

BISHOP WILLIAM TAYLOR AND METHODIST MISSION: A STUDY IN NINETEENTH CENTURY SOCIAL HISTORY

DAVID BUNDY

PART II: SOCIAL STRUCTURES IN COLLISION

The influence of Missionary Bishop William Taylor extended beyond his intense efforts in Australia, India, South America and Africa. His example and the legends of his effective mission activity were significant for groups as different as Norwegian Methodism¹ and Chilean Pentecostalism.² There is little doubt that he did more than any other individual to expand the geographical frontiers of Methodism during the last half of the nineteenth century. However, Taylor's independent entrepreneurial style led to conflict with established mission organizations. Partly because of that conflict, little effort has been made to understand the dynamics of the life and ministry of Taylor or his contribution to missiology.

The first part of this essay examined the development of William Taylor "From Campmeeting Convert to International Evangelist," focusing on the social, cultural and economic structures which determined the parameters of his possibilities.³ His youth, early ministry, missionary experience in California were narrated on the basis of available evidence, as were the financial reversals and Taylor's effort to repay the debt incurred. This debt took him around the world. It finally brought him to India where we continue the description and analysis of his life.

Taylor as Missionary: Phase II, India and South America, 1870-1884

India, November 1870-Spring 1875. Taylor's arrival in India would have dramatic results for Taylor, for Methodist missions, and, especially, for the Methodist Church in India. He was approaching fifty years of age when he arrived in India. The past decade had been spent with Wesleyan Methodists, and there appears to have been little contact with American Methodist clergy in leadership positions since the appointment to California in 1849. Taylor and the church to which he would now again try to relate had both changed. Thoburn, who had extended an invitation to In-

¹Anon. "Pintseløftet," *Kristelig Tidende* 18, 23 (Fredag 7 Juni 1889), 177-178; Anon. "Biskop William Taylor," *Kristelig Tidende* 18, 23 (Fredag 7 Juni 1889), 179.

²See below, note 68.

³David Bundy, "Bishop William Taylor and Methodist Mission: A Study in Nineteenth Century Social History, Part I: From Campmeeting Convert to International Evangelist," *Methodist History*, XXVII, No. 4, 198-212.

dia, records his astonishment at the change he perceived between the Taylor of 1858 (the date of their first meeting) and the sick exhausted man who arrived in Lucknow:

He had wonderfully changed since I had last seen him, both in manner and appearance. He was now a veritable patriarch, with erect and imposing mien, long white beard, a piercing but kindly eye, and a reserve which often impressed strangers more powerfully than any words could have done. His pulpit style had completely changed, so much so, indeed, that there was absolutely nothing about him which reminded me of the William Taylor whom I had known a dozen years before . . . He . . . proceeded to read and expound the second chapter of Acts. He did this in a manner of seeming indifference, and apparently took no note of time . . . His sermon was but a continuation of the previous exposition, and was such as to startle and shock many of his hearers. He talked as if he was perfectly indifferent to the opinion of any one present . . .⁴

The next evening the congregation was smaller, a fact which "seemed to rouse up rather than depress the preacher, and the sermon was searching and incisive."⁵ Eventually a "revival" began among the English and "native Christians" but among the non-Christian people there was no positive response. The experience of South Africa was not to be repeated, much to the disappointment of Taylor and the Methodist missionaries.⁶

Taylor's fortunes began to change when he accepted an invitation to Bombay. Short on funds, he traveled third class on the floor of a train. He preached at first in missions maintained by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and in others of the Free Church of Scotland. However, the "special meetings" in churches drew to an end, and opposition, fanned by a hostile press, grew among the Anglican and other area churchmen. They were distressed at Taylor's visiting and preaching to numerous groups in warehouses and private homes. Alienated from the churchmen, he organized a number of converts into "bands" and, on February 14, 1872, established a Methodist Episcopal Church.⁷ This

⁴James M. Thoburn, *My Missionary Apprenticeship* (New York: Hunt and Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston and Curtis, 1884), 280-281, reflecting the remark in Thoburn, *Diary*, December 1, 1870: "Brother T(aylor) preached a long, and rather tedious sermon. He is more droll and less polished than he used to be, and many were offended." Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India* (New York: Nelson and Phillips, 1875), 16, noted, "I preached . . . but it did not seem to affect them at all for good. Some stared at me as though I was there on exhibition, and others seemed disposed to have a jolly time among themselves." (reprinted in William Taylor, *Story of My Life: An account of what I have said and thought and done in my ministry of more than fifty-three years in Christian lands and among the heathen, written by myself* ed. John Clark Ridpath, engravings by Frank Beard (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1895), 521. Thoburn's frustrations continued, see Thoburn, *Diary*, Dec. 3, 1870, Dec. 5, 1870, Dec. 16, 1870, and Dec. 20, 1870. Thoburn, *Diary*, 14 September 1858, reports hearing Taylor preach for the first time. On Thoburn, see, Guy Douglas Garrett, "The Missionary Career of James Mills Thoburn," unpublished Ph.D. Diss. Boston University, 1968.

⁵J. M. Thoburn, *My Missionary Apprenticeship*, 282.

⁶*Ibid.*, 282.

⁷William Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 150-167; Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 543-573; Thoburn, *Diary*, June 2, 1872.

act entailed breaking the comity agreements as well as mission policy regarding the organization of new mission centers. Taylor appears to have taken the action knowing there would be repercussions.

The comity agreements had been instrumental in Methodist missionaries being assigned to northeast Bengal and North Mysore.⁸ Here they had operated since 1855. Taylor's evangelistic efforts among English residents were, in fact, proselytism from the Anglican church. Others came from other national churches. It was Taylor's conviction that he should go where invited and that, just as businessmen had no restrictions on where they could endeavor to sell their goods, the Christian missionary should also be free to follow the opportunities.⁹ He appears, at least in the early stage of the expansion (1872-1873), to have cooperated with existing churches of many denominations. When such cooperation proved impossible due to mistrust, distance, or theological compatibility, he organized the "bands."¹⁰ This caused considerable embarrassment for the Mission Board and provoked criticism of the Americans by the Wesleyan Methodists at the First Ecumenical Methodist Conference in London, 1881.¹¹

It was the organization of the "bands" into churches, not missions, which brought him into conflict with established Methodist Episcopal mission procedures. During the first year in India, Taylor had traveled widely. He observed several troubling features in the missions. First, there

⁸The comity agreements divided different countries into spheres of influence so as to reduce competition and conflict between western Christian missions. This was usually expressed in military terms, especially with the growth of American imperial interests. For example, a handbook for mission agencies in China was Milton T. Stauffer's, *The Christian Occupation of China. A General Survey of the Numerical Strength and Geographical Distribution of the Christian Forces in China made by the Special Committee on Survey and Occupation. China Continuation Committee, 1891-1921* (Shanghai: China Continuation Committee, 1922). For a discussion of these as they affected the Methodist Church in India, see M. Harper, *The Methodist-Episcopal Church in India* (Lucknow: Lucknow Publishing House, 1936), *passim*.

