

The Split That Didn't Happen

Kevin D. Newburg

Nineteenth-Century Divisions over Holiness

For the first three-fourths of the nineteenth century, Methodists generally agreed that their task was to spread scriptural holiness across the continent. The proclamation of the quest for holiness that could be achieved in this life was a distinctive of the Methodist movement. However, by the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, a number of factors coalesced that created divisions within the Methodist fold. For some, the idea of achieving holiness had lost its luster; they questioned the notion of Christian perfection and tended to describe sanctification, on the rare occasions when they spoke of it at all, as a lifelong quest, a never-ending process, rather than a here-and-now reality. Others felt that the movement had outgrown the holiness antics of its youth. They desired a church with decorum, worship that was orderly and sedate, well-reasoned sermons delivered by educated professionals. For many, holiness was associated with the camp-meeting—with impassioned preaching, and with loud, almost out-of-control worship. This perspective had gained traction with the establishment of a separate holiness association, which sponsored holiness camp meetings, at which holiness evangelists who were endorsed by the holiness association spoke, and where holiness literature, published by holiness presses, was pedaled. Still others objected to what would become known as the American Holiness Movement; whose most famous advocate was Phoebe Palmer, who had rewritten the script regarding how to seek and achieve entire sanctification. So, for many reasons, by the end of the century, the tenet of holiness had become yet another divisive issue within Methodism. At the risk of even further overgeneralization, the two main Methodist denominations (the MEC and MECS) both decided that they would no longer endorse the para-church associations, camp meetings, evangelists, and publications. They would find ways to keep holiness in-house, to limit its excesses, to give it a quiet dignity—for many leaders the quieter the better.

In this context, many proponents, clergy and laity alike, felt that they were being pushed out of both local churches and entire denominations. And so, some left, joining already existing denominations or starting new ones. Whether they were forced out, eased out, or belligerently chose to leave was and is a matter of perspective. By the first decades of the twentieth century, some holiness advocates found the new Pentecostal movement to be an amenable sanctuary to proclaim holiness, though clearly with an altered tenor. But while some chose to leave, most of these old-fashioned Methodists chose to stay within the denominations of their ancestors or their youth. They remained in their local churches, which continued to be pastored, more often than not, by men who continued to preach holiness.¹ They knew that they were bucking the trends, they knew that many in leadership were unhappy with them (not with them specifically, but with them generically), they knew that the camp meetings they attended and the literature they read was not official, but they kept reading and attending and believing and proclaiming—just not as loudly as they had in the past.

Henry Clay Morrison and Asbury Theological Seminary

Well, at least most of them were quieter. Some were just as loud, perhaps even a little louder than they had been in the past. One such bold advocate was Henry Clay Morrison. Morrison had always been a bit of an outsider, certainly a guy who had no qualms about ignoring the rules—today we would call him an entrepreneur. Morrison believed that the MEC and MECS had both turned their backs on Methodist holiness, and he had no illusions about his ability to turn them back around. Instead, he opted to create a safe place for Methodist holiness adherents that would be in a liminal space between official and unofficial. This space, at least the space for the instruction of clergy, was given the name Asbury Theological Seminary (ATS or Asbury). Asbury would be a place where young men and women could get a formal education that would equip them for ministry in all of the Methodist movement denominations, broader than any one, open to those from all. It was the place where Francis Asbury's quest to spread scriptural holiness across the continent would still be the guiding principle (though the geographic vision was expanded to the entire world). Asbury was an intentional alternative. It was the place for the outsiders. It was independent of denominational constraints and beholden to no one but God. The institution would raise its own funds, recruit its own students, produce its own literature, and train its own professors. Here's the way the founding of ATS was described in 1978:

In 1923 several members of the faculty of Asbury College met with President Henry Clay Morrison to discuss the matter of evangelical theological education. Growing out of a recognition of the need for a graduate theological seminary committed to the historic Wesleyan interpretation of evangelical Christianity, plans were made for the organization of Asbury Theological Seminary.

