



Who's Your Daddy? In Search of the "Father" of Pentecostalism

Eben de Jager

The Unit for Reformational Theology and the Development of the
South African Society, Faculty of Theology
North West University, South Africa
edejager@multitouch.co.za
ORCID: 0000-0003-2131-5653

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.104.43>

Abstract

The concept of assigning a person the title of father of an ideology or view has its roots in ancient Greek and Roman society where some of the earliest of such references occur. Fatherhood in the context of this paper refers to the originator of the ideas and concepts central to and underpinning Pentecostalism. To determine who the rightful "father" of Pentecostalism is, a closer consideration of the history of the Movement and the contemporary views on the possible contenders, are justified. The four predominant theories in contemporary scholarship seem to be 1) Charles Parham is the father of Pentecostalism thanks to the events in Topeka, Kansas in 1901 and his subsequent doctrine of spirit baptism with accompanied speaking in tongues, 2) William Seymore and the events in Azusa Street Mission from which the global Pentecostal Movement grew, 3) Both Parham and Seymore contributed in a significant way and should thus be equally recognised for their respective roles, 4) The Holy Spirit is the father of Pentecostalism as Spirit Baptism is a Holy Spirit initiated event. There is significant evidence that both Parham and Seymour distanced themselves from what has become common practice among Pentecostals and tenets central to Pentecostalism respectively. This would eliminate both men, and thus three of the four views, with the last option also raising concerns.

Keywords: Pentecostalism, Parham, Seymore, father, Azusa Street.

Introduction

In the last couple of decades, several books, theses, papers, and articles that reflect on and/or challenge the merits of Charles Parham as the Father of the Pentecostal Movement have been published. Some have supported the view initially held by William Seymour, that Parham was the original leader, but many have argued in recent years that William Seymour should be recognised as the actual Father of the Pentecostal Movement. The arguments presented often do not reflect the theological divergence between these two men and tend to be viewed through the lens of current perspectives such as decolonization, rather than the data presented by history.¹ This paper is an attempt to consider the historical data to establish who should be recognised as the father of Pentecostalism.

¹ Many may rightly argue that history is itself influenced by race on politics, thus no history is free of either. That said, the history of the Pentecostal church was not authored by any one race and the central role of African Americans in the origins of Pentecostalism is undeniable and well documented. See Espinosa (2014) and Hollenweger (1972).



Rather than primarily consulting recent scholarship on occurrences during the turn of the century 1900-1901, the works of Charles Parham's *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness* (Parham 1902) and *The Everlasting Gospel* (Parham, 1911), and his wife, Sarah Parham's *The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement* (Parham, 1930), will be consulted as primary sources to understand from first-hand accounts what Charles Parham experienced and how he interpreted those occurrences. Seymore's sentiments were often reflected in *The Apostolic Faith*, the official periodical of the Azusa Street Mission. Other reports on events, such as those documented in local newspapers, and non-Pentecostal publications will provide a balance to Parham and Seymour's respective perspectives and provide insight into how some third parties reflected on relevant events. Later scholarship will be referenced to fill in any necessary details not provided by the mentioned publications.

The Concept of Fatherhood

In South Africa, the study of fatherhood has seen rapid and insightful growth in the last couple of years, especially with the State of South Africa's Fathers reports coming out in 2018 and 2021. Van den Berg, Makusha and Ratele (2021:12-21), the second State of South African Fathers report brings several aspects of fatherhood to light which may contribute to the thesis presented in this paper. First, it highlights that fathers are "men that embody care", and do not necessarily refer to the biological father. Secondly, the aspects of care and involvement are not determined by co-residence or physical proximity of father and child. On the contrary "[w]hen emotional care is missing, physical presence may not make up for lack of involvement between parent and child." The function of father can be satisfied to some extent even if the father is physically absent for whatever reason.

The father metaphor is often used to refer to the person who is credited with founding or defining something, discovering something, or inventing something. Recognising someone as the father of a place, idea or ideology can be traced back to Greek times though it became more prominent during the Roman Empire (Stevenson, 1990:127). In Roman culture, the term "father" was used in contexts wider than merely the immediate family of an individual. It reflected the role of a person in society, politics and philosophy as the caretaker, protector, and authority. As such, the fatherhood metaphor is based on the traditional role ascribed to a *paterfamilia* as the one who seeded, protected, nurtured, developed, provided for, and had authority over that which he brought forth (Stevenson, 1990).

