A Case for the Mediated Study of the Progressive Era Holiness Movements: The Impact of Periodical Culture on the Fragmentation of Late Nineteenth Century Methodism

1

Christy Mesaros-Winckles, PhD

Associate Professor Communication Arts & Sciences

Adrian College

15th Oxford Institute of Methodist Theological Studies

In 1857, Benjamin Titus Roberts published "New School Methodism" in *The Northern Independent*.[1] Roberts, a Methodist Episcopal elder in the Genesee, New York Conference, lambasted conference leadership for neglecting the poor, indulgent living, and turning away from traditional Methodist theology, such as entire sanctification. Roberts did not mince words in his article, labeling New School Methodist elders as individuals who "desire to raise money for the benefit of the church, they have recourse in selling of pews to the highest bidder, to parties of pleasure, oyster suppers, fairs, grab-bags, festivals, and lotteries.[2]

Installment one of "New School Methodism" appeared just six days before the Genesee Annual Conference and was not well received. Conference leadership responded by branding Roberts as the leader of a growing fantastical movement in Western New York and charging him with "unchristian and immoral conduct" for the article.[3] Roberts' subsequent conference trial resulted in an official reprimand and warning to desist from such writing in the future. However, what neither the Genesee Conference nor Roberts understood was the rhetorical impact of "New School Methodism." The article, and Roberts' subsequent trial, made him a hero for reformers in the Genesee Conference. Printed texts take on a life of their own once they enter the public arena, and that certainly was the case with "New School Methodism." As media ecologist Neil Postman explains, "Unforeseen consequences stand in the way of all those who think they see clearly the direction in which a new technology will take us."[4] Just as Guttenberg, a devout Catholic, could not foresee Martin Luther's use of the printing press to democratize access to the Bible,[5] Roberts and Genesee Conference did not envision "New School Methodism" becoming the manifesto for Methodist reformers.

In the year following the trial, Methodist Episcopal clergyman George Estes republished "New School Methodism" as a tract two different times, distributing it widely in the Genesee Conference. Estes added his own commentary on Roberts' 1857 misconduct trial in the first tract, publishing only the most controversial portions of "New School Methodism." The second tract published the article in its entirety, with an introduction by Estes. Roberts denied giving permission for the tracts' publication, but as the author of the original article, the Genesee Conference still held him responsible for the growing reform movement.[6] New charges were brought against Roberts at the 1858 Genesee Annual Conference, and he was ultimately expelled from the denomination.[7] Roberts and like-minded Methodists would go on and found the Free Methodist Church two years later in 1860.[8] Building the denomination on the Old School Methodist tenants Roberts had outlined in his 1857 critique, Free Methodism's core principles included free pews, entire sanctification, abolitionism, and a ban on secret societies.[9]

However, the birth of Free Methodism was not a stand-alone event in mid-nineteenth century American Methodism. Instead, it was one of many examples of the growing popularity of Holiness theology and shifts in power and practice occurring in American Methodism. The Free Methodist Church emerged during a time of extensive Holiness camp meetings and Holiness revivals, which, as historian Timothy Smith explains, caused a fundamental shift in spiritual authority. No longer did individuals solely rely on ordained clergy to provide spiritual insight, instead a growing body of lay leaders and religious periodicals also contributed to the spiritual education of Americans.[10] While large denominations had developed a thriving periodical culture in the early 1800s, by the latter half of the century, the cost of producing a periodical had dropped significantly,[11]and more independent periodicals, particularly in the Holiness tradition, emerged. The rise of independent Holiness periodicals began in 1839, when

Timothy Merritt, a prominent Methodist Episcopal member in New England, began an independent periodical *Guide to Christian Perfection*. Renamed *The Guide to Holiness*, in 1845 it was purchased by Dr. Palmer, who installed his wife Phoebe as editor in 1858. *The Guide to Holiness* became a model for other independent ventures.[12] Roberts began a similar independent Holiness periodical in 1860 called *The Earnest Christian,* with the intent of using the journal to promote Holiness theology and revivalism.[13] Eight years later, fellow Free Methodists began an independent weekly periodical called The *Free Methodist.*[14]

