
"We believe in the gift of tongues": The 1906 Pentecostal Revolution and Its Effects on the LDS Use of the Gift of Tongues in the Twentieth Century

Alan J. Clark

At a conference of Christian clergy held in Utah on March 31, 1900, one of the ministers present prayed that a "Pentecostal revival" might occur throughout the entire state. In response, an editorial writer for the *Deseret News* questioned what the minister meant by his supplication. "Suppose some one, in answer to the petition of the minister in the sectarian conference were to arise in the assembly and speak in tongues?" the editorial writer asked. "How is it likely that it would be received? Would not the preachers present declare that the speaker was a 'Mormon' and therefore should be ejected from the meeting? If such a manifestation as that on Pentecost were 'revived' literally, would there not be consternation in the crowd?" For Latter-day Saints, *Pentecost* meant the return of spiritual gifts, including the gift of tongues, which most other Christian churches condemned in 1900. Given this belief, the writer concluded that the ministers should be wary of their words, for "there has been a 'Pentecostal revival' already."¹

Latter-day Saints believed that "Pentecost," which included speaking in tongues, had already "reoccurred" as a result of the restoration of the gospel through the instrumentality of Joseph Smith. In fact, members of the LDS Church were already accustomed to manifestations of the spiritual gifts, including speaking in and interpreting tongues in their meetings. In a few short years, however, the scenario would turn itself completely around. The

ALAN J. CLARK (alan.clark@cgu.edu) is a PhD student in the department of religion at Claremont Graduate University studying North American religious history. He received his BA from Arizona State University, and his MA from Brigham Young University. His interests include religion in the Intermountain West, Pentecostalism, and LDS Church history in the Progressive Era.

LDS Church would express caution regarding the gift of tongues while the Christian community would be singing its praises. Significantly, the Pentecostal revival that emerged among Protestants in the early part of the twentieth century subsequently led LDS leaders to consider the proper place of speaking in tongues in the Church. To prevent confusion and deception resulting from the growing use of tongues in the Pentecostal churches, the Church's First Presidency gradually reemphasized the appropriate role and use of the gift of tongues in the Church.

The Azusa Street Mission

William J. Seymour, an African-American preacher, first embraced the Pentecostal message in 1905 while attending a Bible school taught by Charles F. Parham in Houston, Texas. In his teachings, Parham advocated that the gift of tongues evidenced the presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of any true follower of Jesus Christ—a message that soundly resonated with Seymour. In 1906, after being appointed minister to a small church congregation in Los Angeles, Seymour immediately began preaching the manifestation of tongues among true believers. However, his preaching divided the worshippers, and “he was locked out of his [church] building by the trustees and found himself unemployed.”²² Undeterred, Seymour, and those loyal to him and his message, relocated to an abandoned two-story building on Azusa Street, where, under his leadership, the Azusa Street Mission began. Seymour's preaching that a person had not received the spirit in their lives until they had received the gift of tongues, in addition to other spiritual manifestations such as healing and prophesying, and their twenty-four-hour revivals, soon caught the attention of Los Angeles' Christian community. When a reporter from the *Los Angeles Daily Times* reported a slanderous article concerning the mission at Azusa Street, Frank Bartleman, a close associate of Seymour, mused that the “press wrote us up shamefully but that only drew more crowds.”²³

In time, the Azusa Street congregation became internationally famous for its role in igniting a new Pentecostal revival, which eventually influenced a large element of Christianity. The use of the gift of tongues, known as glossolalia, spread throughout Protestantism like holy fire from heaven.

Pentecostalism grew quickly despite negative criticism from the mainstream churches. A prominent professor from the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama wrote that Pentecostals come in two types, “neurotics, and [the] mentally retarded.”²⁴ Others compared it to the anti-institutional practices during the time of John Wesley, purporting that “the boisterous behaviour of its [the Methodist Church's] former revivalism became an embarrassing memory.”²⁵ In spite of the criticism, curious ministers from across the country

sought out William J. Seymour and eventually found themselves reborn in the gift of tongues. Charles H. Mason, William Durham, and T. B. Barratt carried spirit baptism in the gift of tongues from Azusa Street to the American South, the Northeast, and overseas to Europe. By 1910, Pentecostalism had found its way to the continents of North and South America, Europe, and Asia.⁶ By 1955 there were 18,834 local Pentecostal churches and 1.5 million believers in the USA.⁷

