Separate but Non-Sectarian: The Salvation Army's Place in the History of Wesleyan Ecclesial Division

James E. Pedlar

The first half of the nineteenth century was a tumultuous time for British Wesleyans. Wesleyan Methodism began to splinter very soon after Wesley's death, beginning with the Methodist New Connexion in 1797, and small secessions such as the so-called "Kirkgate Screamers" in Leeds, 1805 and the Band-Room Methodists in Manchester, 1806. These splits were followed by the emergence of the Primitive Methodists in 1811 and the Bible Christians in 1815. The short-lived Tent Methodists formed in 1822, and the carnage continued with the infamous "Leeds organ case," which led to the establishment of the Protestant Methodist Connexion in 1828. In 1835 that body joined with the newly-formed Wesleyan Association, which had emerged in opposition the Wesleyan Methodist Conference's plan to establish a theological institution with Jabez Bunting as President. The heterodox Arminian Methodist Connexion emerged in Derbyshire in the early 1830s, only to have most of its membership join the Wesleyan Methodist Association in 1837. These secessions were dwarfed numerically by the exodus from the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion in the 1850s after the infamous Fly Sheets controversy. Some of these discontented Methodists eventually found their way into the Wesleyan Reform

James E. Pedlar is Assistant Professor of Wesley Studies and Theology at Tyndale University College and Seminary in Toronto, Canada

Union and others joined with the Wesleyan Methodist Association to form
the United Methodist Free Churches in 1857. William and Catherine Booth
were caught up in some of these controversies, throwing their lot in with the
Wesleyan Reformers during the 1850s for a brief time, before moving on to
Congregationalism and eventually settling in the New Connexion. All of these
schisms, of course, are limited to the Wesleyan family of churches in Britain.
We could go on to survey the many divisions of Methodism in North America
over issues of polity, slavery, and, holiness revivalism.[1]

   The splintering of nineteenth century Wesleyanism was so pervasive that
it is rather difficult to sort out the various bodies. The fact that many of these
groups later merged back into united Methodist denominations further muddies
the waters. In his 1968 book, *Methodism Divided: A Study in the Sociology
of Ecumenicalism*, Robert Currie attempted to clarify the developments by
providing a two-fold typology of British Wesleyan division, categorizing
denominations as either constitutionalist "secessions" or revivalist "offshoots."
So, he described the New Connexion, Protestant Methodists, Wesleyan
Methodist Association, and Methodist Reformers as "secessions," and the
Band Room Methodists, the Primitive Methodists, the Bible Christians, Tent
Methodists and Arminian Methodists as "offshoots." The secessions developed
over a longer period of time through a period of extended controversy, were
usually led by Ministers, and were composed mainly of Wesleyan membership,
whereas the offshoots developed more quickly, were normally led by Wesleyan
laypersons or lay-ministers, and attracted more non-Wesleyan membership.[2]

   While Currie's analysis is sociological, it also reflects the way those in the
"offshoot" camp drew on some of these distinctions in defending themselves
theologically against the charge of schism. For example, when Hugh Bourne,
co-founder of the Primitive Methodist Connexion, wrote the first history of that
denomination in 1823, one of his chief objectives was to defend the new body
against the charge of schism. His main tactic was to stress that he had never
intended to separate, nor to take members away from the Wesleyans, but rather
to establish "a new thing" in areas where Wesleyans had not been at work.[3]
Likewise, William O'Bryan, founder of the Bible Christians, stressed that before
his expulsion he had "established preaching in eight different parishes on the
north coast of Cornwall, in most of which promising Societies were formed."[4]

In many ways The Salvation Army fits Currie's pattern of an "offshoot" and shares many traits with these revivalist bodies. It was not formed out of an immediate secession from another Christian body. In fact, because William and Catherine Booth had been operating as independent evangelists since 1861, the relationships between the early Christian Mission and other religious bodies were even more tangential than they were in most other Wesleyan offshoots. Another similarity is that Booth, O'Bryan, and Bourne all broke ties with established Wesleyan bodies because they were operating as freelance evangelists, or wanting to operate as such. In all three cases a loosely organized revival operating alongside the established denominations provided the network and organization that would develop into a denomination. We see this pattern repeated also in later holiness denominations, many of which emerged out of holiness and camp meeting associations.[5] Salvationists defended their new movement using many of the same arguments that were used by other revivalists, arguing that the founders never intended to start a new denomination and they gained most of their members through new evangelistic work rather than "sheep-stealing."

