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“The Holiness Movement Church has no history apart from the labours of women. It is true they did not organize it, but it is equally true, that they were the pioneers of it. They were efficient in evangelism. There were a good many Circuits raised up by their labours.”1 The author of this 1909 statement was Ralph Horner, founder the Holiness Movement Church and later of the Standard Church of America. Horner’s words indicate the importance of women in these two groups, something common throughout the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition. Yet the words also suggest a limitation imposed by the usual role of such women: they were evangelists and founders of new communities of believers. As holiness groups developed into churches and gained denominational organization, women’s leadership within them became problematic.

The devolution of women’s role is frequently seen when young movements develop institutional structures. Yet the groups founded by Horner are distinctive in that he attempted to negotiate a place for female leaders. He instituted the position of Deaconess, and filled that term with content far different from that which defined the deaconess orders of his day. This study analyses that adaptation, its successes and its limitations, and also seeks to identify the response of women to Horner’s initiative. Finally, it looks at the ideas of Horner which, while permitting an expansion of women’s role, simultaneously placed boundaries upon it.2

Ralph Horner was born in 1854 near Shawville, Quebec. He was converted in 1872, and two months later received the second work of grace,
also called sanctification or perfection, that was the mark of the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition. Soon he began to conduct services, and in 1882 he was received on trial for the Methodist ministry. He was ordained in 1887. Both before and after his ordination, Horner worked as an evangelist. Many Methodists felt uneasy regarding some aspects of Horner’s evangelism such as simultaneous prayer, uncontrollable laughter, and prostration, and in 1895, when Horner’s name was removed from the list of Methodist ministers, the issue of physical manifestations had certainly contributed to the feeling against him. The basis for the decision, however, was his breach of church discipline: he refused to serve a circuit because he maintained that he was called to and ordained for evangelism. After Horner was deposed, he again obtained ministerial status, this time through the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in New York. He and his supporters subsequently incorporated as The Holiness Movement Church in Canada.

From the early days of his career, Horner had made use of the evangelistic work of women. He had trained lay people in evangelism while he was still a Methodist minister, and it is clear from contemporary reports that many of these were women. In 1893, suspicion regarding the methods of Horner had caused the Montreal Conference of the Methodist Church to license non-ordained evangelists. According to the examinations, six of the seven evangelists examined for the propriety of their beliefs and methods were women. Four of these six soon became evangelists in Horner’s new church.

Horner justified women’s preaching by use of scriptural arguments familiar to those in the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition. Susie C. Stanley has stated that “when groups value prophetic authority, they recognize the gifts of the Holy Spirit regardless of whether men or women receive them,” and Horner’s religion recognized this authority given by religious experience. He asserted that “[w]omen who receive the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, can not but prophesy. We read, ‘Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,’ also, ‘on My servants and on My handmaidens I will pour out of My Spirit, and they shall prophesy.’”

In practical terms, the results of evangelistic women’s work were essential to the movement. The Holiness Era, newspaper of the new denomination, printed testimony to the work of these evangelists. In 1899, for example, A.B. Van Camp traced the brief history of his congregation in Kingston, Ontario. In the fall of 1897 came “two holy women of God,” Lois Moke and Agnes Coulthart. Eva Birdsell and Inda Mason followed them the
next spring. In the summer of 1898, the author’s sister Cora Van Camp, and a Miss Hamilton began to hold tent meetings in Kingston, so that by autumn, according to the writer, “It is safe to say that nearly half the city was brought in touch with and felt the effect of the Holy Ghost preaching.” These were among the women “efficient in evangelism” who “raised up circuits,” and it was essential that Horner find a place for them in his new church.

The commonly used term for such women was “lady evangelist,” and this continued to be the dominant term. Yet within the Methodist Church, except for those licensed by the Montreal Conference, lady evangelists had enjoyed no official status and were under no denominational control. When Horner attempted to make a place for the leadership of women in the new denomination, however, he simultaneously acknowledged their value and place them under the church’s authority by giving them a new, official role, the role of deaconess.