The Pentecostal Movement in Utah

In 1914, the Pentecostal clamor spread to Utah, when missions began opening doors to spread the Pentecostal fire in the stronghold of the LDS Church.⁸ In October 1916, Maria Beulah Woodworth-Etter, otherwise famous for her tent revivals among the Holiness sects, held revivals in Salt Lake City under the banner of Pentecostalism and the gift of tongues.⁹ She and other preachers met with resistance however, and no permanent churches were established. The 1914–1917 directory of ministers for the Assemblies of God Pentecostal churches listed five ministers residing in Utah, whereas by 1926, the directory showed only one remaining.¹⁰ Another U.S. survey estimated only forty Pentecostals living in Utah in 1936.¹¹ It was not until fifty years after the outpouring at the Azusa Street Mission that R. G. Fulford of the Rocky Mountain District of the Assemblies of God could report that “God has graciously helped our work in Utah, and at present we have 14 churches, with 12 of them well established.”¹² However, the supposedly good numbers reported in Utah were minimal compared to the growth of Pentecostalism in almost every other location in the United States, an indication that the movement during this same time period had left only an insignificant footprint along the mountain and valley settlements of Utah.

Even though the two faith groups did not share the same geographical space, they shared a common belief in the use and practice of the gift of tongues. These common beliefs confused many outsiders at first. As early as 1908, references to the Mormons and their use of tongues began spattering the question and answer columns in Pentecostal newspapers. Many, having only just recently discovered baptism in the Spirit through the gift of tongues, wondered whether they shared a common doctrine with the peculiar religion of Utah. Some Holiness churches (which later became Pentecostal) called themselves the “Latter Rain” movement, which became confused with the “Latter-day Saint” movement, a name used by many LDS missionaries to introduce themselves.¹³ Columnists responded divisively: “They [the LDS Church] are entirely different from the Assemblies of God in the Pentecostal movement.”¹⁴

Nevertheless, members of the Pentecostal movement astutely noticed and hastily denied the purported similarities between their new acceptance of spiritual gifts and tongues with that of the Latter-day Saints. Editorialists cited the works of Eber D. Howe and Samuel Hawthornthwaite to demonstrate the erroneous way in which the Mormons went about speaking in tongues.¹⁵ These hackneyed attempts to explain away the existence of spiritual gifts among the Mormons left members of the fledgling Pentecostal churches with nothing to go on but the inflammatory word of their own biased newspapers.

Popular opinion and the national media of the early twentieth century also bombarded the LDS Church with accusations of depravity and debauchery. Most Christians were not willing to fasten any ties to the heretical image of the Mormon polygamists, “who come to their door, give out the literature, tell of wonderful things having been revealed to their leaders, and talk knowingly of deeply spiritual truths, such as divine healing, the baptism of the Spirit with speaking in tongues,” only to turn around and supposedly lure young women into uncivilized and adulterous relationships.¹⁶ At the turn of the century, the U.S. Congress entertained a constitutional amendment to ban polygamy. This coalesced with the U.S. Senate hearings around the election of Reed Smoot, a Mormon Apostle, to the U.S. Senate. Few of the mainstream American churches accepted the practices of the new Pentecostal movement, but their dislike for the gift of tongues paled in comparison to their disgust of Mormon polygamy and theocracy.¹⁷

The media worked in conjunction to create tension and animosity between the LDS Church and the Pentecostal churches. Fewer people noticed the shared beliefs of the LDS Church and the Pentecostal movement because of polygamy, and its entailed dissolution of the social order overwhelmed the media of the period, casting a suspicious shadow over Salt Lake City. When asked why he did not include the Mormon use of tongues in the celebration of Pentecost, one editorialist commented: “I know of no well authenticated facts concerning the ‘tongues’ movement among that people. I am not willing to receive the statements of their leaders upon that or any other subject.”¹⁸ Even though the explosive outgrowth of Pentecostalism ought to have promulgated the shared belief of spiritual gifts with the Mormons, that insight was lost in the helter-skelter media coverage of polygamy.