With many disciplines, fields, ideologies, and the likes, it would be an over-simplification to recognise only one individual as the "father" thereof. An example would be that Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle each had a significant role to play in the origins of modern philosophy, and no justice could be done in identifying one of them as the father of philosophy.

In the use of this "father" metaphor, the proverbial DNA of the father's thought should be evident in the very essence of what he brought forth. It is recognised that generational changes must be accepted, for no idea or ideology is fully formed and perfected from the beginning, yet the latest version should still have the most essential traces of the originator's ideas and vision recognisable, though it may be in a moderately modified form.

In the context of this paper, the fatherhood concepts involved with the Pentecostal Movement are in view, and the DNA, or essence of the unique doctrine that gave rise to the later Pentecostal Movement, will have to be considered.

A Concise Review of the 4 Views on Pentecostal Fatherhood

There are different views on who the father of Pentecostalism is. These views can generally be classified into the following categories.



Charles Parham as Father

Scholars such as Goff (1988:11) recognise Charles Parham as the father of the Pentecostal Movement. This is generally due to the events that occurred on 1 January 1901 when Agnes Ozman spoke in tongues while attending Parham's Bethel Bible School in Topeka Kansas, as well as Parham's establishment of the doctrine that tongues serve as initial evidence of Spirit Baptism. Anderson (2005:55), Espinosa (2014:11), and Synan (2001:4) acknowledge the view of Parham as the "father of Pentecostalism" in their work.²

William Seymour as Father

Some scholars view Seymour as the father of the Pentecostal movement. Parham's leadership position went almost unquestioned for many years. The significant contribution Seymour made was recognised by scholars who wished to correct the imbalance in recognition given to these men respectively, as well as to Parham's racist ideology and Seymour's distinct theology (Hamilton, 2013:27).

Kgatle (2020a:2), after considering a decolonised discourse on 4 possible contenders, concludes "that William Seymour is the true founder of the 20th century American Pentecostal Movement".³ Others who share the view of Seymour as father of the Pentecostal Movement are Anderson (2005), Espinosa (2014), Hamilton (2013), Lovett (1975), Nelson (1981) and Tinney (1978).

The Dual Fatherhood Theory

The dual fatherhood view seeks to harmonise the former and latter views by crediting both Parham and Seymour as the two fathers of Pentecostalism. Mofokeng (2022:80) seems to support this view when he recognises the role of both Parham and Seymour. Likewise, Orogun and Pillay (2021:4) claims, "Seymour, along with Charles Parham, could well be called the 'co-founders' of world Pentecostalism".

The Holy Spirit as Father

The first alternative view to Charles Parham as the father of the Pentecostal Movement was put forward while Parham was still in Los Angeles, opposing the manifestations he saw in the Azusa Street Mission. The November 1906 edition of the *Apostolic Faith* does not mention Parham at all and argues that the Holy Spirit is the leader of what was happening at the Azusa Mission. This is in stark opposition to his leadership being recognised in the September and October editions. This change was due to the confrontation between Parham on the one hand and Seymour and the Azusa Street Mission leadership on the other. The differences, which will be detailed later in this paper, were based on the very nature of the tongues practised there as well as other manifestations and worship practices which Parham did not agree with.

A Brief History of Events Relevant to the Rise of Pentecostalism

Charles Parham fell into disfavour with the Methodist denomination for holding to, amongst other views, annihilationism (Liardon, 2006:66; Nel, 2017b:5). He surrendered his licence and "left denominationalism forever", opposing the idea of denominational structures (Goff,

² It is recognised that some of these scholars oppose the view that Parham is the father of Pentecostalism.

³ The 4 contenders in Kgatle's view were Parham, Seymour, "The interracial origin that recognises both Charles F Parham and William Seymour as founders" and an option where no person or place is identifiable as the true origin of the emergence of American Pentecostalism.