⁹Taylor frequently used business metaphors and was proud that his missions were conducted according to sound business principles. Throughout his writings, an awareness of the economic realities and their importance for the development of the church is demonstrated.

¹⁰Taylor's theological openness appears remarkable considering his background. In William Taylor, *Pauline Methods of Missionary Work* (Philadelphia: National Association for the Promotion of Holiness, 1879) he stated: "I did not commence the work (in India) in the name of any denomination of Christians. I had been laboring in foreign fields for many years as an evangelist in the organized work of missionaries of all the leading missionary societies of Christendom, and am prepared to testify to the great zeal and patient toil of those men of God (p. 39)." He returned to a similar theme in *Story of My Life*, 743, "I am not a bigot; I have always as I had opportunity, preached for all churches of the Protestant world, of all zones and climates, and would preach in the Romish churches just as cheerfully if they would let me."

¹¹J. H. Messmore, "The Story of the North India Conference," *India Mission Jubilee of the Methodist Episcopal Church* ed. F. B. Price (Calcutta: Methodist Publishing House, 1907); John N. Hollister, *The Centenary of the Methodist Church in South Asia* (Lucknow: Lucknow Publishing House, 1956), 259, *et passim*.

was a lack of evangelistic activity among the converts. Secondly, there was economic and social dependence of converts on the missionaries who relocated them near stations, undertook to protect them from angry relatives, and paid them wages from foreign funds. This created a "white-preacher cast." Thirdly, this dependency diverted funds intended for evangelization. He did not accuse his colleagues of wanting to establish a dependent church. He did observe that the structures of the missionary enterprise did not allow the possibility of a truly Indian church.¹²

The development of Taylor's plan for the church in India is clear from the diary, with correspondence and assorted missiological excursions inserted, edited as *Four Years Campaign in India* (1875). In December 1871, while working with the Maratti Mission, he mused as to whether:

God intends a regular distinct Methodist organization along-side the existing churches . . . an indigenous Church of Christ without formal connection to any foreign church, or supported from any—I cannot tell . . . At any rate, I must organize fellowship bands to nourish the babes God is giving us.¹³

On about February 5, the decision was made to establish a Methodist Episcopal church.¹⁴ On the eighth of February, a petition was presented by 30 band members requesting such a step.¹⁵ The request was answered affirmatively on February 14 with a letter describing the demands of Methodist spirituality.¹⁶ On March 4, 1872, a letter to Bishop E. Janes explained, not very diplomatically, the situation:

We hereby ask you, and our Missionary Committee to send us men as we may require them, but not money. If you wish to pay their passage to Bombay, and can . . . do it, without placing this Mission on the list of *dependent* Missions, all right. One appropriation of funds from any Missionary Society would set upon us the brand-mark of existing Indian Missions, and tend to bring us down to their dead level.¹⁷

In the event of an emergency, he said, help would be accepted, although the Indian Methodists would also "make a collection for the 'poor saints in Judea' or in New York." He went on to request two missionaries, ". . . liberally educated, . . . who will trust God and His Indian Methodists for food and raiment. We can't promise high salaries; but no faithful minister here need incur debt for food or raiment, nor suffer want of either."¹⁸

¹²Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 14-150. Taylor decided that the church needed to adapt as completely and as quickly to Indian customs and social structures as was possible. He even copied the architecture of a new theater building in Calcutta for his church, hoping for an "Indian building" rather than a European style building. Typically, he noted it was also less expensive.

¹³Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 113-114.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 148-149.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 150.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 151-154. The letter was printed in the *Bombay Guardian*.

¹⁷Taylor to Bishop Edmund Janes, March 4, 1872, published in Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 164-165.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 165.

Finally, a petition to the 1872 General Conference dated March 4, 1872, requested the organization of "a Bombay Conference,—not a Mission Conference. If we stand on our own two legs, by the power of God, and draw no Mission funds, why call it a Mission Conference."¹⁹

Consternation within the Methodist Episcopal Church about Taylor's plans for India elicited an episcopal visit to India by Bishop Harris (1873). Harris, relieved that rumors of Taylor's founding an independent church were unfounded, arrived at a compromise very similar to the structure of the California mission. All ministers in India serving outside of the India Annual Conference would be members of that conference and all areas outside those bounds would be designated the "Bombay and Bengal Mission." Taylor was designated Superintendent and understood there would be no interference by the Mission Board in the governance of the new mission. Taylor was admitted to the India Annual Conference from California in January 1874 and became Superintendent of the enormous mission.²⁰ The General Conference of 1876 constituted the Mission as the South India Conference.²¹

Taylor left India in 1875 to assist in Moody's campaign in London, visit his family and find missionaries for the newly founded churches.²² He expected to return. He never did.

The South American Decade, 1875-1884. Taylor published no details of his odyssey during this decade except the narrative of the establishment of his South American missions. It is clear that he raised money to send missionaries to India, Burma and South America, that he came to work independently of the Mission Board which he perceived to be determined to undermine his efforts through pious claims of more efficiency in ministry if their money was accepted, and that the controversy about his "self-supporting" method of mission continued to swirl.²³ Some of his

¹⁹Taylor to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, March 4, 1872, published in Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 165-167. The petition was tabled. Taylor was convinced that it was not seriously considered.

²⁰Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 293-295. See also, Harper, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 31-33; Hollister, *Centenary*, 117. It is interesting that Taylor makes no comment about California at this point. There is also no mention of the debt which he had struggled for at least fifteen years to repay. I have been unable to ascertain whether or not the problem was resolved.

²¹Thoburn, *Diary*, May 16, 1876.