Latter-day Saints, however, did take notice of the growing interest in and use of spiritual gifts among other Christians; their response was an appeal to authority. The gift of tongues had been instrumental in the conversions of Heber C. Kimball and Brigham Young in 1831 and 1832, both of whom became stalwart leaders in the Church.¹⁹ If any religious group in that American era knew the appropriate place and use of glossolalia, the Latter-day Saints claimed to know best. When the news of an incident involving the

gift of tongues among Christians in India reached the ears of LDS missionaries, Church members responded: "We do not hesitate to express the belief that it [the gift of tongues among the Christians in India] does not come by the power of the Holy Ghost, as the genuine gift of tongues always does, but that it is produced by an entirely different agency."²⁰ Latter-day Saints were no more willing than the Pentecostal members to concede that their beliefs could be in any way similar. The Latter-day Saints condemned the American Pentecostal movement and accused the ministers of being caught up in "delusion."²¹ Church leaders had made the claim that the world would one day be tempted to imitate their beliefs, and now there was evidence. In the December 1909 Christmas message of the First Presidency to the Church, they happily intoned, "The world is gradually learning that the Church has been misunderstood and should have a respectful hearing. In fact this recognition has taken the form, among some of the Christian sects, of adopting certain principles of the gospel taught by the Church."²² Members grabbed hold of these messages and used them to disparage the use of glossolalia by others. A commentary on spiritual gifts included this explanation: "It is a noteworthy fact and a most important one, that there is no imitation of a genuine article unless that article exists at the same time as the imitation."²³ Average Church members were likely to agree "that the Church is the only one in the world which possesses divine authority to confer upon converts the Holy Ghost, of which the genuine gift of tongues is at once a fruit and a proof."²⁴

Curiously enough, as the LDS Church began to diminish the use of some spiritual gifts, the Pentecostal movement expanded their use. For the Latter-day Saints, baptism and rebaptism had long been administered as a healing ritual, women had been permitted to administer healing rituals through prayer and the laying on of hands, and men and women spoke in tongues and interpreted meaning in Church meetings—but these practices began to fade. For many years, priesthood holders worked under relatively scant supervision from the general and local authorities of the Church; missionaries baptized new members, and local congregations continued rapidly increasing in size, which meant that the main leadership of the Church could not always be sure how the day-to-day use of spiritual gifts applied in practice and principle in the everyday lives of the members. Meanwhile, the spiritual gifts of visions and prophecies burdened local bishops who attempted to discern between negligent overuse of spirituality and appropriate displays of the spirit. All these factors contributed to the need for review and revision of the doctrines and practices of the Church as a whole.

Priesthood Correlation and the Exercise of Spiritual Gifts

To assess and review the state of the priesthood quorums and operations throughout the Church, beginning in 1908 the First Presidency created the General Priesthood Committee. Priesthood lesson manuals were produced in order to create a uniform curriculum of study. Weekly meetings and record keeping were instituted for all of the various quorums so that local bishops might be apprised of their activities. Attendance at meetings increased as more members felt included and accountable.²⁵

All of these institutional changes allowed for a more organized and uniform Church structure, but they increased tension with individual member's freedom of charismatic and Pentecostal expression. Official declarations from the First Presidency on the propriety of healing rituals, for example, abounded. From 1914 to 1924, the practice of female ritual healing went from the purview of the women's Relief Society to that of the local bishop, and rebaptisms for health were removed from the list of acceptable ordinances, as well as anointing and dedicating the gravely ill in preparation for their deaths.²⁶ James R. Clark summarized the actions of the First Presidency as "an excellent illustration of the eternal vigilance exercised by the First Presidency lest apostasy or perversions of the ordinances of the gospel gradually enter the Church by custom."²⁷ Joseph F. Smith and Heber J. Grant, each acting as presidents of the Church, set new parameters around appropriate "Pentecostal" expression.