1984:235; Parham, 1902:19). After five years of doing evangelistic work, Parham was led to open a Bible School in Topeka, Kansas (Parham, 1902:19).

Sarah Parham (1930:51-52) records that the students at the Bible School he opened in October of 1900 at Stones Folly in Topeka, Kansas, were tasked in late December with considering what the indisputable Bible evidence of Spirit baptism was. Their conclusion was “that they [those who were baptised with the Spirit] spake with other tongues” (Parham, 1930:52). On 1 January 1901, Agnes Ozman, one of the students at the school, requested that Parham lay hands on her so she could receive the gift of tongues, which would allow her to go abroad and minister in “foreign fields”⁴ (Parham, 1930:52). After initial uncertainty, because he had not had the experience himself, Parham agreed to lay hands on her and prayed that she receives the gift of tongues (Parham, 1930:52). Parham (1930:52-53) records that Agnes “began speaking in the Chinese language and was unable to speak English for three days.⁵ When she tried to write in English to tell us of her experience, she wrote the Chinese [sic], copies of which we still have in newspapers of that time.”⁶ Several newspapers reported on the event and published Ozman’s writing in what was claimed to be Chinese.⁷

Subsequently, other students at the school also received the gift of tongues. Parham considered tongues to be the indisputable initial evidence of Spirit baptism and started preaching and teaching that message (Hunter, 1998:190-191).⁸ From Parham’s perspective, the nature of the tongues spoken at Topeka was *xenolalic*, but other observers had different opinions, for example, Mr Riggins, a former member of the school, described the tongues as “jabbering a strange gibberish”, “gesticulating and using this strange and senseless language” and “senseless jargon” (Topeka Capital, 1901:np).

Some years later, in 1905, Parham’s ministry took him to Texas. Parham secured a building for a Bible Training School in Houston, Texas in December 1905 (Parham, 1930:135). An African American student, named William J. Seymour also attended the classes and was known for his humble attitude (Parham, 1930:137). Though Sarah Parham (1930:137) writes that Seymour “was given a place in the class” he was actually segregated from the rest of the class due to Jim Crow laws (Goff, 1988:10; Robeck, 2005:13). Parham’s services showed the same prejudice, since he “welcomed blacks, Indians, and Mexicans to his services, though always segregated from whites” (Espinosa, 2014:50).

Seymore was invited to minister in California in the early Spring of 1906 by Julia Hutchins, a female pastor of an African American Church of the Nazarene. Hutchins soon found some of Seymour’s teaching unacceptable and refused him access to minister further in her congregation, whereupon Richard and Ruth Asberry made their residence at 214, North Bonnie Brae Street available for services (Hayford, 2006:72; Hollenweger, 1972:22)⁹. It was

⁴ Evidently, the expectation was that Ozman’s tongues would be *xenolalic* in nature and she would be able to speak to the natives of “foreign fields” in their own language.

⁵ This claim by Parham stands opposed by Ozman (Later LaBarge) in her own testimony of occurrences at Stones Folly as she states “On January 2, some of us went down to Topeka to a mission. As we worshipped the Lord, I offered prayer in English and then prayed in another language in tongues” (Apostolic Faith April 1951). Parham claimed that for three days from January 1 Miss Ozman could not speak English while she herself claims to have prayed in English during that time. (See also Hayford 2006:59). In Ozman’s testimony recorded by Sarah Parham (1930:66) Ozman claimed to have spoken several languages, not just Chinese. See also MacArthur (2013:21) who points out several other discrepancies in Parham’s and Ozman’s versions of events.

⁶ Subsequently other cases of writing in tongues have been recorded as well. See Garr (The Apostolic Faith 1907a:1)

⁷ See *Topeka Daily Capital* 6 January 1901 and *St Louis Dispatch* 27 January 1901. The images printed in these publications do not closely resemble Ozman’s writing. A copy of her writing is provided at the end of this article.

⁸ Hunter points out that tongues as initial evidence may have been a view Parham held even before the experience of Agnes Ozman on January 1, 1901. As Goff (2001:120) points out, Parham has been exposed to speaking in tongues before it manifested at his Bible school, in Topeka.