While editors, such as Roberts, should have been aware of the democratic nature of the press, a historical evaluation of Holiness periodicals during the 1880s seems to indicate otherwise. The impact of periodical culture is too often viewed through a transmission model of communication, where the editor holds the power, disseminating news and informing their readers what to believe.[15] What independent periodicals, such as *The Earnest Christian*, underestimated was the agency of the reader in evaluating, critiquing and embracing the printed word. Therefore, the power of the periodical should not be viewed simply as the *transmission* of information but evaluated by the *engagement* with it. Media historian James Carey calls this a "ritualistic" view of communication. As Carey notes, if we take a ritualistic view of newspapers, news reading and writing becomes a dramatic act that can either be used to maintain or disrupt the status quo.[16] Taking a ritualistic view of periodicals also considers the power struggle that inevitably emerges as the public reimagines the messages they receive. As Carey explains, organizations must remain constantly aware that "There are always new generations coming along for whom our productions are incipiently problematic and for whom reality must be regenerated and made authoritative."[17] Drawing on Carey's perspective on media as a ritualistic practice, I contend that a reevaluation of the late-Progressive Era periodical culture is essential to

comprehensively grasping the societal and cultural transformations within Methodism and its diverse offshoots. The discourse surrounding Holiness theology and practice in print culture during the 1880s anticipates the rise of Pentecostalism and the increasingly personalized nature of religious experience in the United States, a trend that continues into the twenty-first century. Furthermore, this paper strives to provide a framework to view theological and sociological trends in denominational history from a mediated context, allowing scholars to better understand the impact media plays in shaping social norms and theology.

As Postman notes in *Technopoly*, the act of writing itself has as much impact as its distribution. As he explains, "Writing is not a neutral technology whose good or harm depends on the uses made of it." Instead, the impact of writing is "the structure of technology itself—that is, that its functions follow from its form."[18] When Roberts put his critique in writing, he created something that was ultimately beyond his control.

Roberts understood the rhetorical impact of the printed word but underestimated the ritualistic nature of the press. Ironically, a little over twenty years after his "New School Methodism" experience, Roberts found himself no longer the rebel but a defender of tradition, as radicals in the next generation of Free Methodists accused Roberts and denominational leaders of the very same things he had accused Methodist Episcopal leaders of in the 1850s. Employing similar rhetorical tactics, radical Free Methodists utilized mediated culture to further their arguments. S.W. Sherman, a Free Methodist elder from central Illinois, began an independent periodical *The Vanguard,* where he regularly critiqued Free Methodist policy on missions and doctrine.[19] C.S. Hanley, another Free Methodist elder, began the independent Holiness periodical *The Firebrand*, and Solomon and Etta Shaw, Michigan evangelists with ties to Free Methodism, began *The Michigan Holiness Record* to promote inter-denominational Holiness

work around the state.[20] Shaw, Hanley, Sherman, along with two Free Methodist elders Vivian Dake and Lee Harris, comprised what Holiness historian Stan Ingersol has termed "the radical Holiness alliance."[21] Sherman, Shaw and Hanley used their periodicals to promote independent Holiness work and condemn practices in Free Methodism that they felt went against the standards of Biblical Holiness. Dake and Harris began separate independent ministries that challenged denominational policy and oversight. Harris established a mission in Monrovia, Liberia only loosely connected to Free Methodism,[22] while Dake founded the Pentecost Bands, evangelistic brigades composed mostly of young adults who traveled around the midwestern United States and eventually overseas promoting Holiness theology.[23] Both Harris and Dake routinely promoted their ministries not only *in The Free Methodist,* but in *The Vanguard*, *The Michigan Holiness Record*, *The Earnest Christian* and other like-minded publications.[24]

