THE HOLINESS TRADITION IN GERMAN-SPEAKING METHODISM

MICHEL WEYER

This paper is an attempt to chart the course of the idea of sanctification within German-speaking United Methodism. The historical roots of that Methodism are to be seen in the nineteenth century-missionary work of three former Methodist bodies. The Wesleyan Conference of Great Britain started its work by 1830 in Swabia; by 1850, the German-speaking section of the former Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States sent its first missionaries to Bremen, while, at the same time, the American Evangelical Association started its Germany-Mission in Stuttgart. It required three decades to spread out from these three missionary bridgeheads and to gain a foothold in German-speaking Europe. Methodism established itself later as three distinct Free Churches which have been united since 1968. As a matter of fact, the period of the establishment of Methodism on our continent was the great time of the holiness revival within American Methodism. So we have to be prepared to meet with a young European German speaking Methodism, which will be very strongly influenced by both the traditional Wesleyan emphasis on sanctification as Christian perfection and by the special understanding of the doctrine within the American holiness revival. Present German-speaking Methodism is still considering that sanctification is the central point of its theology "inasmuch as it is willing to be faithful to its original calling and heritage." But in fact, a serious theological revision has taken place in
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modern German-speaking Methodism as to the understanding and interpretation of the heritage. My purpose is to take you now on a short journey through a hundred and fifty years of Methodist history, showing you, firstly, how deeply committed to Wesley’s emphasis on Christian perfection and to the holiness revival young German and Swiss Methodism was. Secondly, I would like to make clear why and how that Methodism became more and more critical of its traditional views, and why it modified its early theology of holiness. Since I have to be brief, I refer you for more details and evidence to a former study on the subject.¹

¹

There is considerable evidence that the message of early Methodist preachers in German-speaking Europe gave primary attention to both conversion and sanctification. The very first publications of young German-speaking Methodists are typical of its deep concern for promotion of holiness of heart and life in the congregations. Besides Mr. Wesley’s The Character of a Methodist and A Plain Account of Christian Perfection, German translations of classics of British methodist piety like The Life of William Carvossa⁵ or The Life and Experience of Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers were instrumental in moulding the piety of the first German Methodist generations.⁶ From its very beginning, German Methodism made it clear that he was considering holiness as the heart of its message and theology. This is obvious in Sigmund Jacoby’s three editions (1853, 1855, and 1870) of a Handbook of Methodism⁷ in which the pioneer of German Methodism pictured Methodist history, doctrine and discipline, not only for the use of the Methodist congregations but as information for German public and Protestant opinion as well. Christian perfection is the distinctive feature of Methodism, Jacoby claimed, and he defended Wesley’s view of holiness against all possible objections. Theological disapproval, of course, was never lacking in the country of Luther’s Reformation. Wesleyan holiness would be in all the ensuing years for most German-speaking Protestant theologians the evangelical version of the old mystical and Roman-Catholic enthusiasm; in any case a great danger to the centrality of the Reformation principles sola fide et sola gratia.⁸ In spite of the theological resistance which hindered their European missionary work, Methodists did not reduce their Wesleyan emphasis on sanctification. On the contrary, Dr. William F. Warren,⁹ the first professor of theology at the Methodist Episcopal Seminary in Bremen,¹⁰ stressed the great difference between Wesley and the Continental Reformers. While Reformation theology considers justification as its “formal principle,” Warren claimed, Methodism has its “formal principle” in Wesley’s doctrine of Christian perfection.¹¹ As Warren put it: Calvin’s ideal is the Christian as the servant of God; Luther’s ideal is the child of God, but Wesley’s ideal is “the perfect man, the mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ” (Eph. 4:13). The main deficiency of the dominant German-Lutheran theology was in Warren’s eyes its “astonishing ignorance of the Holy Spirit.”¹² Consequently, German Methodist theology saw from its very beginning in the stressing of a “second work of grace and of the Spirit,” following the “work of justification,” its own necessary and distinctive theological contribution to German Protestantism.
Just that "perfect love" sounded sometimes like something theoretical, not only in Warren's theology but also in most of the Methodist works of these first decades. Therefore, when the European holiness revival broke out, German Methodists welcomed it thankfully, seeing in it, with regard to "perfect love," the "step which leads from theory to praxis." During the years 1873-1875, the holiness revival, pictured in his dissertation by Dr. Melvin E. Dieter, spilled over from America into Europe. But we have to be aware of the fact that the revival had already started within German Methodism a few months before Robert Pearsall Smith's well-known holiness crusade began on the continent. Under the influence of many reports in German Methodist magazines on what was happening in American camp-meetings for the promotion of holiness, and at the invitation of the preachers and their strong emphasis on the necessary "second blessing," first "experiences of entire sanctification" had already occurred in German and Swiss Methodist congregations. Since the creation, in 1867, of the "National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness," the readers of the German Methodist press had acquainted themselves with the main aspects of the holiness revival, with the convictions of a John Inskip or other American holiness-movement leaders. Most of the leaders of German-speaking Methodism in Europe were from the very beginning in contact with that American holiness revival. Heinrich Nuelsen for instance, the head of the Methodist Publishing House in Bremen, was since 1846 an enthusiastic reader of the American Guide to Holiness, and desired the publication of a similar magazine in German.