⁹ Again, Hollenweger substitutes Terry for Hutchins.



during the services held here that Seymour himself received the baptism of the Holy Spirit and began speaking in tongues (Parham, 1930:162). Up until this point, the services held by Seymour in Los Angeles were only attended by African Americans, but at the Asberry residence, whites started attending as well (Espinosa, 2014:53). These interracial gatherings and communal worship across colour lines became a hallmark of the later Azusa Street Mission as well, as Seymour reported in the third edition of *The Apostolic Faith* (1906c:1) when he wrote that the “‘colorline’ was washed away in the blood”.

Attendance of services at 214 North Bonnie Brae Street grew rapidly and the need for a larger facility was clear. An old Methodist Church at 312 Azusa Street was secured and Seymour ran his Mission from there (Hollenweger, 1972:22). The rapidly growing ministry had drawn the attention of the media and soon many newspaper articles reported on it with mixed reviews.

The Azusa Street Mission’s own publications, *The Apostolic Faith* (1901a; 1901b) reflected a *xenolalic* view of the gift of tongues with a strong missionary goal, as did Parham in books and articles he published. Seymour was however also confronted with manifestations with which he needed Parham’s assistance and wrote letters to that effect, calling on him to come to Los Angeles and lead the revival that was happening there (Parham, 1930:148). His letter dated 27 August 1906 seems to indicate that he still considered Parham his mentor (Parham, 1930:154-155). He also acknowledged Parham as a mentor in some services as K Browler recorded when stating “Mr. Seymour stated how God had wonderfully healed a little man, who taught him that blessed truth he was preaching here in Los Angeles” (Parham, 1930:162).

Parham left Zion City in late October travelling to Los Angeles in answer to Seymour’s call for assistance (Parham, 1930:160). Browler recorded that:

Seymour introduced Chas. F. Parham to the Azusa people as his 'Father in this gospel of the Kingdom'; and all wanted to see the 'father' of the black son. This stirred up the devil in a great shape; satan's servants who had been at work in the mission in great power, saw their destruction. The next day he closed the door against his 'father'. (Parham, 1930:162-163)

This radical change in Seymour’s estimation of Parham had to be caused by a significant and considerable difference of opinion on what was happening at the Azusa Street Mission.

Parham did not consider the Azusa Street manifestations as biblical because, in his estimation, it did not correlate with the Acts 2 narrative at all. Parham described what he saw at the Azusa Street Mission as “manifestations of the flesh, spiritualistic controls” and “hypnotism”. He reported that “After preaching two or three times, I was informed by two of the elders, one who was a hypnotist (I had seen him lay his hands on many who came through chattering, jabbering and sputtering, speaking in no language at all) that I was not wanted in that place” (Parham, 1930:163).

According to Sarah Parham, after this altercation with Charles Parham, Seymour sought to indicate that the Azusa Street Mission was where the baptism with the Holy Spirit fell (Parham 1930:163). He however already acknowledged Parham’s leadership and the true origins of the Pentecostal Spirit baptism in his first edition of *The Apostolic Faith*¹⁰, and in subsequent editions again related the story of Agnes Ozman and other Topeka students speaking in tongues (The Apostolic Faith, 1906b:1).

¹⁰ Parham is referred to as “God’s leader in the Apostolic Faith Movement” and stated “[t]his work began about five years ago last January when a company of people under the leadership of Chas. Parham, who were studying God’s word, tarried for Pentecost in Topeka, Kan.” on the front page of the *Apostolic Faith* paper printed by the Azusa Street Mission (The Apostolic Faith 1906a:1). The occurrences in Topeka, Kansas in 1901 are detailed on the same page. It is contextually evident that Azusa leadership initially considered themselves as a continuation of that original outpouring.



The November issue of *the Apostolic Faith* (1906c:1) stated that “the Holy Ghost is the leader” of the revival and Parham is not mentioned once in the whole edition. Critics of the new Pentecostal Movement quickly picked up on this change of leadership and used it to ridicule the fledgeling Movement as is evidenced by the cartoon published in *The Burning Bush*, the Metropolitan Church Association’s¹¹ muckraking newspaper (Martin, 2004:138).¹²

Parham wrote a note of warning in December 1906, which was published in the *Apostolic Faith* periodical in Zion City in January which stated among other things that “[n]ever were God’s servants surrounded with more deceptive counterfeits of real divine experience than in this day and age; and never was it more imperative that all should stand firm and steadfast for the truth.” (Parham, 1930:166-167). He was fundamentally opposed to the nature of the manifestation practised at the Azusa Street Mission and expressed his opposition publicly, calling it a fake, counterfeit work. The primary point of contention was the nature of the manifestations at Azusa.

