2. Rosa Bevill, “The Trap
Door to Hell: An Ex-Medium Warns Against the Evils of Spiritualism,” \textit{The Pentecostal Evangel} nos.

\textsuperscript{59} Archibald P. Collins, “The Faith that Counts with God: Discernment, a Much Needed Gift,”
\textit{The Latter Rain Evangel} 10, no. 10 (July 1918): 14-8.
of writing in tongues,” he ended this practice at the Azusa Street Mission.  

Stanley Frodsham, office editor of *The Pentecostal Evangel*, referenced Baptist preacher Dr. Russell H. Conwell’s communications with his dead wife as an example of an illegitimate manifestation. Frodsham pointed out that Conwell was engaging in an activity that was directly forbidden in the scriptures in Deuteronomy 18:10.  

Lee referred Pentecostals to 1 Samuel 28 where King Saul consulted the witch of Endor to bring up the spirit of Samuel so that he could communicate with Samuel. Lee stated that Saul was killed and incurred the wrath of God because he communicated with a familiar spirit. Lee continued, “James says if any man lack wisdom, let him ask God. And not one time does he say, to seek to those that have familiar spirits or necromancers (one that talks to the dead).”  

Lee believed that the Bible warned Christians not to be participants in these activities.  

Finally, a manifestation could be judged to be counterfeit, if it was achieved without the assistance of God. When Charles F. Parham visited the Azusa Street Mission for the first time, he stated, “I sat on the platform in Azusa Street Mission, and saw the manifestations of the flesh, spiritualistic controls, saw people practicing hypnotism at the altar over candidates seeking the baptism; though many were receiving the real baptism of the Holy Ghost.”  

Parham’s comment implied that the practice of hypnotism over a candidate could induce glossolalia without the aid of God. Other early Pentecostal leaders  

--- 

and writers alluded to this conclusion as well. Seymour and Wigglesworth identified Christian Scientists\textsuperscript{64} and Theosophists,\textsuperscript{65} groups that did not accredit God with the achievement of supernatural manifestations, as those that practiced counterfeit manifestations.\textsuperscript{66}

Pentecostals rejected counterfeit manifestations because of their belief that in order to produce a counterfeit manifestation, one had to be possessed by an evil spirit and deny the atoning work of Jesus Christ. Frodsham, long-time editor of \textit{The Pentecostal Evangel}, exclaimed, “When anyone apostatizes to Spiritualism the first thing he has to throw away is the atoning blood of Christ!”\textsuperscript{67} Flavius J. Lee, general overseer of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), stated that although Christian Scientists and hypnotists healed people, they did so without honoring the atoning blood of Jesus and through the aid of demons.\textsuperscript{68} Rosa Bevill, a former spiritualist medium, claimed that she was able to tell fortunes and write inspired messages, but evil spirits had possessed her when she

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{64} Christian Scientist practitioners do not believe that the work of healing is a supernatural experience, but a natural one. Pentecostals, on the other hand, would term this as supernatural. For ease, the Pentecostal description will be used. See The Christian Science Board of Directors, “What is Christian Science?” Christian Science, \url{http://christianscience.com/what-is-christian-science#basic-teachings} (accessed September 29, 2015).}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{65} Theosophists admit that their powers are the result of man and not the result of God. See the founder of Theosophy’s comments in Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, “What is Theosophy?” \textit{The Theosophist} 1 no. 1 (October 1879): n.p., \url{http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/theosoph/theos1a.htm#whatistheosophy} (accessed September 29, 2015).}


accomplished these feats. R. E. Massey told the story of another spiritualist who was trying free herself from the evil spirits that possessed her. He explained that she had gained the ability to perform supernatural acts after an “unseen spirit” possessed her, proving that she had “sold herself to the Devil” in order to perform counterfeit manifestations.

Spiritist/Spiritism

This term was applied in three different ways in early Pentecostal writing. First, it was used to denote a separate group of people who practiced counterfeit manifestations. Similar to how Methodists are listed as a distinct group from Anglicans in a list of Christian churches, spiritists were considered a distinct group from Spiritualists, Christians Scientists, and others who practiced counterfeit manifestations. Second, it was used as an umbrella term to include all groups of people that practiced counterfeit manifestations. Third, it was used as an interchangeable term to describe members of Spiritualist churches. The third use of this term was employed in the articles written on

73. D. Wesley Myland argued that the term “spiritual” should only apply to holy things from God. Because Spiritualists’ practice did not originate with God, they should not be called “spiritual.” D. Wesley Myland, “The Voices of God: An Exposition of the Twenty-Ninth Psalm – Concluded,” The Latter Rain
the gift of discernment. The two writers that use this term are Wigglesworth (1923) and Gee (1928). Both articles appear in *The Pentecostal Evangel*, which used the term to refer to Spiritualists during the time these articles are published. Because of this, the term “spiritist” will be understood in this thesis as employing the same ideas as the term “spiritualist.”

---

Gift of Discernment

Within early Pentecostal theology, the term “discernment” was used to describe the ability to distinguish between good and evil through either the natural senses or the spiritual senses. Pentecostals concluded that humans possessed a natural discernment that enabled them to distinguish between good and evil spirits driving a person’s actions and thoughts without the assistance of God. This type of discernment may be naturally apparent to an individual or it may require training. An example of early Pentecostals utilizing natural discernment is in their practice of “testing the spirits.” Pentecostals assert that the scriptures provide tests that one can use to identify the spirit driving an individual’s actions. While applying these tests may require education, obtainment of this learning and the application of these tests can be achieved through natural means.

Pentecostals also held the opinion that there was a spiritual discernment that was only achieved through the assistance of God. They assumed that during times that natural discernment could not accurately identify the spirit driving an individual’s actions, God would grant a person spiritual discernment, also referred to as the gift of discernment. This type of discernment not only identified the spirit driving a person’s actions, but it could also identify the spirit guiding an individual before he or she acted and it could confirm if an evil spirit was behind an individual’s sickness. Pentecostals based the existence of this special type of discernment on 1 Corinthians 12:10 where the gift of discernment is defined as the ability to distinguish between spirits. Early Pentecostals referred to this gift by multiple terms, including spiritual discernment, the gift or ability of discerning the spirits, and the gift of discernment.
Pentecostal opinions on the gift of discernment are predominantly drawn from the six articles and three chapters written by eight early Pentecostals between 1914 and 1941. Both the magazines and the denominations for which these authors wrote provide insight into the reach these materials had in the larger Pentecostal Movement. The following survey of the histories and qualities of these sources will help to characterize and clarify their contributions to this study.

Smith Wigglesworth (1859-1947), Stanley Frodsham (1882-1969), and Donald Gee (1891-1966) wrote three articles for The Pentecostal Evangel between 1923 and 1935. Joseph James Roswell Flower (1888-1970) and Alice Reynolds Flower (1890-1991) began publishing this magazine on July 19, 1913 under the name The Christian Evangel. In April 1914, the Assemblies of God formed, and Joseph Flower was elected to the position of secretary-treasurer. His magazine was joined with the Assemblies of God, and it became the new denomination’s first official periodical. In March 1915, the magazine changed its name to the Weekly Evangel in order to highlight the fact that it was published weekly. Endorus N. Bell, the first superintendent of the General Council of the Assemblies of God, merged his magazine Word and Witness with The Weekly


76. McGee, “Flower,” *NIDPCM* 642. It was not the intention of the members who formed the Assemblies of God for the organization to be become a denomination, but “theological controversies …rapidly forced the group to develop into a denomination.” Terry Minter, “Antecedents to the Assemblies of God,” (PhD diss., Regent University School of Divinity, 2011), 1.

Evangel in May 1918, and the name was changed back to The Christian Evangel.\textsuperscript{78} On October 18, 1919, the name of the magazine was changed to The Pentecostal Evangel and it continues under this title today.\textsuperscript{79} In 1916, Stanley H. Frodsham became editor of The Pentecostal Evangel, and he maintained this role until he retired in 1949.\textsuperscript{80}

The mergers that resulted in the formation of The Pentecostal Evangel were reflective of the merger of Pentecostal sects joining together to form the Assemblies of God. Joseph Flower and his wife Alice began the Association of Christian Assemblies, which organized Pentecostals in Indiana and the surrounding states in 1913. This organization became the base of individuals who formed the Assemblies of God.\textsuperscript{81} Even though Word and Witness magazine, the primary periodical for the Church of God in Christ (white), did not merge with the Assemblies of God magazine until 1918, the Church of God in Christ (white) did join the Assemblies of God in 1914.\textsuperscript{82} This organization was a collection of 352 ministers from various Pentecostal groups that


\textsuperscript{81} McGee, “Flower,” NIDPCM 642.

\textsuperscript{82} Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, “Digital Collections: Word and Witness,” Consortium of Pentecostal Archives, https://pentecostalarchives.org/collections/pentecostalEvangel/ (accessed October 13, 2015). The designation “white” is used to distinguish between the two Pentecostal churches that were both named Church of God in Christ. One was composed of African-American members and the other of Caucasians. The Caucasian church merged with the Assemblies of God in 1914, but the African-American church has become “the largest African-American Holiness Pentecostal church in North America.” DuPree, “Church of God in Christ,” NIDPCM, 535.
operated primarily in the South and Southwestern United States. With the geographical influence that the Assemblies of God gained immediately, it is not surprising that it has become “the largest Pentecostal fellowship in the world.”

Both Harold Horton (1880-1969) and Howard Carter (1891-1971) benefitted from the large reach that the Assemblies of God had both in America and in England when they published their books through the Assemblies of God Publishing Houses in both countries. Gospel Publishing House, the publishing house for the American Assemblies of God, distributed Horton’s book *Gifts of the Spirit* in 1934. By 1946, the British Assemblies of God Publishing House was also printing and distributing Horton’s book. The British Assemblies of God Publishing House also published Howard Carter’s book *Questions & Answers On Spiritual Gifts* in 1941.

Anna C. Reiff (1869-1960) and Smith Wigglesworth wrote two articles that were circulated in *The Latter Rain Evangel*. This paper was the official publication of the Stone Church, located in Chicago, Illinois. It was published from 1908 to 1939, in response to a message from God given to the Stone Church that they should start a paper “for the glory and honor of Jesus the Christ.” The entire message from God is printed

---


on the second page of the first issue of the paper. It informs the reader that God is the manager, director, and editor of the paper and that only what He desires to be printed will be printed in the paper.\(^{87}\) The managing editors were William Hamner Piper (1868-1911), pastor of the Stone Church, and Anna C. Reiff, who was called upon by Piper to assist with editing.\(^{88}\) After Piper’s unexpected death on December 29, 1911, Reiff took over editorial responsibility for the paper.\(^{89}\) In the first issue published after Piper’s death, Reiff restated Piper’s vision for the paper saying, “The work is God’s; we must not forget that. He can carry it on by whomsoever He wills…”\(^{90}\)

Because they believed the paper was led by God’s direction, Piper and Reiff were not as concerned about promoting their own doctrinal beliefs as they were about unifying Pentecostal Christians. Heather D. Curtis writes that Piper was more focused on “unifying Christians across doctrinal and class lines.”\(^{91}\) After Piper’s death, his wife stated, “[God] is far more desirous that we have unity than that we split hairs over doctrine. I can go to heaven on ‘the finished work of Calvary’ and the ‘second work of grace,’ too.”\(^{92}\) This focus on unity enabled The Latter Rain Evangel to help “independent

\(^{87}\) Piper, “Voice of the Spirit,” 2.


\(^{92}\) Lydia M. Piper, “What is That to Thee? Follow Thou Me,” The Latter Rain Evangel (October 1912): 14-17. Lydia Piper is referring to the two dominant views of sanctification that divided Pentecostals along doctrinal lines. The difference between these two views will be discussed in Chapter Three.
[Pentecostal] ministers maintain contact with one another and with the general movement."^{93}

In the inaugural issue of *The Latter Rain Evangel*, Piper stated that he hoped to add contributors to the paper from around the world in order to update the readership about God’s work everywhere.^{94} The paper began with testimonies, sermons, and messages from the Holy Spirit that occurred only at Stone Church. As time went on, the content of the paper grew to include information regarding upcoming Pentecostal conventions, tent revivals, and camp meetings; reports and sermons from those events; sermons by guest speakers at the Stone Church and at other national and international Pentecostal churches; reports of missionary donations made by the paper, which included how much each missionary received; reports about those missionary efforts; information on books, pamphlets, and other items for sale by Pentecostals; and other information the editors thought Pentecostals would find helpful or useful in their ministries or personal walk with God. It is not surprising that with all *The Latter Rain Evangel* offered its readers, the Stone Church “became known as a center of [American] Pentecostalism for many years."^{95} It was truly a Pentecostal hub that enabled Pentecostals to keep up with what was happening in the world of Pentecostalism.

*Confidence* magazine contains the brief treatment of the gift of discernment by Pastor Jonathan Paul, leader of the German Pentecostal Movement, during the Sunderland Convention of 1914, a Pentecostal conference hosted by Alexander A.

---


95. Minter, “Antecedents to the Assemblies of God,” 160.
Boddy’s All Saints Church in Sunderland, England. These conferences were held annually from 1908 to 1914. Sunderland was also the place where British Pentecostals first heard and embraced the Pentecostal message. Between Boddy’s publication of *Confidence* magazine, the conferences held at All Saints in Sunderland, and the fact that All Saints became an education center on the Pentecostal message, it is understandable why many considered Sunderland the center for British Pentecostalism. Sunderland maintained this role until the start of World War I in 1914.

In 1928, Elijah C. Clark wrote *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost “And More,“* which included a chapter on the gift of discernment. The Church of God Publishing House (Cleveland, TN) was the distributor of this book. By 1926, the Church of God


98. World War I created a need for the British Pentecostal Movement to organize itself into formal denominations, so that, Pentecostal conscientious objectors could be officially recognized by their country’s war department. After this people began to associate with their individual denominations. See Edith Blumhofer, “Alexander Boddy and the Rise of Pentecostalism in Great Britain,” *The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 31-40.
(Cleveland, TN) had 25,000 members in 31 states.\(^\text{99}\) The November 21, 1928, issue of *The Church of God Evangel*, the official periodical of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), announced that it had 34 state overseers to supervise operations in 31 states, two foreign countries, and one to oversee “colored work.”\(^\text{100}\) During this time the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) could be found in Maine, Florida, Arizona, California, and multiple states in between. They are noticeably absent from many of the West and Northwestern states. The states of Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Iowa are not found on the roster. Even so, the influence of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) extended remarkably far for an organization that consisted of only four congregations in 1905.\(^\text{101}\)

All of the authors writing about the gift of discernment wrote for Pentecostal papers or publishing houses that were attached to churches or organizations that were plausibly considered to be centers of Pentecostalism for both America and Britain. Reiff and Wigglesworth published their articles in *The Latter Rain Evangel*, the organ of the Stone Church. Gee, Frodsham, and Wigglesworth published their articles in *The Pentecostal Evangel*, the official publication of the American Assemblies of God. Horton’s and Carter’s books were published by the American and British publishing houses for the Assemblies of God. Pastor Jonathan Paul’s comments are recorded in *Confidence*, the official magazine of All Saints Parish Church in Sunderland, England,

---

\(^\text{99}\) Conn, “Church of God (Cleveland, TN),” *NIDPCM* 532.

\(^\text{100}\) S. W. Latimer, “State Overseers,” *The Church of God Evangel* 19, no. 46 (November 1928): 2. The need for a category that ministered to congregations that were not Caucasian, most likely resulted from the separation of Caucasian and African-American congregations within the denomination in 1926. J. H. Curry, an African-American minister, held this position. Conn, “Church of God (Cleveland, TN),” *NIDPCM* 533.

\(^\text{101}\) Conn, “The Church of God (Cleveland, TN),” *NIDPCM* 530.
the center for British Pentecostalism at the time. Finally, Clark’s book was published by the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), which had a significant influence across the United States.

**Conclusion**

The early Pentecostal Movement was plagued by counterfeit manifestations that resulted in several negative consequences for the movement during its formative years. To counteract these manifestations, Pentecostals employed four strategies in their meetings, one of which was the implementation of the gift of discernment. Because this strategy was considered to be more effective than the other three strategies employed, it is surprising that Pentecostal publications record very few treatments educating members on the gift of discernment between 1906 and 1922. From 1922 to 1941, five prominent Pentecostal publishing houses distributed nine unique treatments on the gift of discernment. After this nineteen-year period, no new publications on this topic are published until 1970. There must be a reason for this topic to have received focused attention from 1922 to 1941.

Chapter Two will discuss the negative consequences Pentecostals presumed were the result of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings, the strategies they employed to counteract the effects of these manifestations, and the reason there appears to be a delay in educating members on the gift of discernment.
CHAPTER II

THE COUNTERFEIT PROBLEM: CONSEQUENCES AND STRATEGIES

Early Pentecostals identified three negative consequences that resulted from the operation of counterfeit manifestations\(^1\) in their meetings from 1906 to 1941. They believed that the gift of discernment was given to the churches by God in order to protect them from the deception of counterfeit manifestations.\(^2\) Yet it was not until 1922 that the Pentecostal Movement began to focus on educating Pentecostals about the gift of discernment.\(^3\) Did counterfeit manifestations suddenly appear or become more numerous in Pentecostal meetings in 1922? If not, what was the Pentecostal Movement doing about this matter prior to 1922? This chapter will suggest answers to these questions by exploring Pentecostal beliefs regarding counterfeit manifestations, by identifying the negative consequences Pentecostals credited with the operation of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings from 1906 to 1941, and by examining strategies Pentecostals developed to counteract the effects of these manifestations.

---

1. Counterfeit manifestations are supernatural manifestations such as glossolalia and prophecy that do not have their origination with God. Sometimes these manifestations were clearly identifiable as being counterfeit, at other times, they appeared identical to the genuine manifestations received through the Holy Spirit of God.


3. It is recognized that isolated attempts were made in 1911 (See Seeley D. Kinne, _Spirituals: Gifts, Graces, Operations, Ministries, Demonstrations, and Various Phases of the Spirit Kingdom_), 1914, (Paul’s short treatment at the 1914 Sunderland Convention), and 1918 (Charles Mellis’ tract _Spiritual Discernment_); but the Pentecostal Movement does not seem to push for an understanding of discernment until Wigglesworth’s sermon on November 3, 1922, which was published in _The Latter Rain Evangel’s_ December 1922 issue. This was then followed by two articles in 1923, two treatments in 1928, on treatment in 1934, one in 1935, and finally one in 1941.
Early Pentecostal Conclusions Regarding Counterfeit Manifestations

There appears to have been a delay in recognizing the counterfeit manifestations at work at the Azusa Street Mission. In April 1906, the *Los Angeles Times* had criticized the meetings at the Azusa Street Mission, using the terms “weird,” “fanatical,” “wild,” and “mad,” to describe them, but Seymour and other participants in Azusa Street meetings did not identify these criticisms with the presence of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings.⁴ Instead, they believed that the paper’s negative reports represented the devil at work, trying to fight the good work of God.⁵ As late as September 1906, Seymour provided no indication that he was conscious of counterfeit manifestations at work in the meetings. In the first issue of his paper *The Apostolic Faith* (September 1906), he announced that God had granted the gift of writing in unknown tongues to people at the Azusa Street Mission, a practice that he would denounce a year later as “fanaticism” or counterfeit.⁶

It was not until Parham’s visit at the end of October 1906 that someone recognized counterfeit manifestations operating in the Azusa Street meetings.⁷ Parham

---


⁶ Ibid. Announcements, *The Apostolic Faith* 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 2.

⁷ Cecil M. Robeck, Jr. states that Parham visited the Azusa Street Mission in November 1906. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., *The Azusa Street Mission & Revival: The Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006), 127. Parham’s wife, Sarah, reported that Parham “hurried to Los Angeles” at the end of October. Sarah E. Parham, *The Life of Charles Parham: Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement* (New York: Garland, 1985), 160. J. R. Goff, Jr. cites an arrival for Parham in late October. J. R. Goff Jr., “Parham, Charles Fox,” *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, 955-57. S. Parham also stated that William Seymour had identified counterfeit manifestations at the Azusa Street Mission and had written numerous letters to C. Parham requesting his help in identifying what was real and what was false. The only letter that she transcribed from Seymour, written August 27, 1906, provided no indication that Seymour requested help in identifying the counterfeit manifestations. In fact this letter indicated that Parham had been invited to Los Angeles with the
wrote, “I sat on the platform in Azusa Street Mission, and saw manifestations of the flesh, spiritualistic controls, saw people practicing hypnotism at the altar over candidates seeking the baptism; though many were receiving the real baptism of the Holy Ghost.”

Parham was outraged! He seized the pulpit and began preaching against these expressions that were clearly not from God, but after a few sermons, he was removed from the church by two elders and forbidden to return. Even though Parham tried to draw people away from the Azusa Street Mission with meetings that he held less than a mile away from the Azusa Street Mission, he was not successful and his reputation suffered as a result.

expectation that a greater revival would result with his presence. In the September 1906 issue of The Apostolic Faith Seymour announced that C. Parham would be visiting September 15, 1906, and he printed a letter from C. Parham, which stated that C. Parham had received positive reports regarding what is happening at the Azusa Street Mission. Sources to prove S. Parham’s statement that Seymour was aware of the counterfeit problem prior to C. Parham’s arrival in October 1906 could not be located. Parham, The Life of Charles F. Parham, 154-6. William J. Seymour, “Letter from Bro. Parham,” The Apostolic Faith 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1.