As soon as the first experiences of full sanctification in German congregations were reported, a long extract of Warren's Dogmatics was reprinted in the Methodist press. This is meaningful: It had to be made clear that what happened was the realization of what Wesley considered as the summit of the Christian life.

German Methodism was not isolated in its reception of the holiness message and of the revival coming from America. There was great openness for it in important sections of German Pietism within the established churches. What is meant here is the so-called deutsche Gemeinschaftsbewegung. Many of the German and Swiss churchmen who were invited by Robert Pearsall Smith to participate in the famous convention for the promotion of holiness in Brighton, were members of the pietistic Gemeinschaftsbewegung, with a typical pietistic concern for the work of sanctification in Christian life. The ten Methodist ministers who participated in the meetings could observe with a certain satisfaction what they tended to consider as a "Methodization" of a Protestant world, which was until now quite reluctant to accept their special holiness theology. Now, German Methodists could go so far as to express their hope that the traditional dissensus on the question of sanctification could disappear thanks to the continental holiness revival. The revival also encouraged Methodists to go on preaching holiness, without compromise and without a theological inferiority complex. It seems that some Methodist preachers, whose formal theological training was still poor, had sometimes been impressed by the theological arguments of the critics. Unlike the American holiness movement, which had a deep concern for social reform with emancipatory consequences, the German Methodist holiness revival—in spite of some social achievements that need to be mentioned—was characterized by a most individualistic understanding of holiness, which is true for the movement within German Lutheran pietism as well. This can be
seen in the two most influential Methodist books of that period.