What makes The Salvation Army unique is that Salvationists continued to maintain that they were *not* another denomination, even after they had clearly established themselves as an autonomous body and even when it was clear that their members had no church home outside of The Salvation Army. The unique self-understanding of the movement is indicative of the profound ambiguity in early Salvationist ecclesiology. William Booth claimed his Army was a missionary agency, not a Christian denomination. However, the Army's autonomy meant that it took on the functions of a "church" from an early point in its history. Booth added to the ambiguity by sometimes claiming that his movement and its offices were in no way inferior to any other church or body of clergy. In what follows I will sketch out some of the main features of William Booth's ecclesiology, beginning with more general convictions and concluding with the question of the Army's own ecclesial status. Although the early Salvation Army's ecclesial status was unique and idiosyncratic, it was built upon common assumptions shared by other Wesleyan revivalists in the nineteenth century. Thus, it throws into sharp relief many of the challenges facing nineteenth century Wesleyan ecclesiology.

An "Unsectarian" Ideal

Early Salvationists combined high expectations for "genuine" Christianity with open-heartedness toward true Christians across the denominational spectrum. According to Roger Green, Booth believed the universal Church was composed of all believers who had experienced justification by faith and who witnessed to Christ in word and deed.[6] Salvationists saw themselves as part of the Church, and never claimed that they alone *were* the true Church. They aimed to avoid controversy with other denominations in matters of Christian faith and practice, and saw the salvation experience as something which transcended theological differences. So Catherine Booth wrote in 1883: "We believe God cares very little about our sectarian differences and divisions. The great main thing is the love of God and the service of humanity; and when we find people actuated by this motive, we love them by whatever name they are called."[7] William Booth claimed that by not holding membership in any church, Salvationists were "non-sectarian" and could "promote general godliness and harmony" and "avoid as the very poison of hell all controverted questions."[8]

To a certain extent, the Booths could claim to be following the example of John Wesley, who admired genuine Christians from across the denominational spectrum, including those who he believed to be in serious doctrinal error.[9] However, it would be wrong to suggest that Wesley or the Booths were completely indifferent about theology. William Booth tenaciously upheld fundamental evangelical doctrines, and would follow Wesley in affirming that theological diversity was inevitable and acceptable, provided these diverse views did not undercut the soteriological core of the Christian faith. Similarly, both Wesley and Booth would prioritize the transformative experience of faith in Christ over orthodoxy for its own sake. William Booth explicitly claimed that his non-sectarian vision for the Army was rooted in his Wesleyanism, and even suggested that Salvationists could succeed where Wesley had failed in this regard.[10] His ambition was that the Army would "spread far and wide a spirit of love and hearty co-operation" and "lessen the dividing walls of sectarianism."[11]

These anti-sectarian convictions also enabled early Salvationists to support common missionary efforts among those who shared a vibrant evangelical faith. They were true to the spirit of nineteenth century revivalism, which presupposed that evangelical Protestants shared enough ground to work together on revival

campaigns and "home missions." Extra-denominational mission agencies were common, and revivalists saw such bodies not as "churches" but as missionary organizations that advanced the kingdom alongside local churches.[12] When William Booth addressed the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in 1880, he would explicitly identify the Army as one of these extra-denominational mission agencies. They were not interested in setting up a church, but establishing a mission to the unchurched. "We do not fish in other people's waters. We are not chargeable with that…No, we get our converts out of the gutters, we fish them out of the slush and slime."[13]

Victorian evangelicals cooperated in missionary activity because they viewed Christian unity as a "spiritual" or "invisible" reality. This understanding of unity is evident in the founding of such bodies as the Evangelical Alliance (1847).[14] As John Read notes, similar convictions were held by such leaders as Congregationalist David Thomas, who had an important impact on the Booths.[15] But such comfort with denominational separation could lead to a seeming lack of concern for ecclesiological questions in general. A telling example is seen in New Connexion theologian William Cooke's *Christian Theology, Explained and Defended* (1848), a standard theology text in that denomination. Cooke was William Booth's teacher as Booth studied for ministry in the New Connexion. This text works its way systematically through Christian doctrine, with nine of eighteen chapters focused on soteriology, and one on Christian ministry, but it has no chapter on the church.[16] Likewise, Cooke's *Catechism* contains only a one-sentence definition of the church and a one-sentence answer to the question, "Who is the head of the church?," both of which are dealt with at the very end of a chapter on the means of grace which focuses most of its attention on sacramental questions.[17]