Revivalism and Holiness Post-Civil War

The theological debates that raged in *The Free Methodist* and independent Holiness periodicals during the late 1880s had their origins a few decades earlier in the post-Civil War camp meeting movement. As soldiers returned home, the day-to-day dynamics of congregational life changed, and church culture changed along with it. Methodist advocates of entire sanctification became concerned that, like other denominational traditions, this too would fall by the wayside.[25] Thus, the Methodist tradition of camp meetings became a means to perpetuate religious enthusiasm, community, and Holiness theology in a new generation. Spurred into action by best-selling author and Methodist minister J.A. Wood, whose 1860 book *Perfect Love* became a cultural phenomenon, Wood and fellow Methodists Harriet Drake, Rev. William Osborn and Rev. John Inskip organized the first national camp meeting in Philadelphia on June 13, 1867. The camp meeting was advertised as an event for those concerned about the "promotion of the

work of entire sanctification,"[26] and was so successful that a second meeting was immediately organized in Vineland, New Jersey.[27] Between eight and ten thousand people attended the Vineland Camp Meeting,[28] and its massive success led to the formation of the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Christian Holiness. While the organization was Methodist in origin, anyone could join, especially those who did not have a local Holiness congregation to attend.[29] Between 1867-1883, the National Camp Meeting Association held approximately fifty-two camp meetings around the country. To help converts remain true to Holiness theology after their camp meeting experiences, the association encouraged regional, state and local chapters, which also held their own yearly camp meetings.[30] On both a national and regional level, the National Camp Meeting Association also spurred the development of new Holiness periodicals. The national organization published *The Advocate of Christian Holiness* in 1874,[31] and several regional and state associations followed suit with their own periodicals. *Perfect Love* author Brooks became editor of the Western Holiness Association's periodical *Banner of Holiness*, the Southwestern Association published *The Good Way*, which was edited for a time by Free Methodist elder W.B.M Colt.[32] The Shaw's *Michigan Holiness Record* was also the official publication of the Michigan Holiness Association; the Georgia Association published *The Way of Life*; the Pacific Coast Association published *The Pacific Herald of Holiness,* and Nevada and Iowa Association published *The Highway*.[33] In addition to the national and regional Holiness periodicals, independent Holiness periodicals were also springing up during this same period. In addition to *The Firebrand* and *Vanguard,* other Holiness titles included: *Banner of Love*, *Crown of Glory*, *The Gospel Banner*, *Words of Faith*, *Guide to Holiness*, *The Christian Harvester*, *The Christian Witness*. *American Wesleyan* and *The Christian Standard*. [34]

The growing Holiness periodical industry of the 1870s and 1880s was fueled by the success of camp meetings, which had become a pop culture phenomenon. Newspaper accounts from the era note thousands regularly attended camp meetings during this period.[35] The immense success meant there were now Holiness converts scattered around the United States, many without a local Holiness church to join. So, the growing Holiness periodical industry became a way for disconnected Holiness adherents to create a community that transcended geographic boundaries and denominational ties, ultimately connecting and democratizing Holiness theology. Additionally, Holiness converts often had no previous ties to Methodism and found loyalty rhetoric to the Methodist Episcopal or Free Methodist Church irrelevant. Their loyalty was to the Holiness principles they believed, regardless of the denomination that espoused them.[36]

Religious historian Nathan Hatch categorizes the increasing influence of periodical culture during this period as a "dispersion of power influence and authority" from the denominational level to the level of the individual and the "religious insurgent willing to employ fresh strategies to capture public attention."[37] The democratization of Holiness theology was fueled by the way readers engaged, often subscribing to multiple periodicals that presented differing views of Holiness theology.

By the 1880s Free Methodism was no longer a radical social movement but a traditional denomination with all the issues of bureaucracy and leadership that come along with that designation.[38] As Carey explains, when we understand that mediated communication *creates* and *shapes* culture, a ritualistic view of periodical culture then allows scholars to reflect on how readers engaged with the text because they possessed, "a particular hunger for experience, a desire to do away with the epic, heroic and traditional in favor of the unique, original, novel, new."[39] The more fanatic of the Holiness periodicals such as *The Firebrand* and *The Vanguard*

catered to the readers' desire for "unique, original and novel" and their desire to do way with traditions they saw as irrelevant or cumbersome to Biblical Holiness. Editors such as Roberts, who favored Holiness theology associated with specific denominational guidelines, quickly found themselves under fire as readers and radical Holiness editors used their periodicals to attack denominational practices that, to them, appeared to handicap revivalism and social reform in bureaucratic red tape.