William Orwig’s volume, *Die Heilsfälle*, which means “The fulness of salvation,” the classic of holiness theology from the American Evangelical Association, published in German in Cleveland in 1872, just after the great “Union camp meeting of Easton, Pa.”24 became in the ensuing years a bestseller in each of the three German Methodist bodies, a “must” for the private library of all local preachers, exhorters, and class-leaders.25 Orwig was the spokesman of the victorious understanding of holiness within the American Evangelical Association after years of theological debates.26 He makes out of the experience of full salvation as a distinct “second blessing” the shibboleth of true Christianity. Methodist people, Orwig claimed drastically, have no alternative but “full salvation” or “apostasy.”27 It is really not easy to determine if this was still Wesleyan or not.28 This view of holiness, with reference to Wesley, but certainly more to American holiness revival theologians, had been strongly contended within the American Evangelical Association by people like Superintendent Salomon Neitz, who represented a more Lutheran view of holiness. A theological debate had taken place from 1856 to 1867 which ended with the victory of the Wesleyan view and its main spokesmen, Orwig and the future bishop Johann Jakob Escher.29 During all these years, the Evangelical Association in Europe was acquainted solely with the view of the victorious party.30 A similar holiness controversy had taken place within American Episcopal Methodism. But whatever crossed the Atlantic had been favourably inclined to the views of the holiness movement. The same holds true for the Evangelical Association and for Episcopal Methodism as well.31 In 1875 the German-Swiss Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church engaged August Rodemeyer, one of its ministers, to write a book on holiness in order to respond to the great need of holiness literature made evident by the young European holiness revival. The Conference reminded its members that the “calling of Methodism is to spread holiness over the lands.”32 As a result, Rodemeyer published in 1876 his monograph *Biblical Holiness*.33 Basically, the volume is not a serious biblical study on the subject but a kind of compilation of former authors, a mixing and matching of about 200 quotations of more than 70 different promoters of holiness. Rodemeyer is not aware enough of the diversity of accentuations represented by his many spokesmen. Besides the classical British Methodist tradition represented by Wesley, Fletcher, Adam Clarke and Richard Watson, the book contains references to William Arthur’s famous book *The Tongue of Fire* (1856) and to most of the holiness works John L. Peters has treated of in his dissertation on “Christian Perfection and American Methodism.” Like William Orwig, Rodemeyer put the accent deliberately on the instantaneous experience of a “second blessing,” never forgetting, however, to point out that Wesley’s understanding of sanctification was both, a gradual and an instantaneous one, faith and nurture, process and crisis. Like Orwig, Rodemeyer was a strong supporter of the well-known “altar theology,” which was so typical of Phoebe Palmer, the mother of the Methodist holiness revival,” whose publications our author knew.34 This “altar theology” was a part of the holiness theology which Robert Pearsall and Hannah Whitall Smith had brought to Europe. That short and sure way to holiness, by an act of faith, with a dimension of shocking automatism, had been contended within American Methodism with refer-
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ence to Wesley himself, who always respected the sovereignty of God and the mystery of the action of the Holy Spirit. The "altar theology" shaped the German Methodist exhortative preaching style. One of the favorite sayings in many Methodist predications and prayers of the following decades was Rodermeyer's words "I lay on the altar and I am waiting on the fire." This kind of piety influenced German Methodist hymnody as well. It is not unimportant to mention the support found by the transmission of the American holiness ideal to German-speaking Methodism in the two bishops Matthew Simpson and Johann Jakob Escher who often crossed the Atlantic to preside at the European conferences. So German Methodism got totally involved in the ideas, the hopes, the standard of life and the way of preaching the American holiness movement of these years provided. It must be added that this was a time of strong missionary expansion.

The revival lasted only a few years—and the expansion as well. When in the eighties German Methodists were confronted with the new reality they reacted in a typical manner. They could not accept stagnation and exhorted themselves: 'let us go on to perfection!' They were convinced that holiness is not only the secret of a happy life but of the missionary success of the church as well. As a result, the conviction that there is a close relationship between holiness and the progression of the kingdom of God led German Methodism to an intensification of its efforts to promote holiness in the old manner. Once again, translations of American and British holiness literature were propagated in the local churches. A German Guide to Holiness, the so-called Wegweiser zur Heiligung became instrumental in many circles. But what attracts the attention of the observer of that Methodism by the end of that century is the fact that holiness is no more the all-dominating subject of discussion, neither in the periodicals for collaborators nor in the pastoral meetings. The range of theological themes became now wider and wider. Holiness became one issue among others. Nevertheless, German Methodism paid attention to the renewed exhortation of the 1888 General Conference which pointed out that "the experience of entire sanctification" remains the secret of Methodism's "efficiency." And Bishop W.F. Mallalieu, an outstanding promoter of holiness who visited European Episcopal Methodism in the same year, working intensively with the ministers and preaching the holiness message in many congregations, did his best to convince his hearers that, if they remained faithful to the inherited holiness ideal this would soon or later lead to a "baptism of the Spirit for preachers and for the whole population." The theological training of the ministers at the Seminary in Frankfurt was placed under the motto "Holy to the Lord," and holiness periodicals from England and America like Living Epistle or The King's Highway found their way into the seminary library.