Cooke's theology text is an extreme illustration of Friedrich Schleiermacher's famous comparison between Protestant and Catholic ecclesiology: "Protestantism makes the individual's relation to the Church dependent upon his relation to Christ, while Catholicism, contrariwise, makes the individual's relation to Christ dependent on his relation to the Church."[18] The institutional life of the Church was relativized and downgraded in significance in relation to its true "spiritual" or invisible nature. The Salvation Army began in this context with a plan to act as a non-sectarian and revivalistic home mission

movement, and the early Salvationists' lack of concern regarding their ecclesial status should be seen against this background.

Participatory Postmillennial Pragmatism

William Booth's understanding of the church was also built upon his high view of human participation in God's work of redemption. He believed Christians were truly divine agents, playing an essential role in God's plan to establish his kingdom on earth. According to Roger Green, "the one true sign of the Church" for Booth was "participation in the work of redemption, both personal redemption and, after 1889, social redemption, leading ultimately to the establishment of the kingdom of God."[19] Booth's postmillennial eschatology fueled his robust understanding of human agency. As ardent postmillennialists, the Booths believed that the Church had the means to usher in the worldwide triumph of the gospel prior to the cataclysmic intervention of the second coming.[20] Like many nineteenth century evangelicals, they lived expectantly, believing that the dawn of the millennium was almost upon them and that it was time for the Church to mobilize for the final advance of the gospel. Since the millennium loomed on the horizon, the institutional forms of the Church were relativized and given a subordinate position in relation to the function they might serve in this grand mission.

The Booths were also strong supporters of the "new measures" revivalism associated with the ministries of Charles Finney and James Caughey.[21] The Army creatively developed a wide variety of novel means to bring sinners to a saving knowledge of Christ. William Booth had a Biblicist view of Christian practice and little sense of being bound by Christian tradition. This meant that the development of new methods was "very desirable... supposing that such are *in accordance with the great doctrines and principles taught in the Bible.*"[22] Booth even admitted that he believed the church was in competition with secular forms of entertainment, and needed to offer something exciting and different to the masses.[23] The unique and novel institutional forms and evangelistic methods of The Salvation Army emerged out of this set of views and assumptions about church and mission.

William Booth believed the Holy Spirit had a key role in leading God's people to develop unusual and novel means of spreading the gospel. He emphasized the

Spirit's empowering work, as did with his Wesleyan-Holiness contemporaries. He also saw the outpouring of the Spirit as an eschatological sign, a conviction which would become a hallmark of Pentecostalism in the following generation (albeit modulated into a premillennial key).[24] The millennial reign of Christ, according to Booth, would be "preceded by further and mightier outpourings of the Holy Ghost than yet known," and thus global evangelization would "be carried on with greater vigor, although, in substance, on the same lines as those on which the apostles fought and died."[25] A golden age of gospel influence over the whole world was possible *now* if the Church would rise up and fulfill its mandate in the power of the Spirit.

The Church *per se*, however, did not feature prominently in Booth's expectant vision. The millennial kingdom would arrive as the "throne of righteousness" was "set up in the hearts of men" who were wholly sanctified by "the power and operation of the Holy Spirit."[26] The progression of the work of redemption began with the Spirit's work in individuals and moved to the advent of the millennium as believers lived holy lives and reversed the curse of sin in the world through their influence.[27] "Just in proportion as these principles triumph in the hearts and consciences of men will millennial blessedness prevail."[28] Even more explicitly, Booth could speak of how Salvationists hasten the coming millennium by spreading the principles of "that millennial kingdom which God has already established in his own heart."[29]

In summary, early Salvation Army ecclesiology was shaped by revivalistic pragmatism, expectant Spirit-centred postmillennial missionary urgency, and an "unsectarian" vision for the Church. All of this was undergirded by common Protestant evangelical presuppositions about the priority of spiritual unity over institutional unity and continuity. The practices and institutions that gave shape to church life were seen as merely functional in relation to mission of evangelism, and the existence of separated denominations was not seen as a hindrance to the mission, except insofar as "sectarian" attachment to one's own traditions might become a barrier to innovation in mission.[30]