²²Taylor reprinted Bowen's article about the letter inviting him to England, but not the letter, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 328-331. Taylor is uncharacteristically silent about the time in England, and I have been unable to find any evidence of Taylor's participation in the "Higher Life" meetings in England during this period. Cf. Thoburn's surprise at his departure in *Diary*, February 18, 1875. For a positive evaluation of Taylor's work in India, see J. E. Scott, *History of Fifty Years, Comprising the Origin, Establishment, Progress and Expansion of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Southern Asia* (Madras: Jubilee Managing Committee M. E. Press, 1906).

²³William Taylor, *Our South American Cousins* (New York: Nelson and Phillips, 1878), *passim*; idem, *Story of My Life*, 647-688. In *Pauline Methods of Missionary Work*, Taylor

supporters (and detractors) for their various reasons overstated the theory. Taylor chided the editor of *The New York Advocate* who held that all missionaries of all missions should adopt the "Pauline Method," as well as the author of a letter to the editor suggesting the editor renounce his salary as an example to the missionaries. He responded that "such reasoning involves a fallacious stretch of our principles, specially applicable to Corinth in Paul's day, and to India in ours."²⁴ In other countries, he argued, the possibilities for applying the "Pauline Method" should be considered, and when it is possible,

they should at once be applied by the men on the ground, and not by the dictation of any speculative generalization. No missionary authorities . . . have any right to put missionaries on a lower grade of support than that of regular pastors at home.²⁵

Between October 16, 1877, and June 1878, Taylor made an initial voyage (in steerage) to South America. At each port, he studied the economic base of the city, made contact with the English speaking population, and in Callao, Iquique and Valparaiso signed contracts to supply teachers for English schools. The travel and support of the teachers and their families were to be paid by subscription and through tuition. In Valparaiso, he raised a subscription for a "seaman's bethel" by preaching on board the fleet then in harbor. Taylor intended from this financial base and the contacts made in the line of their employment, the teacher-missionaries would do evangelistic work and build a "self-supporting" church. Many of the subscribers were Roman Catholic or members of other groups. Taylor did not specify that the resulting churches should be Methodist Episcopal although such was clearly his hope.²⁶

Taylor understood this activity as a "test" of his "Pauline Method." A "Transit and Building Fund" was organized in New York and ordained men were recruited and "appointed" by Taylor to the various sites. Careful accounts were kept of income, expenses, properties and of the staffing of projects. He and other early co-workers have provided accounts of the efforts.²⁷

describes briefly (p. 44) the inability of the Missionary Society to send the twelve missionaries he felt needed in India (Taylor had originally requested two) and the efforts to secure funds for the passage of the men he chose. He tells (p. 46) of sending a missionary to Rangoon, Burma. Even Thoburn, *My Missionary Apprenticeship*, 386-394, was surprised at the timing of Taylor's initiative in Burma, cf. Thoburn, *Diary*, May 5, 1879. However, Thoburn, *Diary*, August 9, 1879, read Taylor's *Pauline Methods of Missionary Work* and observed that, "Some of Taylor's remarks are caustic and will provoke criticism, but on the whole he is right in his positions."

²⁴Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 406.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Taylor, *Our South American Cousins*, *passim*; idem, *Story of My Life*, 647-683. Cf. the analysis of *The History of American Methodism*, ed. E. S. Bucke, 3 (New York: Abingdon, 1964), 99-103.

Expectations were not always met. Many of the missionaries were unprepared for life in another context; some became ill and died. Some subscriptions were not met, and most significantly, war between Chile and Peru caused major dislocations of population, including missionaries. These problems increased the skepticism of the Mission leaders and their expressions of concern prompted reactions from Taylor's supporters. Holiness leaders (Inskip, McDonald, Fowler and Lowrey) rallied to his cause and raised funds in their constituencies.²⁸

The debate provoked him to write *Pauline Methods of Missionary Work* (1879). This volume published, significantly, by the National Publishing Association for the Promotion of Holiness (J. Inskip) presented a detailed exposition and defense of the "Self-Supporting Mission Method," describing the procedures, funding arrangements and results in India and South America.

In 1882, the General Missionary Committee discussed Taylor's mission and decided to take action. He was informed that the:

missions in South America were out of order, and that I should resign them to the Missionary Society, otherwise all my missionaries in South America connected with Conferences would have to return to their Conferences or locate.²⁹

Taylor chose to locate in his Conference (South India) as did all but one of his missionaries. Before leaving the U.S. in late 1882, he published another apology-history of "Self-Supporting Missions."³⁰ For about ten months he was "preacher in charge" of the church in Coquimbo, Chile. While there he used his salary from the church together with some funds from the U.S. to build "with my own hands and native help" a large two story school building.³¹

While in Coquimbo, he was elected lay delegate from the South India Conference to the 1884 General Conference called for May 1, 1884, in Philadelphia.

²⁷Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 647-683. Also important are the accounts of participants in the "Self-Supporting Mission:" Goodsil F. Arms, *History of the William Taylor Self-Supporting Missions in South America* (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1921) and O. Von Barchwitz-Klauser, *Six Years with William Taylor in South America* (Boston: Published for the Author by McDonald and Gill, 1885).

²⁸See the years 1878-1884 of the *Christian Standard*, *Christian Witness*, *Indian Witness* and many contributions to various editions of *The Christian Advocate* where Taylor's point of view is defended.

²⁹Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 684, 687. Thoburn, *Diary*, January 5, 1883, reported efforts to change the South India Conference's self-supporting status: "Bishop Foster and Dr. Reid were with us throughout . . . They were both bent on inducing us to surrender our self-supporting policy and the Bishop put very heavy pressure on us, but to no purpose."

³⁰William Taylor, *Ten Years of Self-Supporting Missions in India* (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1882).

³¹Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 687.