Opinions differ regarding why these actions occurred during this period of LDS history. According to Thomas G. Alexander, "such experiences were incompatible with the type of scientific rationalism increasingly popular in church circles."²⁸ The spiritual gifts represented types of expression that could not be interpreted through a rational scientific inquiry, and so needed to be curtailed to some extent. Furthermore, the institutional integrity of the Church could be better preserved if certain forms of personal expression were inhibited. In regard to healing, Jonathan Stapley and Kristine Wright claimed that "leaders reformed the relationship of the Melchizedek Priesthood to the Mormon healing liturgy."²⁹ Lee Copeland viewed the Church as becoming more bureaucratic and less accepting of individual freedoms. He argued that "before 1900, both glossolalia and xenoglossia were common, but these extremely personal experiences did not fit into an evolving church which emphasized order, authority, permission, and control."³⁰ This meant that Church leaders made changes to their own practices because of what they witnessed going on outside of the Church. Several of the Christian Holiness sects had also embraced spiritual healing as early as the 1880s, and this may have directly affected the direction that LDS leadership decided to pursue.

Perhaps the reasons for the changes reflected both the cultural influences at play and the greater need to restore order and activity in the priesthood quorums of the Church. As the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve struggled to implement new organization into local quorums, such as the correlated lesson materials and unified meeting schedules, they also attempted to attach more significance to the role of the individual priesthood holder. Restructuring the gift of healing as the sole responsibility of the elders of the Church emphasized the need for priesthood holders to be active and worthy in order to assist the body of the Church in such a significant capacity. In April 1909, Ruder Clawson related how participating in healing the sick strengthened the testimonies of those involved.³¹ Discussing the value of priesthood education and participation, he praised the changes, saying, "To me this seems beautiful; it seems consistent and right, that thereby they might acquire a love for it, and a spirit of devotion and of loyalty to their quorums."³² Joseph F. Smith reiterated similar sentiments in 1911: "I believe in the Holy Priesthood, in its power, in its rightfulness to administer in the temples and in the waters of baptism, and in the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, and for healing of the sick, and for ordinations, and for all other purposes for which the Priesthood is rightfully used."³³ Francis M. Lyman, in an entire conference address on the topic, implored on behalf of the Church leadership that "we want the brethren bearing the Priesthood in every ward in Zion to be a little jealous to take care of the employment that is furnished them there in their office as teachers, and in administering to the sick."³⁴ Church authorities in the early twentieth century used the administration of healing as a mechanism to increase responsibility and involvement of priesthood holders, while sacrificing the complete freedom to operate spiritual gifts that had existed in earlier periods of the Church.

Reassessing the Gift of Tongues

Previous leaders of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints had also warned members about the misuse of spiritual gifts, especially the gift of tongues. When questioned in 1833 about the appearance of the gift among members of the Church, Joseph Smith wrote: "As to the gift of tongues, all we can say is, that in this place we have received it as the ancients did we wish you however to be careful lest in this you be deceived."³⁵ A few months later, having received a letter sent to a Sister Whitney containing a prophecy given through the interpretation of the gift of tongues, the Prophet urged members to be wary of interpreting the spiritual gift: "Many who pretend to have the gift of Interpretation are liable to be mistaken, and do not give the true interpretation of what is spoken."³⁶ On August 1, 1834, the high council in Missouri

disciplined Samuel Brown for the inappropriate use of the gift of tongues.³⁷ Smith always promoted the gift with caution, just as Paul did in the New Testament. In another incident the following year, he banned the use of the gift of tongues during Church trials because “in all our decisions we must judge from actual testimony.”³⁸ Later in 1839 he instructed the members of the Quorum of the Twelve, “Let no one speak in Tongues unless he interpret except by the consent of the one who is placed to preside,” effectively placing the veracity of the Pentecostal gift in the purview of the priesthood.³⁹ The Prophet often found himself having to remind the Saints that the gift was mainly intended for missionary work and the conversion of souls unto God: “Tongues were given for the purpose of preaching among those whose language is not understood, as on the day of Pentecost.”⁴⁰ But as often as he censured, he also promoted the gift. At the initiation of the Relief Society in 1842 he said: “You may speak in tongues for your own comfort, but I lay this down for a rule, that if anything is taught by the gift of tongues, it is not to be received for doctrine.”⁴¹ In short, Smith respected the gift of unknown tongues as an accepted, if not deceptive and easily faked, spiritual gift.

As such, the gift of unknown tongues remained completely unrestricted by doctrine or official decree during the first decade of the twentieth century. This is uniquely different from the gift of healing and its associated ordinance. The role of the gift of tongues in the history of the Church may have held such a prominent a place in the hearts and minds of the LDS members that it could not be forsaken altogether. And not all Church authorities believed that its practice should be diminished.