Debates on Independent vs. Denominational Work 1884-1890

A particularly instructive case of this tension between denominational oversight and independent experience can be found in the debate conducted in the pages of *The Earnest Christian*, *The Free Methodist*, *The Vanguard* and *The Michigan Holiness Record* during the 1880s. These conversations were not shaped solely by the periodical editors but also reflect the views of readers. As historian Candy Gunther Brown notes in her study of religious periodical culture during this period, reader letters critiquing or supporting the views of different periodicals helped shape public thought on various topics.[40] Roberts editorials during this period indicate he was aware of divisions the growing Holiness periodical culture was creating, noting in the June 1884 *Earnest Christian* that there was an "unnecessary multiplication of Holiness sects, and Holiness periodicals is an injury to the cause is evident to every thoughtful person." Roberts commented that the diversity in Holiness perspectives was dividing "up too minutely the army of God. They fritter away means that might be employed to better advantage."[41]

J. Travis, editor of *The Free Methodist* in 1884, had similar concerns, noting in the August 27, 1884, issue that the number of Holiness periodicals springing up was creating more opportunities "to practice cheap straightness" in editorial writing. According to Travis, "cheap straightness" occurred editors critiqued their fellow Holiness periodicals in a manner they would

likely not do if they were discussing a topic face-to-face. Yet, what editors such as Travis and Roberts did not seem to realize was their own critiques also contributed to the continual reshaping of Holiness theology. Both editors regularly wrote the same critiques they criticized their contemporaries for making. Thus, not only was the dynamic culture of editorial writing by readers reshaping Holiness theology and practice in the late nineteenth century, but the editorial critiques of editors who read competing periodicals and wrote critiques on that content also contributing to the very divisions they denounced.

Just a few months prior to his August 1884 editorial, Travis had engaged in the same "cheap straightness" he denounced, critiquing and quoting an article in *The Christian Advocate*. Entitled "Free Methodism" *The Advocate* accused Free Methodist evangelists engaged in inter-denominational revivals of using those events to direct new converts to Free Methodist churches. Travis defended Free Methodist evangelists, acknowledging that what *The Advocate* critiqued was occurring but was not endorsed by the denomination.[42] Editorial debates on inter-denominational work continued over the next few years, and as Free Methodism expanded its efforts into foreign missions the debates began to center around denominational oversight and appointment of foreign missionaries.

In particular, 1886 saw a flurry of editorials from both readers and Holiness periodical editors on independent vs. denominational missions. In August 1886, S.W. Sherman published a searing critique of denominational oversight in *The Vanguard*, accusing Free Methodist's denominational mission board of hindering individuals called by God to the field. *The Vanguard* critique spurred Free Methodist elder A. Bradfield and *Free Methodist* editor J. Travis to publish their own assessments of Sherman in the October 1886 *Free Methodist* issues. In the October 6 issue, Travis challenged Sherman's argument that spiritual calling superseded experience, noting

Sherman's comparison of himself and William Taylor was far-fetched due to his own limited missionary experience. Travis also accused him of using spiritual calling as a tool to avoid oversight.[43] In the October 27 issue, Bradfield accused Sherman of simply using his periodical as a fundraising tool for his own independent projects, noting "It is like a physician or a lawyer uniting with a body of religious people for the sake of patronage." Bradfield also urged the denomination to restrict the publication of independent periodicals by Free Methodists, such as Sherman. Bradfield noted that independent ventures were "inimical to our prosperity." However, beyond refusing to appoint elders like Sherman, editorial oversight of the independent periodicals was beyond denominational control.[44]

In 1886, while *The Free Methodist* published critiques of *The Vanguard*, *The Michigan Holiness Record* and *The Vanguard* were cross-publishing positive accounts of independent work conducted by Shaw and Sherman.[45] With *The Record* offering discounted subscriptions to *The Free Methodist,* and readers own accounts of subscribing to multiple Holiness periodicals, a far from unified picture of independent missions' work was present in 1886 periodical culture.[46] Articles critiquing or supporting independent work and the individuals in charge of such efforts, continued to appear in *The Earnest Christian*, *The Free Methodist*, *The Michigan Holiness Record* and *The Vanguard* between 1887-1889. Perhaps the most contentious discussions appeared in 1889, as *The Record's* S.B. Shaw separated from the Free Methodist Church and formed an independent Holiness denomination, the Primitive Holiness Mission.[47] While Roberts condemned Shaw's separation in *The Free Methodist*, many other Holiness editors supported his new ministry.