9. Parham also preached against the racial intermingling that he was witnessing. David Dorries states that Parham preached against “the close association between blacks and whites at Azusa Street,” in addition to “the many spiritualists and occultists [that] had infiltrated the mission.” David Dorries, “Azusa Street Revival,” Encyclopedia of Religious Revivals in America, 2: 37-42.

10. Vinson Synan stated that Parham specifically preached against the hypnotists and the spiritualists. H. Vinson Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 102. Robeck stated that Parham had intended to gain control of the Azusa Street Mission through his preaching, justifying his actions by “explaining that [the Azusa Street Revival] was merely an extension of his own work but gone awry.” Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., “Seymour, William Joseph,” The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 1053-58. In the book written by S. Parham about the life of her late husband, she explained that two elders of the church, one of whom was a hypnotist, removed C. Parham from the church. S. Parham, The Life of Charles F. Parham, 163. David Dorries agreed and stated that Seymour’s associates removed Parham from the building and forbid his return. Dorries, “Azusa Street Revival,” 1:41. Synan explained that when C. Parham was removed from the Azusa Street Mission, “Seymour suffered a total break with his teacher [Parham] that was never healed.” Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition, 102.

Although Parham was removed from the Azusa Street Mission, it appears that Seymour recognized truth in Parham’s assessment. A month after Parham’s arrival and protestations, Seymour published an article in *The Apostolic Faith* entitled “Counterfeits,” in which he stated that people who were not saved had imitated the works of God. He then explained that Satan had imitated the gifts of God, and that his power could be found in Christian Scientists, Theosophists, and Spiritualists. The Azusa Street Mission had been in a revival for about eight months by the time that its leader William Seymour first addressed the counterfeit problem. By this time many people had visited the mission and had carried its practices back to their churches throughout the United States and across the globe.

12. Christian Scientist practitioners do not believe that the work of healing is a supernatural experience, but a natural one. Pentecostals, on the other hand, would term this as supernatural. For ease, the Pentecostal description will be used. See The Christian Science Board of Directors, “What is Christian Science?” Christian Science, http://christianscience.com/what-is-christian-science#basic-teachings (accessed September 29, 2015).

13. Theosophists admit that their powers are the result of man and not the result of God. See the founder of Theosophy’s comments in Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, “What is Theosophy?” *The Theosophist* 1 no. 1 (October 1879): n.p., http://www.theosociety.org/pasadena/theosoph/theos1a.htm#whatistheosophy (accessed September 29, 2015).


15. People began meeting at 312 Azusa Street in mid-April 1906, and Seymour’s article “Counterfeits” was not published until December 1906.

16. Gaston Barnabas Cashwell visited Azusa Street in November 1906, and then started the “East Coast counterpart of the Azusa Street meetings” in Dunn, NC. H. Vinson Synan, “Cashwell, Gaston Barnabas,” *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, 457-58. Elizabeth Wheaton visited meetings both at Seymour’s Bonnie Brae Street (the location of Seymour’s Los Angeles ministry prior to moving to the Azusa Street location) and Azusa Street. Later she brought the Pentecostal message to Europe and was jailed on one occasion for a street meeting she held in Edinburg, Scotland. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., “Wheaton, Elizabeth Ryder,” *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, 1193. African missionaries Samuel and Ardella Mead attended meetings at the Azusa Street Mission from the late summer into the fall of 1906. There they received the baptism in the Holy Spirit and identified individuals who had received xenolalia in an African tongue. They
After early Pentecostals recognized that they had a problem with counterfeit manifestations, they needed to understand them. Some leaders put forward the explanation that Satan is present when God’s people gather. Reiff and Clark both referred to Job 1:6 to prove this point: “Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them” (KJV). Reiff and Clark believed this scripture reflected the “standard operating procedures” of Satan. When God’s people gather, Satan also shows up. Reiff further proved this “standard operating procedure” of Satan by stating that she had observed this in the Stone Church.

She wrote, “The Lord was working around the altar, but Satan was working also.”


20. Ibid.
wrote that Satan’s power could be uncovered through the exposure of Christian Scientists, Theosophists, and Spiritualists.\textsuperscript{21} Wigglesworth warned that Christian Scientists, Theosophists, and spiritists\textsuperscript{22} needed to be identified and cleared out of Pentecostal meetings so that they could not demonstrate any power.\textsuperscript{23} Gee cautioned Pentecostals to be watchful of converts, who recently were “steeped in heathenism, spiritism, and demon possession,” suggesting that recent converts might not yet be free of the former spirits that had once dominated them.\textsuperscript{24} Frodsham discussed this problem when he wrote,

There are some who come to believe the gospel, who would affiliate with the people of God, but are not set free from the spirit that dominated them in the old days. Such was Simon the sorcerer. He believed the message of Philip. He was baptized and was one in the community of the saints in Samaria. But there was still that old proud dominating spirit, a spirit full of ambition that dominated him in the early days when men said of him, “This is the great power of God.”\textsuperscript{25}

There was an understanding among early leaders of Pentecostalism that Satan could work through one of their own who was not yet free from evil spirits.

**Negative Consequences Resulting from the Presence of Counterfeit Manifestations**

Reactions to the presence of counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings led to the identification of three negative consequences these manifestations created for the Pentecostal Movement. First, the credibility of the movement came to be questioned.

\begin{itemize}
\item 22. Early Pentecostals used the term “spiritist” to describe Spiritualists. See Chapter One: Terminology.
\end{itemize}
Second, genuine manifestations were restrained in the meetings. Third, since people were failing to identify accurately the source of manifestations, causing them to accept and follow counterfeit manifestations.

Credibility Questioned

One negative consequence early Pentecostal leaders associated with the presence of counterfeit manifestations was that they led people outside of the Pentecostal Movement to question its credibility. Instead of their supernatural manifestations being associated with God, they were often associated with the presence of Satan. By 1907, Pentecostals in England and Germany “were being labeled… as having a false or… demonic spirit.”26 Assertions like those found in England and Germany classified Pentecostals with groups that did not rely on God to produce supernatural manifestations, such as Spiritualists and Christian Scientists.27 As a result, people outside of the movement came to the conclusion that Pentecostals were not engaging in Christian practices and they rejected the movement.

Pentecostals continued to cite their struggle with negative credibility resulting from the operation of counterfeit manifestations through 1938. In 1918, Pastor Archibald P. Collins (d. 1921) said, “It is the counterfeit which the devil has put on us that has caused so many godly people to discredit the Movement; they see the false before they

---


see the true.” Collins recognized counterfeit manifestations as causing Christians to reject Pentecostalism. When Reiff wrote her article on discernment in 1923, she opened with a comment that she had received from people on several occasions: “When I read your paper I believe the Pentecostal teaching, but when I go to some of the meetings I don’t want the experience I see manifested in some of the people.” Reiff then explained: “Many of us can understand how some would shrink from seeking an experience which the enemy has so often imitated.” Reiff agreed with Collin’s conclusion that Christians were rejecting the Pentecostal Movement due to counterfeit manifestations. Clark also referred to this problem in his chapter on discernment, published in 1928. He wrote, “Our opposers, [which he later describes as other Christians], …have branded the Pentecostal people as being of the devil.” As late as August 1938, George H. Poteat stated that people had “inconsistently brand[ed] the manifestations of the Holy Ghost, … as fanaticism.” This statement conveys the idea that people were still uncertain if the practices found in Pentecostalism were associated with God or with Satan.


32. George H. Poteat, “Report from Bible School in Maine,” The Church of God Evangel 29, no. 24 (August 1938): 7. After 1938, this problem appears to have been resolved, as Pentecostal papers do not report on this issue again. After this article was printed, I could not locate any other articles that associated Pentecostalism’s credibility problems with counterfeit manifestations. Articles from the Consortium of Pentecostal Archives were searched utilizing the word “counterfeit” through 1944. I also searched the word “credibility” for articles written from 1935 to 1950 and did not locate any other articles mentioning this specific problem. This corresponds with James D. Menzie’s 1934 assessment that the credibility problem in the Pentecostal Movement had passed. James D. Menzie, “Make Way for the Holy Ghost: A Timely Warning for a Crisis in Pentecost,” The Latter Rain Evangel 26, no. 24 (January 1935): 12-4. It appears that criticisms lodged at Stone Church had died down because The Latter Rain Evangel does not mention this
Early Pentecostal leaders assumed the conclusions reached about the Pentecostal Movement were due to ignorance of biblical teaching and actual Pentecostal practice. Clark believed that if Christians who opposed the movement would just read their Bibles and attend meetings for themselves, they would see that Pentecostals were preaching and practicing the teachings found in Scripture.33 He believed that many Christians rejected the Pentecostal Movement due to ignorance of the Bible’s teaching and of the actions that were actually taking place in the meetings. But ignorance was not the only reason people rejected the Pentecostal Movement.

The next reason early Pentecostal leaders supposed that the credibility of the movement was questioned was due to misunderstandings among Pentecostal members regarding the operation of spiritual gifts that originated from God verses supernatural manifestations that did not originate with God. Wigglesworth illustrated this consequence by telling the true story of two young ladies who worked in a telegraph office. One of the women had a vision of Satan, who appeared as an angel of God. He told her: “If you will obey me, I will make you the biggest and best preacher in the world.” Satan then problem being present after 1933. Every article written after 1933, refers to this problem in the past tense. See Frank D. Lindquist, “Brokenness, the Key that Unlocks: Is Jesus Your Yoke-Fellow?” The Latter Rain Evangel 26 no. 12 (September 1934): 16-8. Mrs. Adolf Blattner, “Results of Sowing the Incorruptible Seed: The Compensations of Pioneering in Venezuela,” the Latter Rain Evangel 26, no. 2 (November 1934): 13-15, 20. [The volume number appears to be a misprint by the editor. Based on at the volume number for September 1934, October 1934 would have started volume 37.] Archibald Copper, “What the Pentecostal Message has Meant to South Africa,” The Latter Rain Evangel (November 1937): 9-11, 21-22. The June 1934 issue provided the last known date of this problem occurring. Florence Irene Travis, “The Angel of the Lord Delivered,” The Latter Rain Evangel 26, no. 9 (June 1934): 21-2. While the Stone Church and James D. Menzie appear to be the first Pentecostal group to notice this issue disappear, other groups in Pentecostalism were still dealing with credibility problems through 1938, as seen in comments made in the Bridal Call – Crusader Foursquare, The Holiness Pentecostal Advocate, and The Church of God Evangel. Charles W. M. Walkem, “Bird’s Eye Bible Briefs: Divine Healing – Public and Private,” Bridal Call – Crusader Foursquare 2, no. 2 (July 1935): 9, 23. Paul F. Beacham, “Question Box,” The Holiness Pentecostal Advocate 18, no. 49 (April 1935): 3, 10. Poteat, “Report from Bible School in Maine,” 7. By 1939, Pentecostal groups appear to have dropped this concern with the lack of reporting on the issue.

proceeded to give her instructions to go to the train station at 7:30, purchase two train tickets for the train that came into the station at 7:32, and board the train. Once aboard the women were to look for a man with his back to the engine and he would have money for them. Satan accurately foretold where the train was going (Gasglow), what time the train would arrive at the station (7:32), and how much money they would have left after purchasing the tickets (6 pence). The women followed the directions of Satan, but they were not able to locate the man that was supposed to be on the train with money for them. Satan applauded their obedience and told the one woman that her obedience to him was proven through her actions and that he would make her “the biggest and best missionary in the world.” After this experience, they showed up in Wigglesworth’s meeting and were corrected for their actions. Wigglesworth informed the women that God would not tell someone that he or she was going to be a great preacher or missionary because statements like these spoke to a person’s pride. Therefore, the women had been following the leading of Satan and not of God.34 Because Pentecostals were being misled by the truth found in the message, rather than evaluating the content of the manifestation, they were mistakenly following counterfeit manifestations. Instances like these caused Christians to act on counterfeit manifestations that did not result in what they promised. Pentecostals not only gained reproach by following such counterfeit manifestations, but they also gained reproach by exhibiting erratic behaviors that would not lead a person towards God. Pastor Samuel A. Jamieson (d.1933) stated that demonic spirits had induced Pentecostals “to do many dreadful things.”35 He continued by warning Pentecostals

against impulses that would lead one to run down the hallway of his or her rooming house at midnight praising the Lord. He stated that such behavior was inspired by demons, and it brought reproach upon the Pentecostal Movement.\textsuperscript{36} Behavior that would wake people out of their sleep did not result in moving people toward God. Instead, such erratic actions were open to ridicule because nothing good came of the action. Therefore, such actions should be seen as counterfeit.

Pentecostal writers also assumed that the credibility of the Pentecostal Movement was questioned due to the actions of non-Christians who attended the meetings. In Joseph Tunmore’s October 10, 1916, sermon in Zion City, Illinois, he stated that during the service held the night before he had spoken to a woman who had been speaking in tongues for hours. In this conversation, he discovered that the woman was not saved. He scolded the congregation and said, “These shallow experiences are what is causing all this trouble in Pentecost. They claim the Pentecostal baptism and do not have it at all.”\textsuperscript{37}

The difficulty with situations like this one was two-fold. First, if the person speaking in tongues was a spiritualist, then outsiders would associate the Pentecostal Movement with Spiritualism. In Reiff’s article on discernment, she highlighted Acts 16:16-18 to describe this problem. This passage tells the story of a girl who followed Paul and Silas around town shouting, “These men are servants of the Most High God, which show us the way of salvation.” Reiff explained that while the statement was true, the


\textsuperscript{36} Jamieson, “The Seven Fears and the Seven Cheers,” 2.

girl’s association with fortune telling brought reproach upon the work of God. Because Pentecostals associated the practice of fortune telling with spiritualism, Acts 16 was proof that the activity of spiritualists in Pentecostal meetings brought unnecessary reproach upon the Pentecostal Movement.

Second, if such a person was not living a holy life, his or her association with Pentecostalism brought reproach on the movement from an ethical vintage point. Outsiders observed people leaving Pentecostal meetings and then watched them continue to sin in their daily lives. Both Christian and non-Christian outsiders would see this behavior and would not want to become a part of the movement. Pentecostals cite this problem over and over again in their articles. In August 1922, Ambrose J. Tomlinson (1865-1943), general overseer for the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), wrote an article for The Faithful Standard, outlining three different cases where church leaders were living sinful lives while pastoring or being welcomed as guest speakers in Pentecostal churches. One pastor had cheated on his wife with another woman, another was prideful and shamelessly requested money of the membership, and the third, a woman, acted inappropriately with a young man and then ran away with another woman’s husband. Tomlinson stated that people like this have served to hinder the work of God.

---

41. Ambrose J. Tomlinson, “Another Traitor: In Every Great Cause there is a Traitor. Usually More than One. There have been Traitors in Our Own Midst. They have not Betrayed the Savior with a Kiss – but They have Hindered the Work, and Hindering the Work MEANS SENDING SOULS TO HELL.
Emma Zimmer wrote, “I have heard sinners say, ‘The Pentecostal people do this and that.’” She replied, “Yes, the counterfeit [Pentecostals] do.”

Zimmer believed that people who were not living holy lives were not true Christians and that they were indeed harming the movement. In 1934, Frank J. Linquist, founder of North Central University in Minneapolis, MN, told his listeners at a camp meeting about a man who had fallen into sin and had brought reproach upon Pentecostalism. That same year Florence Irene Travis described how unholy living by Pentecostals had negatively impacted her ministry in Williamstown, West Virginia. She stated that outsiders had heard of murders committed by Pentecostals in Texas and Kentucky. In addition to this knowledge, the town had also had a negative experience with previous Pentecostal evangelists. The reputation of these unholy Pentecostals hurt the work of Travis’ group so much that the townspeople set the church on fire while the leaders were inside. They survived even though the townspeople had fastened the church doors shut from the outside of the building. These Pentecostals were forced to leave the town and were unable to change the reputation of Pentecostalism in that location.

These examples of unholy living among self-professing Pentecostals harmed the credibility of the movement.

---


45. Ibid., 22.
The final reason credibility of the movement was questioned occurred when people attended Pentecostal meetings, received the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and then questioned the authenticity of their baptisms in the Holy Spirit. Clark wrote that people who opposed the Pentecostal Movement were successfully deceiving people who had authentic baptisms in the Holy Spirit into thinking that their experience was from Satan rather than from God.\(^{46}\) It was easy to come to this conclusion when one combined the rampant operation of counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings with Pentecostal theology on demon possession, which taught that imperfect Christians could become “demon possessed,” a condition in which an evil spirit exercises control over an individual. Pentecostals believed that Christians, who were justified, sanctified, and lived holy lives free from sin, were protected from demon possession.\(^{47}\) They pointed to 1 John 5:18 for support: “We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not” (KJV).\(^{48}\) Pentecostals believed that in order for Satan to possess a “Christian,” the person needed to provide an “open door.” Wigglesworth stated, “Before Satan can bring his evil spirits there has to be an open door. … How does Satan get an opening? When the saint ceases to seek after holiness, purity, righteousness, truth: when he ceases to pray, stops reading the Word and gives way to carnal appetites.”\(^{49}\)

\(^{46}\) Clark, *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, 125.

\(^{47}\) Pentecostal beliefs about justification, sanctification, and holy living will be discussed in Chapter Three.

\(^{48}\) Wigglesworth and Clark refer to this scripture in their defense that Christians are spared from demon possession. See Wigglesworth, “The Discerning of Spirits,” 3. Clark, *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, 125.

Pentecostals believed that demon possession showed up in various forms depending on the type of spirit that possessed a person. Frodsham identified several evil spirits that could possess a person, including “the fox spirit, the wolf spirit, the spirit that has no compassion…the spirit of judgment.” While the spirits that Frodsham named appear to be connected to particular sins of the individual, Wigglesworth believed that a person could become possessed by a spirit associated with a particular illness as the result of sin. He wrote, “So often sickness comes as a result of disobedience.” While Horton did not state that demon possession was the result of sin in a person’s life, he did agree with Wigglesworth’s assessment that sickness could be the result of demon possession. Horton affirmed that whether the person was in need of healing or deliverance, his or her illness was the result of the “oppression of the devil” and the person was in need of the “corrective energy of the Gifts of the Spirit.” Carter also shared Wigglesworth and Horton’s opinion that sickness could be the result of demon possession. Finally,

50. Frodsham, “The Editor’s Notebook: The Discerning of Spirits,” 4. Frodsham does not provide a definition for these spirits, but his reference to Acts 20: 17-35 and Luke 13:31-32 immediately prior to this list of spirits implies that these spirits were evil. The Acts 20 text describes wolves as those who seek to devour sheep. Frodsham used the imagery of sheep to describe the laity of the church, of a shepherd to describe the leadership of the church, and of wolves to describe the devil and his evil spirits. When Frodsham stated that the “wolf spirit… would devour the flock,” he was suggesting that the devil and his evil spirits desire to destroy and possess the laity of the church. The Luke 13 text cites Jesus as calling Herod a fox. It appears that Frodsham concluded that the fox spirit possessed Herod and that it was evil because Jesus did not use the term “fox” in a positive manner.

51. Wigglesworth, “The Discerning of Spirits,” 3. This idea was consistent with what many Holiness leaders taught prior to the emergence of Pentecostalism. For example Alexander Dowie believed that one could not receive healing until he had been purified through justification and sanctification. Sickness in one’s life was an indication that someone was impure or was the result of someone else’s sin, which caused an infectious disease to spread to a person without sin. David William Faupel, “Theological Influences on the Teaching and Practices of John Alexander Dowie,” Refleks 8, no. 1 (2009): 2-29. Grant Wacker, “Marching to Zion: The Story of John Alexander Dowie’s 20th Century Utopian City – Zion, Illinois,” Assemblies of God Heritage 6, no. 3 (Fall 1986): 7-10. Wigglesworth’s statement signals that early Pentecostals embraced this idea and brought it into Pentecostal theology and practice.


Pentecostals believed that demon possession could be demonstrated in the form of counterfeit manifestations, such as when the spiritualists imitated tongues under the power of the devil.\textsuperscript{54}

In addition to the possibility of demonic origins, Pentecostals believed that manifestations could have their source in the human spirit. Reiff stated this plainly when she wrote, “Just as in the prophetic utterance, so there are three sources for the speaking in tongues: the Holy Spirit, an evil spirit, and the flesh, or the psychical (soul-life).”\textsuperscript{55} She continued,

\begin{quote}
It is not always the Holy Spirit which speaks in the unknown tongue. It is often our own spirit, but the Holy Spirit gives us the utterance. Paul makes this plain when he says, “If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth.” [cf. 1 Cor. 14:15] He does not say it is the Lord. … Simply because a message is given in the unknown tongue, does not necessarily make it the infallible Word of God.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

This explanation indicates that when a manifestation is sourced in the human spirit, God may enable or allow the utterance to be spoken, but the contents should not be trusted as coming from the Lord. Instead, it is considered from the self, since it originated from the human spirit. Lindquist agreed that manifestations such as tongues needed to be judged so that “we will not be led away by a message supposed to be of the Lord, but from the human spirit.”\textsuperscript{57}

It is understandable how someone who heard this teaching and was aware of the counterfeit manifestations at work in the Pentecostal Movement could question the

\textsuperscript{54} Gee stated that evil spirits “are capable of possessing human beings and manifesting themselves through them.” Gee, “The Discerning of Spirits,” 7.