Church leaders left mixed messages about its proper place and practice in the growing, reforming religion, which highlighted their own uncertainty and desire to discover its proper use. Abraham O. Woodruff, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve, said in 1901 that “the people of God do enjoy the gift of prophecy, the gift of healing, the gift of tongues; and probably the latter gift has been taken advantage of by the evil one more than any other gift in the Church.” He endorsed the gift but explained further that bishops were free to restrain from speaking in tongues those whom they saw fit.⁴² That same year Rudger Clawson, also a member of the Twelve, gave similar instructions to a bishop in Idaho Falls.⁴³ That said, only a month earlier Clawson recorded a meeting in which a fellow Apostle, Reed Smoot, reported that during “fast meetings in Provo last Sunday . . . the spirit and power of testimony rested upon the people and the gifts of the gospel were manifested. One brother spoke in tongues.”⁴⁴ In this case, no reprimands were given, nor any instructions to priesthood leadership to prevent such Pentecostal displays, suggesting Church officials addressed the practice on a case-by-case basis. In his seminal volume entitled *The Articles of Faith*, James E. Talmage wrote: “The Latter-

day Saints claim to possess within the Church all the sign-gifts promised as the heritage of the believer. They point . . . to a multitude who have voiced their testimony in tongues with which they were naturally unfamiliar; or who have demonstrated their possession of the gift by a phenomenal mastery of foreign languages, when such was necessary to the discharge of their duties as preachers of the word of God."⁴⁵ However, he also taught that speaking in unknown tongues is most often exercised "in the function of praise, rather than that of instruction and preaching."⁴⁶ Consistently throughout the early twentieth century, Church leaders counseled restraint in the exercise of tongues, while others affirmed its validity and acceptance as a Pentecostal expression of appropriate spirituality. Notwithstanding their differences in opinion, LDS leaders urged caution with the gift of tongues.

Some authors point to President Heber J. Grant as the Church leader who brought about the discontinued use of unknown tongues in the Church. As evidence of this, historians Thomas Alexander and also Dan Vogel and Scott Dunn cite a March 1923 letter from the First Presidency to Heber Q. Hale, stake president of the Boise Stake, regarding the gift of unknown tongues taking place in a Relief Society meeting of that stake.⁴⁷ In the letter, the First Presidency instructed Hale "to advise Sister Nelsen to let speaking in tongues alone and to confine her speech to her own language, and then she will be responsible for what she says."⁴⁸ However, this counsel did not imply that the gift should not be exercised. In 1919, only a few years previous to the aforementioned Hale letter, Heber J. Grant took the opportunity as the new president of the Church to reiterate to the world the LDS beliefs. Speaking on the seventh Article of Faith (which addresses spiritual gifts), Grant recounted two precious memories from his own life when he witnessed the gift of unknown tongues being exercised. He then concluded: "Tell me that the gift of tongues is not exercised in this Church? As well tell me that I do not know that I stand here today."⁴⁹ I contend that Heber J. Grant did not end the practice of unknown tongues. Had he wished to reform the Church's policies regarding the gift of unknown tongues, he had ample opportunity to do so as president of the Church, but according to my research no official declaration was ever given. Instead, the Church under his administration worked to alleviate the increasing tension that existed between it and the Pentecostal movement by encouraging local bishops to more carefully observe and check the use of the gift in the public meetings of the Church. Grant reaffirmed its validity as a true gift of the spirit, and then, like so many other leaders before him, warned against its misuse, hoping to dispel the confusion brought on by the Pentecostal revival.

It is not surprising, then, that the use of unknown tongues in the LDS Church began to fade as Church leaders warned against the dangers of