By 1889 *The Free Methodist* was also under the editorial oversight of Roberts, who despite denouncing the divisions caused by Holiness periodicals, did not hesitate to participate in

the back-and-forth editorial critiques.[48] In May 1889, Roberts came into possession of a letter Shaw had sent to Free Methodist elder Vivian Dake, a protégé of Roberts and organizer of the Pentecost Bands. The letter invited Dake to join Shaw in his independent Holiness work and mentioned Shaw's desire to form his own Holiness organization.[49]

It is unclear how Roberts obtained the letter, but Shaw's invitation to Dake appears to have infuriated Roberts who wrote a scathing critique of Shaw in the May 22, 1889, *Free Methodist*. Titled "A New Church," Roberts noted Shaw's connections with the denomination had been in doubt for some time as "some of our most judicious preachers, well acquainted with him and his work, have felt for some time, that he has no real love for the Free Methodist Church; and that all he was among us for was, that he might obtain from us patronage for his paper and recruits for his bands." He concluded the article with a quote from Acts 20:30 where Paul warns church plants that "also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them."[50]

Shaw quickly responded to Roberts in the May 1889 *Record,* accusing Roberts of refusing to publish his rebuttal "A New Church, Not Quite" in *The Free Methodist*.[51] Roberts went on the defensive, reprinting and responding to a joint editorial published in *The Christian Voice* and *Banner of Holiness* supporting Shaw and condemning *The Free Methodist.* The statement *said* "that the FREE METHODIST is mistaken in its facts, and unjust in its insinuations." Roberts demanded a retraction from the publications, defending his editorial as factual.[52] Roberts also published a rebuttal to Shaw in the September 19, 1889, *Free Methodist*. Accusing Shaw of manipulating facts to justify his new mission, Roberts concluded his critique by remarking "such utter disregard for the truth we never witnessed before by a professed 'holiness teacher.' From such holiness, good Lord, deliver us."[53]

The widespread coverage of Shaw's separation from Free Methodism is evident in letters to the editor in the November-December 1889 *Record*, as readers wrote in noting they were following the arguments in numerous Holiness periodicals. A W.H. Bauser wrote a defense of Shaw and independent Holiness periodicals, mentioning his own association with Free Methodism was contentious, and while he had joined Free Methodism because of it was based on "holiness." He felt "It was far from the best organization for carrying on the holiness work," noting he sometimes felt the denomination had a "disposition to become churchy."[54] A J.Y. Lambert also wrote in a scathing critique of both *The Free Methodist* and Methodist Episcopal Church, remarking he had been ostracized by local ministers for five years, his "business tampered with, my children abused" because he was an independent Holiness worker who preached divine healing, distributing tracts and papers in support of his views throughout his community:

> You have found out, Bro. Shaw, that you are not to be allowed to live as you see the Bible teaches you. If you want to live in peace you must follow some human leader, casting out devils, except you follow those who claim a monopoly of that business, is sufficient for persecution and ostracism.[55]

Lambert's letter illustrates the increasing independent Holiness work and contentious relationship about Holiness evangelism between denominations and independent organizations, both of which felt they had a monopoly on the correct way to spread Holiness theology. Roberts' attack on Shaw and Shaw's subsequent separation from the denomination, triggered ongoing discussions about the growing independent Holiness movement.

Editorials on the separation continued to be published and discussed well in 1890. A. Coplin, editor of *The Holiness Evangelist*, wrote a February 1890 letter to the editor for *The*

Record, offering Shaw support for his new ventures.[56] *The Christian Harvester* published a defense of Shaw and independent Holiness work that *The Record* republished in the March-April 1890 issue.[57] The only publication which appeared to have sided with Roberts and *The Free Methodist* was *The Wesleyan Methodist*, which also published a searing indictment on sectarianism and Shaw in 1889.[58] Historian Synan Vinson defines the early 1890s as a period of increasing tension in Methodist circles as advocates of Holiness theology became less connected to denominations, and those who supported denominations such as the Methodist Episcopal and Free Methodist Church less loyal to the doctrine of Holiness.[59] The growing tensions illustrated in the Shaw case resulted in more than twenty-three Holiness denominations forming between 1895 and 1905. As Vinson notes, "Never before in the history of the nation had so many churches been founded in so short a time." It was an indication of how intense the divisions, perpetuated by revivalism and periodical culture, had become.