\textsuperscript{55} Reiff, “Discerning of Spirits,” (December 1923): 15.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 16.

authenticity of his or her baptism in the Holy Spirit. One might wonder if he or she personally inspired the glossolalia out of strong desire for it. Such people might also have believed that they were not completely sanctified or pure at the time of their spiritual baptism and may have concluded that instead of receiving the Holy Spirit, he or she had received an evil spirit. Not only were these considerations troubling for the people in turmoil over their experience, but they became damaging to the Pentecostal Movement when enemies used these stories as propaganda against it.  

Genuine Manifestations Restrained

Counterfeit manifestations not only negatively impacted Pentecostalism’s reputation; they produced negative consequences inside the church as well. One internal issue resulting from the operation of counterfeit manifestations was that they inhibited the operation of authentic manifestations. Anna Reiff recounted that after an evil spirit was cast out of a man who was practicing spiritualism in the meeting, “the atmosphere of the room was completely changed, the hindrance was gone, and the Holy Spirit fell upon waiting souls who burst out spontaneously in new tongues given by the Holy Ghost.” Reiff believed that the operation of counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings prevented the authentic gifts of the Spirit from operating in the meetings.  

Failure to Accurately Identify the Source of a Manifestation

Pentecostal leaders identified several reasons many Pentecostals were not accurately identifying the source of false manifestations. The first was that evil spirits are deceiving

58. Clark refers to this problem in his chapter on discernment. See Clark, The Baptism of the Holy Ghost, 125.


60. Reiff does not explain why she believed this happened only that it did happen. No other Pentecostal authors reference this problem in their writings.
and can have a semblance of truth. Both Reiff and Wigglesworth identified this difficulty in their discernment articles. Reiff stated, “Sometimes the false has a semblance of the true, and the untaught would be misled.” She supported this belief by referencing the story in Acts 16:16-18 of the girl who followed Paul and Silas around town shouting, “These men are servants of the Most High God, which show us the way of salvation.” While this statement was true, the Apostle Paul identified an evil spirit in the girl and cast it out.\footnote{Ibid., 15.} Wigglesworth illustrated this problem in the story about the two young ladies who worked in a telegraph office. As stated earlier, Satan had accurately foretold the time the train would come into the train station, where the train was going, and how much money the women would have left over after purchasing two train tickets. Because of the truth of this manifestation of Satan, the women were deceived into following the false manifestation. Wigglesworth informed his audience that just because there is truth in the message, it does not mean that the message came from God. In fact, he stated, “It needed only brains to think it out, but the people who get to that place do not use their brains and will not let anyone else think for them. They say, ‘Don’t you try to stop me. You do not need to talk to me, you have not had the Lord speak to you.’”\footnote{Wigglesworth, “The Gift of Discerning of Spirits,” 7-8.} Wigglesworth thought it was obvious that this manifestation was not from God, but he had found that situations like these had lead people astray because of their unwillingness to have their manifestation evaluated by others. This mentality was the second reason people were not identifying counterfeit manifestations, what Pentecostals called “unteachable spirits.”
Frodsham described the “unteachable” spirit as “an evil spirit that …despises the counsel of old and mature men of God.”\(^6^3\) Piper, pastor of the Stone Church, stated that the people dominated by this spirit “refuse to be ruled by anyone…[and] refuse to recognize the fact that God has set leaders in the church to watch in behalf of their souls.”\(^6^4\) People ruled by this spirit refused to have the content of their manifestations judged, and they continued to operate based on the manifestation’s revelation, even if it did not originate with God.\(^6^5\) These people were filled with a false belief that everything that they experienced was from God, and they refused to recognize that the devil or self might be operating in something they received. This belief not only caused these people to be misguided at times and act on leadings that were not from God, but it also caused others to question the authenticity of manifestations they saw operating in Pentecostal meetings.

Thirdly, people did not identify counterfeit manifestations because they mistook their feelings for knowledge received from God. Pentecostal pastors Paul and Jamieson warned of this problem. Paul recounted a situation when a woman came to a meeting and told the members that God had advised her of His selection for the church’s positions of elder, bishop, and another office.\(^6^6\) Her “nominations” were accepted, and the men were voted into the positions. Paul cautioned that it was possible that this “knowledge” had its source in the good feelings that the woman had towards those individuals, rather than the


\(^6^4\) William Hamner Piper, “Obey My Voice and I will be Your God!” \textit{The Latter Rain Evangel} 3, no. 7 (April 1911): 9-12.


\(^6^6\) Paul does not state the name of the third position.
Lord. Jamieson described a situation where a man had a strong feeling that he should “run through the hall of his large rooming house at midnight, praising the Lord at the top of his voice.” Jamieson stated that if the man had not had the gift of discernment, he would have acted on that feeling. He continued, “many Christians make a mistake, obeying religious demons in the belief that they are under the power of the Holy Ghost. Oh how we need the gift of discernment and to beware of the deceptions worked by the devil through preternatural means.”

The fourth reason some Pentecostal leaders believed some people were not accurately identifying the source of counterfeit manifestations was because they were not checking the content of the messages and comparing it with the Word of God. In 1914, Pentecostal newspapers began to report on the “yellow book” problem. From 1911 to 1914, two women from Chicago, IL wrote down messages that they presumed were from Jesus in yellow paperback volumes. This work resulted in twelve volumes that were distributed “free of charge all over the world,” including “India, China, Japan, Australia, Africa, Palestine, England, Canada,” and the United States. Problems with the theological content and the status that these books were being given by some Pentecostals had become so problematic that Eudorus N. Bell (1866-1923), first superintendent of the General Council of the Assemblies of God, and Alfred G. Garr, Sr. (1874-1944), former


69. These books are numbered volumes that share the title In School with the Holy Ghost – The Angel Message. They were called “yellow books” because the covers were yellow, the color God had chosen for them. Barry Chant, “03 Prophecies in Print? The Yellow Book Controversy,” Australasian Pentecostal Studies 8 (2004), under “Prophecies in Print?” http://aps-journal.com/aps/index.php/APS/article/view/73/70 (accessed August 26, 2015).
Pentecostal missionary to India, Japan, and China, began warning people to stay away from the “yellow books.” Garr called the theology promoted in these books “demon doctrines” and pointed out statements in these messages that contradicted the Scriptures. One such statement was that “Angels dwell in the Saints.” Though Bell believed that not all of the messages were harmful, he was concerned that the messages contained in the books were promoted as infallible and equal to the Scriptures in authority, when it was clear that they contained “inconsistencies and doctrinal mistakes.” As a result, Bell believed the literature to be hurtful to Pentecostals, and he warned his readers against the “yellow books.”

The fifth reason some Pentecostals might not identify the source of a manifestation accurately was their tendency to allow their pride to dictate truth. Wigglesworth described the power of pride in two stories he told in his 1922 sermon on discernment. The first story was recounted earlier in this chapter – the story of the two young women working in the telegraph office who followed the orders of Satan to go to the train station. In the initial meeting with Satan, he told one of the women, “If you will obey me, I will make you the biggest and the best preacher in the world.” Wigglesworth immediately stated, “Now God never speaks that way.” Yet the women followed their pride and acted on this voice. In the second true story, he spoke of a young teacher who, after having received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, was told by the saints present at his


baptism that he was the best teacher. One woman said, “I shouldn’t wonder if you were not the second John the Baptist.” Satan repeated this statement in the mind of the young man on his way home and awakened him in the middle of night and said it again. By morning the man was going up and down the street shouting, “I am John the Baptist.” Wigglesworth warned, “Whenever a person comes to you and says, ‘I never heard a man preach like you,’ you can make sure that it is the voice of the devil every time.” Satan deceived people by speaking to their pride.

The sixth reason people did not identify counterfeit manifestations was that Satan might tell someone to keep the manifestation a secret from others and simply to follow him. Smith Wigglesworth again used the story of the two women at the telegraph office as an example. He reported that Satan instructed one of the women not to tell anyone what he had said except her sister, who went with her. Wigglesworth argued, “God never reveals anything that you cannot tell on the housetop; everything God says to you, you can preach out and if you feel you dare not tell what you have heard this voice telling you, you may be sure it is evil.” Secrecy empowered Satan to operate and it kept people from identifying his false manifestations.

To summarize, there were six reasons early Pentecostals failed to identify counterfeit manifestations. First, evil spirits were deceiving and their manifestations had a semblance of truth in them. People were distracted by the truth conveyed in the manifestations and failed to recognize other indications that the manifestation was false. Second, some Pentecostals harbored “unteachable spirits,” which prevented them from

74. Ibid., 7-8.
75. Ibid. 7.
seeking counsel and confirmation from others on whether a manifestation was from God or not. Third, some Pentecostals incorrectly equated their feelings with knowledge from God, and therefore, acted on the knowledge gained through feelings that might not have originated with God. Fourth, some Pentecostals were not checking the content of messages received through manifestations and comparing them with the Scriptures. Fifth, some Pentecostals allowed their pride to blind them from identifying the truth regarding the source of a manifestation. Finally, secrecy prevented some Pentecostals from identifying the true source of a manifestation. When manifestations were not shared with others, it prevented instruction and counsel by other Christians who had more experience in hearing the voice of God. Secrecy enabled Satan to work and to entice Pentecostals into following counterfeit manifestations.

**Strategies Implemented to Address the Presence of Counterfeit Manifestations**

Early Pentecostals developed several strategies for addressing the challenges arising from the counterfeit problem, but it took time to discover and implement them. James D. Menzie explained this delay in action in his 1934 sermon, “Make Way for the Holy Ghost.” He stated,

> It had never happened before, and there was no one who knew by experience that the devil could come and counterfeit the work of God, and that the “flesh” could imitate the Holy Spirit. So it took us years to find out what the Bible had to say about these things, and before that time came many had gone into fanaticism and brought the work into reproach.

Pentecostal leaders appear to give limited attention to the gift of discernment prior to 1922. In light of Menzie’s admission of ignorance early in the movement, the sudden

---


77. Ibid.
appearance of articles focused on discernment between 1922 and 1941 must be due to some leaders having finally recognized the benefit of this gift in resolving their counterfeit problems. In addition to this, early Pentecostals employed arguments, provided both leadership and laity with information on how to “test the spirits,” and installed and trained leadership on their responsibilities in dealing with counterfeit manifestations.

Arguments
Early Pentecostal writers employed three main arguments to defend the Pentecostal practice of the gifts of the Spirit in spite of the presence of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings. These arguments were attempts to resolve the credibility problem that had resulted from the operation of these manifestations in Pentecostal meetings. Gee illustrates the first,

Those who pretend to pass judgment in spiritual matters must be prepared to show their credentials of personal spiritual experience. Unfortunately a great many people condemn in a wholesale manner manifestations and experiences connected with the Baptism in the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts when they have had practically no personal experience of either. We bluntly ask, [“]Are they in a position to judge?[“] Both the New Testament and common reason agree in giving a negative reply.79

Gee held the opinion that one could not judge the movement until he or she had personally participated an authentic spiritual and supernatural experience.80

78. “Testing the spirits” was one way of identifying the source of a spirit without a supernatural revelation of the source, which is what the gift of discernment provided.


80. Although critique of the theological opinions of Pentecostals is not the focus of this thesis, it is important to point out that Gee’s statement here contradicts another statement he made in the same article that all Christians had the ability to utilize the tests found in the scriptures in order to judge manifestations and determine if they were from God or not. According to Gee’s own words, a person did not have to have a spiritual experience to judge a spiritual manifestation. Ibid., 6.
The second argument was used to address those rejecting the Pentecostal Movement, but had not attended a Pentecostal meeting. Clark argued, “But if you will get up a little closer and take off your spectacles of prejudice, look the minister in the face, then listen and go home and shake the dust off your Bible, you will find he preached the Word of God.” Clark believed that ignorance of what the scriptures taught and lack of attendance at Pentecostal meetings was causing people to unfairly dismiss and reject Pentecostalism.

The final argument maintained that the existence of counterfeit manifestations should not cause one to reject authentic manifestations. Reiff argued,

In the commercial world we do not refuse the real products because of imitations that are foisted upon an unsuspecting public; we do not discard U.S. currency because there are counterfeit bills in circulation. So let us not turn away from the precious gifts of God because Satan has produced the spurious. Did Moses and Aaron become discouraged and refuse to obey God when Jannes and Jambres, the magicians, imitated the supernatural? Not at all.

Instead of rejecting the true because of the counterfeit, Pentecostals reasoned, the existence of the counterfeit proved the existence of the genuine. Ambrose J. Tomlinson (1865-1943), editor of The White Wing Messenger and general overseer of what would become the Church of God of Prophecy, concluded, “There cannot be a counterfeit without a genuine. There would be nothing to undertake to imitate.” G. Krieger of Houston, Texas, wrote, “We realize that the Devil has the counterfeit of speaking in


tongues, but that’s just a proof that the real exists also.”84 Finally, *Confidence* magazine published an article written by a C.E.D. de L., who wrote, “Surely, we may here take to heart the danger of rejecting the true because of co-existing counterfeit, and the folly of despising the wheat because there is chaff.”85 Early Pentecostals believed that just because the existence of counterfeit manifestations had worked “great havoc” on the church, people should not reject the genuine manifestations that came from the Holy Spirit; likewise, they believed counterfeit manifestations should not provoke a ban on the manifestations in Pentecostal meetings.86

**Education on “Testing the Spirits”**

The second strategy Pentecostals employed to resolve the negative effects created by counterfeit manifestations was to provide people with information on how to “test the spirits.” Early Pentecostal writers provided two “tests” that they obtained through the Scriptures. The first test resulted from their interpretation of Matthew 7:15-23, which reads:

> Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into...


86. Gee, “The Discerning of Spirits,” 6. In December 1920, a writer with the initials F. A. H. wrote that there was discussion of banning manifestations in church because of the counterfeit, but he argued that the existence of the counterfeit should not keep believers from the spiritual blessings that result from the genuine manifestations. F. A. H., “Where Are We Going?” *The Pentecostal Evangel* no. 372/373 (December 1920): 9. Menzie echoes this belief in his article, “Make Way for the Holy Ghost.” He argued that the existence of the counterfeit should not keep the people from practicing the gifts of the Spirit and that the church needed to embrace these practices that originally drew people to the movement in the first place. Menzie, “Make Way for the Holy Ghost,” 13-4.
the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity (KJV).87

Based upon this text, Pentecostals concluded that a person could determine the authenticity of a manifestation based upon the behaviors observed in an individual who exhibited a supernatural manifestation. They decided that a person who exhibits a genuine manifestation would display good fruit in his or her personal life and that one that produced bad fruit could not be trusted to be acting under the power of God. Early Pentecostals connected good fruit to the fruit of the Holy Spirit found in Galatians 5:22-23, i.e. love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and self-control; they connected bad fruit with the fruits of the flesh found in Galatians 5:19-21, i.e. bad fruits of fornication, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions, envy, drunkenness, or carousing.

Authors writing about the gift of discernment employed this test. When Wigglesworth described the women from the telegraph office, he found that the good fruit of peace was lacking. He said, “One could see there was no peace abiding within.” He then warned, “If ever you get out of the will of God and Satan comes in you will find there is no rest. I have learned that if anything disturbs my peace it is always Satanic.”88 Gee wrote that the fruits of love and compassion would be present in a person who was granted the gift of discernment. He affirmed, “The possessor of such a gift would also


have the ‘love of God shed abroad’ in his heart ‘by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us’: and far from exercising the gift in a harsh, censorious spirit, he would rather have a great compassion.” 89 Clark also mentioned the requirement of love and meekness in his chapter on discernment. 90 Finally Frodsham listed the characteristics that identify a true prophet of God: “The true prophet of God will ever be despised, will ever be meek, will ever be lowly. He will not seek filthy lucre. He will not seek the praise of men. He will seek to be true to the One whose messenger he is.” Frodsham contrasted these good fruits with the bad fruits found in false prophets. He continued, “But false prophets seek to exalt themselves. They seek to feed themselves. They seek to clothe themselves. They are not filled with a deep compassion for the flock.” 91 It was a definite sign that one was not operating under the power of God if he or she did not demonstrate good fruit in his or her personal life.

The second “test” early Pentecostal writers obtained through the Scriptures and employed was observation of the “fruit” of the manifestation. They utilized the content of 1 John 4:2-3 and 1 Corinthians 12:7 to apply this test. 1 John 4:2-3 advises, “Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist” (KJV). Wigglesworth, Clark, Gee, and Carter employed this test by asking the spirit of the manifestation if Jesus had come in the flesh. If the spirit replied, “No,” then they concluded that the manifestation was

90. Clark, The Baptism of the Holy Ghost, 123.
counterfeit; if the spirit replied “yes,” then the manifestation was assumed to be genuine. 92 1 Corinthians 12:7 states, “But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal” (KJV). Reiff explained, “[This] means that the manifestation is given to profit the whole company of believers and that no gift of God is given for any private glorification or selfish use.” Reiff continued to clarify that a manifestation is not intended “for guidance or direction, to confirm our interpretation of Scripture or to bring forth a doctrine that is not scriptural.” 93 Reiff concluded that if a manifestation resulted in edification of the entire church, then the manifestation was genuine; if the manifestation only edified a single individual then it was counterfeit. Furthermore, she supposed that genuine manifestations would not produce personal benefits, such as guidance, direction, confirmation of one’s interpretation of Scripture, or to instate a doctrine that one desired, but had no scriptural support. If a manifestation produced personal benefits, then Reiff assumed that the manifestation was counterfeit. 94

The fruit of an individual’s personal life, the confessions that the person and the spirit behind the manifestation made, and the manifestation’s outcome were all indicators of whether a manifestation was from God or another source. Gee informed his audience that these tests were available to all members of the church when he stated, “The use of


94. It is important to clarify that early Pentecostals believed that the gift of discernment did have a slightly different function from the other gifts of the Spirit and the direction of its message could be directed towards an individual rather than towards the entire congregation. Howard Carter stated that the gift of discernment “may be for the whole church, or it may be for the local community, or for the good of some individual. If a person had the discerning of spirits, and there is one possessed of evil spirits, the gift in that instance is used for the good and blessing of the afflicted person.” Carter, Gifts of the Spirit, 156.
these tests for the supernatural are open to all believers, and do not imply the possession of any particular gift of the Spirit.”⁹⁵

**Installation and Training of Leadership**

The third strategy that early Pentecostals applied to the counterfeiting problem focused on the installation and training of the leadership regarding their responsibilities in dealing with counterfeit manifestations. Both Paul and Gee recognized that human leadership was needed in Pentecostal meetings. Paul states, “Every meeting was the meeting of the Lord Himself, and they must acknowledge that the Lord Himself was the Leader. Yet they needed in every meeting a human leader.”⁹⁶ Paul held that the responsibility of leadership in a meeting was “to discern if things were given by the Lord Himself.”⁹⁷ He believed that leadership would be able to identify counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings. In 1933, Gee dedicated an entire article, “God’s Pilots,” to the need and operation of human leadership in the church. In this article, Gee used 1 Corinthians 12:28 to support his belief that God granted the gift of “chairmanship” or “pilotage” to certain people in the church by emphasizing the gift of governments mentioned in this text. He argued that the Greek word for “governments” meant “pilotage.” Therefore, God granted certain people the gift of being a pilot. Gee stated, “Pilots preside over the meetings of the assembly.”

Gee continued to describe three responsibilities that “pilots” or pastors have to fulfill in Pentecostal meetings. First, they are to “avoid danger.” Gee stated that pastors

---


could accomplish this by utilizing spiritual discernment and by requesting ministerial credentials from people who want to occupy the pulpit. Second, pastors are to “keep the ship in deep water,” i.e. keep the meeting in the Spirit by keeping him or herself in the Spirit at all times; knowing their Bibles and hymn books inside and out; reading Scripture in the meetings; and focusing the meeting on those actions which bring the revelation of grace and truth, rather than emotionalism. The congregation could ensure that meetings remained under the power and direction of God by only bringing people into leadership who have been actually granted the gift of piloting from God, have spiritual experience, and have deep spirituality. The third task of a pastor is to “steer the vessel to its desired destination.” In order for this obligation to be realized, the pastor must seek the will of God for the meeting. The pastor must come to Pentecostal meetings with this knowledge so that he or she can steer the meeting towards God’s goal. Gee urged pastors to arrive at meetings early so that they could be prepared to change their sermons due to the leading of God. Gee also discouraged churches from engaging in excessive worship before preaching began. He called this a “preliminary” that could distract the meeting from God’s purpose.