"…separate from, going before, coming after, and all round about…"

With this set of ecclesiological assumptions in place we can discuss the matter of the Army's ambiguous ecclesial status. William Booth did not want his organization to become entangled in churchly trappings, and insisted that the Army was a missionary agency. In many ways, he could claim that there were precedents in the various voluntary societies that had existed alongside the churches in England since the late seventeenth century. The notable difference was that members of those societies were also members of some regular church body; otherwise the lines between specialized voluntary society and denomination would be blurred. Booth wanted to carve out a unique space for the Army on the ecclesiological map. It was to be an autonomous mission, independent of all the churches, both as an institution and in terms of the church membership of its soldiery.[31] As noted above, like the leaders of other "offshoots," Booth claimed that the Army was not competing with denominations or engaging in "sheep stealing." Their original goal was to convert people and send them to the churches, but their converts were not comfortable in the churches, nor were they well received.[32] The story of rejected converts comes from the early history of the Christian Mission, meaning that, from an early date, the Mission's converts made their spiritual home in the Mission and not in the churches. Thus, Harold Hill argues that "the point at which the Mission became the de facto community of faith for its adherents probably came earlier rather than later, probably 1867," and that by 1878 it was functioning as a denomination, although Salvationists continued to deny such a characterization.[33]

The Salvation Army may have been functioning like a denomination in 1878, but its status would seem to have been far from settled in the mind of William Booth, given the negotiations that he undertook with the Church of England in 1882. The fact that these discussions even took place (and had been preceded by discussions with other bodies)[34] is evidence of the lingering questions about the Army's ecclesial status, both inside and outside the movement. On the Army side, the question of permanent autonomy from other churches was still undecided. The talks did not progress very far, bumping up against several issues, the first of which was Booth's autocracy, followed by questions concerning

doctrine, sacramental ambiguities, women in leadership, emotionalism, and irreverence in worship.[35]

Throughout the negotiations, Booth had continued to maintain that he was not founding another church, but an Army. By the time the talks fell apart Booth had become even more confident that he must protect the Army's autonomy and independence in order to ensure its future effectiveness. His own autocratic authority was non-negotiable, since it was "necessary for the effectiveness of our War."[36] Of course, a redoubled emphasis on his movement's identity as "an Army" did not resolve the movement's ambiguous ecclesial status. The negotiations were an opportunity for Booth to bring theological clarity to his understanding of the Army, but as Roger Green has noted, his "lack of an ecclesiology" hindered him as he faced this important juncture.[37]

William Booth wrote his 1883 "New Years Address to Officers" announcing the discontinuation of sacramental observance while the talks with the Church of England were unraveling.[38] In his oft-quoted and somewhat tentative statement about sacraments, one of the reasons he proposed for ceasing observance was that "we are not professing to be a church, nor aiming at being one, but simply a force for aggressive salvation purposes."[39] However, the fact that Booth also recognized that the Army was functioning as a church home is evident in the fact that he simultaneously announced that he was planning to introduce a "formal service for the dedication of children," to enable parents to "introduce their children to The Army."[40] As Norman Murdoch notes, "While rejecting the church's sacraments, the army [sic] was producing its own."[41]

It is no coincidence that in the same "New Year's Address" Booth dealt directly with the question of the Army's ecclesial status. Although he admitted that some people were "very much perplexed" and "quite anxious and agitated" about the Army's relationship to the churches, Booth claimed he felt no anxiety about the matter.[42] He told the story of being at a meeting of church leaders when he was struck by an epiphany, "as if a voice from heaven had said and is still saying, that we are to be an Army, *separate from, going before, coming after, and all round about the various existing Churches.*"[43] The churches, he concluded, should relate to the Army as something akin to the Fire Brigade. "You cheer them on, encourage them, subscribe to their funds, go to their assemblages and bless them. We say, 'Do the same with us.'"[44] Booth was

setting forth a vision of the Army as missionary "first responders" who were on the front lines of relieving misery and furthering the coming of God's kingdom.