The Holiness Movement Church opened its first General Conference in November of 1899. The earliest minutes do not pay specific attention to the role of women within the new group, but a newspaper report of the next year’s Conference referred to Agnes Coulthart, “deaconess.” Subsequent issues of the paper have not survived, and early minutes of the General Conference contain no more information about women’s leadership. From the records of a related holiness group, the Gospel Workers Church, however, it is clear that by spring of 1903, the Holiness Movement Church Discipline referred to deaconesses. The title was, of course, an old one, going back to New Testament times, but taking on new life in the nineteenth century. Among the groups using it was the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, which instituted an order of deaconesses in 1888. Canadian Methodists were familiar with this initiative, and some sought approval for a similar Canadian order. At its General Conference in 1890, the Methodist Church passed a motion to allow any Annual Conference to make provision for an organization similar to a deaconess order, and subsequently the Toronto Conference organized a Deaconess Aid Society, and opened a Home. The 1894 General Conference instituted a deaconess order.

The Canadian order was founded for the same purposes as deaconess groups elsewhere. Throughout the history of the church, women had been strong supporters of its mission, but in the latter part of the nineteenth century, their work became much more conspicuous as women organized their volunteer labour both within their denominations and in such societies
as the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Methodist officials recognized the advantages of organizing for its own use “this woman force, that is fast becoming a power throughout the world,” and feared that “if shut off this force might soon work out on its own line.” Problems connected with increasing urbanization and immigration suggested an area which seemed particularly suitable for deaconesses: work among the sick and the poor. Church leaders were happy to use the skills of women in the gender-appropriate activities of nursing and social work.

The General Conference instituted the deaconess order during the same year that the Montreal Conference suspended Horner from the ministry, and Horner could not have escaped familiarity with the idea of deaconesses. Their traditional activities, however, were not those that his new church would assign to the women with this title. Instead, Horner and his colleagues infused new content into the position of deaconess, thereby giving ecclesiastical status to the lady evangelist.

Horner had been ordained by the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in New York, but he did not receive his ideas on how to incorporate women into the structure of his church from that group. Not until 1923 did the Wesleyan Discipline include a section on Deaconess Work. The duties described there could have described equally well the work of a Methodist Episcopal or a Canadian Methodist deaconess, including as they did, “ministering to the poor and needy; laboring with the sick and dying; [and] comforting the bereaved and sorrowing.” They were not those undertaken by Holiness Movement deaconesses.

The Holiness Movement Church sought to regulate females in leadership roles as it did males. Its Discipline, revised in 1907, set forth requirements for study and time of service before a woman could become a deaconess, comparable to the study and probation requirements to be met by a man seeking ordination. Once she fulfilled the requirements, she could be ordained deaconess, or could, if she wished, obtain a certificate of standing to labour as evangelist. Some of these women left to work in missions supported by the denomination, principally in Egypt and in China. For those who remained in North America, as either deaconesses or evangelists, their work would be the very demanding activity of “constant evangelism.”

In 1910, the General Conference specified the wording of the “letters of standing for lady evangelists.” The letter certified that the bearer “is hereby authorized and recommended as a proper person to conduct the public worship of God, and to minister to the flock of Christ, as long as her
spirit and practice are such as will adorn the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” At the General Conference three years later, this certificate was reworded so that it no longer mentioned the more pastoral role of “minister[ing] to the flock of Christ.” The omission is significant because although women continued to do public evangelism, they did not have as large a role in the pastoral work that became increasingly important as the denomination developed.

A.B. Van Camp’s report shows the energy of women in the early years, as they pioneered new locations, and followed one another in waves to strengthen fledgling work. The Holiness Era announced revivals held by women, and gave notice of holiness conventions which simultaneously reached out to the unsaved, and strengthened those who were already holiness members. Some notices only stated that “some lady preachers are expected to be present.” At other times, however, female evangelists, especially Birdsell and Mason, received specific mention: “Elders Horner, Sproule and Claxton, and Evangelists Birdsell and Mason ... and others are expected to be present.” They were sufficiently prominent in the movement so that the use of their names would attract readers to the meetings.