But the time of the mystical experience of God's love poured into the heart in one moment of grace seemed to be over. Marks of a changing situation and mood are to be found in our sources. Some ministers were no longer ready to preach "Without sanctification no one will see the Lord." A more Lutheran sensitivity was expressed by a new generation of preachers whose theological training was now more sophisticated
than at the beginning. It seemed that the first critical discussion of the traditional holiness doctrine in comparison to the German occurred in 1892. Lutheran theology was influencing Methodist thinking. The sensitivity to Lutheran or Reformed criticisms of traditional Methodist understanding was growing, all the more considering the fact that the criticisms came from Pietistic circles, themselves much concerned about sanctification, but not willing to understand it in a Wesleyan sense. Johannes Haarbeck, for example, the head of a training school for evangelism in Barmen, declared in 1896 at a most important conference of one group of the German "Gemeinschaftsbewegung," the so-called Pfingstkonferenz des Gnadauerverbandes, how difficult it was for him to come to terms with the "non-biblical" Methodist holiness-theology which had continued to influence many German Pietists. Other speakers at this conference pleaded for a more "German" theology of sanctification. By the end of the century, many German Methodists were drawn into the orbit of Theodore Jellinghaus, a Lutheran churchman who had been much influenced by the holiness movement in Brighton. Not satisfied with the holiness theology he found there, he tried in his famous book *Das völlig gegenwärtige Heil durch Christum,* well-known as the "Dogmatics of the German holiness movement," to bring the concern of holiness in better harmony with the Lutheran central doctrine of justification. This is certainly the first root of the theological revisionism which is to be noted within German Methodism. Nevertheless, it wasn't until many years later that traditional Methodist theological categories underwent more visible revision. German Methodist seminary teaching in Frankfurt (Episcopal Methodism) and in Reutlingen (Evangelical Association) remained on the traditional path until World War I seen in the absolutely dominant use of the textbooks of Arnold Sulzberger (Episcopal Methodism), J. Escher or Johannes Schempp, Sr. (Evangelical Association).

It seems that a pentecostal crisis was necessary for a revision of German Methodism. But the role of that crisis was a most ambivalent one. It was obviously a delaying element as well. The pentecostal controversy which caused so much trouble in the whole Pietistic and revitalistic influences in the German-speaking Protestant world just before World War I is very symptomatic of both the will and the difficulty of German Methodism to distance itself from the attitudes and convictions of its origins. I have pointed to the conviction of Methodism that the holiness of the church is the condition for its missionary growth. As a result, Methodism was most interested in all news of holiness revivals everywhere in the world. German Methodists reacted passionately as soon as the first news of the revival in Wales reached the continent. They interpreted the events of the years 1904 and 1905 as a continuation of the holiness revival of the former generation. It gave new hope to their own mission, which had seemed more difficult because of growing secularization. So we observe a strong return to the old one-sided concentration on our topic, with the only difference being that a more pentecostal terminology was being used. Was not the Wales revival the best proof that holiness preaching would continue in the old manner? The German *Gemeinschaftsbewegung* was organized in two bodies. The one, the so-called Gnadauerverband, reacted with utmost reserve, while the Blankenburger Allianzkonferenz showed great enthusiasm for the new revival. German Methodists had better fellowship with the people of Blankenburg because of their greater receptivity to Wesleyan categories. The emergence of *glossolalia* and the Pentecostal movement, which
caused such a great trouble within the German Gemeinschaftsbewegung, did not disturb Methodists in that early phase. On the contrary, efforts were made by the German Methodists to play down everything in the "new holiness movement" that could be shocking for German Protestants. The fact that T.B. Barratt, one of the leaders of the new movement, was a Norwegian Methodist minister was even a source of satisfaction. But warnings about enthusiasm can be observed already in this early stage.