Thus, by 1883 Booth had crystallized his vision of the Army as a body "separate from, going before, coming after, and all round about" the churches – part of the universal Church and working alongside denominational churches, but standing apart as a unique body. However, Booth wanted the Army to be seen not only as "separate," but as "separate but equal," and some of his statements in this regard add further ambiguity to the Army's status. Eason and Green draw attention to Booth's 1888 claim that the Army had "six thousand two hundred and seventeen clergymen and clergywomen."[45] Bramwell Booth quotes his father making a statement that goes even further.

> The Salvation Army is not inferior in spiritual character to any Christian organization in existence. We are in no wise dependent on the Church...We are, I consider, equal every way and everywhere to any other Christian organization on the face of the earth (i) in spiritual authority, (ii) in spiritual intelligence, (iii) in spiritual functions. We hold 'the keys' as truly as any Church in existence.[46]

Eason and Green rightly note that this "was not the language of a mission seeking to funnel converts into the larger church."[47]

In spite of the tensions in his statements, Booth seems to have seen the Army as a peculiar and unique kind of body, perhaps something like a religious order, as Harold Hill has argued.[48] Nevertheless, it was different from a religious order in that the Army was fulfilling the functions of a church for its soldiery and understood itself to be on an equal footing to the established churches. When given a chance to resolve this tension by becoming an agency of the Church of England Booth rejected the possibility, but did not take the logical step of embracing a denominational status. The sacramental question must be understood as a reflection of this broader ecclesiological ambiguity, since he explicitly justified the non-observance of sacraments as part of an attempt to avoid the trappings of a church.[49] Even still, this autonomous mission could not avoid fulfilling the functions of a church for its members, as the introduction of funeral and dedication rites demonstrates.

So where does this idiosyncratic ecclesial body fit within the tangled mess of the nineteenth century Wesleyan family of churches? Booth claimed that his movement was "a continuation of the work of Mr. Wesley," though he noted that they had gone on "a great deal further, on the same lines which he travelled."[50] The Salvation Army's ecclesial position was indeed "a great deal further" than Wesley's, given the latter's protracted struggle to maintain Methodism's status as a movement within the Church of England. However, as Earl Robinson has noted, many of the Army's ecclesiological ambiguities were inherited from Methodism's eventual, if reluctant, separation, and the resulting lack of clarity in Methodist ecclesiology.[51] Thus, similar issues can be seen in the ecclesiology of other Wesleyan bodies, particularly of the revivalist type. In William Booth's case, a functionalized understanding of the church and its mission made the question of ecclesial identity a superfluous issue. The Army was fulfilling the mission of the Church universal, and Booth believed it was doing so more effectively than the churches. Therefore why would it not be seen as equal to the churches? And if institutional forms are wholly subordinate to missionary purposes, why would Booth's effective organization seek integration within another ecclesial institution? This line of thinking is not a great leap from Cooke's omission of the Church from his *Christian Theology* text. Furthermore, other offshoots are characterized by similar concern for avoiding theological controversy, building unity around the religion of the heart, following the personal leading of the Spirit, even if it meant going against ecclesial overseers, and subordinating institutional forms to the mission of reaching new converts. And while the Army's status was more clearly extra-denominational than these other offshoots, they all began as "missions" working loosely alongside established churches, before eventually starting off on their own. Early Salvationists sought to make that arrangement permanent, preserving their status as an extra-denominational mission in perpetuity. They failed to grasp that the church is necessarily institutional, and thereby succumbed to an idiosyncratic form of institutionalization without realizing it. In the end, they did become an "offshoot" sect, as Cardinal Manning predicted in his 1882 article in *The Contemporary Review*. I will close with his word of warning.

> Nevertheless, we have a conviction that the Salvation Army
> will either become a sect, or it will melt away. This world
> is not the abode of disembodied spirits…The history of

Christianity abundantly proves that neither the human intel-
lect nor the human will can alone perpetuate any teaching
without change. Nor can human authority or human obedience
perpetuate itself without an organization. But what is such an
organization but a sect…?[52]

Endnotes

[1] Several important studies of these developments were written in the middle of the twenti-
eth century. See John Kent, *The Age of Disunity* (London: Epworth Press, 1966); Robert
Currie, *Methodism Divided: A Study in the Sociology of Ecumenicalism* (London: Faber,
1968); John C Bowmer, *Pastor and People: A Study of Church and Ministry in Wesleyan
Methodism from the Death of John Wesley (1791) to the Death of Jabez Bunting (1858)*
(London: Epworth Press, 1975).