Taylor as Missionary: Phase III, Africa, 1884-1902

General Conference, 1884. Taylor answered the role call in Philadelphia. The initial stages must have been tense. There were the ongoing disputes over the refusal of the South India Conference to accept Mission Society monies for the "native work" and guidance in policy matters. Taylor's missions in South America were continuing problems. Neither were easy matters to settle, especially since Taylor's books explaining his programs and results had been sold by the thousands and, because of the controversy, Taylor was regarded by significant segments of the church as a hero in the struggle of the "outsiders" against the New York "insiders."³²

Another problem faced by the General Conference was Liberia. The church had recognized for some time the need to address the problems of the Liberian mission efforts. In 1880 the possibility of a missionary bishop for Liberia was considered, but on the basis of Taylor's testimony regarding the undesirability of Liberia as a base for evangelizing Africa, and because of a lack of viable candidates, no action was taken.³³

The missionary bishop issue resurfaced in 1884. There was, as well, an effort to elect a black bishop to the Board of Bishops. Advocates of electing a Black to the episcopacy attempted to diminish opposition by nominating two black candidates for the position of missionary bishop for Africa. Again there was little enthusiasm. When William Taylor was nominated, his candidacy drew support from a number of parties. Those opposed to electing a black bishop, those in favor of Taylor's "Self-Supporting Missions" and the Holiness forces had a candidate who united their conflicting interests. For the Missionary Society it also allowed the possibility of "promoting" Taylor out of South America, and with him half a world away, made conceivable the "regularization" of his South American missions. He was elected on the first ballot.³⁴

³²An examination of the Methodist and Methodist related periodicals for the years 1882-1884 as well as the publication of E. Davies, *The Bishop of Africa: or the Life of William Taylor, D.D. With an Account of the Congo Country, and Mission* (Reading, MA: Holiness Book Concern, 1885) suggests that the opposing images of Taylor as embattled hero and irresponsible, callous, exploitive missionary were firmly in place. See, for example, the hero in "Bishop Taylor and His Work in Africa," *The Gospel in All Lands* 12 (June 1886), 262. However, Taylor was not the only frustrated individual. Thoburn's *Diary*, 3-29 May 1880, reflects his frustration at the General Conference's doing, "nothing whatever for India (May 29, 1880)."

³³M. D. Collins, "How William Taylor Came to be Bishop of Africa," cited in Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 692-695; "Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church," *The Gospel in All Lands* 10, 9 (August 28, 1884), 106. See also the account in Davies, *Bishop of Africa*, 78-103.

³⁴*Ibid.* Unfortunately, the role and significance of racial concerns at the 1884 and 1888 General Conferences is not discussed by the otherwise valuable work of Karen Young Collier, "An Examination of Varied Aspects of Race and Episcopacy in American Methodism 1884-1939," unpublished Ph.D. Diss. Duke University, 1984.

Taylor saw this as a vote of confidence in the "Pauline Method" of missions. He was willing to surrender the South American missions on the condition that the Mission Society not force any mission to receive funds, that it agree to allow anyone wishing to establish a self-supporting church to do so, and that any churches so established relate to the conference of their choice rather than to the Missionary Society.³⁵ As a vocal advocate of civil rights for Blacks and other minorities, the defeat of the two black candidates seems at first sight incongruent. However, he was convinced that the horrors of slavery had so damaged the American Black's natural leadership abilities, that a number of generations would be needed for them to receive healing through participation as free persons in society. He found evidence for his theory in the perennial problems of the colonization efforts in Liberia and the ineffective, scandal ridden, dependent Methodist Church in Liberia composed primarily of former North American slaves. He was convinced that the free tribes of southern Africa and the indigenous peoples of the interior, unspoiled by slavery, were better equipped to evangelize Africa.³⁶

Defining the Missionary Episcopacy. Taylor soon discovered that to be an elected missionary bishop was considered different from being a "regular" bishop. As missionary bishop he was left out of the list of Bishops in the Discipline and his salary was not to be paid out of the Episcopal Salary Fund, as were the salaries of other bishops, but from the treasury of the Missionary Society. Taylor argued:

I see several erroneous statements in regard to the Missionary Bishop. One is, that he is elected for four years only, whereas he was elected the same as the others — for life. Another, that he is not a Bishop of equal standing with the others. A Bishop of the M.E. Church is a Bishop — no more, no less; the difference being that the General Conference gives to one a definite and limited Episcopal jurisdiction, whereas the other Bishops once a year fix the sphere and limits of their respective fields. Under that arrangement I would be subject to the Board of Bishops. As it is, I answer only to the General Conference quadrennially, which suits me exactly for my varied work. The other would embarrass me.³⁷

Taylor refused to accept his salary from the Missionary Society. He argued first, that he was appointed by the General Conference, and secondly, that he did not want to be obliged to consult with the Missionary

³⁵Davies, *Bishop of Africa*, 80-81, quotes Taylor's Resolution presented to the General Conference.

³⁶William Taylor, *The Flaming Torch in Darkest Africa* with an introduction by Henry M. Stanley (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1898), 510-535, *et passim*. Cf. the analysis of *The History of American Methodism*, ed. E. S. Bucke, 3 (New York: Abingdon, 1964), 104-109.

³⁷Taylor to W. McDonald, cited in Davies, *Bishop of Africa*, 99. On the one hand, it seems surprising that Taylor had not understood the projected status for missionary bishops. However, Thoburn seems to have experienced a similar shock of awareness. In his *Diary*, May 29, 1888, discussing the issue of the missionary bishopric, he concluded, "God must vindicate my title or it will be worth very little."

Society which works "10,000 miles from the front."³⁸ In a letter to the treasurer of the Episcopal Salary Fund, he explained:

On my personal account, I would not ask nor accept a salary . . . but now my Church relationships involve new conditions . . . — a missionary episcopacy. As a pioneer in this path, it becomes my duty to define the status and defend the rights of missionary bishops. I might be able to get on, even in the jungles of Africa, where I could make nothing from books; but a succession of missionary bishops might not be able to live without a salary . . . I must respectfully ask for an appropriation of a salary from the Episcopal Fund equal to that of the other bishops of our Church.³⁹

When the Episcopal Salary Fund was not made available to him, Mrs. Anderson Fowler, long time supporter and co-worker of Taylor in New York, supplied his salary for the first quadrennium through the newly established "Africa Fund" of the old (but newly incorporated) Transit and Building Fund.⁴⁰ The question was not resolved until the 1888 General Conference. It was ruled that a missionary bishop was a true bishop and not under the control of the Board of Bishops. Taylor concluded: "this 'control' refers not to the person of the missionary bishop, but to the churches he is organizing, and to his episcopal jurisdiction over them."⁴¹

Liberia, Angola, Congo, Mozambique. Taylor arrived in Liberia intending to make the church there, composed almost exclusively of former North American slaves, self-supporting. He soon decided such a program was doomed to failure, informed the Missionary Society that the Liberian Methodist Church was hopelessly addicted to subsidies,⁴² and began planting "self-supporting" missions in the interior and along the southern coast among indigenous tribes.⁴³

In Angola, "self-supporting" missions were established within months of his arrival in Africa.⁴⁴ In the Congo, he pushed a line of mission stations

³⁸Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 750.