unknown tongues, while at the same time reaffirming its validity inside and denying its use outside of the LDS priesthood. Writing about spiritual gifts, John A. Widtsoe suggested that “such gifts, when found outside of the Priesthood, are often dangerous, and usually are manifestations of evil spirits.”⁵⁰ Other leaders continued to stress how, even though the Pentecostal movement sought an experience with the Holy Spirit similar to that of the LDS beliefs, it could very well be the work of the devil. No LDS authorities of whom I am aware specifically mention the Pentecostal movement or the charismatic movements which succeeded it, but their comments certainly intended to include all movements that claimed the use of such spiritual gifts. Even Bruce R. McConkie, writing nearly eighty years after the 1906 Pentecostal beginning, affirmed the Church’s use of speaking in unknown tongues, but stigmatized the outside use of it by saying that “Lucifer can cause his disciples to give forth nonsensical gibberish in tongues known to devils.”⁵¹ This kind of language could only be targeting the ever-growing population of Pentecostal and charismatic believers. The leadership of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints only discouraged the use of unknown tongues when it might become an impediment to the members of the Church. With so many professing the signs of the Holy Spirit, investigators of the LDS faith might mistake Pentecostal preachers and ministers as teachers in the same fold. Thus the gift of tongues remained a powerful piece of LDS history and doctrine, but it no longer served as a unique identifier for the gospel of Jesus Christ as taught by the LDS Church. General Authorities continued to discourage its use, and over time, bishops felt directed to prohibit unknown tongues altogether rather than deal with them on a case-by-case scenario.

A recent study by Matthew Davies argues in detail that the LDS Church sought to “reclassify glossolalia as part of a larger effort to gain favorability for the Church in the larger American society.”⁵² He asserts that during the first decade of the twentieth century, Church leaders replaced the belief in unknown tongues with the belief in known tongues, or xenoglossia. This, he contends, was done to give the Church more of a traditional Protestant image. “The LDS Church reinterpreted one of its most crucial doctrines [the gift of unknown tongues] . . . to reenter society,” he argues, “and when confronted with a competing claim of apostolic restoration [the Pentecostal revival], emphasized the reinterpreted doctrine rather than the Church’s historic practice.”⁵³ While Davies’ conclusion about the timing and new emphasis on the gift of known tongues is historically accurate, his reasons for why the changes occurred are inadequate. At a time when official documents and decrees abounded with cessations on other practices, such as polygamy and healing, no official decree was written pertaining to the gift of tongues, known or unknown. LDS Church leaders simply did not attempt to reinterpret

the gift of tongues, they only attempted to ensure that the body of the Church not be led away by the use of tongues prevalent in the Pentecostal movement.

In 1900, when the LDS editorialist questioned, "What would be the consequence if [Pentecost] . . . were repeated today?"⁵⁴ the Pentecostal revival that began in 1906 presented an answer. In terms of the LDS Church and the rise of the Pentecostal movement, the response was profoundly different, particularly in the exercise of the gift of tongues. Paul taught that "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace" (1 Cor. 14:33). Instead of declaring an end to a cherished spiritual gift, the First Presidency acknowledged the confusion and difficulty of discerning true expression of the gift. The Church's general leadership lauded its place as one of the heralding signs of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ in modern times, but also directed and inspired local leadership to begin monitoring the practice more carefully. Even William Seymour, the leader of the Pentecostal movement, admitted the necessity for such caution and censorship in his own church's use of the gift of tongues. After betrayal by friends, he mourned that "wherever the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit will only be known as the evidence of speaking in tongues, that work will be an open door for witches and spiritualists, and free loveism."⁵⁵ The Pentecostal revival of 1906 gave the LDS Church an opportunity to evaluate its adherence to its own beliefs and then reacted cautiously and conscientiously to what might have been a religious identity crisis.

Notes

1. "A Pentecostal Revival," *Deseret Evening News*, March 31, 1900, 4. Some nineteenth century Christian ministers understood a Pentecostal revival not to mean the return of spiritual gifts, but instead an increase of the Holy Spirit.

2. William K. Kay, *Pentecostalism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 25.

3. Frank Bartleman, *Azusa Street* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1980), 54. See also "Weird Babel of Tongues," *Los Angeles Daily Times*, April 18, 1906. For more on William Seymour and the Azusa Street mission, see Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997).

4. Randall J. Stephens, "Interpreting American Pentecostal Origins: Retrospect and Prospect," in *American Denominational History: Perspectives on the Past, Prospects for the Future*, ed. Keith Harper (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2008), 173.

5. Kay, *Pentecostalism*, 14.

6. For more exploration on the international growth of Pentecostalism see Vinson Synan, *The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal, 1901–2001* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Inc., 2001); and Allan Anderson, *An*

Introduction to Pentecostalism (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

7. Nils Bloch-Hoell, *The Pentecostal Movement: Its Origin, Development, and Distinctive Character* (New York: Humanities Press, 1964), 60.