After having been ejected from the Azusa Street Mission, Parham conducted meetings at the Temperance Temple in Los Angeles and sought to distinguish his ministry from what was happening in Azusa Street. Parham, whose services were known for its orderly conduct, sought to distance himself from the frantic, disorderly manifestations which characterised the Azusa Street Mission (and much of the later Pentecostal Movement), which on many occasions would lead to the police removing the assembly from town limits (Shumway, 1919:13).

Parham was unmoved from the xenolalic view for the rest of his life, but the Azusa Street Mission group and “early Pentecostals had to look again at what the New Testament teaches” (Nel, 2017a:2). The manifestations that occurred were accepted as valid, legitimate, and true, and led to a re-evaluation of the function of the gift of tongues. It was at this point that its use for personal praise and worship, rather than for missionary purposes, started to be emphasised (Buzenits, 2014:63-84).

Seymour quickly became disillusioned by what he had seen among tongues practitioners. Not long after the rift with Parham, Seymour was no longer convinced that speaking in tongues was the only evidence of Spirit Baptism. This may have been because Parham manifested the gift of tongues but not the character and demeanour associated with the fruits of the Spirit. In September 1907 Seymour wrote:

Tongues are one of the signs that go with every baptized person, but it is not the real evidence of the baptism in the everyday life. Your life must measure with the fruits of the Spirit. If you get angry, or speak evil, or backbite, I care not how many tongues you may have, you have not the baptism with the Holy Spirit. You have lost your salvation. You need the Blood in your soul. (The Apostolic Faith, 1907b:2)

In Seymour’s first edition of *The Apostolic Faith* (1906a:2) it stated: “The Baptism with the Holy Ghost is a gift of power upon the sanctified life; so when we get it we have the same evidence as the Disciples received on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:3,4), in speaking in new tongues.” In 1915 he drafted a document which contained the ‘Doctrines and Disciplines’ of his congregation. In it he stated:

The Speaking in tongues being one of the ‘signs following’ the baptized believers and other evidences of the Bible, casting out devils, healing the sick and with the fruits of the Spirit accompanying the signs. (Martin, 2000:48)

¹¹ The MCA was also known as the Burning Bush Movement due to the newspaper’s notoriety (Martin 2004).

¹² See the cartoon at the end of this chapter.



And he later continues:

When we set up tongues to be the Bible evidence of baptism in the Holy Ghost and fire only, we have left the divine word of God and have instituted our own teaching - While tongues is one of the signs that follows God's Spirit-filled children, they will have to know the truth and do the truth. (Martin, 2000:81)

Seymour realised that many tongues practitioners lacked any long-term change in their lives which was indicative of a lack of the Spirit in their lives (Nel 2017,a:2). He realised that the fruit of the Spirit, rather than the gift of tongues, was evidence of Spirit baptism. Nonetheless, the glossolalic manifestation evidenced at Azusa Street became the norm throughout Pentecostalism and spread worldwide, and is still held as the primary evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Evaluating the Evidence

Parham's view of the nature of tongues as a xenolalic manifestation which empowers the recipient to do missionary work, remained the same throughout his ministry. Even in the face of mounting evidence that the tongues spoken at Topeka and elsewhere because of his ministry, were not intelligible language, Parham continued to promote in sermons, books and reports to the media, that these manifestations were intelligible human languages meant to empower the receiver for missionary objectives. He seems to have been in denial about the nature of tongues that manifested in and from his ministry, for time and again it was shown not to be xenolalia.