³⁹Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 749-750.

⁴⁰Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 750.

⁴¹William Taylor, "Where Do They Belong," *The African News* 1, 1 (Jan. 1889), 71; repr. Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 745. Despite the similarity of his situation, Thoburn felt that Taylor was overstating the conflict: "Bishop Taylor . . . is possessed with the idea that he has a great mission to establish self-supporting missions, and that a lot of leading men are opposing him, and he is more ready to suspect than I have seen him in former years. He does not impress me as when he was in India, and I fear has drifted into a current of feeling which does not help him or his work."

⁴²William Taylor, "Declaration to the Missionary Board of the Methodist Episcopal Church," *The African News* 4, 11 (Nov. 1892), 9.

⁴³Taylor, *Flaming Torch*, 510-535; idem, *Story of My Life*, 703-727; Wade Crawford Barclay, *The Methodist Episcopal Church 1845-1939: Widening Horizons, 1845-95* (History of Methodist Missions, 3; New York: Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, 1957), 894-913; "Bishop Taylor in Africa," *The Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885), 283-284; "Bishop Taylor in Liberia," *The Gospel in All Lands* 13 (June 1887), 286; "Bishop Taylor's Work in Africa," *The Gospel in All Lands* 13 (July 1887), 335.

⁴⁴Taylor, *Flaming Torch*, 478-497; idem, *Story of My Life*, 703-713, 745-746; Record Book, Methodist Episcopal Church and Mission Conference, South Central Africa, Angola. Archives, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, CA (for a description of this document, see

toward the interior.⁴⁵ Mozambique offered another opportunity; a missionary already in place who wanted to identify his work with the Methodist Episcopal Church and Taylor.⁴⁶ Nearly every decision, appointment and death seems to have resulted in controversy. The pages of *The African News* and the various editions of the *Christian Advocate*, especially the New York edition, discuss in detail a myriad of contended issues.

Retirement, 1896-1902. At the General Conference of 1896, Taylor, suffering from an attack in Brussels and exhaustion, was retired. As usual, he did not take kindly to the suggestion despite his affection for his successor, Bishop Hartzell.⁴⁷ Taylor returned to South Africa for an evangelistic tour and preached his last missionary sermon "in a wild but populous mountain region."⁴⁸ He eventually retired to California to a family interested only in control of his retirement funds.⁴⁹ He wrote a poignant letter to Hartzell:

(I have) interest in you and in your work and wish it was in my power to render financial aid and wish it was in my power to render aid to the spiritual host, some of whom I know, Mr. Waterhouse and others. It would be my delight to join you in shouting for the battle for souls. I have finished my course among effective workers. I have finished my course among effective hosts for Jesus—55 years of effective service as an effective minister without a break. . . . My race is run. . . . My itinerant race I ran 55 years without a break. . . . 5 years unable to preach—failure of voice . . . I will pray for your work. . . .⁵⁰

Taylor died at Palo Alto, California, May 18, 1902.⁵¹

Bundy, *Bishop William Taylor, Part I*, note 6); W. S. Matthew, "William Taylor in Angola," *The Pacific Christian Advocate* Aug. 1, 1929, 16-17, 24; W. Taylor to R. Grant, 26 February 1885-18 March 1885, Archives Board of Global Ministries, Commission on Archives and History of the United Methodist Church, Madison, NJ (74-11: 1259-4-3:11); Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 905-913; "Bishop Taylor's Central African Mission," *The Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885), 377; "Bishop Taylor's African Expedition," *The Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885), 519; "Bishop Taylor's African Missions," *The Gospel in All Lands* 13 (Jan. 1887), 46-47; "Bishop Taylor's African Missions," *The Gospel in All Lands* 13 (Apr. 1887), 188; "Tidings from Pungo Andongo," *The Gospel in All Lands* 13 (Nov. 1887), 523; "Bishop Taylor's Missions in Angola," *The Gospel in All Lands* 14 (May 1888), 216-218; E. Davies, "'Africa the Open Sore of the World,'" *The Gospel in All Lands* 14 (May 1888), 218-219.

⁴⁵Taylor, *Flaming Torch*, 498-509; idem, *Story of My Life*, 713-726, *passim*; Barclay, *The Methodist Episcopal Church*, 913-920; "The Methodist Central African Mission," *The Gospel in All Lands* 10, 16 (Oct. 16, 1884), 203 indicates this was Taylor's plan from the beginning.

⁴⁶Taylor, *Flaming Torch*, 551-554; Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 921.

⁴⁷"Retirement of Bishop Taylor," *The Gospel in All Lands* 22 (July 1896), 321; Taylor, *Flaming Torch*, 555-567.

⁴⁸Taylor, *Flaming Torch*, 568-584.

⁴⁹The story of Taylor's retirement is a tragic tale which is certainly of significance for understanding Taylor's earlier career. The correspondence preserved in the Archives Board of Global Ministries, Commission on Archives and History of the United Methodist Church, Madison, NJ (74-11: 1259-4-13:11 and 12) reflect the struggles (from 1892) between Ross Taylor, Edwin Taylor, Mrs. Ross Taylor, and the Bishop's wife to control Taylor's episcopal salary. After Taylor's retirement the competition focused on the retirement funds. Taylor was at least partly senile and needed care, but none of the family wanted the responsibility along with the money. Jesse A. Baldwin and A. B. Leonard of the Mission Board made

Foci of Conflict

The foci of the conflict between Taylor and the Mission Board, as they understood them, included most aspects of the missionary enterprise as well as the role of the Mission Board in the ecclesiological structure of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With regard to missionary endeavor, there were differences over mission polity, decision making processes, institutional responsibility, financing, recruitment of North American and indigenous missionaries, the control of the results of the missions, and the identity of newly founded churches outside established Conference jurisdictions. The Mission Board understood its task to be the administration of all missionary activities of the Methodist Episcopal Church.⁵² Taylor understood that the Board should be aggressively establishing Methodist Episcopal churches throughout the world, but did not understand its charter to involve a monopoly on such evangelistic and organizational activity.⁵³ Let us look briefly at the issues in contention.