The pietocostal agitation led in 1907 to public unrest in some congregations of the state churches. As a result, E. Chr. Achelis, a Lutheran theologian attacked German Methodism in the Protestant press. The perfectionist views of Reverend Jonathan Paul, a Lutheran pastor and without doubt the most eminent of the theological leaders of the early pietocostal movement in Germany, was nothing but the bitter fruit of Wesleyanism, Achelis claimed. So Methodist writers had to try to distinguish the differences between Wesley and Rev. Paul in regard to the purity of the heart. Two years later, in the famous Declaration of Berlin, German pietists condemned Pentecostalism as "a movement from below." German Methodists approved, but many who were willing to avoid what they considered a non-Wesleyan enthusiasm, were not ready at all to consider the "new holiness movement," as they called it, a movement from below.

Perhaps Elias Schrenk, the admired evangelist of the established church impressed German Methodism when he broke publicly in 1910 with the holiness revival, warning German Protestantism against further receptiveness to Wesleyan theology: "We must do everything possible," he said, "to give more room to the healthy doctrine of sin and grace which came to us through Luther; "What Jonathan Paul teaches," he added, "is closer to what Tersteegen and Wesley taught than to the sound theology of our Reformation. And we do have a sounder theology than Englishmen!"

After World War I things changed very rapidly. Adolf Schlatter and Karl Heim, two pietistic-oriented German Protestant scholars, greatly influenced on German Methodism. Methodist pastors, whose much more sophisticated formal theological teaching had led to a more open attitude towards modern scholarship, learned more about analyzing the Bible. Even more decisive was the influence of Professor Adolf Köberle, a student of Karl Heim. His book Justification and Sanctification, published in 1928, was for many Methodist ministers a real turning point in their understanding of holiness. The German Wesley-research of the ensuing years also contributed to the emergence of the general assumption that a fundamental revision was necessary.

The revision can be best illustrated by the modification of the doctrinal tract on entire sanctification in the Discipline of the Evangelical Association. This modification was prepared also by what Dr. Johannes Schenapp had taught all these years at Reutlingen Seminary. His lecture in dogmatics shows how critical he was to Wesley's view of holiness and to the holiness movement. He could not find a biblical foundation for "a special high of the experience of salvation." The Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection was in his eyes a danger to the doctrine of assurance. It is not by accident that most of his students did not come to terms with the Discipline. So after World War II they pleaded for a new formulation of the doctrine of holiness. It is interesting to note that this happened without consultation with the American church. The European Central Conference of Heidelberg
in 1947 simply made use of its right to adapt the Discipline. The imperative speech was replaced by an indicative-descriptive one. The man who is regenerated must no more "strive to holiness," but "have the deep desire" to do so. Many of the traditional terms were modified, for instance "stand of perfection," a term which misleads one to the false idea of holiness as a higher position. The gradual character of sanctification became absolutely dominant. The regenerate person was invited to maturity in faith, love, and hope. The new text did not mention full liberation from sin any more, because this type of traditional doctrine applied only to a special, problematic and non-biblical understanding of sin. Christian life was presented as something that is fundamentally incomplete, but in which the joyful hope remains that God won't leave his work unfinished. The notion of a "second blessing," similar to the first work of justification and regeneration, surpassing and completing what God did in his first work—this notion was dropped. What later German Methodists considered as a deficiency of this new version is the absence of all reference to experience, what is probably a consequence of the dominant influence of dialectical theology at that time. Another criticism was that this new understanding of holiness was not less individualistic than the traditional one.