Parham's primary objection to the manifestations at the Azusa Street Mission was that the tongues were "chattering", "jabbering" or "sputtering", "speaking in no language at all", served no missionary purpose and therefore did not align with the biblical manifestation. He had secondary concerns about the unruly and mixed worship style which may have been motivated, in part at least, by racist sentiments he seems to have held. Racism was never a claim made against Parham by the Azusa Street Mission leadership when he was alive. The conflict centred around the nature of the gift of tongues practised there, and was, therefore, a theological conflict, not racial conflict.

On the other hand, Seymour, who initially promoted the gift of tongues as xenolalic and highlighted the missionary value it held, later supported and promoted the glossolalic manifestations typically experienced at the Azusa Street Mission. Some months after his fallout with Parham, he stated that he does not hold to the view that receiving the gift of tongues is the evidence of Spirit Baptism, which is a fundamental tenet of Pentecostal theology.

Neither in Parham's ministry, nor in the ministry of Seymour were the believers gifted with xenolalic tongues as both initially insisted it should be. None of the tongues practised at Parham's Topeka and Houston Bible schools, nor the Azusa Street manifestations, were ever shown to be xenolalia. Foundational to Parham's doctrine of initial evidence was xenolalic tongues as described in Acts 2. Parham did not recognise the Azusa Street manifestations, which permeate Pentecostalism today, as the authentic and legitimate re-occurrence of the biblical gift of tongues. Regardless of his founding of the theology of tongues as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism, his rejection of glossolalic tongues eliminates him from recognition as the spiritual father of the Movement known for that manifestation. If indeed he was to be proposed as Father of Pentecostalism, the father abandoned the child in its infancy because the child did not carry his "genes", effectively rendering the Movement fatherless.

The Seymour stream sought to re-interpret the function of the gift of tongues, abandoning the xenolalic view in favour of a glossolalic understanding. The use of the gift as a devotional language for prayer and worship was promoted in the *Apostolic Faith* and other Pentecostal publications and became the norm in the worldwide Pentecostal Movement. Seymour also



distanced himself from the Azusa Street manifestation, though not for the same reason as Parham. To Seymore the objection was not the nature of the tongues, but rather the view that tongues is the evidence of Spirit baptism. He subscribed to the idea that one could indeed speak in tongues without having the Holy Spirit and therefore “it is not the real evidence of the baptism” (The Apostolic Faith, 1907b:2). This severs Seymore from the Pentecostal belief that speaking in tongues constitute evidence of Spirit baptism, which should eliminate him from consideration as the legitimate father of Pentecostalism. Again, the divergence in DNA renders the paternity test negative.

The above would make the view that Parham and Seymore share credit for fathering the movement untenable since they held incompatible views on the nature of tongues as well as whether tongues is evidence of Spirit baptism. Parham rejects the nature of the contemporary Pentecostal manifestation while Seymore rejects arguably the fundamental tenant of contemporary Pentecostalism, tongues as the sign of Spirit baptism. This view leaves Pentecostalism twice abandoned.

Lastly, the idea promoted by Seymore and his fellow Azusa Street leaders that the Lord was the leader of the Movement is a noble attempt at solving the glaring problem the Azusa Street Mission leadership faced after having promoted Parham as leader initially. It would not only draw attention away from the Topeka origins they previously recognised but also undercut any authority of Parham as both mentor of Seymour and originator of the initial evidence doctrine, thus neutralising his opposition to the Azusa Street manifestations. Promoting this position would also imply that Parham was opposing God himself by denying the validity of the Azusa Street manifestations. The motivation for this view seems to have been to address a crisis, rather than earnest belief. They had no problem recognising a human as leader (father) before the crisis hit.

Conclusion

There are significant reasons to reject Parham and Seymour, collectively, as fathers of the Pentecostal Movement. These two men held opposing views on the nature of the gift of tongues and the accompanying manifestations. Though Parham’s racist tendencies most likely did contribute to his objections to what he encountered at Azusa Street, no such claims were lodged against him, which likely indicates that the main objections were theological in nature.

Parham as an individual does not qualify as father of the Pentecostal Movement. Although he was the originator of the initial evidence doctrine, he rejected the manifestation of tongues featured at the Azusa Street Mission, which is still practised in the Pentecostal Movement to this day. He most assuredly would not recognise the “evidence” accompanying the contemporary manifestation as the evidence he believed the Bible referred to. He showed no care for, and wanted no involvement with, the manifestations of Azusa Street which he believed was a deceptive counterfeit of the real baptism of the Holy Spirit. With no care and involvement in the later Movement, and an active drive to distance himself from it, Parham showed that he was not inclined to self-identify as the father of the movement. He would likely have considered such a title as an insult when considering his reaction to its most recognisable manifestation at that time.