Methodist Polity. The differences with regard to polity were complex. Taylor understood that the goal of Methodist polity was to provide a structure for the local church and to bring it into connection with other local churches. Both sets of structures were to make the local church more effective in its spirituality and evangelism. The structures were to serve the individual society, not to interfere with the local church as long as it conformed to its organizational charter as a Methodist Episcopal church. The decision-making process, as it impinged upon the local church, was to be centered in that church. The episcopacy and other structures were to serve the churches in areas where cooperative effort was needed but were not to establish separate, and as he perceived them, second class churches.⁵⁴

The Mission Board agreed with much of Taylor's view. They did not see their task to interfere with churches under the jurisdiction of the Conferences. However, in mission situations, the new churches needed the guidance in the making of policy, and, as well, the Mission Board had

admirable efforts to placate the competing family members and arrange care for Taylor. Leonard had to threaten the family with making the correspondence public (A. B. Leonard to Ross Taylor, Sept. 8, 1899, Archives Board of Global Ministry, Commission on Archives and History, Madison, NJ /73-44: 1261-5-3:02/) before a satisfactory, if not ideal, solution could be found.

⁵⁰William Taylor to Bishop J. Hartzell, Received Jan. 19, 1901 (General Commission on Archives and History, Madison, NJ).

⁵¹John Paul, *The Soul Digger, or, Life and Time of William Taylor* (Upland: Taylor University Press, 1928), 303.

⁵²Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 118-130.

⁵³Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 647-688, *et passim*.

⁵⁴Taylor, *Pauline Methods*, 6, *et passim*; *idem*, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 154-167; *idem*, *Story of My Life*, 560.

a responsibility to the North American churches supplying the funds for missionary activity to see that the funds were effectively used and that policies and decisions made were congruent with the expectations of the North American churches. After all, the new churches were Methodist Episcopal churches.⁵⁵

Recruitment. The Mission Board had, by the 1870's, come to realize that some caution was necessary in the solicitation of missionary candidates. The emotional energy generated in a "call" was not enough to sustain most missionaries in difficult situations. They had had many unfortunate experiences and were attempting to establish criteria to minimize personal failure. One concern was that families not be subjected to hardship and exposed to the possibility of untimely death.⁵⁶

Taylor felt that almost any North American person "called of God" could function just as well in any part of the world provided there was also a commitment to language-learning and adaptation to local foods and customs.⁵⁷ For him, this included families. He grieved over each death among his recruits, but remembered his own children who died in North America. Death was the common and, he believed, glorious end. His own family had accompanied him to California as a missionary. He enlisted his son Ross and wife and their family of four children to be among the first missionary recruits to Angola. Their quick return to the States was a major disappointment.⁵⁸

Institutional Responsibility. The Mission Board felt a responsibility to provide for the financial and material needs of the missionary on the field as well as travel to the field and return. Uniform periods of service were established and a furlough system developed. It was expected, by the 1870's, that a missionary should not be forced to live in an "uncivilized" manner and that the demonstration of "civilization" was an essential component of the missionary enterprise.⁵⁹

Taylor believed that no such provision was necessary. If God called workers, the money would be provided. To provide structures for this, a Missionary Transit Fund, later called the Transit and Building Fund, was established to receive and disburse funds raised by the candidates and by Taylor or his assistants. The candidates were expected to conform to the culture of their new homes. Part of this conformity involved earning a living and developing any resources necessary for ministry in the host

⁵⁵Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 930, *et passim*.

⁵⁶Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 162-163, 928-929, *et passim*.

⁵⁷Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 626; *idem*, "Can Our Missions in Africa Be Made Self-Supporting?" *The African News* 1 (1889), 307-308.

⁵⁸Taylor, to my knowledge does not discuss Ross's defection. There are only the terse notes in the *Record Book* (see above note 44). See Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 904, notes.

⁵⁹Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 159-166, *et passim*.

country. Where this was not possible, Taylor was willing that funds could be received from the States. He resisted the establishment of terms for missionaries. If they adapted well and were having an effective ministry, there was no reason for them to return to the United States after four years. If they were ineffective, for whatever reason, he suggested that the more rapid their return, the better.⁶⁰

Financing. The Mission Board intended that all finances should be raised through the regular structures of the church and its mission program. It looked with some concern at Taylor's efforts to raise money through direct appeals for his programs and personnel. The Board also felt that the task of evangelization was being neglected because of the time commitment of Taylor's missionaries necessary for "Self-Support."⁶¹ Taylor was scrupulous to not accept money for his personal needs. His own salary was earned from the sale of books. When he pastored a church he accepted the salary but invested it in the local ministry. He did provide information as to how those "Christian philanthropists" desirous of contributing to the development of the "Self-Supporting Missions" program could do so. He allowed that initial capital investment in buildings, machinery, farm or other equipment could be provided by believers in the States if funds could not be raised in the new ministry center.⁶²

Funding for the ongoing ministry of a congregation was to be supplied by the congregation itself. For Taylor, the subsidizing of individuals or churches diminished their effectiveness as active Christians. It appeared to the local populations that the way to receive a portion of the available foreign funding was to join the "white preacher caste." He noted that missionaries who received their salary from the United States lived on an economic level different from that of the local ministers. This economic disparity made it difficult for the missionaries to have meaningful contact with the people of the country where they were attempting to minister.⁶³

Control of the Results. Taylor firmly believed that the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church applied to any group of believers anywhere in the world resulted in a society with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of a long established church. This included the

⁶⁰Taylor, "Can Our Missions in Africa be Made Self-Supporting?" *The African News* 1 (1889), 307-308; *idem*, *Pauline Methods*, 33-34; *idem*, *Story of My Life*, 699; "Five Methodist Mission Stations in Angola," *The Gospel in All Lands* 15 (Oct. 1889), 478-479. Note how the "self-support" activities are highlighted in William Taylor, "Bishop Taylor's Report to the Missionary Committee," *The Gospel in All Lands* 16 (Jan. 1890), 41-42, 16 (Feb. 1890), 80-83; and "Report of Bishop Taylor for Congo and Angola Districts and Africa Conference," *The Gospel in All Lands* 16 (June 1890), 269-271.