8. "Salt Lake City," *The Christian Evangel* (Findlay, OH), October 24, 1914, 4. A number of newspapers reported early missionary work by Pentecostals in Utah. See also "The Largest Untouched Field in the United States," *The Weekly Evangel* (St. Louis, MO), December 9, 1916, 15; and "The Churches," *The Salt Lake Herald*, September 17, 1916, 3.

9. "The Largest Untouched Field in the United States," *The Weekly Evangel*, December 9, 1916, 15; and "This Week's Cover," *The Pentecostal Evangel* (St. Louis, MO), May 30, 1954, 10.

10. *Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God in the United States of America, Canada and Foreign Lands 1914–1917*, 27–40; and *Official List of Ministers and Missionaries of the General Council Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO), revised to December 1, 1926. Based on subsequent editions of this directory, only one registered minister remained in Utah until 1945. For further reference see Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center online database at <http://ifphc.org/>.

11. Bloch-Hoell, *The Pentecostal Movement*, 57.

12. "Home Missions in Rocky Mountain District," *The Pentecostal Evangel*, June 30, 1957, 21. This number represents the number of Assemblies of God churches only. Certainly there were other Pentecostal denominations in the state, but it serves to demonstrate the relative absence of Pentecostal churches as compared to the rest of the country.

13. An anecdotal example of this confusion can be found in Andrew L. Fraser, "'Your Young Men Shall See Visions': How I Came into Pentecost," *The Latter Rain Evangel* (Chicago, IL) April 1915, 10.

14. E. N. Bell, "Questions and Answers," *The Pentecostal Evangel*, January 22, 1921, 10.

15. Eber D. Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled* (Painesville, OH: Published by Eber D. Howe, 1834), and Samuel Hawthornthwaite, *Mr. Hawthornthwaite's Adventures Among the Mormons as an Elder during Eight Years* (Manchester: Published by Samuel Hawthornthwaite, 1857). These sources have been cited to refute the use of the gift of tongues in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints during most of the twentieth century. Accounts such as these seek nothing but harm toward the LDS Church, with an aside to misguided and unfounded testimonials on the history of the LDS Church and its practices.

16. "False Doctrine," *The Bridegroom's Messenger* (Atlanta, GA), April 15, 1911, 1.

17. For further details on the polygamy debate, see Kathleen Flake, *The Politics of American Religious Identity: The Seating of Senator Reed Smoot, Mormon Apostle* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003); and Sarah Barringer Gordon, *The Mormon Question: Polygamy and Constitutional Conflict in Nineteenth Century America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

18. "Questions Concerning Tongues," *The Bridegroom's Messenger* (Atlanta, GA), May 15, 1908, 2.

19. See Dan Vogel and Scott C. Dunn, "'The Tongue of Angels': Glossolalia among Mormonism's Founders," *Journal of Mormon History* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1993): 7–8; and Lee Copeland, "Speaking in Tongues in the Restoration Churches," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 24, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 15–16.

20. "Speaking in Tongues," *Liahona: The Elders' Journal* 5, no. 36 (February 22, 1908): 955.

21. "Speaking in Tongues," 955. Latter-day Saints did not condemn the Pentecostal

movement by name. It is the use of tongues by another faith group that they condemned.

22. Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder, and Anthon H. Lund, "Greetings from the First Presidency," in James R. Clark, comp., *Messages of the First Presidency*, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965), 4:207.

23. "Spiritual Signs," *Liahona: The Elders' Journal* 5, no. 18 (October 19, 1907): 496.

24. "Speaking in Tongues," 958.

25. See William Hartley, "The Priesthood Reform Movement, 1908–1922," *BYU Studies* 13, no. 2 (Winter 1973): 3–8.

26. See Joseph F. Smith, Anthon H. Lund, and Charles W. Penrose, "To the Presidents of the Stakes and Bishops of the Wards," October 3, 1914, and Clark's commentary in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 4:312–15. See also Heber J. Grant, Charles W. Penrose, and Anthony R. Ivins to Reed Smoot, November 24, 1922, and Clark's commentary in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5: 220, 224–25.

27. Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5:224.