German Episcopal Methodism also developed a new theology of sanctification with similar modifications. Dr. Theophil Spörri, trained under Adolf Schlatter and Karl Heim in Tübingen, was influential through his teaching at the Seminary in Frankfurt. In the fifties he questioned the relevance of the traditional view in a recapitulation of what was in his eyes essential to Methodism. He made Wesley's "lack of clarity," his inconsistencies and "oscillations" responsible for the "aberrations of the holiness movements" of the past. Spörri saw the "task of modern Methodism" to be a better definition of the doctrine of holiness. This is possible, he said, only in the light of modern biblical and theological knowledge. Methodists, he added, must also be ready to take into account the results of modern psychology. Wilhelm Thomas, Spörri's colleague at the Seminary in Frankfort, backed this attack with a study on "Holiness in the New Testament compared with Wesley's doctrine." The pictured theological reflection prepared and accompanied a revision of the traditional question to the candidates connected with the conference. The Central Conference of Central and South Europe on Episcopal Methodism replaced the traditional "Do you expect to be made perfect in love in this life?" with the question: "Do you earnestly endeavor that perfect love determine more and more your character and your life?" It is not uninteresting to mention that the historical questions going back to Wesley are nowadays absent in the Discipline of the German Central Conference of the U.M.C.

Does this mean that German-speaking Methodists have left the holiness tradition of their fathers and mothers? Not entirely. Certainly, an important shift has occurred in the theological interpretation of what Christian perfection is, but holiness of heart and life is always the goal for German Methodists. Geleite Gnade, the recent major presentation of Methodist theology in the German-speaking area by Dr. Klaiber and Dr. Marquardt reflects the dominant response to the issue of sanctification. Not everyone agrees with this position. Twenty years ago, a session of the Commission on theology of the European Council of The United Methodist Church in Wels, Austria, pointed out that there is no "consensus omnium" on the relevance of the Wesleyan doc-
trine of sanctification within European Methodism. The old doctrine seems to be appreciated differently among Continental and Scandinavian Methodists, and among German-speaking Methodists as well. Some German Methodists are considering the former commitment of Methodism to the holiness movement as a most dangerous phase of our history which led Methodism to sectarianism. Consequently, these German Methodists are tending to forget this sectarian past, playing down its importance and duration, speaking of eccentric holiness groups which soon disappeared from the church scene. This is a sanitization of the early history, psychologically comprehensible but historically untenable. On the other side, some German Methodists seem to desire the renewal of the old holiness theology, though lightly revised. It is surely not without significance that a collaboration has been established between German Methodist charismatics and the British Methodist Cliff-College, a conventional center of Wesleyan holiness.