ATS was officially opened in the fall of 1923. From 1923 to 1931 Asbury Theological Seminary was an integral part of Asbury College. In 1931 articles of incorporation were drawn up and the Seminary became a separate educational unit.²

No one knows how many American Methodists during the 1920s and 1930s continued to believe in holiness; these types of questions weren't asked in the annual statistical reports. What is evident is that there were enough of them to keep ATS afloat. Asbury didn't create them, they were there. Asbury is more of a reflection of their presence, as is the case with all special interest groups. Asbury was intended specifically for those within the holiness ranks who believed God was calling them into ministry and that the preparation for ministry required formal training. These men and women could have gone to any of the official Methodist denominational seminaries and received an equally academic preparation, but not one as thoroughly steeped in holiness theology. This is not to say that some of those called to be preachers didn't attend the official denominational colleges and seminaries, they certainly did. Other holiness advocates chose to follow the other available paths to ministry that didn't require a residential academic prologue. The holiness people were there, they were there in significant numbers and probably in significant percentages. They were typically quiet outside of their local, or perhaps regional, context, but they were nevertheless there, and the continued existence and growth of Asbury testifies to their presence.

The Asbury Seminarian

When the *Asbury Seminarian* was launched in 1946, it had a clear purpose: "to contend for the fundamentals of the evangelical faith." The ATS leadership believed that a scholarly journal was needed because, "The currents of modern philosophical thought are largely materialistic. The currents of modern theological thought are in a large measure humanistic. Over against these

trends, *The Asbury Seminarian* will stand uncompromisingly for supernaturalism.”³ Reading the *Seminarian* one does not find specific references to other theological schools, nor to their wayward professors; however, right from the beginning, it was clear that one of the strongest rationales for the decision to publish a journal was to act as a corrective to those who had lost their way. In that first issue, the editor Harold Kuhn described “The Crisis in Theological Education Today,” where he explained how the secular had taken over from the sacred. He pointed to a philosophy of “continuity” that had destroyed the possibility of God’s activity, and he basically said that there is no gospel in the social gospel. While Kuhn didn’t mention any names, all of his readers knew who he was talking about. In the third issue, B. Joseph Martin, in his article “Religious Education Under Fire,” bemoaned, “Ours is a heathenism, not of the jungles, but of college and university campus.”⁴

Asbury College and Asbury Theological Seminary existed for the teaching and promotion of the holiness message. And the holiness message was rooted in the biblical story of God’s supernatural intervention in the world and in the lives of people. The New Testament told the story of the creation of the church in which people were still being affected by the supernatural activity of God via the indwelling and cleansing presence of the Holy Spirit. From the beginning, the leaders of Asbury understood that any diminution of the authority of the Bible posed a serious threat to their defense of the doctrine of holiness. In the second issue of the *Seminarian* is found just such a defense, first by reifying the authority of the Bible in the article, “The Seat of Authority in Protestantism.” In general, the article takes issue with theological liberalism and its “attempt to discover an extra-biblical seat of authority for Christianity, successively in reason and in experience.” A significant step in the process is the separation of the “two Testaments” as “objects for study” in which “The one is played off against the other.” But the biggest culprits are the various attacks on the authority of Scripture waged by higher criticism. “The centrifugal tendencies in biblical scholarship have found a culmination in the Form-Critical method, in which the New Testament is fragmented in near-atomic fashion.”⁵ In the same issue, a corresponding defense of holiness is presented in “The Scriptural Basis of Wesley’s Doctrine of Christian Perfection,”⁶ a condensation of Professor George A. Turner’s Harvard PhD dissertation. In the final issue of the first year, James Robertson summarized the task at hand:

Not only is Asbury one of a steadily diminishing number of seminaries that continue to emphasize a transcendental faith, but in her stand for the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification she is unique. In fact, the spread of scriptural holiness is her ruling passion. In a world and in a Church enslaved by the god of reason she is charged with a great mission, one that will tax to the utmost her intelligence, her courage, and her grace. For her the day of defensive warfare is over. For her the day of march has come.⁷