Conclusions: Moving Beyond Theological History

In reflecting on the impact of this period, particularly the impact of Roberts' 1857 "New School Methodism" and the subsequent Holiness periodical culture that formed, it is crucial that historians move beyond simply a history of theological thought and also evaluate the impact of mediated culture on divergent strands of Methodism. In his analysis of American Methodism during this period, Kevin Watson argues that Roberts' 1857 article "marked a crucial fork in the road for American Methodism."[60] Watson makes a case for revisiting American Methodism from the 1850s to 1950s, noting that too many histories have emphasized the history of American Methodism as an inclusive camp composed of various theological commitments, consequently under emphasizing how those various commitments contributed to divisions in the movement.[61] In his seminal history *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*, Donald Dayton also urges scholars

to begin addressing not just the theological history of American Methodism but sociological connections between various sects, noting that "Evangelism is rooted in the various sects, renewal movement, and new denominations spawned in the wake of nineteenth century revivalism."[62] Expanding on Dayton's call, this paper has attempted through media ecology to provide another framework for evaluating the segmentation of American Methodism. The diversity in American Methodism is not solely the result of divergent theological beliefs, but of a vibrant and changing movement that is as much a mediated movement as a theological one. Thus, changes in American Methodism cannot easily be explained without addressing the divergent voices and publications that perpetuated its evolution. Methodism has always been a religious movement that embraced the power of mediated culture, from Wesley and his *Armenian Magazine* to numerous Holiness periodicals of the nineteenth century. If Methodism truly wants to remain relevant in today's increasingly diverse mediated culture, it must seriously re-evaluate its own mediated history to understand its current place in twenty-century culture. To quote communication historian James Carey, culture is "never singular and univocal. It is, like nature itself, multiple, various and varietal."[63] If scholars truly wish to learn from the past to address current issues facing the Methodist tradition in the present, exploring the mediated history of Methodism is essential. Today, social media has replaced periodical culture and community. Now, instead of clergy being concerned about periodical editors expressing views contrary to denominational theology, social media influencers hold that role. Furthermore, social media also raises the same concerns about spiritual authority as periodical culture did in the 1880s. It takes the power of spiritual guidance and community development beyond the power of the pastor on Sunday morning and puts the power in the hands of the public. The problems of mediated culture have not changed over the past few hundred years but continues to evolve as

new technology develops. As this case study has attempted to illustrate, it is imperative that religious scholars begin to recognize that mediated culture is not value neutral,[64] that it does and will continue to reshape the way religious traditions are practiced and the communities that surround those traditions. It is crucial for religious traditions to have open discussions about social practices and educate congregations on how to become critical media participants. A top-down mandate on acceptable and unacceptable uses of mediated culture is neither possible nor wise. Critiquing certain types of mediated culture risks mirroring the approach taken by Holiness periodical editors in the 1880s—drawing attention and interest to the very concerns leaders aim to address. Instead of critique, education provides a counterbalance, a more "free-will" approach that empowers Methodists to become as Neil Postman could say "a loving resistance fighter." [65]