[2] Currie, *Methodism Divided*, 54–55.

[3] Hugh Bourne, *History of the Primitive Methodists Giving an Account of Their
Rise and Progress up to the Year 1823* (Bemersley: Printed for the author, at
the Office of the Primitive Methodist Connexion, by J. Bourne, 1823), 20–26.

[4] William O'Bryan, "Some Account of the Rise and Progress of the Missions Belonging to
the Arminian Bible Christians," in *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain*,
ed. John A. Vickers et al., vol. 4 (London: Epworth, 1988), 329.

[5] See Melvin Easterday Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen,
NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1980).

[6] Roger J. Green, *War on Two Fronts: The Redemptive Theology of William Booth* (Atlanta:
Salvation Army Supplies, 1989), 31–32.

[7] Catherine Mumford Booth, *The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church and
State* (London: The Salvation Army, 1883), 29. For more on Catherine Booth's
ecclesiological views, see John Read, *Catherine Booth: Laying the Theological
Foundations of a Radical Movement* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012), 119-151.

[8] William Booth, "What Is The Salvation Army?," *The Contemporary Review* 42 (August
1882): 181.

[9] See the discussion of this issue in Randy L. Maddox, "Opinion, Religion and 'Catholic
Spirit': John Wesley on Theological Integrity," *The Asbury Theological Journal* 47, no.
1 (1992): 63–87.

[10] "Warned by the failure of John Wesley in maintaining his unsectarian position, we are striving to avoid what we think were his mistakes." Booth, "What Is The Salvation Army?," 181.

[11] Ibid., 181–82.

[12] Glenn K. Horridge, *The Salvation Army, Origins and Early Years: 1865-1900* (Godalming, UK: Ammonite Books, 1993), 9–11. On the rise of extra-denominational revival efforts Richard Carwardine, *Transatlantic Revivalism: Popular Evangelicalism in Britain and America 1790-1865* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2006), 189–90; and John Kent, *Holding the Fort: Studies in Victorian Revivalism* (London: Epworth Press, 1978), 100–128.

[13] William Booth, "Wesleyan Methodist Conference," in *Boundless Salvation: The Shorter Writings of William Booth*, ed. Andrew M. Eason and Roger J. Green (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 176.

[14] See the papers collected in Philip Schaff and Samuel Ireneaus Prime, eds., *History, Essays, Orations, and Other Documents of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, Held in New York, October 2-12, 1873* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1874), especially Charles Hodge, "The Unity of the Church Based on Personal Unity with Christ" (139-144), R. Payne Smith, "Christian Union Consistent with Denominational Distinctions" (145-149), and Gregory T. Bedell, "Spiritual Unity not Organic Unity" (150-153).

[15] John Read, *Catherine Booth: Laying the Theological Foundations of a Radical Movement* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 130–31.

[16] William Cooke, *Christian Theology, Explained and Defended*, 2nd ed. (London: Bakewell, 1848).

[17] William Cooke, *A Catechism: Embracing the Most Important Doctrines of Christianity, Designed for the Use of Schools, Families, and Bible Classes* (London: Methodist New Connexion Book-Room, 1851), 64–72. It should be noted that major Wesleyan Methodist theologians such as Richard Watson and William Burton Pope included substantive discussions of the Church in their systematic theology texts.

[18] Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith in Outline*, trans. D. M. Baillie (Edinburgh: W. F. Henderson, 1922), 10.

[19] Green, *War on Two Fronts*, 56.

[20] See Philip W. Davisson, "Sweeping Through the Land: Postmillennialism and the Early Salvation Army," *Word and Deed: A Journal of Salvation Army Theology and Ministry* 5, no. 2 (May 2003): 29–50.

21 Norman Murdoch, *Origins of The Salvation Army* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994), 5–20.

22 William Booth, "The General's New Year Address to Officers," in *Boundless Salvation: The Shorter Writings of William Booth*, ed. Andrew M. Eason and Roger J. Green (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 190.

23 Ibid., 196.

24 Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1987), 143–71.