The two co-dependent themes of Wesleyan holiness and biblical authority dominate the pages of the *Seminarian* and its successors, with articles such as: “The Perfection Concept in the Epistle to the Hebrews,”⁸ “John Wesley’s Personal Experience of Christian Perfection,”⁹ “The Redemptive Purpose in the Perfection of Human Personality,”¹⁰ “Our Wesleyan Heritage, Part III, Christian Perfection,”¹¹ “‘Shall We Continue in Sin?’ An Exposition of Romans Six,”¹² “The Role of the Holy Spirit In Entire Sanctification In the Writings of John Wesley,”¹³ “Entire Sanctification,”¹⁴ “Human Development and Christian Holiness,”¹⁵ “A Case for Biblical Authority,”¹⁶ “In Pursuit of Holiness: Some Thoughts for the Asbury Community Near and Far,”¹⁷ “Recovering the Vision of Holiness: Wesley’s Epistemic Basis,”¹⁸ “An Inclusive Vision of the Holy Life,”¹⁹ “The Motif of Real Christianity in the Writings of John Wesley,”²⁰ “Sanctification in the New Testament,”²¹ “Sanctification in the Tradition of Desert Fathers: A

Methodist Perspective,”²² “Sanctification and Liberation,”²³ “Holiness of Heart and Life: Lessons from North American Methodism,”²⁴ “The Beauty of Holiness,”²⁵ “What Is the Range of Current Teaching on Sanctification and What Ought a Wesleyan to Believe on This Doctrine?,”²⁶ and G. Herbert Livingston’s “Biblical Authority,” where the two central issues are combined in the life of the true Wesleyan preacher:

Since Asbury Theological Seminary is a seminary training preachers for future service, a word about preaching and biblical authority may be in order as a conclusion. A preacher without an authoritative message is an anomaly; he is a living contradiction. Several factors must combine to transform him into a transmitter of the authority of God.

Like the messenger of old, a true preacher must experience a call to preach; he/she must receive a commission from the Holy Spirit to perform the preacher’s task. This divine call should be augmented by the church’s commissioning of the preacher, who in response must have a deep conviction that the Bible is the authoritative Word of God. The preacher should study the whole Bible with diligence, care, and honesty.

The preacher must know the reality of the regenerating and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. Authority and power [go] together and they must be joined in the preacher’s life if he/she is to deliver Scriptural messages effectively.²⁷

Asbury’s periodicals weren’t hostile to the Methodist denominations, not even critical, they didn’t need to be. Asbury understood why it existed, and everyone who taught or studied there knew it as well; they were all there on purpose. Sanctification: it was proudly announced in their purpose statement, taught in their classes, written about in articles and books, dialogued over in conferences, preached in chapel, sought after in small groups. Sanctification shaped everything about the institution. The other Methodist theological institutions did not derive their existence from this one central core, and everyone knew that; there was no need to point it out, it was obvious. Instead the ATS periodicals did their thing, their holiness thing. The *Asbury Seminarian* had articles about archaeology, Christian education, form criticism, Barth, worship, counseling, existentialism, liberation theology, ecumenism, preaching, and so on; they covered all the bases, and then they covered those bases with holiness. Most of the articles throughout the decades have been written by Asbury professors.

As the decades progressed, the number of articles contributed by like-minded holiness scholars (typically from the Free Methodists, Church of the Nazarene, and Wesleyans) increased.²⁸ They didn’t find a great deal in mainstream Methodism to highlight. Even their book reviews rarely included an Abingdon publication (sometimes an Asbury professor was published by Abingdon, and that might merit a review). Instead they looked elsewhere for commentaries, sermon collections, theological ponderings, and historical instruction. Ironically, the presses they did tend to review were typically not within the holiness camp, but rather represented a broader evangelicalism. The commentaries, for example, were written by those who understood the various critical approaches, but treated the texts as sacred, the Word of God. They might take the pericopes apart in order to get a better look, but they always put them back together.

Most of all, the ATS periodicals did what was most important, they proclaimed holiness. To be more exact, they focused on the stages of Wesleyan grace: prevenient, justifying, and sanctifying. There were plenty of articles about evangelism—domestic and international. The goal was to save the world and then to “holy-fy” it. They didn’t focus on social issues, or on ecumenism, not because they didn’t care, but because they understood that the social issues could be solved only by holy people, individually and in community. They weren’t particularly ecumenical, because, first, they weren’t in any official position to ecumenize, and second, they

were trying to spread holiness into all of the denominational lands, not just those with a Methodist genesis. They were about renewal rather than cooperation.