In Seymour’s case, recognising him as the father of Pentecostalism is also problematic. Though he admittedly was not the originator of the initial evidence doctrine, he still embraced it and taught it. He seems not to have had any problem with the tongues manifestation at the Azusa Street Mission, though some associated manifestations were cause for concern. He showed fatherly care and involvement in the development and growth of the Movement to the point of being willing to reject his mentor to do so. He, however, recanted his view that the gift of tongues is the evidence of Holy Spirit baptism. He therefore opposed a central tenet of Pentecostalism which would disqualify him from being considered father of the Movement.

The Azusa Street leadership started promoting the idea of the Holy Spirit as the leader of the Movement to address the conflict they had with Parham and their previous recognition of him as leader. It could be concluded that they attempted to rise above the conflict and called to on a Higher Power for resolution of the matter. Be that as it may, this view seems to have been born from necessity, rather than anything else.

God works through human agents of whom many who are seen, at least by some in Christendom, to have been inspired by the Holy Spirit. These men are recognised as fathers of the theology they gave life to.¹³ It seems like every doctrine in theology could then by right be ascribed to the Holy Spirit and no individual should be recognised as father of any doctrine that is believed to have come from God. In today's world it may be prudent to move away from the concept of fatherhood altogether as it may well be branded as a remnant of the patriarchal system and therefore considered offensive.



Agnes Ozman's "Chinese" writing (Topeka Daily Capital 1901:2)



Cartoon from the 21 February 1907 edition of *The Burning Bush* (Martin 2004:138)

¹³ Think Protestantism, Dispensationalism, Calvinism or any other theology that has a person recognised as father of the doctrine.



References

- Anderson, A. (2005). The Dubious Legacy of Charles Parham: Racism and Cultural Insensitivities among Pentecostals, *PNEUMA*, 27 (1), 51-64.
- Apostolic Faith, (1906a). Pentecost has Come, *The Apostolic Faith*, 1(1), September.
- Apostolic Faith, (1906b). Pentecostal Baptism Restored. *The Apostolic Faith*, 1(2), October.
- Apostolic Faith, (1906c). Bible Pentecost. *The Apostolic Faith*, 1(3), November.
- Apostolic Faith, (1907). Bible Pentecost. *The Apostolic Faith*, 2(9), September.
- Apostolic Faith, (1951). Personal Testimony of being the first person to Receive the Holy Ghost at "Stones Folly" in Topeka, Kansas. (January 1, 1901). *The Apostolic Faith*, April.
- Espinosa, G. (2014). *William J. Seymour and the Origins of Global Pentecostalism: a Biography and Documentary History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Goff, J. R. (1984). Charles F. Parham and His Role in the Development of the Pentecostal Movement: A Re-evaluation, *Kansas History*, 7, 226-237.
- Goff, J. R. (1988). *Fields White unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.
- Gundry, R. H. (1966). Ecstatic Utterance (N.E.B.)? *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 17(2), 299-307.
- Hamilton, B. C. (2013). *The Spirit in Black and White. Early Twentieth-Century Pentecostals and Race Relations, 1905-1945*. (PhD Diss., Rice University)
- Hayford, J. W. (2006). *The Charismatic Century: The Enduring Impact of the Azusa Street Revival*. New York, NY: Hachette Book Group.
- Hollenweger, W. J. (1972). *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing.
- Kansas City Times. (1906). Parham's New Religion Practiced at 'Stone's Folly. *Kansas City Times*. January 27.
- Kgatle, M. S. (2020a). Decolonial Discourse on the Origins of the 20th Century American Pentecostal Movement, *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 46(1).
- Kgatle, M. S. (2020b). 'Spirit baptism and the doctrine of initial evidence in African Pentecostal Christianity: A critical analysis', *HTS Theologiese Studies/ Theological Studies*, 76(1), a5796. [https://doi.org/ 10.4102/hts.v76i1.5796](https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i1.5796).
- Los Angeles Times, (1906). *Weird Babble of Tongues*. 18 April.
- Lovett, L. (1975). Black Origins of the Pentecostal Movement, in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.
- Martin, L. (ed.) (2000). *Doctrines and Disciplines of the Azusa Street Apostolic Faith Mission of Los Angeles, California*. Joplin, MO: Christian Life Books.
- Martin, L. (ed.) (2004). *Skeptics and Scoffers: The Religious World Looks at Azusa Street: 1906 - 1907*. Pensacola, FL: Christian Life Books.
- McArthur, J. F. (2013). *Strange fire: The danger of offending the Holy Spirit with counterfeit worship*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.