Frodsham added to the responsibilities that Gee mentioned and told the leaders of the church, “And thou shalt choose, and cause others to choose, that which is good. Thou

---

98. To keep a meeting “in the Spirit” means to keep it under the power and direction of God.

99. Pentecostals believed that one remained in the Holy Spirit through holy living, Bible reading, and prayer. An act of sin removed one from the Holy Spirit. Bible reading and prayer were practices that one employed in order to aid in the prevention of sin. Bible reading reminded one of his or her responsibilities towards God in living a holy life and what that looked like. Prayer kept one in communion with God, giving him or her the desire to remain in close communion with God.

shall cause the saints to refrain from and hate that which is evil.”\textsuperscript{101} Frodsham believed that it was the pastor’s duty to manifest the fruit of the Spirit because he believed that the lay members of the church followed his or her example. Gee concurred with Frodsham’s conclusion that the people would follow the example set before them by the leadership. Gee wrote, “We look to that man, and we have a right to look to him, to interpret the guidance and leadings of the Holy Spirit.”\textsuperscript{102} If a pastor performed an action that was not in line with God’s will, this could place the entire church outside of God’s will. Gee described the church as a photograph of the pastor, a representation of the leadership. The pastor’s role was very important because of the impressive nature of the role on the congregation. Therefore, it was essential that leadership of the church live a holy life and be proactive in dealing with the counterfeit problem.

**Conclusion**

By the time Wigglesworth wrote the first extensive article on the gift of discernment in December 1922, the Pentecostal Movement had been dealing with negative consequences resulting from the operation of counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings for over sixteen years. The reason Pentecostals delayed their response to counterfeit manifestations was due to limited theological development regarding the operation of supernatural manifestations from God, Satan, and humanity. As their theology developed in response to their experiences and study of the Scriptures, Pentecostals implemented strategies to resolve the negative consequences they assumed were created by counterfeit manifestations. These strategies included arguments, installation of pastors, and education of the lay membership and pastors on how to “test” the spirits. Pastors of the

\textsuperscript{101} Frodsham, “The Editor’s Notebook: The Discerning of Spirits,” 5.

\textsuperscript{102} Gee, “God’s Pilots,” 2.
church were further educated on their role in preventing counterfeit activity in Pentecostal meetings. Clear ideas regarding the operation and benefits of accessing the gift of discernment appear to have developed relatively late.

The gift of discernment gained much attention from 1922 to 1941. Understanding this strategy is the focus of the next two chapters. Chapter Three will provide brief biographies of the people who authored the nine treatments on the gift of discernment from 1914 to 1941. Next, this chapter will utilize the writings of these authors to determine early Pentecostal opinions regarding the function and benefits of the gift of discernment. Chapter Four will explain early Pentecostal viewpoints concerning the practice of the gift of discernment, including the outcomes they assumed this gift should produce, the requirements they supposed were necessary in order for the gift of discernment to operate in an individual, and how they identified individuals who had been granted the genuine gift of discernment.
CHAPTER III

THE GIFT OF DISCERNMENT: PART 1

The gift of discernment in Pentecostal theology is the gift of the Holy Spirit mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12:10, which describes it as the ability to distinguish between spirits. Pentecostals focus on identifying whether the spirit responsible for a manifestation is the Holy Spirit, an evil spirit, or the human spirit.

Eight individuals provided in-depth treatments of the gift of discernment between 1914 and 1941. This chapter begins with brief biographies of each in order to understand their backgrounds and their impact on the Pentecostal Movement, then describes the writers’ opinions of the functions and benefits of the gift of discernment.

Biographies of the Authors

Anna C. Reiff (1869-1960)

Anna Cassel Reiff was born October 18, 1869, in Lower Providence Township, Pennsylvania.¹ She met Lydia Markley, future wife of William Hamner Piper, while

---

¹ The only article I found that provides any biographical information about Anna C. Reiff is Gordon Gardiner’s “Out of Zion … into All the World,” written in May 1982. Additional facts on Anna Reiff such as her date of birth were found on Ancestry.com. In 1922, Anna C. Reiff applied for a passport from Chicago, IL. This application lists her full name, date of birth, where she was born, and her current occupation at the time (publisher). This information matches known facts about Anna C. Reiff. Gordon P. Gardiner states that Reiff was born on a Pennsylvania farm just outside of Yerkes. Lower Providence Township is located about five miles from Yerkes, PA. Additionally, multiple sources report that Reiff was an editor of The Latter Rain Evangel from 1908 to 1939. In 1912, she became the head editor of the paper after the death of William H. Piper. It is possible that she was also considered the publisher of the paper as well. Finally, according to Gardiner, Reiff moved from Pennsylvania to Chicago, IL in the 1890s and remained there until 1948, when she and Miss Rose Meyer opened a lodge in Stone Lake, WI. Reiff would have been a resident of Chicago in 1922, when this passport was requested. These similarities prove that Anna Cassel Reiff, who applied for a passport in Chicago in 1922, is the same Anna C. Reiff, editor of The Latter Rain Evangel. Gordon P. Gardiner, “Out of Zion … into All the World,” Bread of Life 31. no. 5 (May 1982): 7-10, 13-5. Anna Cassel Reiff’s passport application was located on Ancestry.com. Anna
living in Philadelphia as a secretary. On December 29, 1894 Markley attended a healing service at Central Music Hall in Chicago, Illinois, led by John Alexander Dowie, founder of the International Divine Healing Association. While she was there, her leg, which had been paralyzed for seventeen years, was reportedly healed and restored to its proper length. After Lydia Markley’s marriage to William Piper on December 29, 1896, the newlyweds and Reiff moved to Chicago and began working with Dowie. Reiff became Dowie’s general secretary and was installed as a deaconess at his church. In the spring of 1906, Dowie was expelled from Zion City for financial mismanagement and Wilbur Glenn Voliva was installed in his place.

---


3. Lydia Piper writes that she was healed of a number of troubles on December 29, 1894. Reiff states that Lydia had been healed two years prior to her marriage to William Piper on December 29, 1896. Reiff explains that Lydia was healed under the ministry of Dr. Dowie. See Lydia M. Piper, “A Personal Word,” The Latter Rain Evangel 4, no. 4 (January 1912): 4-5. Anna C. Reiff, “Asleep in Jesus,” The Latter Rain Evangel 4, no. 4 (January 1912): 2-4. John Alexander Dowie moved his services to the Central Music Hall in April 1894. See Grant Wacker, “Marching to Zion: The Story of John Alexander Dowie’s 20th Century Utopian City – Zion, Illinois,” Assemblies of God Heritage 6, no. 2 (Summer 1986): 7-9.


5. Edith L. Blumhofer states that William Piper did not associate with Dowie’s ministry until the year after his marriage to Lydia, implying that Lydia did not move to Chicago until after her marriage to Piper. Edith L. Blumhofer, “Piper, William Hamner,” The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 989-90. Gordon Gardiner states that Reiff followed Lydia Markley to Chicago. Gardiner, “Out of Zion,” (May): 10. These two statements support the conclusion that it was after Markley and Piper’s marriage that all three individuals moved to Chicago to work with Dowie.


Following the removal of Dowie, a small prayer group composed of members who had left Zion City invited Parham to bring the Pentecostal message to Chicago, namely that baptism in the Holy Spirit should have the physical evidence of speaking in unknown tongues. Parham came in September and began to hold meetings that attracted other Zion City members. Both Dowie and Voliva viewed Parham’s actions as an attempt to gain control of the Zion City community. Therefore, Voliva warned people against Parham’s Pentecostal teachings and forbade residents of Zion City from communicating with Pentecostals. It was during these controversies that Reiff embraced the Pentecostal message and was baptized in the Holy Spirit through the ministry of Endorus N. Bell and John Sinclair. In December, Reiff and the Pipers left Zion City and Piper opened the Stone Church. In 1908, the Stone Church began publishing The Latter Rain Evangel, and Reiff assisted Piper in editing the new Pentecostal paper. After Piper’s unexpected death on December 29, 1911, Reiff became managing editor of the


9. Ibid., 3-4.


13. Gardiner states that Reiff was a charter member, signaling that she was in attendance the first service at the Stone Church. Ibid.

During her time as managing editor of *The Latter Rain Evangel*, Reiff and her assistant Miss Rose Meyer recorded in shorthand every sermon preached in the Stone Church for many years, three times on Sunday and every night during special meetings. Often they would double up; one covered the home church while the other was off to a missionary convention, General Council, or camp meeting.

On November 3, 1922, Smith Wigglesworth came to Chicago and preached an entire sermon on the gift of discernment at the Union Pentecostal Meeting. Reiff or Meyer was present at this sermon and his thoughts were recorded in the December 1922 edition of *The Latter Rain Evangel*. In 1923, these ladies published two more sermons by Smith Wigglesworth in *The Latter Rain Evangel*, which mentioned the need for the gift of discernment. By December 1923, Reiff had published her own thoughts on this gift, which *The Pentecostal Evangel* reprinted two months later in February 1924. Clearly Reiff was inspired by Wigglesworth’s sermon in November 1922, but she had also identified an issue that other Pentecostals had also concluded was important.

Reiff continued as managing editor of *The Latter Rain Evangel* until July 1939, when the paper was merged with *The Gospel Call*. She followed the publication to

---


Gospel Call and became associate editor. In 1948, she retired from The Gospel Call and moved to Wisconsin, where she and Meyer operated a lodge in Stone Lake. Reiff passed away at the age of ninety on July 26, 1960.

Elijah Columbus Clark, Jr. (1889-1950) Elijah Columbus Clark, Jr., commonly referred to as E. C. Clark, was born October 5, 1889, in Flat Top, West Virginia. By 1921, he was pastor of the largest Church of God (Cleveland, TN) in West Virginia and was ordained a bishop for the Church of God in 1925. During the Fall of 1927, Clark attended a bible school in Pittsburg, PA, where he studied the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old and New Testament. The following year he utilized this education to write his book The Baptism of the Holy Ghost “And More,”

24. No one has written about E. C. Clark. In order to form a biography of the man, information was gathered through articles that mention E. C. Clark from 1928 to 1950. This information did not provide a date or place of birth. Ancestry.com was consulted to determine if reliable information could be found on E. C. Clark, and a death certificate for Elijah Columbus Clark, Jr., who was a preacher for the Church of God, was located. The date of death on the death certificate matched the date of death listed in September 9, 1950, issue of Church of God Evangel for E. C. Clark. This exact match proves that E. C. Clark is Elijah Columbus Clark, Jr. and that the information found on the death certificate, such as birthplace and date of birth, can be relied upon as accurate information for E. C. Clark. Joseph M. Coin, “Tennessee, Death Records, 1908-1958: Certificate of Death: State of Tennessee, Elijah Clark Columbus, Jr.,” Ancestry.com, http://www.ancestry.com (accessed October 22, 2015). Rev. O. W. Polen, “Rev. E. C. Clark Passes to His Reward,” The Church of God Evangel 41, no. 29 (September 1950): 11. Clark’s death certificate is listed in Appendix B.
which contains his treatment of the gift of discernment. Over his 33-year association with the Church of God, he served as state overseer for Alabama, Indiana, West Virginia, Kansas, Missouri, and Ohio; managing editor and publisher for the Church of God Publishing House for seven years, business manager for two years, member of the executive Council of Twelve for at least 15 years, and member of the board of trustees for four years. He also served on numerous boards and filled the roles of pastor and staff editor at various times throughout his service with the Church of God.


29. A. V. Beaube stated that Clark had a 35-year ministry. This might have been an overestimation of service by rounding his 33 years of service up to a nearest round number. He first served as managing editor from April 1933 to August 1936 and then was elected into the position again September 1942. He served until September 7, 1946, when he took on the role of Business Manager for the paper until August 1948. These details were compiled by looking at each *Church of God Evangel* from 1920 to 1950, which contained the words “E. C. Clark.” His election is stated in the following article: Paul H. Walker, “A Few Observations of the Bishop’s Council and the General Assembly,” *The Church of God Evangel* 33, no. 28 (September 1942): 2, 15. Rev. O. W. Polen stated that E. C. Clark was managing editor from 1932 to 1934 and from 1942 to 1945, but these dates do not align with what *The Church of God Evangel* actually reported from month to month about the paper’s managing editor. (Every issue of *The Church of God Evangel* lists the current managing editor.) E. C. Clark’s membership in the Council of Twelve is noted in his announcement as editor in September 1942, where it stated that he had served fourteen years. In Polen’s tributary article on Clark, after his passing, Polen stated that Clark served 12 years on the Supreme Council prior to 1942 and three more years after 1942. If Polen’s later dates are added to Simmon’s earlier calculation, which also might have been Clark’s, Clark served on the council for 17 years, but with the discrepancy of information, one can only be absolutely sure that he served at least 15 years. Clark is not listed as a member of the board of trustees in the *Church of God Evangel’s* announcement in 1943. The announcement of the board members could not be located for 1944, and Clark appears on the board in September 1945. Clark is listed as being on the board as late as July 1949, but a list of board members between this date and the date of his death one year later could not be located. It is possible that he served right up until his death and/or served before 1945, but that information cannot be confirmed. J. H. Walker, “Recommendations and Appointments,” *The Church of God Evangel* 34, no. 27 (September 1943): 6, 14; John C. Jernigan, “Fortieth Annual General Assembly Now History,” *The Church of God Evangel* 36, no. 28 (September 1945): 6, 14-15; “Excerpts from 1948 Minutes,” *The Church of God Evangel* 40, no. 20 (July 1949): 12; Polen, “Rev. E. C. Clark Passes to His Reward,” 11; A. V. Beaube, “The General Assembly as I Saw It,” *The Church of God Evangel* 41, no. 27 (September 1950): 7, 15; Simmons, “The Church of God Evangel has a New Editor,” 4. “State Overseers,” *The Church of God Evangel* 19, no. 43 (November 1928): 2. T. L. McLain, “Notices and Specials,” *The Church of God Evangel* 19, no. 46 (November 1928): 2.

30. These details were compiled by examining each *Church of God Evangel* from 1920 to 1950, which contained the name, “E. C. Clark.”
route to the Church of God’s annual General Assembly in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1950, 66-year-old Clark suffered a heart attack that led to his death 10 days later on August 27, 1950.31

Smith Wigglesworth (1859-1947)

Evangelist Smith Wigglesworth was born on June 8, 1859, in Yorkshire, England.32 His ministry of evangelism began immediately following his conversion at the age of eight. During his thirties, he came into contact with a group of Christians that taught divine healing and “where God’s healing power was demonstrated in actual physical healings.”33 Although Wigglesworth sent many people to this group for healing, it seems he did not believe that his prayer for the sick would result in the same miraculous healings that he had witnessed at this group’s meetings. As a result, the first time he prayed for an individual to be healed was when he was left in charge of the group’s meeting while the leaders of this group attended a Keswick Convention. Wigglesworth described the man he prayed for at the time as “hobbling on crutches.” He stated, “I prayed for him and he was instantly healed. There was no one so surprised as I was.”


33. Ibid., 20-2. The name of this Christian group is not provided in the literature I reviewed. Because the leaders of this group attended a Keswick Convention, it is clear that they held to some sort of non-Wesleyan Holiness teaching. Keswick conventions were focused on conviction of sin, victory over sin through the work of Christ, living a life consecrated to God, and how to walk in, be filled with, and controlled by the Holy Spirit of God. These meetings taught that baptism in the Holy Spirit provided individuals with power for service, an idea that Pentecostal later embraced. William W. Menzies, “Non-Wesleyan Pentecostalism: A Tradition Keswick and the Higher Life,” Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies 14, no. 2 (July 2011): 213-25
This experience led Wigglesworth to begin a healing ministry “which brought deliverance and health to thousands around the world ‘in the name of Jesus.’”

On October 28, 1907, Wigglesworth visited Alexander Boddy’s church in Sunderland, England and received the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of tongues. After this experience, Wigglesworth’s ministry included preaching the saving work of Jesus Christ, praying for the sick to be miraculously healed, and spreading the Pentecostal message of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Whittaker writes, “People from all over [England] began to visit Wigglesworth’s Mission at Bradford and many of them asked him to visit their churches,” which he did. He was also asked to speak at the first Pentecostal Convention in Bournemouth, which was organized by Frodsham in 1909.

Wigglesworth began ministering in the United States after the passing of his wife Polly in January 1913. He made his first trip to America in 1914. World War I prevented further travel, but after the war he returned to the United States and preached two sermons on the gift of discernment. The first was on November 3, 1922 at the Union Pentecostal Meeting held in Chicago, Illinois. This sermon was recorded and published in the December 1922 issue of The Latter Rain Evangel. The second sermon was recorded during Wigglesworth’s visit to the Assemblies of God’s Central Bible Institute in

34. Whittaker, Seven Pentecostal Pioneers, 22.
36. Whittaker, Seven Pentecostal Pioneers, 28.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., 30-2. 35. Wigglesworth, “The Gift of Discerning of Spirits,” 5. Wigglesworth preached on other topics, but his contribution to the discussion on the gift of discernment is the concern of this thesis.
Springfield, MO. Frodsham recorded this sermon and published it in both *The Pentecostal Evangel* (December 1923) and *Ever Increasing Faith* (1924). Wigglesworth’s emphasis on this topic is most likely what prompted other American Pentecostals to focus on this issue.

Wigglesworth’s impactful ministry extended to other parts of the world. Between 1920 and 1939 he visited France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, America, and South Africa. The start of World War II ended his global ministry. Yet Wigglesworth continued to minister, even when his health began to deteriorate in 1944. After years of bad health he died in February 1947 at the age of eighty-seven while attending the funeral of his friend Wilfred Richardson.

---


41. Ibid. The content of the two works is exactly the same, revealing that the same author wrote both pieces. It is also telling that Frodsham was editor of *The Pentecostal Evangel* during this time. Smith Wigglesworth, “The Discerning of Spirits,” *The Pentecostal Evangel* no. 525 (December 1923): 2-3. Smith Wigglesworth, *Ever Increasing Faith* (Springfield, MO: Gospel, 1924), under “Chapter 17: The Discerning of Spirits,” [http://www.worldinvisible.com/library/wigglesworth/5f00.0930/5f00.0930.17.htm](http://www.worldinvisible.com/library/wigglesworth/5f00.0930/5f00.0930.17.htm) (accessed November 20, 2015).

42. Reiff wrote her article on the gift of discernment a year after Wigglesworth had come to her hometown of Chicago and preached on the topic and was recorded in the paper she edited.


44. Ibid., 42-4.
Donald Gee (1891-1966) 45

Donald Henry Frere Gee was born in May 1891 in London, England. 46 He was converted at the age of 14 at Finsbury Park Congregational Church under the pastoral leadership of Seth Joshua, who had been influenced by the Welsh Revival (1904-1905). 47 In March 1913, he experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of tongues. 48

45. Biographical information on Donald Gee is vague and sparse. Through a search on Ancestry.com, I was able to confirm Gee’s full name and more specific details of his life. With knowledge of Gee gathered from articles written about him by William K. Kay and David D. Bundy, I was able to match identical information on Pentecostal Donald Gee with Donald Henry Frere Gee. First, Bundy states that Gee traveled to Australia and New Zealand in 1928. This was confirmed by two manifests from the year 1928 that list Donald Henry Gee and Donald H. F. Gee. The manifest from the ship “Moldavia,” was for the departure from London to Sydney, Australia, on February 24, 1928. This manifest lists the home address of Gee as 3 Scotland St., Edinburgh, Scotland. It also states that Gee was 36 years old and a minister. The manifest from the ship “Niagara,” was for the departure from Auckland, New Zealand to Honolulu, HI on October 24, 1928. This lists Gee as a resident of Edinburgh, Scotland, aged 37, and minister of religion who had visited Sydney and was born in London, England. Bundy places Gee’s church in Edinburgh. Kay states that his ministry was in Edinburgh, Scotland. The age is right, and all the identifying information matches the Pentecostal Donald Gee. The birth records for Donald Henry F. Gee state that he was born between April and June 1891, the same year that Bundy and Kay state as his year of birth. The location is the Hackney district of London, only a few miles from the district of Islington, where his parents resided at the time of his birth. The family tree data on Ancestry.com states that Gee was born in May 1891; his father died in 1901 when Gee was nine; and his date of death was July 20, 1966. Kay states that Gee’s father died when Gee was nine. Bundy lists Gee’s date of death as July 20, 1966. David D. Bundy, “Gee, Donald,” The New International Dictionary of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 662-63. William K. Kay, “Donald Gee: An Important Voice of the Pentecostal Movement,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 16, no. 1 (October 2007): 133-153. “List or Manifest of Alien Passengers for the United States: R.M.S. ‘Niagara.’ October 24, 1928,” Ancestry.com http://www.ancestry.com (accessed October 22, 2015). “Out-Going Passengers: Moldavia, February 24, 1928,” Ancestry.com, http://www.ancestry.com (accessed October 22, 2015). “England and Wales, FreeBMD Birth Index, 1837-1915,” Ancestry.com, http://www.ancestry.com (accessed October 22, 2015). “Donald Henry Frere Gee: Gee Family Tree,” Ancestry.com, http://www.ancestry.com (accessed October 22, 2015). To view documents located on Ancestry.com see Appendices C, D, E, and F.