When Van Camp described the pioneering evangelistic work of women, he was writing to solicit aid for a chapel that “we are building” in Kingston. The building of a chapel indicates the direction that the movement was taking. From the time of the Wesleyan revivals in Britain a century and a half earlier, converted individuals had been joined together in groups for their nurture in the faith. These communities of believers needed both places in which to meet, and continuing pastoral oversight. The ongoing congregations with formal places of worship were served, not by travelling evangelists, but by ministers appointed to circuits. Since the young congregations were generally small, it was customary to appoint one preacher to minister to the faithful at several preaching places. The Holiness Movement Church adapted the very successful organizational pattern which Horner had known in the Methodist Church.

Another development in the denomination was the growing attention to Sunday Schools; this is seen in the references made in the minutes to the preparation of lesson materials and the appointment of a Sunday School committee. Although the offspring of church members were expected to enter the church following a conversion experience, the group felt a responsibility to prepare them for this through Sunday Schools. The denomination continued to reach out to the unconverted by means of such
evangelistic work as camp meetings, but its concern for the nurture of its youth is further evidence of the denomination’s increasing focus on its congregations, those groups of members and adherents who both needed and desired pastoral oversight.

Unfortunately there are no stationing lists from this time to show how the women of the Holiness Movement Church were deployed. Statistical lists from 1910 through 1912 reveal that evangelists made up approximately one fourth to one third of the leadership of the group.\(^9\) The lists, which enumerate not circuits but chapels and preaching places, show that there were enough chapels and preaching places so that each of the male ministers and lady evangelists could have been assigned to one. The nature of the circuit system, however, makes it highly likely that a much smaller number of leaders would have been assigned to the oversight of circuits comprising more than one place of worship. Thus these figures fail to indicate what portion of the women were still assigned to “constant evangelism,” and whether some were stationed ministering to the flock.

The women clearly took an active part in the internal work of the church. Evangelists frequently contributed to the Holiness Era not only news but articles on a variety of religious topics. They were assigned to prepare lessons for the increasingly important Sunday Schools, and to serve on committees regarding religious education; both of these activities appeared appropriate for women. Some who gave long-term or outstanding service earned their way to more active participation. Cora Van Camp, one of the early evangelists at Kingston, served as a missionary in Egypt. Back in Canada she presented “valuable information” to the 1909 General Conference Special Committee, made an address on the political situation in Egypt at the 1910 General Conference, edited the missionary page of the paper, and served actively on various committees before her return to Egypt. Only in the careers of exceptional women, however, did church assignments thus transcend the limitations imposed by gender.

The next years were a period of upheaval in the Holiness Movement Church. Friction that had been evident by 1914 reached a point of crisis in the General Conference of 1916, when Horner left in protest, and the group remaining passed a motion that he had forfeited his right to retain the office of Bishop. Those attending both a Special Session and the scheduled Ottawa Conference in 1917 were predominantly supporters of Horner, and negotiators tried unsuccessfully to bridge the gap between that group and the General Conference Special Committee. In 1918, the rift was formalized as
a new roll was formed for the Conferences of the Holiness Movement Church, and Horner and his supporters held the first session of the Annual Conference of the Standard Church of America.20

During this time of rupture, women as well as men on conference rolls were forced to decide where their loyalties lay. By 1922, none of the Holiness Movement women who had been working in Canada at the time of the disruption remained on its rolls; only a few women who had been abroad as missionaries reappeared on later lists. The movement into the Standard Church was much stronger among the women workers than among the men. This striking difference is best understood as evidence of the agency of Hornerite women, who moved with Horner into the Standard Church to ensure a continuation of their active role in Christian ministry.

At issue in the division was leadership; this was no conflict over theology or church polity. The church had become an increasingly complex institution, a denomination with its own school, publishing house and newspaper, administering its own missions. It had developed the administrative and leadership capabilities of a number of its members, and some of these leaders came into conflict with Horner. He was aging, and his leadership style was autocratic, a natural corollary of the personal characteristics that had led him to found the group. As the issue in the division was leadership, people took sides in part on the basis of their loyalty to Horner.

Although Holiness Movement women participated in the work of the Ottawa Conference, and some few such as Cora Van Camp were participants in the General Conference, their names seldom appear in the minutes except in connection with their assigned committee work. They were rarely the movers and seconders; they seldom entered into debate; they were not the leaders who might contest the power of their aging Bishop.