⁶¹Barclay, *The Methodist Episcopal Church*, 924; Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 645; Bishop Walden, "Self-Supporting Missions in South America," *The African News* 2 (1890), 383-384.

⁶²Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 396-416; *Record Book* (see above note 44), *passim*.

⁶³Taylor, *Four Years Campaign in India*, 154-156; *idem*, "Can Our Missions in Africa be Made Self-Supporting?" *The African News* 1 (1889), 307-308.

responsibility to direct their spirituality in concert with the Methodist tradition, to engage in evangelist work among their non-Christian acquaintances, and to raise the funds necessary to maintain their church, pastor and ministry.⁶⁴ The Mission Board insisted that Taylor's practices did not take into account the lack of experience and understanding of the Methodist tradition among new converts in foreign lands. As well, the guidance of the North American church was intended to make more effective the outreach into the areas surrounding the mission stations.⁶⁵

Pauline Methods of Missionary Work. Taylor's missiology was worked out in the context of his missionary activity and as a result is a function of his biography, as has been suggested above. When his methods were challenged, he understood the critique as an attack on his apostolate. He developed an apologetic, finding a model for his philosophy of mission in the biblical accounts of the missionary endeavors of Paul. His analysis was as follows:

1. To plant nothing but the pure gospel seed . . .
2. Paul laid the entire responsibility of Church work and Church government upon his native converts, under the immediate super-vision of the Holy Spirit, just as fast as he . . . could get them well organized, precluding foreign interference. His general administrative bishops were natives of foreign countries in which he had planted the gospel; such men as Timothy and Titus.
3. Paul "endeavored to keep the unity of the Spirit . . ." with the home Jerusalem Churches by all possibilities short of corrupting his gospel seed, or allowing the home Churches to put a yoke of bondage on his neck, or of laying any restrictions on his foreign Churches.
4. . . . Hence he went and sent, according to the teaching of the Master, without "purse or scrip," or an extra coat, or pair of shoes above the actual requirements of their health and comfort.
5. In utilizing for the advancement of Christ's kingdom . . . all available resources, he uniformly commenced in Jewish communities.
6. To give permanency and continued aggressive force to his organizings . . . he remained in each great centre of work long enough not only to effect a complete organization, with administrative elders, but to develop the Christian character of each member . . .⁶⁶

In practice, Taylor's "Pauline Method" was pragmatic and opportunistic in its taking advantage of all possible resources and openings for mission. He came also to appreciate the long-term consequences of mission activity, the means used to support it, and the relationship between missionary and convert.

⁶⁴Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 637. The Mission board also desired that the churches should become self-supporting but allowed that a weaning process must take place before they could be expected to be effective without infusions of North American funds. See Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 160.

⁶⁵Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 158-159, *passim*. See, i.e., J. M. McCullough, "Bro. McCabe Answered," *The African News* 1 (1889), 294-295.

⁶⁶Taylor, *Pauline Method*, 5-11; *idem*, *Story of My Life*, 613.

The recurring theme of the autonomy of national Methodist Episcopal Churches is seen throughout Taylor's writings after the India experience and the controversy which ensued.⁶⁷ His perception was that the Mission Society was seeking to place these new churches in a type of bondage. To a certain extent, the newly formed churches shared or came to share this impression. For example, the debate over control of the Methodist mission in Chile 1884-1906 within the Mission Society and the General Conferences, with no concern taken for the opinions of the Methodist missionaries or laity in Chile, was certainly a factor in the conversion of most of the Methodist Church in Chile to Pentecostalism in 1907.⁶⁸ Despite Taylor's appreciation for many aspects of the British Empire, he was very sensitive to any transference of colonial ideology into mission policy and ecclesiology.

Within the Methodist Episcopal Church, the periodical literature reflects a changing concept of missions and of the world outside the United States. The United States had long maintained an imperialist stance *vis a vis* Mexico and Canada. However, as the new industrial strength of the northern states brought the United States into competition with the European imperial powers, that attitude began to pervade mission literature.⁶⁹ The United States was to be a light to the uncivilized and dangerous world. North American Christians had moved beyond a sense of obligation for a "lost" world, and increasingly perceived that they had the "right" to help roll back the darkness of "heathenism" with their money. Any hesitations or questioning about the effectiveness or desirability of their activity was viewed as un-Christian. The idea that money increased the effectiveness of evangelization became a truism within the dominant ecclesiastical cultures.

⁶⁷Taylor, *Story of My Life*, 699, while discussing his mission philosophy, provides an illuminating summary of his method and personal commitment: "One essential condition to that is freedom, freedom at the front."

⁶⁸J. Tremayne Coplestone, *Twentieth-Century Perspectives (The Methodist Episcopal Church, 1896-1939)* (History of Methodist Missions, 4; New York: Board of Global Ministries, 1973), 589-610, provides a very negative North American analysis of the beginnings of the Pentecostal Movement in Chile. For a different analysis, see J. B. A. Kessler, *A Study of the Older Protestant Missions and Churches in Peru and Chile, With Special Reference to the Problems of Division, Nationalism and Native Ministry* (Goes: Osterbaan en Le Cointre, 1967) as well as, Walter J. Hollenweger, "Methodism's Past is Pentecostalism's Present: A Case Study of Cultural Clash in Chile," *Methodist History* 20 (1982), 169-182. For a description of the early negotiations, see Arms, *History of the William Taylor Self-Supporting Missions*, 188-208, 213-235. The Church's action is presented in *Actions of the Board of Managers of The Missionary Society, The General Missionary Committee and The General Conference in Regard to Self-Supporting Missions in Chile* (n.p.: Published by Order of the Board, 1897).

⁶⁹See the various editions of *The Christian Advocate*, 1870-1917.

The Socio-Religious Structures of the Conflict.

One might reasonably ask that since there were so many differences in missiology and ecclesiology between Taylor and the Church, why did Taylor continue as a Methodist after his return to the U.S.A. in 1870. There were alternatives among the Holiness Churches (Wesleyan, Free Methodist) where he was highly respected. Without doubt, Taylor's stubborn desire to vindicate his "Pauline Method" by "scientific" tests as well as the eventual election as missionary bishop served to reinforce his commitment to his church. Furthermore, Taylor was not the only Methodist uncomfortable with the changes in the church.