47. Kay, “Donald Gee,” 134. Bundy, “Gee,” NIDPCM 662. The Welsh Revival is considered to be precursor to the Pentecostal Movement. Many people believed that what had occurred at the Welsh Revival was similar to experiences people had in the Pentecostal Movement.

Unlike other Pentecostal leaders, who seemed to go right into ministry after their Pentecostal experience, Gee continued to work. It was not until after World War I that Gee entered full-time ministry. He became the pastor of a Pentecostal church in Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1920, and in 1924 Gee and his church joined the British Assemblies of God. In February 1928, Gee traveled to Australia to serve as a Bible teacher for several months. During his voyage to Australia, he wrote the content for his book *Concerning Spiritual Gifts*, which contains his 1928 treatment on the gift of discernment. Gee continued his global travels into the 1930s, ministering in Europe, North America, and South Africa. In 1934, Gee became vice-chairman of the British Assemblies of God, serving in this role until 1944 when he was elected chairman. Gee continued in this position until 1948. From 1951 to 1964, Gee served as principal for the British Assemblies of God’s newly acquired Hamstead Bible College in Kenley, Surrey.

49. Kay states that Gee was in attendance at the first British Assemblies of God meetings and that his church was one of the first congregations to join the new denomination. Kay, “Donald Gee,” 138.


52. Whittaker, *Seven Pentecostal Pioneers*, 94.

53. Bundy, “Gee,” NIDPCM 663. The college was originally known as the Pentecostal Missionary Union (PMU) Bible School. The school was closed during the Great War and was reopened in March 1919 at a new location in Hamstead, England. Howard Carter was principal of this Bible school, which became known as Hamstead Bible School from 1921 to 1948. George Newsholme became principal in 1948 and in
At the end of the 1940s, Gee became actively involved in unification efforts between Christians of varying faith practices and among Pentecostals. His effort towards uniting Pentecostals appear to begin in 1947. During this time, Gee and David du Plessis organized the second European Pentecostal Conference in Zurich, a conference aimed at uniting Pentecostals across Europe. During this convention, Gee was appointed editor of the Pentecost, a non-denominational Pentecostal magazine that provided “information about missionary and revival activity all over the world.” Gee published this magazine “four times a year from September 1947 until [July] 1966… [for] a total of 77 issues.” In addition to the Pentecost, he authored more than 30 books and more than 500 articles for the Pentecostal periodical Redemption Tidings. His desire for unity resulted in his ability to “avoid extreme positions on issues of contention within the Pentecostal Movement,” gaining him the reputation as the “Apostle of Balance.”


54. Gee attended the World Council of Churches held in in Amsterdam (1948) and in Evanston (1954). Kay, “Donald Gee,” 149-50. The goal of these conferences was to unify Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox, and Evangelicals, who accept Jesus Christ as both Lord and Savior. In 1947, Gee and David du Plessis organized the second European Pentecostal Conference in Zurich. Bundy, “Gee,” NIDPCM 663.


58. Ibid., 662.
also became involved in the ecumenical movement in 1948 with his attendance at the first World Council of Churches conference in Amsterdam.\textsuperscript{59} Gee attended the second conference held in 1954 but had to abstain from the third conference held in 1961 due to pressure he received from Thomas Zimmerman to not attend.\textsuperscript{60} Even with this setback, Gee continued to work towards the unity of all Christians until his death on July 20, 1966.\textsuperscript{61} He was seventy-five years old.

Harold Horton (1880-1969)

Harold Lawrence Cuthbert Horton was born March 25, 1880 in Wrexham, Wales.\textsuperscript{62} He was raised by Methodist parents and became a Wesleyan Methodist preacher at the age of 21. For 20 years, he “traveled the local circuit of [Methodist] churches in North Wales

\textsuperscript{59} These conferences seek to unite Christians of various faith backgrounds, who accept Jesus Christ as both Lord and Savior, such as, Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox, and Evangelicals.


\textsuperscript{61} Bundy, “Gee,” NIDPCM 663.

preaching and ministering. At some point between 1904 and 1905, he traveled to South Wales and attended the Welch Revival. Even with his experience in South Wales, he would not join the Pentecostal Movement until the 1920s.

Before that time, he would experience a double rupture to his heart that would prompt him to investigate the teachings of Christian Science in search of healing. After two years of suffering, he was invited to attend a London convention to listen to the preaching of Smith Wigglesworth. During this convention, he received the physical healing he had been longing for and was baptized in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of glossolalia.

By 1926, Horton was actively ministering in the Pentecostal Movement. From 1926 to 1928, he taught “French, English, and various Bible studies” at Hampstead Bible School in London, England, opened by Howard Carter in 1922. He moved to Louth, England, in 1928, to pastor a church that had resulted from a Pentecostal revival held by Stephen Jeffreys in June 1927. Horton also worked at the local women’s Bible School that had been organized by Howard Carter, which he was made principal of when its


68. 1926 is the earliest date that I could locate for Horton’s association with Pentecostal ministry. He is listed as a teacher at Harold Carter’s Hampstead Bible School in the following article: “In the Whitened Harvest Fields,” The Pentecostal Evangel no. 643 (April 1926): 12-4.
location was moved to Scarborough, England, in late 1928. In November 1933, Horton moved to Luton, England to aid a church that was about to close. He successfully saved it and remained there until September 1938, when he left to work with the Hampstead Bible School for a second time. During this very busy time of ministry, Horton served as a member of the Executive Presbytery for the British Assemblies of God and published his book *Gifts of the Spirit*, which was utilized as a text book in Pentecostal Bible schools in America, Canada, the British Isles. This distinguished work also contained his treatment of the gift of discernment.

After World War II, he went to the United States where he ministered for five years. While there, he worked with the American Assemblies of God, who published a few of his sermons in *The Pentecostal Evangel*. Some of his activities in America included speaking at camp meetings in Kansas and Wisconsin, and speaking at Central Bible Institute and Central Assembly in Springfield, MO.

69. Ibid. The women’s Bible School was later merged with Hampstead Bible School under Donald Gee’s leadership. Bundy, “Alfred Howard Carter: Pentecostal Warrior,” 14.


Little is known about the last fifteen years of Horton’s life. He returned to England at some point and appears to have continued preaching the Pentecostal message until his death in January 1969. The Assemblies of God published a warm tribute for Horton upon his death in *The Pentecostal Evangel*, calling him “one of the foremost Bible teachers in the Pentecostal Movement.” His mentor and co-minister Howard Carter conducted his funeral on January 9, 1969.73

Stanley H. Frodsham (1882-1966)

Stanley Howard Frodsham was born March 1, 1882, in Southampton, Hampshire, England.74 In 1908, Frodsham came into contact with Pentecostal teaching at Alexander Boddy’s All Saints Church in Sunderland and subsequently received the baptism of the Holy Spirit.75 Frodsham began the publication of a Pentecostal paper called *Victory*, in 1909, which he continued to write until he became editor of *The Weekly Evangel* in October 1916.76 In 1912, Frodsham immigrated to the United States.77 By 1914, he was naturalized as a U.S. citizen.78

73. “Harold Horton is with the Lord,” 7.


75. Alexander Boddy’s church All Saints Parish Church in Sunderland, England, is the birthplace of British Pentecostalism 1907 and where it was centered until 1914.


living in Cazadero, CA, where he hosted his friend Wigglesworth on his first visit to the United States. In October 1916, he was elected editor of *The Weekly Evangel* for the American Assemblies of God and he relocated from San Jose, CA to St. Louis, MO. Frodsham served as editor of this Pentecostal paper, which later became known as *The Pentecostal Evangel*, until September 30, 1949, when he resigned from the position in order for a someone younger to take his place. During his time as editor, Frodsham published his article on the gift of discernment. He also published *With Signs Following*, “the first overview of world Pentecostalism and missions,” and *Ever Increasing Faith*, which contained Wigglesworth’s 1923 sermon on the gift of discernment. After Frodsham’s resignation in 1949, he gave up his ministerial credentials with the American Assemblies of God and spent the last twenty years of his life working in Latter Rain Circles. He died on December 7, 1969, at the age of eighty-seven in Springfield, MO, without acknowledgement by *The Pentecostal Evangel*.

---


Alfred Howard Carter (1891-1971)

Alfred Howard Carter was born January 3, 1891 in Birmingham, England. He was converted at the age of twenty and received the baptism in the Holy Spirit four years later on August 5, 1915.\textsuperscript{84} In 1916, the same year that England passed the Military Service Act, Carter left his position as designer for Thursfields and Company and entered full-time ministry.\textsuperscript{85} Although Carter was granted a combat service exemption for his comments that he would not aid a dying soldier, he refused to enter military service in any capacity. As a result, he was imprisoned on March 16, 1917 at Wormwood Scrubbs Prison.\textsuperscript{86} During his incarceration, Carter “focused his studies on the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit,” which would inspire his 1941 book *Questions and Answers on Spiritual*

prior to his retirement to work as an editor for other organizations outside of the Assemblies of God. A year after he returned from his first departure, he was publically reprimanded by the general chairman of the Assemblies of God, Endorus N. Bell, for approving the publication of an article that was poorly received by readers across America. This article had criticized Pentecostals for praying less, bringing formality into the services, allowing instrument in worship, permitting unsaved and backslidden individuals to lead worship, and for dressing in modern attire. The focus of the article was to point out areas where the author believed the people were failing in living holy and sanctified lives. The point of the author may have been to encourage readers to live more holy lives, but instead the readership did not believe the article offered solutions to the problems he raised. They additionally believed that the article had been one-sided and the absence of the name of the author made them wonder if the author was even a Pentecostal. Bell was furious that Frodsham published the article, believing the article to be unjust. Frodsham, on the other hand, defended the article’s placement in the paper. This may have contributed to his departure in 1928. Although J. R. Flower states that Frodsham had been discussing retirement for five or so years, Frodsham may have felt pressured into retirement due to his age. This is based on remarks that he made about the Pentecostal Movement being in a second or third generation of Christians and the need for a younger editor. His wife Alice also retired from the paper at the same time as Frodsham. The lack of recognition by the Assemblies of God for a man that served the organization for 31 years reflects the opinion that Frodsham and the American Assemblies of God had parted under poor circumstances. Wayne Warner, “Pentecostal Evangel Article Creates Controversy in 1913: Is there Declension in the Pentecostal Movement?” *Assemblies of God Heritage* 20, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 18-23. Flower, “In Appreciation,” 4.

\textsuperscript{84} Bundy, “Alfred Howard Carter: Pentecostal Warrior,” 11.


\textsuperscript{86} Bundy, “Alfred Howard Carter: Pentecostal Warrior,” 12.
Gifts. At the end of the Great War, Carter was released and started a Pentecostal church called People’s Hall.

On February 14, 1921, Carter became principal of Hamstead Bible School, Great Britain’s only Pentecostal Bible school at the time. During his twenty-seven year tenure in this role, he ran Friday night meetings at Sion College, a hall which hosted Pentecostal speakers from all over the world; formed the Bible School Evangelistic Society (B.S.E.S.), which provided graduates of the Hamstead Bible School with the resources they needed to start new Pentecostal churches; began a college for female students in Louth, England, in 1927, which was later moved to Hamstead; and began the Bible School Review, which provided news of the Hamstead Bible School, advertisements for lay educational opportunities, and various essays and Bible studies.

Running the Hamstead Bible School was not the only Pentecostal activity with which Carter involved himself. He spent almost fifty years of his life working with the British Assemblies of God. On February 1, 1924, Carter was one of fourteen Pentecostals who “signed the initial protocol that created the Assemblies of God of Great Britain and Ireland.” That same year, he was elected to serve in the Executive Presbytery. From 1929 to 1934, he served as vice chairman. He became chairman in May 1934 and served

---


88. Ibid.


By 1962, Carter was a resident of the United States. The British Assemblies of God esteemed Carter so highly that they passed a resolution that year to make Carter a permanent minister of their organization even though he was no longer a resident of England.\footnote{Alfred F. Missen, “Howard Carter,” Redemption Tidings 47, no. 9 (April 1971): 3-5. There is conflicting information regarding when Carter moved to the United States. Jonas Clark implies that he moved between 1969 and 1971 after spending 1965 to 1969 in Kenley, England. Bundy states that Carter spent only four months in Kenley in 1965, not four years. He also indicates that Steelberg and Carter were married in New York (1956). Missen, member of the Executive Council for the British Assemblies of God, stated that Carter was a resident of another country by 1962. Ancestry.com did not list any immigration or border crossing for Carter after 1946. The most likely conclusion is that Carter moved to the United States sometime after he resigned from the Hamstead Bible School in 1948. He moved back to England in 1965 to work in Kenley, England again and then moved back to the United States, either in 1965 or 1969. As to why the executive council appears to have waited several years to pass the resolution making Carter a permanent minister of the British Assemblies of God is unclear. Bundy, “Alfred Howard Carter: Pentecostal Warrior,” 16. Jonas Clark, “Revival History,” under “Howard Carter: A Man of Whom the World was not Worthy,” https://www.jonasclark.com/howard-carter-a-man-of-whom-the-world-was-not-worthy/ (accessed November 26, 2015).} Carter passed away on January 22, 1971 in Springfield, MO, at the age of 80.\footnote{Two dates are given for the date of death for Carter. Redemption Tidings, official periodical for the British Assemblies of God, reported that Carter died on January 23, 1971, the same day as Pentecostal William F. P. Burton. Every other source, including Bundy and Clark, report the date of death as January 22, 1971. Ancestry.com did not provide a source for this date and Carter’s headstone in Springfield, MO does not list a day of death, only the year. Because a definite date could not be firmly determined, the more commonly used date has been cited. “Two Warriors with the Lord,” Redemption...}
Pastor Paul (1853-1931)

Jonathan Anton Alexander Paul is referred to as Pastor Paul in every Pentecostal article about him.\(^96\) Paul was born May 29, 1853, in Gartz an Oder, Germany.\(^97\) He served his first pastorate at a Lutheran State Church in 1880 and retained his association with the Lutheran State Church throughout his Pentecostal ministry.\(^98\) On July 17, 1890, Paul had an experience that he would refer to as the moment he received the baptism in the Holy Spirit.\(^99\) In September 1907, Paul received the gift of tongues.\(^100\) His defense of the Pentecostals in October 1907, not only associated Paul with Pentecostalism, but it also caused people to regard him as the leader of the German Pentecostal Movement.\(^101\) After a bitter public battle with the Gemeinschaftsbewegung (The German Evangelical League) over Paul’s *Jesus Wird* (Jesus will) doctrine and the Pentecostal belief in the operation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the Gemeinschaftsbewegung formally separated itself from

\(^{96}\) In Germany, clergy of the Lutheran State Church were referred to as “pastor.” It was a title of respect and one that early Pentecostals, such as Alexander A. Boddy respected. See Alexander A. Boddy, “Days in Germany: Soilesia and its Capital,” *Confidence* 5, no. 1 (January 1912): 3-6.


\(^{98}\) Ibid., 51-52.

\(^{99}\) Ibid., 54.

\(^{100}\) Ibid., 114. Paul maintained that his baptism in the Holy Spirit occurred in 1890, 17 years prior to his receipt of tongues. Paul did not believe that tongues was a evidential sign of the baptism in the Holy Spirit; instead, he believed that the gift of love showcased in a person’s life was proof that one had been filled with the Holy Spirit of God. Ibid., 9, 115.

\(^{101}\) Ibid., 115. Paul was not the original leader of German Pentecostalism. Heinrich Dallmeyer had led the first Pentecostal meetings in Kassel, but the negative attention that the Kassel meetings received from the press and the Gemeinschaftsbewegung prompted Dallmeyer to reject Pentecostalism and argue that the movement had a satanic origin. Ibid., 120.
the German Pentecostal Movement. After Paul lost his two sons in World War I and his wife three years later, he publicly renounced his Jesus Wird teaching and stated his regret for the disunity that had resulted between the Gemeinschaftsbewegung and the Pentecostals.

Paul had an especially close relationship with British Pentecostal leader Alexander A. Boddy of Sunderland, England. Paul was invited as a guest speaker at every one of Boddy’s Sunderland Conferences held from 1909 to 1914. Boddy also attended several Pentecostal conferences that were held in Germany. Boddy’s admiration for Paul is demonstrated in his countless praises of Paul, his inquiries of

---

102. Paul’s Jesus Wird doctrine taught that an individual could “conquer sin through faith and remaining ‘in Christ.’” Ibid., 86. The German Pentecostal Movement was composed of members of the Gemeinschaftsbewegung. When Paul was recognized as leader of the Pentecostal Movement, his doctrine, which the Gemeinschaftsbewegung opposed in 1904, became associated with Pentecostalism. The Gemeinschaftsbewegung’s rejection of the Pentecostal Movement and Paul’s teaching resulted in the Berlin Declaration in 1909 and ultimately to the formal separation between the Gemeinschaftsbewegung and German Pentecostals by 1911. Simpson describes the history of the deteriorating relationship between the Gemeinschaftsbewegung and the Pentecostals in his thesis. Ibid., 86-204.

103. Ibid., 44-6, 64.


guidance from Paul, and the publication of a picture of Paul’s home in Germany so that readers could see where Paul lived. Boddy absolutely adored Paul and Paul’s words on the gift of discernment at Boddy’s Sunderland Conference in 1914 would have received the attention of Boddy and others who held the same level of admiration of Paul.

Paul made several contributions to Pentecostalism throughout his life. He was the main contributor of the German translation of the New Testament called The Mulheim New Testament, the only Pentecostal translation of the Bible to date. He also published and contributed 68 hymns to the hymnbook Pfingstjubel, which Gee declared to be “one of the finest Pentecostal Hymn-books in the world.” Additionally, he published several magazines including Jesus liebt dich (Jesus love you), a children’s church and Sunday school magazine with a circulation of 100,000 for over 33 years. Paul passed away at the home of his daughter Mathilde on April 25, 1931, at the age of 77. His obituary reported that Paul was an honorable and loving Christian.

Summary

These eight authors served as editors of major Pentecostal periodicals and as prominent Pentecostal leaders. Reiff and Frodsham edited the two most recognized American Pentecostal papers, The Latter Rain Evangel and The Pentecostal Evangel. Clark edited


The Church of God Evangel, whose publisher, the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), had a significant presence across the United States. Carter, Gee, and Paul headed important Pentecostal organizations in Pentecostalism, the British Assemblies of God and the German Pentecostal Movement. Wigglesworth did not belong to any formal organization in Pentecostalism, but his ministry spanned the globe. Other authors ministered outside of their home countries as well. Englishman Frodsham spent the majority of his life in the United States, where he eventually died. German Paul spent time outside of Germany visiting other European countries and England. Englishman Carter completed two worldwide ministry tours, covering over 150,000 miles. Englishman Gee traveled across Europe to unify both Pentecostals and Christians across denominational lines. In addition to Harold Horton’s travels to the United States in the 1940s, his book Gifts of the Spirit became an authoritative text among Pentecostals in the United States, Canada, and the British Isles. These authors had significant ministries that reached large and receptive audiences around the world and their examinations of the gift of discernment were widely read.

The Gift of Discernment

These eight Pentecostal writers basically agreed that the gift of discernment identified the spirit behind a manifestation and/or a spirit presently influencing an individual. They also agreed that the operation of the gift of discernment provided four benefits to the Pentecostal church.

Identifying the Spirit Behind a Manifestation

Early Pentecostal writers identified three sources for a manifestation in their articles on the gift of discernment – the Holy Spirit, an evil spirit, and the flesh. Gee’s article focused on distinguishing whether a manifestation had a divine or satanic source, while Paul’s article concentrated on differentiating manifestations that were granted by God verses those that originated in humanity.\(^{112}\) Reiff, on the other hand, named all three sources.\(^{113}\)

Harold Horton disagreed with the conclusion that the gift of discernment would identify a human spirit. He contended that the gift of discernment was a supernatural gift that provided only supernatural revelations. Because there was nothing “miraculous” about a manifestation performed through the human spirit, manifestations originating with the human spirit were not discerned through the gift of discernment. Horton believed that a supernatural manifestation would only originate with God or Satan. He explained that the gift of discernment would reveal “the true source and nature of any supernatural manifestation, whether divine or satanic.”\(^{114}\) Horton’s assessment assumes that the supernatural manifestations found in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10 – healing, miracles, tongues, etc. – could only be performed under the power of God or of Satan, dismissing the possibility that a human could imitate the supernatural manifestation of tongues.

The comparison of Horton’s beliefs with other writers on the gift of discernment demonstrates that early Pentecostals were not in complete agreement on whether a


supernatural manifestation could originate from a human spirit or could be identified by the gift of discernment. Early Pentecostal writers did agree that manifestations did not all originate with God and the competing source of supernatural manifestations needed to be identified and could be identified through the gift of discernment.