On the other hand, women knew that Horner had encouraged them and claimed a place for their evangelistic role. At a memorial service held in 1922 following Horner’s death the previous year, several testified regarding his support. Edna Hepburn was converted in about 1912, and soon after that she felt that God called her to preach. She testified, “I had a severe struggle over this, and I backed down. But I knew, all the time, I had the Bishop’s sympathy. I felt he went through the struggle with me. I got restored and settled that question.” Stella Brown reported a similar struggle when she felt called to preach: “I did not know there were lady evangelists, and thought the suggestion came from the devil. I was in that state of doubt when I met Bro. Horner.”21 These women are among those who began their preaching in the
Holiness Movement Church, and were beneficiaries of Horner’s strong support for evangelism by women. Apparently satisfied with the position he made for them and their ministry, they followed Horner into the Standard Church to ensure a continuation of their active role.

While the sources do not clearly indicate to what work women were stationed in the Holiness Movement Church prior to the division, stationing lists printed in the pages of the new denominational paper the Christian Standard show that a number of these women undertook work in Standard Church pastorates. It was not, however, deemed suitable for them to serve alone: they were assigned in pairs. In 1922, for example, Alma Crawford and Gladys Johnson were sent to Sydenham; Eva Alexander and Stella Brown to North Augusta; and E. Dack and Myrtle Morris to Harley. This pattern is continued in a 1930 list, on which Caldwell and Mina Eastman were sent to Belleville, and Alexander and Dora Haggarty to Peterboro.

In 1923, Deaconess Eva James addressed the Kingston Annual Conference on “the usefulness of lady evangelists.” Her remarks show that while she recognized the opportunity afforded to women leaders in the church, she was also acutely aware of their difficulties: “She spoke very feelingly of the church with an open door for women preachers; of a calling much above the greatest secular pursuits; and followed with a stirring appeal to all her sisters in the ministry to be true, even under persecutions, afflictions, and all that may come.”

Although some women were stationed in pairs for pastoral work, others continued as evangelists, and there is a suggestion that these were insufficiently employed. In 1931, during the depression years, the Standard Church looked for ways to exercise a “new aggressiveness,” launching more and longer revival campaigns. The Conference Committee on Evangelism recommended that “greater use be made of our lady evangelists in the special sphere of work to which they are consecrated.”

The surviving records of the Holiness Movement Church are not parallel with those of the Standard Church of America. Newspapers of the latter group furnish valuable information, but there is no available collection of minutes. The minute book containing the records of the pro-Horner meetings at the time of the split was returned to the Holiness Movement group, and that group’s minutes continue until the denomination’s merger with the Free Methodist Church in 1959. In this case, however, there is a lack of newspaper sources. Thus it is difficult to make direct comparisons, but
similar themes emerge, especially that of the problem of making full use of
the gifts of women in leadership roles.

Following the division of Horner’s followers, the Holiness Movement
Church recognized the need for deaconesses. As noted earlier, the Ottawa
Conference had lost all its women workers, and its leadership ranks were
sorely depleted. At the 1919 Ottawa Conference, two deaconesses were
ordained, and these were soon followed by the others, until a significant
portion of those on the ministerial roll were women. In addition, two of
the three persons working under official authority were women, as was one
of the six probationers.

The women did not necessarily find it easy to participate fully. In
1923, when Deaconess Josie Trotter was “called upon to give her experi-
ence” at the Conference meeting, she “remarked that she would prefer
preaching to the unsaved rather than address this Conference.” At the same
meeting, Cora Warren felt more than reticence. She intimated “that her
services were not appreciated, and contemplated discontinuing her labours”;
the group then gave her assurance of its “appreciation of her services ... in
song, prayer etc., and desire that she may see her way clear to ... continue to
labor” with them.

There is no further indication regarding the basis of Warren’s
complaint, and no way to assess its validity. Scattered items during the
following years, however, give evidence of problems in denomination’s use
of deaconesses. One difficulty was financial: in 1925 and in 1927, subcom-
mittees on pastoral support showed concern for the level of remuneration
given to lady evangelists, and saw the need to ensure that they received their
promised payment. This difficulty was compounded by the insecurity of
their employment. Pastors were assigned to specific circuits, but evangelists
bore the responsibility for arranging their own assignments.