---

[1] Leslie Marston, *From Age to Age a Living Witness* (Winona Lake: Light and Life Press, 1960), 184.
[2] Ibid, 187-188.
[3] Howard Snyder, *Populist Saints: B.T. and Ellen Roberts and The First Free Methodists* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Co., 200)6, 402-408.
[4] Neil Postman, *Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology* (New York: Random House, 1993), 15.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Snyder, *Populist Saints*, 427- 445.
[7] Marston, *Age to Age*, 204-205
[8] Snyder, *Populist Saints*, 460.
[9] Marston, *Age to Age*, 249-263.
[10] Timothy Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in the Mid-Nineteenth Century America (*New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), 80.
[11] David Nord, *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and Their Readers* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 94.
[12]Charles Edwin Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism 1867-1936* (London: Scarecrow Press, 2002), 2-3.
[13] Benjamin Titus Roberts, "Object and Scope of this Magazine," *The Earnest Christian,* January 1860, 6.
[14] *The Free Methodist* began in 1868 under the private ownership and was purchased in 1886 with the intent of becoming the denominational periodical. Marston, *Age to Age*, 489.
[15] James Carey, *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 30.
[16] Carey, *Communication as Culture,* 30.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Postman, *Technopoly*, 7.
[19] Sherman not only published *The Vanguard* but ran an independent rescue mission called Vanguard Mission in St. Louis, Missouri. Craig Charles Fankhauser, *The Heritage of Faith: An Historical Evaluation of the Holiness Movement in America*, Ph.D. Diss. (Pittsburg State University, 1983), 158.

[20] Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 59.
[21] Stan Ingersol, *Burden of Dissent: Mary Lee Cagle and the Southern Holiness Movement*, Ph.D. Diss. (Duke University 1989), 91.
[22] Ibid., 77-80.
[23] Byron Lamson, *Venture: The Frontiers of Free Methodism* (Wilmore: First Fruits Press, 2016), 129-135.
[24] Tension between the denominational periodical *The Free Methodist* and *The Vanguard* increased dramatically in 1890 after Vivian Dake named *The Vanguard* the official periodical for Pentecost Bands in the *1891 Encyclopedia of Missions*. Howard Snyder, "Radical Holiness Evangelism: Vivian Dake and the Pentecost Bands," in William Kostlevy and Wallace Thornton, Jr. (Eds.) *The Radical Holiness Movement in the Christian Tradition: A Festschrift for Larry D. Smith* (Lexington: Emeth Press, 2016), 73.
[25] Post Civil War, younger ministers entered their professions with less training than previous generations. The lack of training resulted in various Methodist traditions going by the wayside as the new generation of ministers saw little need to keep practices such as "the mourner's bench" for repentant sinners. The shifting cultural norms in American Methodism spurred the development of the camp meeting movement in the late 1860s and early 1870s. Synan Vinson, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997), 12-14.
[26] Fankhauser, *The Heritage of Faith*, 62-63.
[27] Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*, 24-25.
[28] "From Cape Island," *Trenton State Gazette*, July 27, 1867.
[29] Vinson, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*, 26-27.
[30] Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 47-48.
[31] Ibid, 23.
[32] Colt was active in the National Camp Meeting Association and was editor of *The Good Way* in 1884. J. Travis, "Notes," *The Free Methodist*, January 30, 1884, 1.
[33]Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 55-56.
[34] The Michigan Record's club rate for Holiness periodicals listed several additional periodicals that Jones did not mention in *Perfectionist Persuasion*. "Record Club Rates," *The Michigan Holiness Record*, January 1888.
[35] Fankhauser notes in his dissertation that these national camp meetings were so large they resembled a small city when the tents were erected. For example, the Round Lake, New York, meeting in 1869 had over eight hundred tents. The 1871 Sacramento, California, meeting was also well attended with newspapers of the time reporting that thousands waited outside the main tabernacle tent because it was already filled. Frankauser, *The Heritage of Faith*, 66 & 75-76.
[36] Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion*, 59.
[37] Nathan Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1898), 144.
[38] Christy Mesaros-Winckles, *Silenced: The Forgotten Stories of Progressive Era Free Methodist Women* (New York, Rowman and Littlefield, 2023), 105.
[39] Carey, *Culture as Communication*, 20-21.
[40] Candy Gunther Brown, *Word in the World: Evangelical Writing, Publishing and Reading in America* 1789-1880 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 178.
[41] Benjamin Titus Roberts, "Holiness Sects," *The Earnest Christian*, June 1884, 187.
[42] J.Travis, "Fact versus Mistakes," *The Free Methodist,* February 13, 1884, 8.
[43] J.Travis, "Assurance-Illogical," *The Free Methodist*, October 6, 1886, 6.
[44] By the late 1880s it was common for Free Methodist Annual Conferences to include a section "On Publications" in their yearly reports. Often, these reports encouraged members to subscribe to *The Free Methodist* and warned them against subscribing to other Holiness periodicals that promoted views contrary to the *Free Methodist Discipline*. For example, in 1888 the Michigan Conference refused to allow Shaw to set up a table at camp meetings to solicit subscriptions for *The Michigan Holiness Record*. Conference secretary Rev. A. Bradfield wrote to Shaw noting they wanted to encourage Free Methodists to subscribe to *The Earnest Christian* and *The Free Methodist*. Also, in 1889 the Minnesota and North Iowa Conference called out *The Vanguard* for appearing to "disregard proper church order and authority." "Minnesota and North Iowa Conference: On Publications," *Annual Conference Records 1889* (Chicago: Free Methodist Publishing House, 1890), 76 & S.B. Shaw, "A Card Answered," *The Michigan Holiness Record*, June 1885, 13.
[45] In this issue Shaw cross-publishes an article from a recent issue of *The Vanguard* summarizing a recent revival service he had conducted. S.B.Shaw, untitled article reprint-*Vanguard*, *The Michigan Holiness Record,* March 1886.
[46] Damon encouraged readers to also subscribe to *The Earnest Christian*. S.B. Shaw, "One Church of God," The Michigan Holiness Record, October 1887, 46. Shaw encourages readers to also subscribe to A. Coplin's *Holiness*