Identifying the Spirit Presently Influencing an Individual

In addition to locating the sources of manifestations, the gift of discernment also provided insight into the kind and source of spirit that guided an individual apart from manifestations. Wigglesworth believed that spiritists, Christian Scientists, and Theosophists could be identified before they even performed any manifestations, as persons guided by an evil or false spirit. He warned that these people must be identified and dealt with so that they would “not have any power in the meetings,” indicating that these people could be identified before they ever performed one single counterfeit act.115 Horton, Carter, and Frodsham concurred with Wigglesworth’s evaluation. Horton wrote that the gift of discernment “reveals the kind of Spirit that is actuating a person who is manifesting supernatural knowledge or power at the time that the miracle is actually taking place.”116 Frodsham asserted,

How necessary it is that there should be that manifestation of the Spirit – the gift of discernment – to recognize these who are disguised as ministers of righteousness, who are false and filled with a lying spirit, who speak not the things of the lowly Lamb, who lead not in the paths of righteousness, but lead to that way which seemeth good unto mankind, but a way that endeth in death.117

Frodsham also referred to Acts 9:26-27, which describes the disciples’ fear of the newly converted Saul and the faith in Saul that Barnabas displayed. Frodsham wrote that God had given Barnabas discernment into the spirit of Saul in order to recognize “the grace that was upon [Saul].”118

Frodsham believed that the gift of discernment not only provided insight into the source of the spirit influencing an individual, but also information regarding the type of spirit influencing an individual. In his article on discernment, he listed several types of spirits that the gift of discernment would reveal. His list of evil spirits included “the fox spirit, the wolf spirit, the ravenous spirit, the spirit that has no compassion, that would feed itself and destroy the flock.”119 His list of good spirits from God included “the spirit of grace, the meek and quiet spirit, the tender spirit.”120 The gift of discernment could provide both the type of spirit influencing an individual and the source of that spirit.

Benefits the Gift of Discernment Provided to the Pentecostal Church

Recognizing the spirit behind a manifestation or an individual provided four benefits. First, it enabled Pentecostal leaders to remove those responsible for counterfeit activity from their meetings and publically condemn the manifestations they produced. Second, it prevented sincere Pentecostals from following the direction of counterfeit manifestations. Members would now know which manifestations were counterfeit and could reject the leadings of these false manifestations. Third, it facilitated the removal of evil spirits from an individual. People who were held captive by evil spirits could now have these evil

118. Ibid., 4.

119. Ibid. It is evident that Frodsham assumed these spirits were different, but he does not clearly define the difference between these spirits for his audience.

120. Ibid.
spirits cast out of them.\textsuperscript{121} Finally, it qualified individuals as both servants of God and for service in Pentecostal meetings. Frodsham assumed that God revealed to Barnabas the spirit of God that was resident in the newly converted Saul so that the disciples would embrace Saul as a new convert.\textsuperscript{122} Carter stated, “[The gift of discernment] can be used also for helping to choose pure and guileless helpers for the work of the Lord.”\textsuperscript{123} Both Frodsham and Carter were convinced that the reason the gift of discernment revealed good spirits was to aid the Pentecostal church in identification of those that were genuine followers of Christ and could be trusted to hold leadership positions in the church.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Early writings on the Pentecostal practice of the gift of discernment originated with Pentecostals who had major ministries and influence in the Pentecostal Movement. Because of the influence of these writers, especially through the magazines and publishing houses they used to disseminate their views, their writings on the gift of discernment would have been widely read. Consequently, these writers provide crucial insight into early Pentecostal understanding on the gift of discernment. They believed that the gift of discernment indicated the kind of spirit and source of a spirit that was behind a manifestation or guided an individual. This information provided four benefits, which could aid in resolving the negative consequences Pentecostals associated with the presence of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings. Utilizing the treatments on the gift of discernment authored by these eight individuals, Chapter Four will discuss the specific outcomes early Pentecostal writers expected to result from information received

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{121} Casting out demons will be discussed in Chapter Four.
\item \textsuperscript{122} Frodsham, “The Editor’s Notebook: The Discerning of Spirits,” 4.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Carter, \textit{Questions & Answers on Spiritual Gifts}, 150.
\end{itemize}
through the gift of discernment, the requirements Pentecostal authors believed were necessary to the operation of the gift of discernment in an individual, and how early Pentecostals identified those who had been granted the gift of discernment by God.
CHAPTER IV

THE GIFT OF DISCERNMENT: PART 2

The previous chapter established that early Pentecostal discernment writers believed that the gift of discernment identified the kind and source of a spirit that was behind a manifestation or guided an individual. This chapter will explore what these writers believed about the operation of the gift of discernment. It will explore the outcomes early Pentecostal writers believed should result from information received through the gift of discernment, the requirements these authors believed were necessary in order for the gift of discernment to operate, and how early Pentecostals identified those who had been granted the gift of discernment by God.

Outcomes of Practicing the Gift of Discernment

These Pentecostal writers identified four outcomes that should result from the practice of the gift of discernment. First, the gift of discernment should edify and unify the church. Reiff supported this conclusion by quoting 1 Corinthians 12:7, which reads, “But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal” (KJV). She explained, “[This] means that the manifestation is given to profit the whole company of believers and that no gift of God is given for any private glorification or selfish use.” Clark assumed that unity of the church should result from edification. When describing the purpose of the Church of God Evangel magazine, he wrote that it was “intended as a means of edification, but it also had for its accomplishment the task of unifying its

readers in the faith.”2 Because of this assumption, it is not surprising that when Clark stated that “the wisdom of God [is] given for edification ‘and not for destruction,’” he reinforced this statement with, “[t]his kind of a gift is for the binding together of God’s people and must not be confused or compared with the usual kind of ‘rebuking power’… [which] looks for faults and something to criticize.”3 Clark believed that the manifestation of the gift of discernment should unify the church and not destroy it. Criticisms leveled at people had the possibility of tearing the church apart, which was contrary to the will of God. This idea aligns with Wigglesworth’s teaching that the exercise of natural discernment should be directed at oneself instead of at others.

The second outcome was deliverance from the power of evil spirits.4 The gift of discernment itself did not deliver a person; it simply informed that an evil spirit possessed an individual.5 Once this problem was identified, two actions could be taken to resolve this problem. First, the evil spirit could be “cast out” in the name of Jesus. Wigglesworth stated, “You can in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ deal with the evil powers and command them to come out.” He then provided three examples of an evil spirit being identified and cast out in the name of Jesus.6 Those who were able to cast a demon out of a person were sanctified believers who lived a holy life. Pentecostals believed that


Christians, who were justified, sanctified, and lived holy lives free from sin were protected from demon possession. Horton stated, “Satan does not cast out Satan … evil spirits will not yield to other evil spirits; they will only yield to the servants of God filled with the Holy Ghost (Acts xix, 13-17), and even these must be living in close communion with God.” The only way to effectively remove a demon was to have someone who could not be possessed by the demon cast it out. The second way people were delivered from evil spirits was through individual action taken by the possessed person. This person needed to submit him or herself to the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Reiff believed this was accomplished by worshipping God. She wrote, “Make that thing worship the Christ within and the devil will flee.” Frodsham believed that this was accomplished through humility. He wrote that someone who is humble would seek the council of old and mature men of God and ask for the prayers of God’s saints and find deliverance.

The third outcome was spiritual correction. Sometimes a person did not necessarily need a demon to be cast of him or her, but for the human spirit to be adjusted. Gee stated that Peter’s rebuke of Simon the sorcerer in Acts 8:18-24 was “based upon discernment of the condition of [Simon’s] heart.” Frodsham referred to Luke 9:53-55 which tells of the disciples of Jesus, James, and John asking Jesus if they should command fire to come down from heaven and consume the Samaritans that refused to

7. See “Authenticity of Experience Questioned and Used as Propaganda” in Chapter Two.
8. Horton, Gifts of the Spirit, 77. Horton does state that Satan may cast an evil spirit out of an individual if it served his purpose, such as getting Christians to involve themselves in Spiritualist or Christian Scientist groups.
receive Jesus. Frodsham stated that Jesus rebuked James and John for this question because He recognized the evil spirit of judgment as the source of their request.12 Both Gee and Frodsham concluded that the gift of discernment could reveal a problem with the human spirit that needed to be corrected.

The fourth outcome was restoration to God. Clark hinted at this idea in his article when explaining that the gift of discernment is for edification and not rebuke. He advised, “You had better go with love and wisdom and ‘restore such a one in the spirit of meekness.’”13 One of the main reasons for the identification of an evil spirit in individuals and why people needed to be delivered from these spirits was so that people could be restored and placed in right standing with God.

These four outcomes were recognized as actions or behaviors that should result from the practice of the gift of discernment. If actions or behaviors contradicted these outcomes then early Pentecostals believed that action or behavior taking place was not the result of God granting the gift of discernment. In addition to the examination of resulting outcomes, early Pentecostals believed that particular individuals had access to the gift of discernment.

**Requirements for the Gift of Discernment to Operate in an Individual**

Early Pentecostal writers held the opinion that in order for the gift of discernment to be able to operate in an individual, he or she needed to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. Paul stated that the baptism in the Holy Spirit provided the gifts or manifestations of the

---


Wigglesworth agreed. In his sermon, recorded in *Ever Increasing Faith*, Wigglesworth stated that he sought the Lord about why God had given him the spiritual baptism. God responded that it was for the deliverance of the captives. For Wigglesworth, this meant that God desired miracles to be performed in order to demonstrate God’s power, bring people to Christ, and free people from the power of evil spirits.

Wigglesworth believed that the baptism in the Holy Spirit brought the manifestation of the gifts into operation in one’s life in order to grant one power for service. Gee stated that the gift of discernment is manifested through a believer who is completely possessed by the Holy Spirit, an experience that Gee believed occurred in the baptism of the Holy

---

14. Alexander A. Boddy, “Tongues in the Public Assembly: Conference of Leaders at the Sunderland Convention, 1914,” *Confidence* 8, no. 1 (January 2015), 12-4. This is contrary to Simpson’s thesis on Paul, which states that Paul believed that the gifts of the Spirit could be exercised prior to the baptism in the Holy Spirit. There are several reasons why this discrepancy exists. First, this comment appears to be sourced from Paul Fleisch’s *Die Pfingstbewegung in Deutschland’s* 1957 publication, which was significantly expanded from the 1914 edition. Carl Simpson, “A Critical Evaluation of the Contribution of Jonathan Paul to the Development of the German Pentecostal Movement” (PhD diss., Glyndwr University, 2011), 22. Second, Simpson implies that Fleisch may not have been completely accurate in his assessment of Paul. Ibid., 40. Third, Walter Hollenweger observes that Paul displayed contradictory accounts regarding sanctification, which Paul believed was connected to the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Walter J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 237-38. Because Paul’s statement, that the gifts of the Holy Spirit occur after baptism in the Holy Spirit, appears in the same article about the gift of discernment, this theological understanding by Paul will be recognized for this thesis.


16. Clark agreed with Wigglesworth’s assessment, describing the appearance of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Holy Spirit as evidence that the “latter rain” of God was falling. In the same way that the “latter rains” fall in the spring time to fertilize the seeds sown in the winter and ripen the fruit for the harvest, Clark believed that God was fertilizing the seeds of the message of Christ that had been sown and making people’s hearts ready to embrace Christ. God was making people ready to receive Christ through the manifestations of the Holy Spirit and He was making his people ready to bring in the harvest of souls by baptizing them in the Holy Spirit so that God could work through them. Clark’s full explanation on the importance of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and meaning of the “latter rain” being poured out by God can be found in his book *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost “And More.”* See Clark, *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, 10-32.
Carter affirmed that the gift of discernment only manifested itself “to or through a Spirit-filled individual.”

It is clear that early Pentecostal leaders believed that the people who had access to the gift of discernment were those who had received the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Early Pentecostals agreed that before one could receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit, one had to successfully obtain justification and sanctification from God.

Early Pentecostals did not agree with how this requirement was accomplished, which led to two theories of how justification and sanctification occurred – The Wesleyan Holiness position and the non-Wesleyan Holiness position, also referred to as The Second-Work of Grace and The Finished Work of Christ respectively.

Wesleyan Pentecostals believed that justification and sanctification were separate experiences, while non-Wesleyan Pentecostals believed that justification and sanctification occurred at the same moment.

Regardless of which view a Pentecostal held, all agreed the baptism in the Holy Spirit

17. Gee believed that the Holy Spirit did not enter into an individual until the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Donald Gee, “Studies on the Fundamental Truths. No. 6 – ’The Baptism in the Holy Spirit, the Initial Evidence of Which is the Speaking with Other Tongues.’ (Acts ii, 4; Acts x, 44-46; 11, 14-16; xix, 6),” Redemption Tidings 2, no. 6 (June 1926): 13-6.


19. Justification pardons one from sin. Sanctification cleansed one from sin.

20. A third theological viewpoint developed later on, but the authors examined by this thesis do not carry this third viewpoint.

took place after one had been cleansed of sin through sanctification, and they agreed that living a holy life was necessary in order to receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit.²²

Both groups also believed that sanctification instilled in each person a pure love for God and man. John Wesley (1703-1791), from whom Wesleyan Holiness Pentecostals derived their Second-Work of Grace theory, stated that the instant a person received sanctification “the heart [was] cleansed from all sin, and filled with pure love to God and man.”²³ William H. Durham, who proposed the non-Wesleyan theory of the Finished Work of Christ, agreed with Wesley and stated, “When a man is converted he is made pure and holy, and he has a real holy love in his heart for God and man. One of the evidences of the new birth is that we love the brethren.”²⁴ As a result, Pentecostals believed that those who had been baptized in the Holy Spirit would have previously received a love for God and humanity, and this characteristic would be evident in one’s life.

In addition to a person receiving sanctification, living a holy life, and walking in love to receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit, many early Pentecostals believed that the first gift of the Spirit to be manifested in an individual was glossolalia.²⁵ For many

---

²² Both Wesleyans and non-Wesleyans believed that once sanctification was granted, an individual had the ability to live a holy life and was expected to live a life that avoided knowingly committing a sin. Voluntary sin would result in the loss of sanctification, thus impeding one’s ability to be granted the baptism in the Holy Spirit.


²⁵ There was a debate among early Pentecostals regarding whether the gift of tongues needed to be the first gift that a person received in order for it to be evident that one was baptized in the Holy Spirit. This debate is found in two articles written by Pentecostals Joseph Reynolds Flower and Aimee Semple McPherson. Joseph Reynolds Flower’s article “The Evidence of the Baptism” published by The Pentecostal Evangel on April 17, 1920, argued that the other gifts of the Holy Spirit – miracles, healings, discernment, faith, knowledge, and wisdom – could all be performed while one is in complete control of his mind and tongue. The gift of tongues, on the other hand, requires that both the mind and tongue be under
Pentecostals this gift was the initial proof that one had genuinely received the baptism in the Holy Spirit. For others, like Paul, glossolalia was the first gift of the Spirit to be manifested, but it did not serve as proof of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. As a result, many early Pentecostals concluded that before one could be granted the gift of discernment or any of the other gifts found in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10, he or she had to first experience glossolalia.

the control of the Holy Spirit. The only gift left that would also require the mind and tongue to be controlled by the Holy Spirit is prophecy, but he refers to Acts 19:16, stating that because the apostles spoke in tongues first and then prophesied, that the gift of prophecy is an “inferior” test of baptism of the Holy Spirit. Aimee Semple McPherson also argued for tongues as the primary avenue of proof of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, but she makes an allowance for interpretation. In her 1938 article, “Holy Spirit Critics Answered by Sister,” McPherson argues that the gifts of wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, and discernment are not valid demonstrations of the baptism of the Holy Spirit because followers of God in the Old Testament had practiced them. She states that the only two gifts that are not practiced until after the Day of Pentecost are tongues and interpretation of tongues. Therefore, these two gifts can be used as proof. See Joseph Reynolds Flower, “The Evidence of the Baptist,” The Pentecostal Evangel no. 336/337 (April 1920): 4; Aimee Semple McPherson, “Holy Spirit Critics Answered by Sister: Critics’ Arguments Proved, Compromise --- Unscriptural,” FC 11, no. 43 (April 1938): 1-2. The authors studied in this thesis believed that glossolalia was the initial gift granted to an individual. When Reiff describes people’s baptism in the Holy Spirit, she includes the detail that they spoke in unknown tongues.

In his personal testimony Wigglesworth stated that he spoke in unknown tongues when he received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Smith Wigglesworth, “Bradford: Testimony of Smith Wigglesworth,” Confidence 1, no. 7 (October 1908): 11, 15-16. Gee wrote that the gift of glossolalia is a divinely appointed evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. He continued, “Since God has ordained this sign let us accept it.” Donald Gee, “Spiritual Gifts,” Redemption Tidings 1, no. 8 (August 1925): 5-7.

Frodsham’s article “Have Ye Received the Holy Ghost” argued that in order for one to have genuinely received the baptism in the Holy Spirit, one needed to receive it “according to the original pattern in Acts 2:4,” which Frodsham stated was evidenced by the gift of glossolalia. Stanley H. Frodsham, “Have Ye Received the Holy Ghost?” The Pentecostal Evangel no. 1049 (May 1934): 2. Clark believed that “no one may Biblically and truthfully assume to say that anyone is baptized with the Holy Ghost, without such outward manifestation as accompanied the outpourings of the Holy Ghost,” which Clark argued was the evidence of glossolalia. Clark, Baptism in the Holy Ghost, 59-68. Finally, although Paul did not believe that the initial evidence of one being baptized in the Holy Spirit was glossolalia, he believed that it was the first gift of the Holy Spirit to be granted to an individual. Simpson, “A Critical Evaluation of the Contribution of Jonathan Paul,” 116.

26. Paul believed that the fruit of the Spirit in one’s life was proof of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, specifically, the demonstration of love. When it came to the supernatural gifts of the Spirit operating in an individual, he believed that one must first experience glossolalia before he or she could be granted any of the other gifts found in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10, including the gift of discernment. Simpson, “A Critical Evaluation of the Contribution of Jonathan Paul,” 18, 112, 116.
The fact that one had previously received the baptism in the Holy Spirit and had even received the gift of glossolalia at one point did not guarantee that an individual would receive the gift of discernment. Clark explained:

All may receive the Holy Spirit and be baptized with it but gifts imparted by the Holy Spirit are divided to every man severally as he will, 1 Cor. 12:11. The Holy Spirit may give to one man several gifts and He might not impart to others any special gift. The analogy runs, “For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, and so on. In the Church body it is not necessary that every member have a spiritual gift, however it is definitely needful that all should have the baptism of the Holy Spirit.”

While Clark believed that no one was guaranteed to receive this gift, he agreed with other writers that if one needed the gift, then God would grant it. Frodsham stated that when someone needed the gift of discernment, all he or she needed to do was “look to thy Lord.” Both Gee and Clark believed that God would grant the gift of discernment when the church was at risk of being deceived. Gee argued,

The mistake which some… are making to-day however, is in underestimating the watchful and gracious provision of the Great Head of the Church in arming her sufficiently against such subtle deceptions. … This spiritual gift [of discernment] is one proof of His care and provision of her need, and to state that the church does not possess it to-day is an astounding piece of presumption with absolutely no Scripture to support it, or reason either. … How terribly, if unwittingly, they dishonor God by inferring that He leaves us more defenseless than ever.

Clark wrote, “This gift was given for the protection of the church…. Those who oppose spiritual gifts would strip the church of its own God-given protection.” Gee concluded that at the time God granted the other gifts of the Spirit, the gift of discernment would

---

Also be granted.31 As Clark stated, God might not grant this gift to everyone in the church, but God would grant it to someone.

In addition to God’s choosing an individual to whom he would grant the gift of discernment in time of need, Pentecostal writers believed that Pentecostals were responsible for remaining available for God to grant the gift. Wigglesworth and Clark believed that in order to access the gift of discernment when it was granted, one needed to stay in the Spirit of God by maintaining one’s sanctification and living a holy life. Clark stated that if one wanted to be able to access the gift of discernment, then he or she would need to be submerged in God.32 Wigglesworth stated that anyone that dwelt in the Spirit of God continually would be granted the gift of discernment anytime they needed it.33 He explained that one dwelled in God by maintaining a life of holiness. He rationalized, “It is not possible to love the present world and have the Holy Ghost within; you cannot love carnality and have the Holy Ghost.”34

In addition to personal characteristics, the Pentecostal leaders examined in this study believed that the gift of discernment was granted most often to those who held a position of leadership in the church. Pentecostals Frodsham, Clark, Gee, and Paul believed that leaders of the church were the main possessors of this gift. Frodsham wrote, “The leaders need to discern, in order to keep the flock from the wolves.”35 Clark stated that the gift of discernment is “more suitable” and “intended” for those who hold the

32. Clark, Baptism of the Holy Ghost, 123.
34. Ibid., 7.
positions of authority in the church, i.e. elders, bishops, deacons.\textsuperscript{36} Gee believed that God granted the gift of discernment to those in charge of assemblies and held the office of “governments.”\textsuperscript{37} Gee made this point painfully clear in his article “God’s Pilots.”