Who's Who at Asbury Theological Seminary

Asbury had, and has, a certain self-sustaining nature. From its earliest years, its graduates have acted as a dedicated band of recruiters, of both students and donors. Asbury has always had an esprit de corps in which all associated with it understood that it was unique. The other UM schools might have subtle, perhaps even significant, differences among them, but none could be accurately compared to ATS. None of the other schools was as clear about their Wesleyan holiness purpose. Asbury graduates didn't tend to suggest that all Methodist seminaries were created equal; they didn't tend to even create a hierarchy into which ATS was placed. Instead, Asbury was unique and separate from any such ranking. For a few years, one of the quarterly issues of the *Seminarian* included a wealth of information about the school, which helps us to understand both its breadth and its insularity. For example, in 1978, there were 685 students from 40 different denominations at the school, with 558 enrolled in the MDiv program—536 men and 22 women. Students came to the seminary from 44 states and 253 undergraduate schools. But for all of their diversity, the student body was dominated by three Methodist denominations: 553 students came from The United Methodist Church, the Free Methodists, or the Wesleyans; of that number, 441 were UM. The top ten states accounted for 365 members of the student body; and nine undergraduate schools supplied 229 students. They were taught almost exclusively by Asbury graduates, at least three-fourths of the professors had at least one degree from Asbury College or ATS. The courses they could take included: The Christian Doctrine of Holiness; The Idea of Perfection (Historical Development); The Theology of John Wesley; Wesleyan-Arminian Theologians; Major Theological Developments within Methodism; Advanced Wesley Studies; The Idea of Perfection (Biblical Basis); History of Methodism; A Survey of the History and Thought of the Holiness Movement; and the Homiletical Study of Holiness.²⁹

Like-minded Outsiders

It is possible that the holiness adherents within Methodism, feeling like outsiders, have through the years found a common identity with other outsiders. It is possible that by, to a great extent, rejecting or ignoring the standard Methodist publications, seminars, agencies, boards, and leadership positions (I think it's safe to say that the ATS people would argue that they are in fact the ones who have been rejected and ignored), the ATS community has taken on some of the characteristics of the other outsiders with whom they have found communal solace. With the great mass of evangelicals, the Asburians have found others whose journeys seems to parallel their own. They reject a liberal approach to Scripture and theology, and equally reject an embrace of the charismatic movement that has been so dominant in the race for global adherents. Conversely, Asbury has always described itself as *evangelical*. In fact, according to William Arnett, ATS's founder H.C. Morrison, "was a zealous proponent of evangelical Christianity, especially during the time of rising tides of liberalism and apostasy." In 1931, it was Morrison who crafted the Articles of Incorporation, which include the sentence, "This Seminary will emphasize in its teaching the divine inspiration and infallibility of the Holy Scripture, and Virgin Birth, Godhead, Vicarious Sufferings, and bodily resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ."³⁰ These sound like beliefs all evangelicals of any ilk would be quite happy with. Often in editorials and

articles, an effort was made to differentiate the Asbury meaning of *evangelical* from the common usage, which was linked so tightly to a Reformed theological perspective. Yet, as the decades passed, the urge to make the distinction waned, and the positions drifted ever so subtly toward a generic evangelicalism. The Book Review portion of the *Seminarian* consistently tended to include books from the large evangelical presses. None is more telling than the 1976 review of Harold Lindsell's *The Battle for the Bible* (Zondervan, 1976). Robert Coleman begins his review with, "This is likely to be the most discussed book in evangelical circles this year. Some will castigate it as the work of a crank; others will see in it the voice of a prophet; but no one who reads the book carefully will come away without being disturbed." Coleman recognizes that Lindsell isn't a holiness advocate, but the issue of authority is so significant that the book demands a reading. He notes, "Surprisingly little attention is given to the Methodist tradition, perhaps because our drift away from Biblical authority is already well known. Nevertheless, the observation of the author is appreciated that 'John Wesley would be dismayed at what has transpired in the church he founded' (p. 154)." From here he takes the opportunity to offer a commentary on Methodism in general:

I suspect that if Wesley were living now, and saw the confusion occasioned by modern equivocation on the inspiration of Scripture, recognizing the danger it portends for the future, he would join the front ranks in the battle for the Bible. However, in contending for the faith, he would seek to reconcile differences by reasoned discourse, and he would not let contention destroy Christian fellowship, nor detract him from his consuming passion for evangelism.