- Nel, M. (2016a). Rather Spirit-filled than learned! Pentecostalism's tradition of anti-intellectualism and Pentecostal theological scholarship, *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 37(1).
- Nel, M. (2016b). Development of Theological Training and Hermeneutics in Pentecostalism: A Historical Perspective and Analysis, *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 42(2), 191–207.
- Nel, M. (2017a). 'The Pentecostal Movement's view of the continuity of tongues in Acts and 1 Corinthians', *In die Skriflig*, 51(1), a2198. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v51i1.2198>
- Nel, M. (2017b). 'Pentecostal Theology' as *Contradicto in Terminis*: A Perspective on the Past and Present. *Scriptura*, 116(1), 1-13.
- Nelson, D. J. (1981). *For Such a Time as This: The Story of Bishop William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival, a Search for Pentecostal/Charismatic Roots*, (Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham).
- Parham, C. F. (1902). *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness*. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College.
- Parham, C. F. (1911). *The Everlasting Gospel*. Baxter Springs, KS: The Apostolic Bible College.
- Parham, S. (1930). *The Life of Charles F. Parham: Founder of the Apostolic Faith*. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College.
- Robeck, C. M. (1988). The Gift of Tongues. G. W. Bromily (ed). *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids, Ill: Eerdmans, 871-874.
- Robeck, C. M. (2005). The Past: Historical Roots of Racial Unity and Division in American Pentecostalism, In *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal and Charismatic Research*, 14. Accessed on 28 November 2019. <<http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj14/robeck.html>>.
- Shumway, C. W. (1919). *A Critical History of Glossolalia*. PhD Thesis. Boston University.
- St Louis Dispatch, (1901). New Sect in Kansas Speaks with Strange Tongues. *St Louis Dispatch* January.
- Stevenson, T.R. (1990). *The emperor as "father" in the ideology of the Roman principate*. PhD Thesis, University of Sydney. <http://hdl.handle.net/2123/6644>.
- Synan, V. (1997). *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Synan, V. (ed) (2001). *A Century of the Holy Spirit. 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Tinney, J.S. (1978). William J. Seymour: the Father of Modern-Day Pentecostalism, in *Black Apostles: Afro-American Clergy Confront the Twentieth Century*, eds. Randall K. Burkett and Richard Newman. Boston, MA: G. K. Hall & Co.
- Topeka Daily Capital. (1901). Specimen of Miss Auswin's Handwriting Which the Apostolic Bretheren Claim is Inspired by God Himself. *The Topeka Daily Capital*, 6 January, p. 2.
- Topeka Daily Capital. (1901). A Queer Faith. *The Topeka Daily Capital*, 14 January. No page.
- Topeka State Journal. (1901). Hindoo and Zulu. *Topeka State Journal*. January 9.
- Van den Berg, W. & Makusha, T. (Eds.) (2018). *State of South African Fathers' Report*. Sonke Gender Justice and Human Sciences Research Council.



Van den Berg, W., Makusha, T. & Ratele, K. (Eds.) (2021). *State of South Africa's Fathers 2021*. Cape Town/Stellenbosch: Sonke Gender Justice, Human Sciences Research Council, & Stellenbosch University, pp 12-20.

Whittier Daily News, (1906). "Apostolic Faith People Here Again, *Whittier Daily News* 13 December, pp. 1.

Conflict of Interest Statement: *The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*



This article is open-access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence
The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.