The church of God is very much cumbered with backseat drivers. I am amazed at the people who are sure they have the gift of discernment, irresponsible people, dear old ladies, meddlesome men, and all sorts of people like that who are not pilots and not responsible for the passengers either before God or men. And yet, nevertheless, these people are quite sure that God has given them discernment for the government of the assembly. The church of God is not driven from the back seat!\textsuperscript{38}

Paul agreed with Gee and said that God placed a human leader in the meeting “in order to discern if things were given by the Lord Himself; and [the congregation] should be thankful… and should always be willing to obey their leaders, and in that way [the church] would get more [of] the gift of discernment.”\textsuperscript{39}

Finally, one early Pentecostal writer, Howard Carter, believed that in order for the gift of discernment to function in an individual, he or she needed to physically see the spirit behind a manifestation or individual. He explained, “To be enlightened about spirits, without seeing them, would constitute a manifestation of the word of knowledge.”

To illustrate his belief, he told the following story:

There was a sister in London who had this gift. She saw the Lord on several occasions. At one time a face came before her, a lovely face of a person who was smiling as if to ingratiate himself to her. She looked questioningly at the smiling face and said at last, “You are not my Lord!” She had “discerned” with a true spiritual discernment that the face was not the face of her Lord. Instantly the smile changed into an awful frown and so dreadful was the look that it frightened her. She called upon the Lord for help, and the face passed away and the Lord

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{36}{Clark, \textit{The Baptism of the Holy Ghost}, 123.}
\footnotetext{37}{Gee, “The Discerning of Spirits” 7.}
\footnotetext{38}{Donald Gee, “God’s Pilots,” \textit{The Pentecostal Evangel} no. 1023 (November 1933): 2-3, 14-5.}
\footnotetext{39}{Boddy, “Tongues in the Public Assembly,” (January), 13.}
\end{footnotes}
appeared. So this sister, by a spiritual intuition which we call the “discerning of Spirits” knew and judged the first vision to be not that of her Lord.\(^\text{40}\)

Carter is the only Pentecostal writer to require an individual to actually “see” the spirit in order for the gift of discernment to be considered genuine. It is not clear how Carter confirmed this fact since he stated that the only person that would be able to see the spirit was the person granted the gift of discernment, others would not be able to see it.\(^\text{41}\)

**How to Identify Someone Who Possessed the Gift of Discernment**

Pentecostal writers on the gift of discernment asserted that a person who had been granted the genuine gift of discernment could be identified through both the content the gift provided and the characteristics of the possessor. Early Pentecostals had often confused natural discernment with the gift of the discernment when attempting to practice the gift of discernment. Gee and Wigglesworth sought to distinguish both the content and the purpose of the two types of discernment. Gee wrote,

> [T]he spiritual gift of “discerning of spirits” (1 Cor. 12:10) must on no account be confused with a critical spirit in the natural. We regret to say that we have met people who are adepts at finding something wrong in the motives of other people; … deceive… themselves that their particular “gift” is “discerning of spirits!” … But a mere glance at the name of this gift reveals more accurately its true character and scope; for it has to do with discerning of “spirits,” not men in their purely natural courses of action.\(^\text{42}\)

Wigglesworth stated,

> There is a vast difference between natural discernment and spiritual. When it comes to natural discernment, you will find many people loaded with it, and they can see so many faults in others. … If you want to manifest natural discernment,
focus the same on yourself for at least twelve months and you will see so many faults in yourself that you will never want to fuss about the faults of another.\textsuperscript{43}

Carter and Horton agreed that early Pentecostals were confusing criticism with the gift of discernment. Carter asserted,

The people who are critical often assume that they have the gift of discerning of spirits, when actually they have not. The discerning of spirits is no more associated with the critical faculty than the gifts of healing are connected with the medical profession; or the speaking in tongues with the learning of languages.\textsuperscript{44}

Horton further explained, “Not one of us requires the baptism in the Holy Spirit to endow us with the gift of criticism and fault-finding. We are all richly endowed by fallen nature with this particular ‘gift.’”\textsuperscript{45}

Taking their cue from Paul’s description in 1 Corinthians 12:10, these early Pentecostal authors concluded that the gift of discernment was not meant to provide a critical examination of the motives or actions of an individual; instead it was intended to identify the “spirit” behind a manifestation. Wigglesworth explained that the purpose of natural discernment was to identify flaws in one’s own life, rather than the flaws in others. He asserted that natural discernment was an important aspect in helping one to live a holy life. It should be made clear, however, that natural discernment did not equal spiritual discernment, nor should natural discernment be used to criticize other people.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{43} Wigglesworth, “The Discerning of Spirits,” 2.

\textsuperscript{44} Carter, Questions and Answers on Spiritual Gifts, 156.

\textsuperscript{45} Horton, Gifts of the Spirit, 73.

\textsuperscript{46} This does not negate the outcome of correction as something that could result from the information received through the gift of discernment. Correction received from God was a positive action that resulted in the person being restored to God. When human criticism was practiced on others, it was intended to condemn another and to place oneself in a superior position to another. Clark, The Baptism of the Holy Ghost, 121, 123.
In addition to the content that the gift of discernment provided an individual, Pentecostal discernment writers held the opinion that there were observable characteristics that determined if an individual had been granted the genuine gift of discernment. Reiff, Frodsham, Gee, and Clark asserted that the fruit of love exhibited through compassion should be evident in a person’s life. Clark stated, “What is most excellent is love itself. Gifts are of no value without it, nor is it possible to exercise a genuine spiritual gift without love.”\(^{47}\) Reiff specified that correction should be done “in a spirit of love.”\(^{48}\) Gee wrote,

> The possessor of such a gift would also have the “love of God shed abroad” in his heart “by the Holy Spirit which given unto us”: and far from exercising the gift in a harsh, censorious spirit, he would rather have great compassion on these poor dupes of evil powers, and seek in the power and grace of the Lord Jesus their swift deliverance.\(^{49}\)

Fordsham’s comments do not specifically state that one with the gift of discernment should have love and compassion, but his interpretation of Jonah 4, Matthew 9:36, and Mark 6:34 imply a belief similar to Gee’s. Frodsham briefly described the story of Jonah’s anger at God for sparing the city of Nineveh from destruction that led him to sit outside the city and watch it from a distance. God caused a gourd to grow and give him shade and then allowed a worm to eat the gourd. Jonah became angry again about the gourd, and Frodsham paraphrased God’s response, “Thou hast had compassion on the gourd but thou has had no compassion upon these people below, who know not how to discern between the right hand and the left.” Frodsham continued using Matthew 9:36 and Mark 6:34 as a basis for his further remarks:

---


And that same One looked down upon the multitudes of Judea and had compassion as He saw them as sheep without a shepherd, not discerning that which was right, not discerning that which was wrong, oppressed by evil spirits, oppressed by him who is the very essence of callousness – the devil, who has no love for those made in the image of God. But this One who has compassion and discerns the condition of those whom He came to save, desires His children who are filled with the Spirit to have discernment that they might recognize both that which is good and that which is evil.

Frodsham’s interpretation of Jonah 4:10-11, Matthew 9:36, and Mark 6:34 indicates that he held the opinion that those who have the gift of discernment should also be filled with love and compassion towards those who lack it. Reiff, Clark, Gee, and Frodsham would agree that the gift of love was a critical fruit of the spirit to possess when one presented him or herself as having been granted the gift of discernment.

Clark concluded that one who was granted the gift of discernment had additional characteristics. First, Clark argued, “This gift can only be possessed by those who have ceased to reason after the order of men’s wisdom, have the heavenly wisdom of God and are taught by the Holy Ghost.” Additionally, Clark asserted that one must be “swift to hear and slow to speak.” He stated, “‘know-alls’ will never have the gift.” Clark presumed that a person who truly possessed the gift would carefully contemplate whether the information he or she received was from God and would rely on the Spirit to provide reassurance rather than human reason. He concluded that rushing into speaking a message from God without quiet contemplation was an indicator that the gift of discernment was not operating in an individual.

50. Emphasis added to point out Frodsham’s quote of Matt. 9:36 and Mark 6:34.
52. Clark, Baptism in the Holy Ghost, 122.
Finally, as stated earlier, many Pentecostal writers on discernment held the opinion that the position of a person in the church indicated that one had been granted the gift of discernment. Both Gee and Paul stated that God specifically granted the gift of discernment to the leadership of the church.\textsuperscript{53} Gee made one exception to this rule. He allowed that other prophets would be granted the gift of discernment to judge a prophecy.\textsuperscript{54} According to these two writers, one could identify a person with genuine discernment based on his or her position in the church, whether as a leader or a prophet.

Wigglesworth differed from this position. He told his audience that if any of them were “living in the fullness of the spirit you will have this gift at any moment when needed.”\textsuperscript{55} Wigglesworth was speaking to the lay members of the congregation, not the leadership. This statement indicates that he did not agree with the conclusion that a person’s position in the church placed one in a special position to receive the gift of discernment. Reiff, in her article, also did not indicate that this gift was only for those who are placed in a specific position. It is possible that these two recognized the danger in giving a pastor too much power in the church, especially when leaders like Ambrose J. Tomlinson, general overseer of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), were warning laity to be aware of pastors and leaders in the Pentecostal Movement who were not living holy


\textsuperscript{54} Gee, “The Discerning of Spirits,” 6. Chapter Five will discuss the development of Gee’s thoughts regarding who can possess the gift of discernment. For now it should be mentioned that when Gee wrote his “God’s Pilots” article five years later in 1933, he does not mention the idea that prophets can be granted the gift of discernment. Instead, he specifically states that those who hold the gift of governments are the only people that can be granted the gift of discernment. Since prophets are mentioned in the same list that Gee got his gift of governments from (c.f. 1 Cor. 12:28), it appears that Gee no longer held the opinion that prophets were granted the gift of discernment. See Gee, “God’s Pilots,” 2-3, 14-5.

lives.\textsuperscript{56} In fact, in one example, Tomlinson stated that God gave a lay member discernment into the spiritual condition of the pastor.\textsuperscript{57}

\textbf{Conclusion}

This chapter provides the varying and similar viewpoints eight Pentecostal writers held regarding the gift of discernment. It begins by identifying four outcomes that these writers concluded should result from the information received through the gift of discernment. First, the gift of discernment should result in the edification and unity of the entire church. Second, people ruled by evil spirits should be delivered by having them cast out or by submitting themselves to God. Third, misguided actions or thoughts stemming from the human spirit should be met with spiritual correction. Fourth, the action taken in accordance with information received through the gift of discernment should result in people being restored to God.

Next, this chapter addresses the requirements these authors determined were necessary in order for the gift of discernment to operate in an individual. Early Pentecostal writers asserted that in order for a person to possess the gift of discernment, he or she must have obtained justification, sanctification, pure love for God and humanity, and the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which released the gifts of the Holy Spirit to an individual. Before a person could receive the gift of discernment, he or she had to receive the gift of glossolalia because it was the first gift that God would grant an

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} Charles W. Conn, “Church of God (Cleveland, TN),” \textit{The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements}, 530-34.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ambrose J. Tomlinson, “Another Traitor: In Every Great Cause there is a Traitor. Usually More than One. There have been Traitors in Our Own Midst. They have not Betrayed the Savior with a Kiss – but They have Hinder the Work, and Hindering the Work MEANS SENDING SOULS TO HELL. There’s No Comfort Here for the Traitor – but there’s a Warning. There will be Judas Iscariot’s in Every Good Work,” \textit{The Faithful Standard} 1, no. 5 (August 1922): 3-4, 21-2.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
individual. Even having met all of these requirements did not guarantee that a person would be chosen by God to receive the gift of discernment, however. These Pentecostal writers held the opinion that God did not grant every gift of the Holy Spirit to every person, but God would not withhold the gift of discernment when a person was in need of the gift. Gee and Clark assumed that God did not leave his people defenseless and would grant the gift of discernment to the church when the church needed it. In order for God to grant this gift to the church in its time of need, the members of the church need to be in a position to receive the gift. Lastly, Carter supposed that a person must see the spirit operating in an individual or manifestation in order for the gift of discernment to function.

In addition to meeting the requirements stated above, early Pentecostal writers concluded that a person needed to dwell in the Spirit. This meant that a person needed to remain sanctified by living a holy life. If one had sinned and lost his or her sanctification, then when God needed to grant the gift of discernment, the individual living in sin would not be in the proper position to receive the gift. God would have to move on until he found a pure individual who was living a holy life. These writers assumed that leaders of the church were not only in the proper position for receiving the gift of discernment, but that it was God’s intention that leaders be granted the gift of discernment in the majority of cases. This opinion was deduced due to the writers’ assumption that God intended the clergy to exercise correction in the church. They presumed that if a church member was in need of correction, it was God’s desire for the leadership to correct and not the laity.

The last question that this chapter answers is how to identify someone who had the gift of discernment. The writers made it clear that criticism of other people was not a
reflection of the gift of discernment in operation. Individuals who had been granted the genuine gift of discernment would demonstrate the fruit of love in his or her personal life. Clark presumed that a person who possessed the genuine gift of discernment would not rush to action, but would take the time to quietly reflect upon the information received to be sure that the information was from God before taking action. Finally, many early Pentecostal authors held the opinion that leaders in the church had special access to the gift of discernment based upon their position within the church. These authors concluded that a person’s position in the church, such as leader or prophet, could be used to identify a person with the genuine gift of discernment. Wigglesworth and Reiff appear to have disagreed with this opinion, instead asserting that anyone in the church who was in the correct position to receive the gift of discernment from God could be granted the gift.

Now that the various opinions regarding the gift of discernment have been described and explained, the next chapter will place these ideas in relation to each other in order to demonstrate the development in thought regarding the gift of discernment among Pentecostals between 1914 and 1941. Once this analysis is in place, it will be possible to state the opinions that continued to be influential in 1941, where this study concludes.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS AND CRITICAL ANALYSIS

This thesis has identified the key opinions regarding the gift of discernment that early Pentecostals articulated through nine treatments of this gift between 1914 and 1941. Chapter Two identified the ecclesial consequences early Pentecostal writers associated with the presence of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings and the strategies they employed to counteract these false manifestations. Because these strategies were often not 100% effective in resolving the counterfeit problem, eight Pentecostal writers and teachers purposed to educate Pentecostal membership on the benefits and proper practice of the gift of discernment. Chapter Three identified the eight individuals – Anna C. Reiff, Elijah C. Clark, Smith Wigglesworth, Donald Gee, Harold Horton, Stanley H. Frodsham, Howard Carter, and Pastor Jonathan Paul – who authored nine unique treatments of the gift of discernment between 1914 and 1941. Chapter Three provided these author’s biographical histories and demonstrated that these author’s writings were widely read among early Pentecostals. This chapter also provided the functions and benefits that these writers concluded the gift of discernment offered Pentecostal churches. Chapter Four presented these authors’ opinions regarding the proper practice of the gift of discernment. This chapter outlined the outcomes that these writers assumed should result from the information received through the gift of discernment, identified the requirements for the gift of discernment to operate in an individual, and how both laity and leadership could accurately identify a person who had been granted the genuine gift of discernment.
Because the information found in Chapter Four was compiled and did not clearly communicate the theological development that took place in Pentecostal thought, this chapter will convey this development in Pentecostal thought by placing these ideas in relation to each other. After these developments in thought have been clarified, suggestions will be given as to why these changes occurred. Next, the understanding of spiritual discernment that was operative among Pentecostals in 1941 will then be clearly defined. Finally, this thesis will end with concluding remarks regarding the findings of this study.

**Theological Development of Pentecostal Beliefs**

Pentecostal theology underwent two major developments concerning the gift of discernment before 1941. Both of these developments took place after 1928 with the articles written by Clark, Gee, and Frodsham. One has to do with the matter of who was employing counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings. The second concerns the matter of to whom Pentecostal authors believed God granted the gift of discernment. This section will first trace the development of these two beliefs in Pentecostal theology and then provide suggestions as to why these developments took place.

**Source of Counterfeit Manifestations: Spiritualists**

After the Azusa Street Mission had been open for eight months, Seymour realized that he had a counterfeit problem. In his December 1906 article, entitled “Counterfeits,” Seymour stated that unsaved individuals were performing manifestations through the power of Satan. He specifically identified Christian Scientists, Theosophists, and Spiritualists as those who were executing counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal
meetings. In 1923, Wigglesworth named Theosophists, Christian Scientists, and spiritists as those who had been known to practice counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings. That same year, Reiff also singled out spiritualists as those responsible for counterfeit manifestations in the meetings.

By 1928, Pentecostal theology had begun to change and Gee pointed to recent converts who had been possessed by evil spirits and performed supernatural manifestations prior to their conversion as the people who might perform counterfeit manifestations in a Pentecostal meeting. Frodsham’s 1935 article also confirmed this change in belief when he stated that people who had practiced spiritualism prior to their conversion had not been delivered from their evil spirits.

From 1906 to 1923 Pentecostals were under the impression that counterfeit manifestations were performed by only unsaved individuals who associated themselves with spiritualism or another form of religion that did not acknowledge God as the source of supernatural manifestations. By 1928, Pentecostal writers were pointing towards saved individuals who had previous associations with spiritualism as possible sources of counterfeit activity in Pentecostal meetings.

One reason for this change was World War I. The Great War, as it is referred to, resulted in over one million British and American deaths, and the accompanying grief attracted thousands of mothers, fathers, spouses, and sweethearts of soldiers lost in the


war to spiritualists who appeared to create an avenue for them to communicate with their deceased loved ones.⁵ Among these grieving individuals were Christians.⁶ Lee (1875-1928), general overseer of The Church of God (Cleveland, TN), told the story of how a professing Christian became involved in spiritualism. He wrote,

    She at one time decided to visit a place where it was said the people talked to the dead. She was greatly surprised to hear the voice, as she thought of her departed mother, so it captivated her that she at once decided that it must be of God. She completely submitted her life to the Spiritualist leaders and became a great medium.⁷

Rosa Bevill, a former medium who also professed Christianity during her time in spiritualism, described the seductive nature of spiritualism. She stated, “I had been converted 9 years before this happened, but these seducing spirits came in such religious forms I thought it was God’s will or I never would have gone so deeply into it.”⁸

In addition to the seducing nature of evil spirits that brought good Christians into spiritualism, spiritualists as well as many Christians connected their practices to the New Testament. Gee stated, that spiritualists “claim[ed] to possess and have in exercise the

---


⁸. Rosa Bevill, “The Trap Door to Hell: An Ex-Medium Warns Against the Evils of Spiritualism,” The Pentecostal Evangel nos. 446/447 (May 1922): 2-3. The “this” which Bevill is referring to in her statement is her revelation from God that evil spirits possessed her and that evil spirits were the source of her communications with the dead.
spiritual gifts of the New Testament.” He also pointed out that a Christian minister had suggested “that the psychic gifts of the séance should be recognized as identical with the spiritual gifts which Paul enumerates in 1 Cor. 12:8-11.” While Gee denounced this idea, it was still promoted, and good Christians turned to spiritualism believing that God approved of their participation.

In addition to seeing an increase in the number of Christians associating with spiritualism due to the devastations of the Great War, their study of scripture may have fueled impressions that self-identified Christians may practice spiritualism in Pentecostal meetings. Gee pointed to Acts 8:13-24 as proof that some spiritualists were self-identified Christians. This text states that Simon the sorcerer had been converted to Christianity through the preaching of Philip, but then offered Peter money to learn how to baptize people in the Holy Spirit. Early Pentecostals held the opinion that Simon the sorcerer was a spiritualist. Gee’s understanding of this scripture caused him to conclude that Simon, although a self-identified Christian, did not have a true conversion, but had instead deceived others of the sincerity of his repentance. Gee still adhered to the opinion that unsaved individuals were the ones practicing counterfeit manifestations in the meetings although, they might call themselves “saved” or had a salvation experience that was not authentic.

---


Frodsham interpreted the Acts 8 text in a slightly different manner than Gee. He concluded that the text indicated that Simon was truly saved, but that Simon needed to be delivered from the old spirit that still dominated him.\textsuperscript{13} Frodsham indicated that Simon was delivered from the evil spirit because he humbled himself and asked for the prayers of God’s saints.\textsuperscript{14}

These differences in interpretation may have been fueled by both Gee’s and Frodsham’s individual experiences with people who practiced counterfeit manifestations or by how they each judged a genuinely saved individual. Frodsham may have known some Christians who had previously practiced spiritualism that he judged were sincere in their devotion to God, yet they were having difficulty in getting rid of the evil spirits that had been a part of their prior life. Gee may have run into people that had converted to Christianity just to be able to practice their rituals with others, and when confronted they were unwilling to change, signaling to him that these people had not had a true conversion experience. Gee also may have held the opinion that there was no room in a saved individual for evil spirits to roam, and therefore the presence of an evil spirit was an indication that the person was not truly saved. Regardless of why Gee and Frodsham differ on this point, it is clear that they had both identified self-identified Christians who

\textsuperscript{13} In Frodsham’s writings on Spiritualism, it is clear that he did not believe that those who confessed spiritualism were saved. In one article he referred to Christians who turned to Spiritualism as apostates because they have to deny the atoning blood of Christ. In contrast, his discernment article is making reference to Christians who had accepted the atoning work of Christ’s blood, but were still struggling with evil spirits that they had once opened themselves up to. It appears that Frodsham did think that these Christians had made a sincere commitment to God, but were still in need of deliverance from the demons of spiritualism. Stanley H. Frodsham, “The Editor’s Notebook,” \textit{The Pentecostal Evangel} no. 907 (July 1931): 4-5.

were recent converts with backgrounds in spiritualism as people who were practicing counterfeit manifestations in the meetings.