NOTES
1. The United Methodist Church represents mainline Methodism in today Germany, Switzerland and Austria, the continental European German-speaking countries. The Church of the Nazarene which is presently also represented in this part of Europe, and in which the traditional Wesleyan view of sanctification is still central, will be intentionally left aside because this blend of Methodism was not a part of German-speaking Methodism from the beginning.
7. See, for instance, Der Evangelist (Episcopal Methodism) 1867, p. 32. The first edition of Mrs. Rogers’ "experience" (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1855), for the use of American German Methodism, was soon in circulation within European Methodism as well, the European edition (Bremen, 1867) is to be seen in connection with the news concerning the post-war American holiness revival and the accompanying demand of holiness literature, while the second edition (Bremen, 1876) arose from the holiness revival on the european continent itself.
8. Ludwig S. Jacoby, Handbuch des Methodismus (Bremen, 1853 and 1855), pp. 253-70; L.S.
9. For Protestant reactions to the Methodist theology of sanctification, which reached their cli-
max with the emergence of the holiness revival, and its repercussions, see: Joh. Jüngst, An-
merkungen zu einer Methodismus in Deutschland und Robert Pearsall Smith (Gotth, 1875); Ernst
Rietschel, Lutherische Rechtfertigungslehre oder moderne Heiligungselehre. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis
der modernen Heiligungsbewegung, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Buches von Th. Jellinaus
"Das völlig, gegenwärtige Heil durch Christum" (Leipzig, 1909); Ludwig Ihnens, Zur Lehre von der
Boardman (Leipzig, 1912).
10. William F. Warren (1833-1929) was an American who studied in Halle and Berlin, then
taught in Bremen from 1861 until 1866, when he returned to the United States to become a
professor and later the first president of Boston University.
11. For the history of seminary training within German-speaking Methodism, see M. Weyer,
Geschichte der Seminare zu Bremen und in Deutsch/and ihren Gliederungen, 1878-1983 (Stuttgart:
Christliches Verlagshaus, 1983), pp. 7-68.
13. Ibid., p. 167.
14. Dieter, The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century, pp. 156-203 (The European Holiness
Revival).
15. See, for instance, Der Evangelist 1872, p. 44. On John Inskip: Dieter, The Holiness Revival,
Wunsch schon seit dem Jahre 1846, wo ich anfang, auf den 'Guide to Holiness' zu abonniert. Ich
lesen diese Schrift immer noch, zu meinem größten Segen." For some orientation to that German
holiness magazine, see Michel Weyer, Der 'Wegweiser zur Heiligung' (1885-1910): Eine wenig
bekannte Quelle zur Erforschung der deutschsprachigen Heiligungsbewegung, in: Mitteilungen der
18. Ibid., pp. 65ff.
19. For more information and literature, see J. Cochlovius, Gemeinschaftsbewegung, in: Theol-
ogische Realencyklopädie, XII (1984), pp. 358-59; J. Oehlermacher, Das Reich Gottes in
Deutschland bauen. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte und Theologie der deutschen Gemeinschaftsbewegung
20. For the official report, see: Convention for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness (1875).
Record of the Convention for the Promotion of Spiritual Holiness: Held at Brighton, May 29th to June 7th
1875 (Brighton: W.J. Smith; London: S.W. Partridge, 1875; reprint ed. (New York: Garland,
1985)). Two important German reports are: H.T. Wangemann, Pearsall Smith und die
Versammlungen zu Brighton in ihrer Bedeutung für Deutschland (Berlin, 1876 2nd ed.); Gustav
Warneck, Briefe über die Versammlungen zu Brighton. Versuch einer zusammenhängender Darstellung
und Beleuchtung der Grundzüge der Smith'schen Bewegung den deutschen Christen zur Prüfung
noch einmal angeboten (Hamburg: Johannes Walther, 1876).
21. The holiness theology taught by Robert Pearsall and Hannah Whittall Smith, Methodist in
its roots, was already a mixture of different influences. M.E. Dieter, "What kind of holiness did
Robert P. and Hannah W. Smith bring to Europe?" paper presented at the 1992 Conference of
the Commission on Archives and History of the U.M.C. in Europe in Denmark (Holbien).
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theoretisch, sondern erfahrungsgemäss akzeptiert haben, kann kaum mehr mit Recht, wie früher, gesagt werden, dass die Lehre von der Christlichen Vollkommenheit zwischen der Bischoflichen Methodistenkirche und der Evangelischen Landeskirche eine Unterscheidungslehre biete."

23. Most symptomatic of this new assurance are remarks like "In Deutschland macht man uns mit Uneracht den Vorwurf, daß wir zu methodistisch zu Werke gehen. Ich fürchte viel mehr, wir haben, wenn auch den Geist, doch zu wenig von der geheiligten, bewährten Methode des Methodismus. Durch die vielen Mäuseleien und thürigen Einwendungen der Gegner sind wir zu blinde geworden. Wo ist der Gauke unserer Väter? ... wir bieben zurück vor einem Pfingstfest, weil die feurigen Zungen und das Rauschen des Geistes den Spott der Gegen wachrufen könnte" (Die Wächterstimmen, 1875, 33-34).


27. Der Evangelist 1872, p. 201; Die Wächterstimmen 1873, pp. 1-3.


29. Der Evangelist, 1873, pp. 209-212.


33. The story of the holiness movement within the German-speaking part of the American Episcopal Methodist Church is still an unfulfilled task of Methodist historiography. An important source would be the magazine Der Wegweiser zur Heiligung; see M. Weyer, "Der Wegweiser zur Heiligung" (1885-1910): Eine wenig bekannte Quelle zur methodistischen Heiligungsbewegung," in: Mitteilungen der Studiengemeinschaft für Geschichte der EMK, October 1992, vol. 2, pp. 17-30; 1893, 139-140.