28. Thomas G. Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890–1930* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 305.

29. Jonathan A. Stapley and Kristine Wright, "Female Ritual Healing in Mormonism," *Journal of Mormon History* 37, no. 1 (Winter 2011): 32.

30. Copeland, "Speaking in Tongues in the Restoration Churches," 23–24.

31. Rudger Clawson, *Seventy-Ninth Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1909), 93–94.

32. Rudger Clawson, *Eightieth Semi-Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1909), 67.

33. Joseph F. Smith, *Eighty-Second Semi-Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1911), 9.

34. Francis M. Lyman, *Eighty-Fourth Annual Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1914), 33–34.

35. Joseph Smith, Letter to Brethren in Zion, July 2, 1833, Joseph Smith Letterbook 1, 52, Church History Library, Salt Lake City, Utah; also cited in Joseph Smith Jr., *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2d. ed., rev. 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971), 1:369 (hereafter cited as *History of the Church*).

36. Joseph Smith, "History, 1838–1856," vol. A–1, 359, Church History Library, Salt Lake City, Utah.

37. Smith, "History," vol. A–1, 527, see also *History of the Church*, 2:137.

38. Smith, "History," vol. B–1, 554, see also *History of the Church*, 2:162.

39. Smith, "History," vol. C–1, addenda, 13; see also *History of the Church*, 3:392.

40. Smith, "History," vol. C–1, addenda, 8; see also *History of the Church*, 3:379. Pentecostals also believed in the gift of unknown tongues, and many Pentecostal missionaries went to foreign lands without first learning the language because they believed that the gift of tongues would be provided them.

41. Joseph Smith, as cited in "A Book of Records, Containing the proceedings of The Female Relief Society of Nauvoo," 40, Church History Library; see also *History of the Church*, 4:607.

42. Abraham O. Woodruff, "Responsibilities of the Priesthood," *Deseret News*, May 18, 1901.

43. See Rudger Clawson, *A Ministry of Meetings: The Apostolic Diaries of Rudger Clawson*, ed. Stan Larson (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1993), 246.

44. Clawson, *A Ministry of Meetings*, 238.

45. James E. Talmage, *The Articles of Faith A Series of Lectures on the Principal*

Doctrines of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1899), 236. The era of priesthood reformation did not sway or influence Talmage's opinion on the gift of tongues.

46. Talmage, *Articles of Faith*, 227.

47. See Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition*, 294–95, and Vogel and Dunn, “The Tongue of Angels,” 25–26.

48. Heber J. Grant, Charles W. Penrose, and Anthony W. Ivins to Heber Q. Hale, March 28, 1923, First Presidency Letterpress Copybook, Church History Library, Salt Lake City, Utah, cited in Vogel and Dunn, “The Tongue of Angels,” 26.

49. Heber J. Grant, “The Treaty of Peace—Restoration of the Gospel,” discourse delivered at the Salt Lake Stake Conference, September 21, 1919, as cited by Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5:154. David O. McKay, a member of the Twelve under President Heber J. Grant and later president of the Church, related his fond experience of the gift of tongues when speaking to the Maori people of New Zealand in 1921. See David O. McKay, “Gift of Interpretation of Tongues Bestowed: Testimony of President David O. McKay,” MS 3645, Church History Library. McKay headed the General Priesthood Committee and never sought to reform the gift of tongues, despite his involvement and acceptance in reforming spiritual healing practices.

50. John A. Widtsoe, *Priesthood and Church Government: A Handbook and Study Course of the Quorums of the Melchizedek Priesthood of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1939), 38.

51. Bruce R. McConkie, *A New Witness for the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 374.

52. Matthew R. Davies, “The Tongues of the Saints: A Historical Inquiry into the LDS Perception of the Azusa Street Revival and the Changing Definition of Tongues,” 2, paper presented at the BYU Church History Symposium, “Joseph F. Smith: Reflections on the Man and His Times,” March 3, 2012, copy in possession of the author.

53. Davies, “The Tongues of the Saints,” 1.

54. “A Pentecostal Revival,” 4.

55. William J. Seymour, as cited by Renea Brathwaite, “Tongues and Ethics: William J. Seymour and the ‘Bible Evidence’: A Response to Cecil M. Robeck, Jr.,” *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 32, no. 2 (2010): 219.