This would be a wise course for his ecclesiastical successors. We cannot ignore the controversy, unpleasant as it may be. To avoid the conflict will cause evangelical Methodists to lose credibility, particularly among students of the Bible. I would only hope that we will discuss the issue in a bond of mutual respect, remembering that our higher responsibility is to proclaim the infallible Word of God to a lost world.³¹

Remarkably, in the same issue, Frank Bateman Stanger focused his editorial column on the US bicentennial, waxing eloquently about: "the spiritual ideals and values which inspired and undergirded the founding of our nation," the United States' "Christian heritage," the way that its early years were "guided by men who feared God." He then proceeded to wax even more eloquently about the recent declension in American society that led him to call for repentance, "We must repent of the loss of our moral integrity. Morally, America is on the downgrade. Moral and spiritual decay is growing like a cancer. The arts, entertainment, politics, the media, have been overtaken by sinister demonic forces."³² The article was not about the loss of holiness, but rather, about the failure to maintain evangelical fervor. A second, brief example is offered in the opening sentence of the 1978 ATS self-description: "Asbury Theological Seminary was founded upon and is committed to a vital evangelical Christian faith from the standpoint of the Wesleyan Arminian school of theological thought."³³ *Evangelical* was the key term, not holiness or sanctification. Finally, there is the highly favorable 1979 review of the first volume of Donald Bloesch's three-volume work, *The Essentials of Evangelical Theology*.³⁴ In 1999, Kenneth Collins contributed "Why the Holiness Movement Is Dead."³⁵ In the article, Collins references a few others who had offered their own perspectives on the plight of the movement. To some extent, all of these statements point to a shift from emphasizing holiness to an emphasis on church growth and broad evangelicalism.

Evangelism

If Asbury has been both a refuge and shaper of a subset of Methodism—has seen itself as distinct from, and either an alternative to or a corrective of, mainstream Methodism—then one of the ways that it has been highly successful in spreading its perspective is through a consistent emphasis on evangelism in both domestic and international contexts. The *Seminarian* has reflected that emphasis in both individual articles and entire issues, such as the first issue in 1957, which contained: “The Evangelistic Challenge for New America,” “How Popular Is Real Evangelism?” “Effective Evangelism: Some Case Studies,” “Evangelism and Education,” and “The Wesleyan Conception of Evangelism.”³⁶ Historical examples of great evangelists were equally common, with John Wesley being the most popular subject. Evangelism was never seen as something limited to the past, however, and, throughout his career, Billy Graham was highlighted as a contemporary example of God using a man to spread the Word. The *Seminarian* was equally supportive of the Church Growth Movement, offering in 1978, Howard Snyder’s understanding of “A Wesleyan Perspective on Church Growth?”³⁷ and the next year, Donald McGavern’s “A 1979 Perspective on Church Growth.”³⁸ Frank Stanger used the 1979 creation of the E. Stanley Jones School of Evangelism and World Mission to editorialize on “The Responsibility of the Seminary for World Evangelization,” in which he asserted that “From its founding nearly six decades ago, Asbury Theological Seminary has been committed to evangelism and missions.” He went on to explain that, unlike most schools, ATS actually prepares graduates to be both evangelists and supporters of world evangelization:

But our emphasis upon missions and evangelism is far more than academic. It is the spirit of our campus. Our services on campus have an evangelistic ring about them. . . . Our pastors-in-the-making are trained to preach evangelistically. All of our courses are taught with an emphasis upon the personal experience of scriptural truth. . . . A missionary conference is held on the campus annually. Students are taught how to make their local churches increasingly missionary-minded and active.³⁹

Stanger’s editorial was followed by Robert Coleman’s “The Priority of World Evangelization” and J.T. Seamands “The Unfinished Task.”⁴⁰

Conclusion

Asbury Theological Seminary did not create the division that currently exists within The United Methodist Church. It is inaccurate to say that ATS has exacerbated the division. Rather, Asbury is, and always has been, an indicator that division exists. There was something almost inevitable about Asbury. Methodist holiness people needed a place to send their future preachers and pastors; they didn’t see an existing institution, so an institution was created. That institution continued to exist, because, in some way or another, those holiness adherents continued to exist.