William Taylor. A product of the hills of Virginia during the 1820's, Taylor struggled to adapt his peasant values to the conditions of a rapidly changing world. He survived, even excelled, as a clergyman because of his ability to adapt to his contexts. One sees this happening in Georgetown, Baltimore, on the trip to San Francisco and in his ministry in that city. His assignment to California was as a missionary. It was the experience of creating and molding a church in San Francisco which marked his understanding of mission. He was given no money, his converts were organized into churches, exploited the natural resources, established social order out of chaos, became wealthy enough to support a regular ministerial and educational structure, and were accepted into the ranks as Methodists equal to those in Baltimore.

For the next several decades as Taylor wandered around the world, at first endeavoring to make good the debt incurred in San Francisco, and later as missionary, he found conditions adequate for the California pattern to repeat itself. In India, he quickly concluded that the church was ineffective because it was not forced to survive on its own as his had been in California. The response of significant numbers to the challenge of being "self-supporting" provided him with evidence that he was correct in his analysis.

The feasibility study of South America therefore took careful note of the economic conditions and possibilities. Sites were chosen with their commercial significance in mind. The planting of mission stations in Africa would follow the same pattern. He was always careful to remind his American readers that conditions in Africa were no more hazardous than those in frontier America, that African beaches and swamps were little different from those of Jersey City and Memphis. For Taylor, there was no Third World. There was only a frontier which needed the "Gospel," careful stewardship, organization and exploitation. These he thought could be accomplished most effectively by Christians, and not necessarily North American Christians. The missionaries were to become one with their hosts. There was to be no structural difference between missionary and "native." He argued, against the evolutionary theories which equated European culture with the apex of development, that information and

intelligence are not the same, and that the children of Africans are no more "heathen" than those of North Americans. To prove that Africans were as capable as North Americans, given equal access to information, he sponsored several students to study in the States. Cultural distinctions were relative for Taylor. He ridiculed the missionaries who insisted on North American style food, housing and customs.

Respect for the people "on the frontier" was coupled with a disdain for the kept minions, as he saw them, of the North American missionary establishment who dared to make decisions for clergy and laity while "10,000 miles from the front." The easy rapport with Bishops Waugh and Simpson during the California experience was not to be repeated with the leaders of the Methodist Episcopal Church during the decades of the 1870's-1890's.

The Methodist Episcopal Church. It was not only Taylor who changed between 1849 and 1875. When he and the Mission Board were again forced to relate because of overlapping interests, there was minimal mutual comprehension or appreciation.

The church, under whose aegis he had ministered in California and preached at a myriad of campmeetings, had undergone a significant social and economic transformation. No longer were the Methodists the "despised" Methodists. Especially in the industrial centers of the American north and midwest, Methodists had achieved social and political "respectability" and in the west they had a hand in the establishment of the institutions of "civilization." The criteria for selection of leadership changed. No longer were the stentorian campmeeting orators and their listeners the powerbrokers of the church. Control of the church came into the hands of the urban upper middle and upper class Methodists, most of them *nouveau riche*, and the implementation of Methodist Episcopal polity reflected their concerns. The alienation of the church from the lower and middle classes, both among its members and in the general populace, was extensive and its effect was beginning to be keenly felt within the church. The Episcopal Address of 1888 posed the question:

Are (the masses) . . . drifting away from us? Have we lost our love for them, or the aggressive spirit which carries the Gospel to their homes and hearts? Have we forgotten our mission as we have increased in wealth? Nothing is more alarming to the philanthropist and the patriot than the alienation of the laboring people from the evangelical churches. Is this alienation a fact? If so, what is its cause? If we have given too much attention to the rich, or cherished too much regard for social position, or have in any wise neglected the poor, we have departed from the spirit of our calling.⁷⁰

That the question was posed in such terms indicates the depth of the social problems within the church. The social, economic, and regional

⁷⁰"Episcopal Address," in *General Conference Journal* (1888), 57-58, cited in Barclay, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, 62-63.

divisions in the post-Civil War church made nearly inevitable the alienation of the disenfranchised as the Methodist *bourgeoisie* grew. Structural fragmentation along scio-cultural and economic lines became frequent as groups such as the Free Methodist Church were formed. Theological issues became rallying points for the disaffected but were of secondary importance.

When Taylor returned to the U.S. after an absence of 15 years, he found a Methodist culture very different from that of 1860. His culture shock is evident. The features of Methodist Episcopal missions in India which he found most appalling were discovered to be but mirror images of the values of the American church. Taylor was not the only person alienated, however, and he found his most receptive audience and primary financial and political support in the U.S. rural north and midwest (with some important exceptions such as the Fowlers) among those who had become identified with the Holiness movement. The Holiness churches and interest groups were quick to catch his vision for "Pauline Missions." Waves of Holiness-Methodist related missionaries blanketed the globe laying the base for the Pentecostal "revivals" of 1906-1939.⁷¹

Conclusion.

The life and ministry of William Taylor is paradigmatic of the response of many Methodist leaders who had earlier emerged among the middle and lower classes to the increasing *embourgeoisement* of American Methodism during the last half of the 19th century and illustrative of the socio-cultural fragmentation of the church during the same period. It is also suggestive of the dynamic which produced the Pentecostal movement. The development of Taylor's missiology is to be understood as a product of that same shift in cultural values. "Pauline Methods" and "Modern Missions" were but expressions of the profound chasm between the frontier experience (which with the settlement of the Continent came to be defined in social and economic rather than geographical terms) and the emerging world view of the American *bourgeoisie*. Methodism had indeed become an American phenomenon.

⁷¹"Pauline Missions" became a codeword among Wesleyan/Holiness and Evangelical missionaries to describe a style of organization and local independence which drew inspiration from Taylor. See Benjamin Caulfield, "The Giant with Seven League Boots," *The Christian Advocate* 28 April 1921, 551-552 and Robert E. Speer, *Servants of the King* (New York: Young People's Missionary Movement of the United States and Canada, 1910), 37-54. The structures and significance of Taylor's missiology have been discussed in the David Bundy, "The Missiology of William Taylor: A Study in Nineteenth Century Intellectual History," unpublished paper presented to the Wesleyan/Holiness Project Scholars Meeting, Wilmore, KY, 28-30 January 1988.