25 William Booth, "The Millennium; or, the Ultimate Triumph of Salvation Army Principles," in *Boundless Salvation: The Shorter Writings of William Booth*, ed. Andrew M. Eason and Roger J. Green (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 60. This echoes Wesley's late statements in Sermon 63, "The General Spread of the Gospel," §16ff, in Outler, *Works*, 2:492ff.

26 Booth, "The Millennium; or, the Ultimate Triumph of Salvation Army Principles," 61–62.

27 Ibid., 64–66.

28 Ibid., 69.

29 Ibid., 71.

30 See George Scott Railton's claim that the Army was not a "sect" because they avoided like "the plague… every denominational rut, in order to perpetually reach more and more of those who lie outside every church boundary." George Scott Railton, *Heathen England*, 3rd ed. (London: S. W. Patridge & Co., 1879), 145.

31 It should be noted that there were exceptions to this non-membership policy in some Scandinavian and Eastern European contexts. See the discussion of the Russian and Norwegian cases in Tom Aitken, *Blood and Fire, Tsar and Commissar: The Salvation Army in Russia, 1907-1923* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2007), 188–91; and Gudrun Maria Lydholm, *Lutheran Salvationists?* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017).

32 William Booth, "How We Began," in *Boundless Salvation: The Shorter Writings of William Booth*, ed. Andrew M. Eason and Roger J. Green (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 24.

33 Harold Hill, *Leadership in the Salvation Army: A Case Study in Clericalisation* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2006), 44–46.

34 On discussions with both the Congregationalists and Methodists, see Norman Murdoch, "The Salvation Army and the Church of England, 1882-1883," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 55 (1986): 33.

35 Randall T. Davidson, "The Methods of The Salvation Army," *The Contemporary Review* 42 (August 1882): 192–99; Murdoch, "The Salvation Army and the Church," 46. See

Roger Green's summary of the negotiations in Roger J. Green, *The Life and Ministry of William Booth: Founder of the Salvation Army* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005), 140–45.

[36] Bramwell Booth, *Echoes and Memories* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925), 69–70.

[37] Green, *Life and Ministry of William Booth*, 144.

[38] See Andrew Eason's summary of the move toward non-observance in "The Salvation Army and the Sacraments in Victorian Britain: Retracing the Steps to Non-Observance," *Fides et Historia* 41, no. 2 (Summer-Fall 2009): 51–71. The most extensive theological treatment of this issue is found in R. David Rightmire, *The Sacramental Journey of the Salvation Army: A Study of Holiness Foundations* (Alexandria, VA: Crest Books, 2016).

[39] Booth, "The General's New Year Address to Officers," 192. Catherine Booth was more ardent in her rejection of sacraments and strongly influenced William on this question. See Read, *Catherine Booth*, 178-204.

[40] Ibid., 193.

[41] By June of 1883, a funeral service had been introduced. Murdoch, "The Salvation Army and the Church," 44.

[42] Booth, "The General's New Year Address to Officers," 190.

[43] Ibid., 191. Emphasis in original.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Cited from a May 12 1888 War Cry article in Andrew M. Eason and Roger J. Green, eds., *Boundless Salvation: The Shorter Writings of William Booth* (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 172.

[46] Booth, *Echoes and Memories*, 68.

[47] Eason and Green, *Boundless Salvation*, 172.

[48] Harold Hill, "Four Anchors from the Stern," *The Practical Theologian* 5, no. 1 (2007): 26–41.

[49] In an 1895 interview Booth stated: "We came to this position originally by determining not to be a Church. We did not wish to undertake the administration of the Sacraments, and thereby bring ourselves into collision with existing Churches." Cited in Harold Begbie, *The Life of William Booth: The Founder of the Salvation Army.* (London: Macmillan, 1920), I: 432.

[50] Booth, "Wesleyan Methodist Conference," 173.

[51] See Earl Robinson, "The Salvation Army—Ecclesia?," *Word and Deed: A Journal of Salvation Army Theology and Ministry* 2, no. 1 (November 1999): 10. See also Albert Outler's classic essay, "Do Methodists Have a Doctrine of the Church?," in *The Wesleyan*

Theological Heritage, ed. Thomas C. Oden and Leicester R. Longden (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 211–26.

[52] Henry Edward Manning, "The Salvation Army," *The Contemporary Review* 42 (September 1882): 341.