Concern for levels of support and employment were combined in the
Pastoral Support Committee’s report to Ottawa Conference in 1930. It
recommended: “That this Conference encourage our lady evangelists that
they continue in our work. That those who are not stationed on circuits be
employed by our pastors, where possible, in special services; and those
employing them become responsible for a reasonable remuneration.”

Similarly at the 1938 meeting of the Ottawa Conference, it was moved, “that
the conference urge every pastor to engage our lady evangelists for at least
one revival campaign each year.” Thus during the depression years of the
1930s, in the Holiness Movement Church, as in the Standard Church of
America, the leadership urged greater use of lady evangelists. Despite Horner’s initiative, women had obtained only a limited place in the pastoral work of their denomination.

According to the rules of the Holiness Movement Church, a deaconess severed her connection with Conference when she married, although she might be granted her former standing “upon her special request.” Some women made that request. Others became members of Conference sometime after marriage to a minister. A few women in both denominations were able to serve as part of clergy couples, but in the records their work became attached to that of their mates, making it difficult to discern the women’s level of activity. Other ministers’ wives held positions as lay delegates to Conference, as members of various Conference committees, and as contributors to denominational periodicals and writers of Sunday School lessons.

A few single women made independent contributions in pastoral roles. A late example of this is Marion Gilmer, of the Holiness Movement Church. She became a probationer in 1943, and a deaconess in 1945. During the years immediately after her election as deaconess, she worked as Sunday School Field Secretary; following that she was stationed at various appointments, sometimes with another woman, but increasingly on her own. She remained in the ministry of her denomination until it joined with the Free Methodists, and was subsequently listed in the pastoral appointments of that group. Yet Gilmer was an exception, a single woman who took her place beside the brethren.

During the pioneering years of aggressive evangelism in the Holiness Movement Church, spirit-filled women took up the work at a rate seldom seen outside the ranks of the Wesleyan/Holiness movement. The women in this movement appeared to enjoy an advantage not shared by women in other Holiness denominations: Ralph Horner created the position of Deaconess to recognize this activity and give it a place within the structure of the organizations. Women valued his initiative: this is shown in the strong movement of women leaders from the Holiness Movement Church into the Standard Church of America at the time of its formation. They did so to ensure that they might continue to take an active leadership role. A number of women had the an opportunity to exercise their calling to religious leadership in the office of deaconess on the mission field, in the stationed pastorate, or as travelling evangelists.
Yet although their opportunities were greater than those of most of their contemporaries, they were still severely limited. In practical terms, this was because in Canada and in the few areas of the United States where the group established itself, it came in a short time to take on the organizational characteristics of a denomination, and in particular of the Methodist denomination from which Horner and many of his early leaders had come. These included a settled pastorate looking after the needs of the group’s members and their children.

Despite his affirmation of the prophetic authority of spirit-filled women, Horner still accepted the era’s ideal of woman’s domestic role. This is seen in the same 1909 article in which Horner so firmly endorsed the labours of women. He argued that “It means more for women to preach, than it does for men. They have more to sacrifice. It means much to give up home. Home is the natural place for a woman. It is super-natural for a woman to be without a home.” Only a few women could be so “carried away in the Spirit . . . so lost in God, that they lose sight of home, etc.” Ultimately, for Horner, a woman did not make a home; a home was something provided by for a woman by her father or her husband. Thus as stationing became the norm within Horner's churches, the place of women in church leadership became more ambivalent. It was not normal for women to establish the homes that were a necessary part of the lives of stationed ministers. Thus many were left in the role of lady evangelist, but that role became increasingly peripheral as more of the attention of the denominations was focussed on its own congregations and less on evangelization of the stranger.

Pleas for the use of lady evangelists in both denominations indicate that this arrangement failed to utilize fully the consecrated women available in these religious organizations where the norm for leadership had become the settled pastorate. Horner redefined the position of deaconess, and within that new definition many women found opportunities to live out their call to ministry. Yet although Horner maintained that “like the men He has made them able ministers of the New Testament,” only a few of the women “anointed to preach the gospel” found opportunities that reached beyond a narrow definition of their work as “lady evangelists.”
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