34. Verhandlungen der täthliche Konferenz der Bischoflchen Methodistenkirche 1875, p. 40.

35. A. Rodemeyer, Biblische Heiligung (Bremen 1876, 1879).

36. Dieter, The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century, p. 27. As Dr. Dieter put it, "Mrs. Palmer believed that Scripture taught that Christ was both the sacrifice for her sin and the altar upon which she could offer up her whole heart in consecration to God. She reasoned that the divine promise of fullness of spiritual life, release from self-will and the habit of sinning could be realized in every Christian through entire consecration of the self offered as a gift of faith upon the "Altar, Christ." The New Testament, she said, told her, "the altar sanctifies the gift." She declared that in the sanctifying efficacy of Christ as the Christian's altar, the exercise of faith was certain to secure to the individual an experience characterized by a freedom from any inclina-
tion which did not spring from love. This remained constant as long as the individual continued to exercise faith and obedience.”


40. Rodemeyer, Biblische Heiligung, p. 296.

41. “Sage dem Herrn: Auf dem Altar ließ ich, und warte auf das Feuer.” The hymn “Übergabe” (on Romans 12) of the Wesleyan pastor Paul Schweikher is a good example of such a theology in hymns. See Der Evangelist 1876, p. 114.


44. See for instance the magazine of the German Wesleyans, Der Methodistenherald 1880, pp. 121ff.; 139ff.; “Lasset uns fortfahren mit der Heiligung”; “Schwierigkeiten im Weg zur Heiligung, und wie sie zu überwinden sind.”


48. See for instance the contents of the Wächterstimmen (Episcopal Methodist) and the Evangelische Bauern (Evangelical Association).

49. Der Evangelist 1888, p. 212.

50. Member of the Palmer’s Tuesday meetings in New York and author of The Fullness of Blessing of the Gospel in Christ (Cincinnati 1903). Mallalieu had a name in the American holiness movement; see Dieter, The Holiness Revival, p. 47.

51. For instance in Niederruzwil, Switzerland (Der Evangelist 1888, p. 269). The agendas of many of the pastoral meetings of these years give evidence that one was not ready to drop the traditional stress on entire sanctification. See for instance Der Evangelist 1892, pp. 272 and 350.

52. His sermon in Geneva on Genesis 5:14 stressed the holy life “in the sense of sinless life, as Mr. Wesley taught us.” Der Evangelist 1888, pp. 353ff.; 361ff. In Zwickau, the bishop preached on the gift of the Holy Spirit in a way that shows a shift from Wesleyan Christian perfection to pentecostal terminology: Der Evangelist 1888, pp. 209-10.

53. Der Evangelist 1888, p. 16.
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79. Erich von Eicken, Rechtfertigung und Heiligung bei Wesley, dargestellt unter Vergleichung mit den Anschauungen Luthers und des Luthertums (Heidelberg 1934); David Lerch, Heil und Heiligung bei John Wesley, dargestellt unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Anmerkungen zum Neuen Testament (Zürich 1941); Percy Scott, John Wesley's Lehre von der Heiligung verglichen mit einem lutherisch-pietistischen Beispiel (Berlin 1939).


82. Wilhelm Thomas, Heiligung im Neuen Testament und bei John Wesley (Zürich 1965). The booklet arose from a paper presented in 1962 to Methodist ministers of the Swiss Annual Conference of the EMC.


85. W. Klaiber/M. Marquardt, Heiligung aus biblischer und evangelisch-methodistischer Sicht (Beiträge zur Geschichte der EmK) (Stuttgart 1987), contains both a strong commitment to sanctification and a distancing from the "light unbiblical accent and at the failure of Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection" (p. 18).