Evangelist; "Record Club Rates," *The Michigan Holiness Record,* January 1888, & C.M. Damon, "A Suggestion," *The Free Methodist*, May 14, 1884, 5.
[47] The organizational policy and theological beliefs for the Primitive Holiness Mission was published in the January 1890 *Record*. "Articles of Faith and Practice," *Michigan Holiness Record*, January 1890, 26-27 & 29-31.
[48] Benjamin Titus Roberts, "Correction," *The Free Methodist*, August 24, 1887, 8, & Benjamin Titus Roberts, "Changing the Issue," *The Free Methodist*, March 27, 1889, 8.
[49] In the January 1890 *Record,* Etta Shaw named Vivian Dake as the correspondent to the unnamed Free Methodist clergyman letter that Roberts had mention in his 1889 *Free Methodist* articles. Etta Shaw, "A Few Important Facts," *Michigan Holiness Record*, January 1890, 28.
[50] Benjamin Titus Roberts, "A New Church," *The Free Methodist,* May 22, 1889, 8.
[51] S.B.Shaw. Untitled Editorial Comments. *The Michigan Holiness Record*, May 1889, 12.
[52] Benjamin Titus Roberts, " 'A New Church' We Hope Not," *The Free Methodist,* July 10, 1889, 8.
[53] Benjamin Titus Roberts, "The New Church," *The Free Methodist,* September 18, 1889, 8.
[54] W.H. Bauser, "Concerning the Mission," *The Michigan Holiness Record*, November and December 1889, 22-23.
[55] J.Y. Lambert, "Concerning the Mission," *The Michigan Holiness Record*, November and December 1889, 23.
[56] A. Coplin, "Interesting Letter," *The Michigan Holiness Record*, February 1890, 37.
[57] *Christian Harvester*, "Bro. S.B. Shaw and His Work," *The Michigan Holiness Record*, March and April 1890, 40.
[58] S.B. Shaw, "A New Church- Not Quite," *The Michigan Holiness Record*, May 1889, 13. Shaw notes in his rebuttal that *The Wesleyan Methodist* had also refused to publish his rebuttal and published its own lengthy critique.
[59] Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*, 39.
[60] Kevin Watson, *Old or New School Methodism: The Fragmentation of a Theological Tradition* (London: Oxford University Press, 2019), 15.
[61] Ibid., 6.
[62] Donald Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (Peabody: Hendrickson Press, 1988), 139.
[63] Carey, *Communication as Culture,* 65.
[64] This transmission model has been so prevalent in the study of mediated culture. In particular, the study of media and religion has too often emphasized this view with media seen as a tool that individuals and denominations can control for their own purposes. Heidi Campbell, *When Religion Meets New Media* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 47-45.
[65] Postman, *Technopoly*, 183.