From its beginning, Asbury reflected a broader American evangelicalism, which defended a biblical supernaturalism as opposed to a liberal biblical theology. It demonstrated a merging of Wesleyan theology with the fundamentals of evangelicalism, of holiness with anti-modernism. Concern about the spread of liberal theology easily coupled with concern for a widespread cultural liberalism, both of which were perceived to have infected the majority of Methodism’s seminaries and, in turn, affected the perspective of those who led the denomination(s). Asbury’s self-understanding as the lone defender of the true faith increased over the years, and its graduates typically reflected this perspective, causing them to see their Christian duty to fight sin not only in the world but also within the church.

In 1960, Gerald Anderson wrote of “The Challenge of the Ecumenical Movement to Methodism” and noted, in what now seems sadly prescient, that:

The task which confronts Methodism today before it can “go” anywhere in the ecumenical movement is to come to some understanding, in a more specific way, of what we as a church see as being our basic position in such areas as doctrine, authority, and polity. We ourselves need a clearer understanding of what we believe, what we are, and what we do. . . .

. . . The net result is that today, in large segments of American Methodism, the tradition prevails that every man not only has equal right to his own opinion, but that every man’s opinion is equally right.⁴¹

The creation of Asbury Seminary was not the genesis of the current crisis facing United Methodism, but it was reflective of internal struggles within the movement, which, if left unaddressed or unresolved, were likely to lead to ever larger fractures within the foundations of the edifice. The positions defended within the pages of the *Seminarian* were not the cause of the denominational struggles, but they certainly are an easy way to trace their development. And, in the case of Anderson’s comments, they served as an accurate predictor of the division that was inevitable unless the core positions of the church were more clearly defined and broadly embraced.

The Split That Didn’t Happen—Kevin D. Newburg

¹ The way we know that they didn’t leave in great numbers is because the holiness denominations show no large influx of members during these decades. Rather they indicate a steady increase which is far more in keeping with evangelistic growth. In the meantime, the MEC/MECS membership statistics also show no precipitous declines nor even abnormal growth rates.

² “Introduction to Asbury Theological Seminary,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 33, no. 4 (August 1978): 11.

³ J. C. McPheters, “Editorial,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 1, no. 1 (1946): 1.

⁴ B. Joseph Martin, “Religious Education Under Fire,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 1, no. 3 (1946): 85

⁵ Harold Kuhn, “The Seat of Authority in Protestantism,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 1, no. 2 (1946): 35.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ James D. Robertson, “The Day of March Has Come,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 1, no. 4 (Winter 1946): 132.

⁸ Alvin A. Ahern, “The Perfection Concept in the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 1, no. 4 (Winter, 1946).

⁹ Roy S. Nicholson, “John Wesley’s Personal Experience of Christian Perfection,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 6, no. 1 (1952).

¹⁰ Charles W. Carter, “The Redemptive Purpose in the Perfection of Human Personality,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 8, no. 1 (1954).

¹¹ Stanley Banks, “Our Wesleyan Heritage, Part III, Christian Perfection,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 14, no. 2 (1960).

¹² George Allen Turner, “‘Shall We Continue in Sin?’ An Exposition of Romans Six,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 29, no. 1 (January 1974).

¹³ William M. Arnett, “The Role of the Holy Spirit in Entire Sanctification in the Writings of John Wesley,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 29, no. 2 (April 1974).

¹⁴ William M. Arnett, “Entire Sanctification,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 30, no. 4 (October 1975).

¹⁵ Donald M. Joy, “Human Development and Christian Holiness,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 31, no. 2 (October 1976).

¹⁶ John N. Oswalt, “A Case for Biblical Authority,” 32, no. 1 (January 1977).

¹⁷ Laurence W. Wood, “In Pursuit of Holiness: Some Thoughts for the Asbury Community Near and Far,” *Asbury Seminarian*, 38, no. 1 (Winter 1982–1983).

¹⁸ J. Steven O’Malley, “Recovering the Vision of Holiness: Wesley’s Epistemic Basis,” *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 41, no. 1 (Spring 1986).