Pentecostal theology did not only develop in regard to who Pentecostals identified as the source of counterfeit manifestations, it also developed in regard to whom God granted the gift of discernment.

To Whom Does God Grant the Gift of Discernment? Leaders or Laity

During the November 1914 Sunderland Conference in England, German Pentecostal Pastor Paul stated his conclusion that God granted the gift of discernment to human leaders in the church. He believed that Pentecostal churches needed to install a human leader in every meeting in order to discern manifestations given by God and those that were not.  

Articles written between 1914 and 1922 show American Pentecostals attempting to employ the gift of discernment in meetings, but instead of having a recognized leader of the church employ the gift of discernment, American leaders were encouraging the laity to practice this gift. In October 1916, Joseph Tunmore, of Pennsylvania, scolded a congregation for allowing an unsaved individual to practice the gift of tongues for hours.  

Six years later in August 1922, Tomlinson, general superintendent of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) described a situation where a member of the congregation received the gift of discernment and through this gift a sinful leader was identified.


By the time that Englishman Wigglesworth wrote his first article on the gift of discernment in December 1922, German Pentecostals viewed the gift of discernment as exercised exclusively through church leaders while Americans saw the gift as legitimately exercised by both leaders and laity. In his 1922 article, Wigglesworth stated his opinion that anyone who dwelt in the Spirit of God continually would be granted the gift of discernment anytime he or she needed it. Here the English and the Americans were in agreement.

In 1928, a separate strand of theology began to develop with regard to whom God granted the gift of discernment. Clark wrote that the gift of discernment was “intended” and more “suitable” for those who held leadership positions in the church. Clark did not go as far as to say that others could not be granted the gift of discernment because he presumed that God granted the gifts to whomever He wished, but Clark did suppose that corrective discernment would only be granted to those who held leadership positions in the church. That same year, Donald Gee stated that the gift of discernment was usually

---

18. The fact that the laity were encouraged to practice the gift of discernment, does not mean that leadership took a back seat. It is obvious that Tunmore had employed the gift of discernment in the meeting to identify the counterfeit manifestation that he had witnessed, he just thought that the laity could and should employ this gift as well.


given to one who had charge of the assembly.\textsuperscript{22} By 1933, Gee had changed his theological position regarding those who were granted the gift of discernment. In his article entitled, “God’s Pilots,” Gee stated that God granted the gift of discernment \textit{only} to people who held leadership positions in the church.\textsuperscript{23}

It appears that Frodsham adopted Gee’s belief. When Frodsham wrote his article on the gift of discernment two years later, he directed his entire article to leaders of the church. While Frodsham did state that God desired His children to possess discernment, there seems to be an assumption in Frodsham’s writings that leaders were granted the gift of discernment, not the laity.\textsuperscript{24} Frodsham stated that when

[Jesus] looked down upon the multitudes of Judea… He saw them as sheep without a shepherd, not discerning that which was right, not discerning that which was wrong, oppressed by evil spirits, oppressed by him who is the very essence of callousness – the devil, who has no love for those made in the image of God.

Frodsham continued, “The leaders need to discern, in order to keep the flocks from the wolves.”\textsuperscript{25} Then he referred to Paul’s farewell address to the elders at Ephesus in Acts 20:18-35 where he specifically pointed to the fact that Paul warned the elders to watch out for the wolves that would come and devour the flock. Frodsham concluded that since Paul had charged the elders with watching out for God’s sheep, then it was the job of the overseers of the church to watch over the laity and keep them safe from the devil and his evil spirits.\textsuperscript{26} He then provided several examples of leaders, such as Jesus and Moses,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Gee, “The Discerning of Spirits,” 7.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Donald Gee, “God’s Pilots,” \textit{The Pentecostal Evangel} no. 1023 (November 1933): 2-3, 14-5.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Frodsham, “The Editor’s Notebook: The Discerning of Spirits,” 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Frodsham referred to the laity as “sheep,” the leadership as a “shepherd,” and the devil and his evil spirits as “wolves.” Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
who discerned evil spirits among the people. Frodsham assumed that it was easy for leadership to obtain the gift of discernment. All they needed to do was “look to thy Lord” and God would grant it to them.27 It does not appear that Frodsham held the opinion that the gift of discernment was ever granted to the laity of the church. Frodsham gave no examples of anyone who had followed Jesus, Moses, or Paul, or any layperson in the contemporary church exercising the gift of discernment. It was only the leaders who discerned. Frodsham described the laity as helpless and completely dependent on the leadership of the church to protect them from evil spirits that sought to “devour” them.

Because Frodsham held the opinion that the laity was not granted the gift of discernment, he concluded that the leadership should have love and compassion for the laity who did not have the ability to discern between the Holy Spirit and evil spirits. Frodsham cited God’s scolding of Jonah in the Old Testament for Jonah’s lack of compassion towards the people of Nineveh, “who [did not know] how to discern between the right hand and the left.”28 The laity was lost without the leadership of the church and was completely dependent on the actions of their leaders.

While Gee and Frodsham had firmly moved in the direction of a leadership-only theology when it came to the gift of discernment being granted to the church, Horton and Carter’s 1934 and 1941 treatments on the gift of discernment do not specify that a person had to be in leadership in order to possess the gift of discernment. Carter indicated that he thought God would grant the gift of discernment to whomever he chose.29 Because it does not appear that Horton and Carter shared Gee and Frodsham’s conclusion,

27. Ibid., 5.
28. Ibid., 4.
Pentecostal theology reflects two separate views on the gift of discernment by the early 1930s. One that held the opinion that only the leadership was granted the gift and one that concluded the gift was available to both laity and leadership.

It appears that Gee and Frodsham concluded that laity were not granted the gift of discernment because they recognized a lack of discernment among the lay members. By the time of their articles were published in 1928 and 1935 respectively, the Pentecostal Movement had experienced the events of the “yellow book” problem, cases where laity had been induced by Satan to perform “dreadful” actions, reports of lay members refusing instruction, and reports of sinful living among Pentecostals. These careless actions of the laity may have led Gee and Frodsham to assume that God did not grant discernment to them. If it was clear to the leaders but not to the laity that what many laypersons had engaged in was wrong, then maybe God had only granted the gift of discernment to the leadership.

Another reason why Clark, Gee, and Frodsham may have moved towards the view that God only granted the gift of discernment to leaders was because they could not find scriptural support for the position Reiff and Wigglesworth held, but could find indirect scriptural support for their opinions on leadership being granted the gift.\(^{30}\) Neither Reiff’s nor Wigglesworth’s articles on discernment provide scriptural support for their opinion that both laity and leadership had access to the gift of discernment. Even when Clark stated that the one who practiced the gift of discernment needed to be “submerged” in God, he did not provide a scripture reference to back up this statement. Clark did, on the other hand, use scripture to back his conclusion that leaders were

---

\(^{30}\) Reiff and Wigglesworth are referenced because their writings appeared before Gee and Frodsham’s. Carter’s treatment, which alludes to 1 Corinthians 12:11 for scriptural support, does not appear until after Gee and Frodsham’s articles were already written.
authorized to correct behavior in the church. He explained that 1 Timothy 5:20, “Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also might fear” (KJV), is written to the bishop of the church, not the laity. Clark concluded that it was for this reason that the gift of discernment was “intended” and more “suitable” for those holding leadership offices in the church.31

Gee cited 1 Corinthians 12:28 to support his belief that God granted the gift of governments to some in the church. Gee noted that the Greek word used for governments in this text literally means pilotage, and he used the depiction of piloting a boat to support his view that the gift of discernment is a responsibility of the person who pilots a meeting.32 Hermann Wolfgang Beyer (1898-1942), a German Lutheran contemporary of Gee and contributor to the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, stated that the Greek word κυβερνήσεις used in this verse meant that the possessor of this gift was “a helmsman to his congregation, i.e. a true director of its order and therewith its life.” Beyer explained that the helmsman “steers [the] Church through all the perils and directs believers safely through all the storms of life which threaten them.”33 Gee concluded that since the gift of discernment was needed in order to “steer the ship safely through the perils it faced,” such as counterfeit manifestations, then God would grant the gift of discernment to the people responsible for “steering the ship,” the leaders of the church.


Finally, Frodsham provided Acts 20:18-35 as proof that it was the job of the leaders of the church to protect the laity from the devil and his evil spirits.\(^{34}\) This text is a farewell speech of Paul to the elders at Ephesus in which Paul tells the elders to watch over the laity of the church because “wolves” will attempt to destroy the “flock” and that some members of the church will attempt to deceive the congregation. One way that leaders were able to do this was through the gift of discernment. Frodsham concluded that God would not expect one to do something and then not provide him or her the resources he or she needed to get the job done. While none of these scriptural references specifically state that the gift of discernment is granted exclusively to church leaders, they all imply it.

**The Gift of Discernment in 1941: Beliefs Held**

By 1941, Pentecostal theology held two theological positions regarding whom God granted the gift of discernment. One group of Pentecostals held the opinion that God granted the gift of discernment to the leadership of the congregation, while the other held that both laity and leadership could be granted the gift. Both groups concluded that in order to be granted the gift of discernment one needed to be justified, sanctified, received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and received the gift of glossolalia.

Pentecostals at this time also held the opinion that God granted the gift of discernment to protect the church from being led away from God.\(^{35}\) This gift identified both good and evil spirits. Evil spirits were identified because when God’s people

---


gathered, Satan showed up and desired to manifest counterfeit manifestations.\textsuperscript{36} Pentecostals concluded that those responsible for practicing counterfeit manifestations were present and former spiritualists, the flesh, and unteachable Pentecostals who refused to listen to the discernment of their leaders.\textsuperscript{37} Good spirits were identified because sometimes a person who had a poor reputation among Christian, may have experienced a true conversion and the only way to know that one had truly converted to Christianity was through the gift of discernment. This would have been important when Pentecostals were unsure if former spiritualists had made a genuine commitment to God.\textsuperscript{38} Pentecostals made it clear that the gift of discernment did not equate to personal criticism of other individuals.\textsuperscript{39} While the gift of discernment might lead to spiritual correction or deliverance from evil spirits, the purpose of the gift of discernment was to edify the congregation.\textsuperscript{40} Because the intended outcome was edification, it was important for the person acting on the information received through the gift of discernment to act with love and compassion when someone needed spiritual correction or a demon cast out.\textsuperscript{41}


\textsuperscript{38} Frodsham, “The Editor’s Notebook: The Discerning of Spirits,” 4.


In addition to the gift of discernment, both leaders and laity were able to employ two scriptural tests to determine if the spirit operating in a manifestations or driving the actions of a person originated with God or not. The first test was to ask the spirit if Jesus came in the flesh. If the response was “No,” then the manifestation or person was not operating under the power of God. The second test observed the fruit of a person’s personal life. If the person produced the good fruits of the Spirit found in Galatians 5:22-23, then that person was operating under the power of God; if a person was demonstrating fruit associated with the works of the flesh found in Galatians 5:19-21, then that person was not operating under the power of God.  

**Conclusion**

When Pentecostals began to discuss the gift of discernment in 1914, they were facing extraordinary credibility problems within a movement that was in its infancy. Pentecostals were accused of accessing their abilities to perform manifestations from evil spirits and were labeled demonic. Both secular and Christian papers produced negative reports both on the beliefs that Pentecostals held and the ensuing actions of its members. Additionally leaders were beginning to identify the operation of counterfeit manifestations in their meetings by both self-identified Christians and those that did not claim Christ as their Lord and Savior. Something had to be done.

Pentecostals employed four strategies to attempt to counteract the negative consequences resulting from the presence of counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings. First, they argued that counterfeit manifestations were to be expected when

---


God’s people gathered together and that people should not let the presence of such manifestations keep them from participating in Pentecostal practice. They also argued that people needed to look past these manifestations and focus on the genuine works of God that were taking place. Another technique was to tell people that they did not know what they were talking about because they had never had a spiritual experience. A second strategy employed was educating members about the spiritual tests that they could utilize in order to identify a counterfeit manifestation so that members would not be duped into following manifestations that did not originate with God. Third, Pentecostals installed leaders who would both direct the meetings and discern the manifestations in the meetings so that counterfeit manifestations could be denounced immediately while genuine manifestations were encouraged. Finally, in 1922 Pentecostals began to focus on promoting the gift of discernment as a strategy in counteracting counterfeit activity. The delay in applying this gift is attributed to the fact that Pentecostals were learning what the Bible had to say about counterfeit manifestations, what they were, how they operated, and how to handle them. Because Pentecostalism was new and people had not been practicing the gifts of the Holy Spirit for hundreds of years, it took time to recognize, understand, and attempt to resolve the counterfeit problem.

When they did apply the gift of discernment to the problem, understanding its operation took time to recognize and develop as well. Again, they did not have a recent history to consult or other churches to look to as examples of how to practice the gift of discernment. It was a new practice for the present-day church. While German Pentecostals began by identifying leaders as the people who held exclusive rights to the gift of discernment, American and English Pentecostals came to form two different
theological opinions on this matter. Initially, there appears to be a consensus among American and British Pentecostals that the gift of discernment could be granted to either leaders or laity, but by 1928 a second theological position began to take hold. Some Pentecostals, like Gee and Frodsham, came to the same conclusion that German Pentecostal Paul had in 1914, believing that God granted the gift of discernment only to the leadership of the church. One reason for this development was the multiple instances of lay members not utilizing the gift of discernment, thus causing some leaders to conclude that the laity was not granted the gift.

Pentecostals also attempted to identify the type of person who was practicing counterfeit manifestations in the meetings. Their struggle in identifying these people is seen in their treatments on the gift of discernment. At first they believed that all people producing counterfeit manifestations in the meetings were self-identified Spiritualists, Theosophists, and Christian Scientists. Over time, Pentecostals began to realize that self-identified Christians were associating themselves with spiritualism and were producing counterfeit manifestations in the meetings. Pentecostal leaders also found examples of this in the Bible and began to change the way they spoke about who was responsible for producing counterfeit manifestations in meetings from those that self-identified as Spiritualists, Theosophists, and Christian Scientists to those that self-identified as Christians. Again, even though World War I had been over for a few years, by the time that Pentecostals first wrote their treatments on the gift of discernment, many Christians had been turning to spiritualism and similar practices in order to communicate with loved ones who had died in the war. Because Pentecostals were still developing their theology and learning how counterfeit manifestations operated between 1922 and 1941, it is not
surprising that they did not notice this issue at first and found it necessary to make changes in their theology in order to incorporate this new knowledge.

Pentecostal leaders were focused on both understanding how the gift of discernment actually worked and spreading this information to the movement so that they could use this tool in safeguarding against the operation of counterfeit manifestations in Pentecostal meetings. They hoped that by effectively counteracting counterfeit manifestations in their meetings, people who were hesitant to join the movement would finally be able to embrace Pentecostal practice.
APPENDIX A

U. S. PASSPORT APPLICATION FOR ANNA CASSEL REIFF
The original and each copy of an application for a passport must have attached to it a copy of the applicant's photograph. A loose signed photograph of the applicant must accompany the application. The photograph must be on this paper, should have a light background, and be not over three inches in size.

The total cost of a passport is $10.00. It is unnecessary to pay for the issuance to any person in connection with the filing and execution of this application or for obtaining the passport. The claim of the court or Passport Agent before whom this application is executed will give the applicant all necessary information and guidance.

[Form for Native Citizen]

Chicago Series

18843

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PASSPORT

JUN 12, 1922

ISSUED

STATE OF Illinois,

COUNTY OF Cook,

M. Anna C. Reiff, (single), a native and long resident of the United States, hereby apply to the Department of State, at Washington, for a passport.

I solemnly swear that I was born at Lower Providence Twp., Mont., in the State of Pennsylvania, on or about the 18th day of October, 1869, that my father, John Reiff, was born in Pennsylvania and is now deceased.

[Signature]

I emigrated to the United States from the port of ______ on or about ______, that I resided ______ years, uninterruptedly, in the United States, from ______ to ______; that I was naturalized as a citizen of the United States before the Court of ______, as shown by the accompanying Certificate of Naturalization; that I have resided outside of the United States at the following places for the following periods: ______ from ______ to ______; ______ from ______ to ______; ______ from ______ to ______.

[Signature]
on ___________________________, as shown by the accompanying Certificate of Naturalization, that I have resided outside of the United States at the following places for the following periods:

from ___________________________ to ___________________________

from ___________________________ to ___________________________.

and that I am domiciled in the United States, my permanent residence being at Chicago, in the State of Illinois, where I follow the occupation of publisher.

My last passport was obtained from ___________________________ on ___________________________.

and was ___________________________. I am about to go abroad temporarily; and I intend to return to the United States within three months with the purpose of residing and performing the duties of citizenship therein; and I desire a passport for use in visiting the countries hereinafter named for the following purpose:

England
Scotland
Savoy
France

I intend to leave the United States from the port of New York, on July 1, 1922, sailing on board the Homeric.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

Further, I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion: So help me God.

[Signature of applicant]

Sworn to before me this _______ day of ___________________________, 1922, by

[Signature of officer]

Clerk of the Court at the Department of State U.S.A.

688

* If born in the United States should submit a birth or baptismal certificate with his application, or if the birth was not registered, a certificate from the attending physician, parents, or other person having sufficient knowledge to be able to testify as to the place and date of the applicant's birth.

† If the applicant's father was born in this country, lines should be drawn through the blanks in brackets.
APPENDIX B

CERTIFICATE OF DEATH: ELIJAH COLUMBUS CLARK
APPENDIX C

LIST OR MANIFEST OF ALIEN PASSENGERS FOR THE UNITED STATES: R.M.S.

“NIAGRA,” OCTOBER 24, 1928

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name</th>
<th>Given name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City or town</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

OUT-GOING PASSENGERS: MOLDAVIA, FEBRUARY 24, 1928

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Passenger</th>
<th>Name of Ship</th>
<th>Port of Embarkation</th>
<th>Port of Destination</th>
<th>Cabin</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>SS Moldavia</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The names and details above are for illustrative purposes only and do not reflect actual passenger information.
OUT-GOING PASSENGERS.

Returns of Passengers leaving the United Kingdom in ships bound for places out of Europe, and not within the Mediterranean Sea.

Note.—In figures carried by each ship are to be included, whether proceeding to European or non-European Ports. 1st Class, 2nd Class, and 3rd Class Passengers are to be entered in separate groups. Children borne of alien parents in the United Kingdom should be entered in the alien portion of the Return, and the fact that they were so born should be marked in the nationality column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship Name</th>
<th>Official Number</th>
<th>Steamship Line</th>
<th>Name of Passenger</th>
<th>Residence Abroad</th>
<th>Description of Passage</th>
<th>White Broad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td>142773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I hereby certify that the Passengers actually listed on board this Ship are栽入 in accordance with the requirements of the British Shipping Act, for the Statistical Return of Passengers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Passenger</th>
<th>Last Address in the United Kingdom</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Port at which Passengers were embarked</th>
<th>Description of Passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;AUGIER&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;MOLDAVIA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

ENGLAND AND WALES FREEBMD BIRTH INDEX, 1837-1915: BIRTHS

REGISTERED IN APRIL, MAY, AND JUNE 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gree, Agnes Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Bromwich</td>
<td>6 b.</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>6 b.</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>9 c.</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>9 c.</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prescot</td>
<td>8 b.</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>9 a.</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashby Z.</td>
<td>7 a.</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>6 d.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stoke T.</td>
<td>6 b.</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Alice</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Derby</td>
<td>8 b.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ernest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prescot</td>
<td>8 b.</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smallburgh</td>
<td>4 b.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>8 d.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Henry V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>1 b.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora</td>
<td></td>
<td>H. Hempstead</td>
<td>3 a.</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>8 d.</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

DONALD HENRY FRERE GEE: GEE FAMILY TREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Henry Frere Gee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1891 - Finsbury Park, Middlesx, England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Death of Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Apr 1901 - Hackney, Middlesx, London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry William Frere Gee (1870–1901)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1911 England Census</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancestry Family Trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England &amp; Wales, Death Index, 1916–2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1901 England Census</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England &amp; Wales, FreeBMD Marriages Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henry William Frere Gee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870–1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mabel Alice Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869–1937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruth Winifred Claxton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winifred M Gee 1916–</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David H Gee 1918–1979</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alois Gee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

STANLEY H. FRODSHAM: BENTZ FAMILY TREE
APPENDIX I

MISSOURI, WESTERN DISTRICT NATURALIZATION INDEX, 1848-1990: 1857-P-118

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name</th>
<th>Given name or names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRODSHAM</td>
<td>Stanley Howard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Address       | 1848 N. Douglas, Springfield, Mo. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate no. (or vol. and page)</th>
<th>Title and location of court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.D.C., Springfield, Mo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of birth or allegiance</th>
<th>When born (or age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>3/1/82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and port of arrival in U. S.</th>
<th>Date of naturalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/10/12 Noyes, Minn.</td>
<td>4/5/33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names and addresses of witnesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Kamerer, Springfield, Mo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names and addresses of witnesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ernest K. Ramsey, Springfield, Mo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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