-
- ¹⁹ Stephen A. Seamands, "An Inclusive Vision of the Holy Life," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 42, no. 2 (Fall 1987).
- ²⁰ Kenneth J. Collins, "The Motif of Real Christianity in the Writings of John Wesley," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 49, no. 1 (Spring 1994).
- ²¹ Walter F. Klaiber, "Sanctification in the New Testament," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 51, no. 1 (Spring 1996).
- ²² Roberta C. Bondi, "Sanctification in the Tradition of Desert Fathers: A Methodist Perspective," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 51, no. 1 (Spring 1996).
- ²³ José Miguez Bonino, "Sanctification and Liberation," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 51, no. 1 (Spring 1996).
- ²⁴ Randy L. Maddox, "Holiness of Heart and Life: Lessons from North American Methodism," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 51, no. 1 (Spring 1996).
- ²⁵ J. Prescott Johnson, "The Beauty of Holiness," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 52, no. 2 (Summer 1997).
- ²⁶ Christopher T. Bounds, "What Is the Range of Current Teaching on Sanctification and What Ought a Wesleyan to Believe on this Doctrine?" *The Asbury Journal*, 62, no. 2 (Fall 2007).
- ²⁷ G. Herbert Livingston, "Biblical Authority," *Asbury Seminarian*, 30, no. 1 (January 1975).
- ²⁸ Eventually ATS graduates found their way into the ranks of other seminaries, holiness and even Methodist, and it is challenging to know which contributors have ATS roots. By the late 1980s and thereafter, the contributors are from a much broader theological spectrum indicating willingness to dialogue with evangelicals who share many of the same theological and hermeneutical approaches.
- ²⁹ "Introduction to Asbury Theological Seminary," *Asbury Seminarian*, 33, no. 4 (August 1978). Denominations: UM 441, Free Methodist 66, Wesleyan 46, Non 24, C&MA 24, Church of God 8, Am. Baptist 6, Friends 6, Presbyterian 6. States: OH 76, KY 54, PA 54, MI 51, IN 37, NY 36, FL 32, GA 25, IL 25, WV 24, AL 23, TX 23. Undergraduate degree: Asbury 118, Roberts Wesleyan 23, Houghton 22, Spring Arbor 14, Marion 12, McMurry 11, Bethel 10, Nyack 10, Seattle Pacific 9 (Total 253). There were 778 students in 1980, 620 in the MDiv program (587 men and 33 women). *Asbury Seminarian*, 35, no. 3 (July 1980).
- ³⁰ William M. Arnett, "Entire Sanctification," *Asbury Seminarian*, 30, no. 4 (Oct. 1975): 43ff.
- ³¹ Robert E. Coleman, review of *The Battle for the Bible*, by Harold Lindsell, *Asbury Seminarian*, 31, no. 4 (October 1976): 44f.
- ³² Frank Bateman Stanger, "A Nation under God," *Asbury Seminarian*, 31, no. 4 (October 1976): 3–5.
- ³³ "Introduction to Asbury Theological Seminary," *Asbury Seminarian*, 33, no. 4 (August 1979): 7.
- ³⁴ John Tyson, review of *The Essentials of Evangelical Theology, Volume One: God, Authority, and Salvation*, by Donald Bloesch, *Asbury Seminarian*, 34, no. 3 (July 1979).
- ³⁵ Kenneth J. Collins, "Why the Holiness Movement Is Dead," *Asbury Theological Journal*, 54, no. 2 (Fall 1999).
- ³⁶ Wayne A. Lamb, "The Evangelistic Challenge for New America," Robert E. Coleman, "How Popular Is Real Evangelism?" Basil G. Osipoff, "Effective Evangelism: Some Case Studies," George A. Turner, "Evangelism and Education," William M. Arnett, "The Wesleyan Conception of Evangelism," *Asbury Seminarian*, 11, no. 1 (1957).
- ³⁷ Howard A. Snyder, "A Wesleyan Perspective on Church Growth?" *Asbury Seminarian*, 33, no. 5 (October 1978).
- ³⁸ Donald McGavern, "A 1979 Perspective on Church Growth," *Asbury Seminarian*, 34, no. 3 (July 1979).
- ³⁹ Frank Bateman Stanger, "The Responsibility of the Seminary for World Evangelization," *Asbury Seminarian*, 35, no. 2 (April 1980): 4.
- ⁴⁰ Robert E. Coleman, "The Priority of World Evangelization"; J.T. Seamands, "The Unfinished Task," *Asbury Seminarian*, 35, no. 2 (April 1980).
- ⁴¹ Gerald H. Anderson, "The Challenge of the Ecumenical Movement to Methodism," *Asbury Seminarian*, 14, no. 2 (1960): 22, 26.