

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_whs\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_whs_01.php)

# Proceedings

OF THE

## Wesley Historical Society

Editor: REV. JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

---

---

Volume XLI

October 1977

---

---

### THE CHANGING FACE OF METHODISM

#### I. The Methodist Service Book

OUR Editor has suggested to me that the publication of *The Methodist Service Book* is one of three major turning-points in our history, the other two being the Restructuring and the Methodist Church Act, 1976. [These will be dealt with in future issues of the *Proceedings*.—ED.] This new book is of course descended from *The Sunday Service of the Methodists* which John Wesley sent to America in 1784 and its subsequent editions,<sup>1</sup> the various revisions and books published by the branches of Methodism during the years of separation<sup>2</sup> (notably in the Wesleyan Church the revisions in 1846 and 1864 and *Public Prayers and Services* (1882)), and the product of Methodist Union, *The Book of Offices* (1936). It differs from its predecessors more than any of them differed from that of 1784 or from the Prayer Book of 1662 or even 1552. The reason for this lies in the great changes which have occurred in the whole world of liturgy in the last fifty years. In the 1950s we used to speak of three great movements: the revival of Biblical Theology, the Ecumenical Movement, and the Liturgical Movement. The first of these was much modified by the radicalism of the 1960s; the second is often said to have run out of steam because of the disappointingly slow progress of actual schemes for Church union, but in fact has been considerably enlarged in its scope because of the Second Vatican Council. The third has greatly accelerated.

The liturgical movement has taken most explaining to Methodists. It might be better to call it the renewal of worship.<sup>3</sup> The very word "liturgy" suggests to many people something printed, fixed, and compulsory, rather than extemporaneous, spontaneous, and free. But, as its derivation from Greek words meaning "the work of the

<sup>1</sup> cf. *Proceedings*, xxvii, pp. 33-41; xxix, pp. 12-20; xxxii, pp. 97-101; xxxix, pp. 137-44; xl, pp. 102-5.

<sup>2</sup> cf. *ibid.*, xxxi, pp. 112-18, 133-43; xxxii, pp. 145-52; xxxiii, pp. 1-3.

<sup>3</sup> This was indeed the title of an account of it published in 1965 by Joint Liturgical group, with a Methodist contribution by Rupert E. Davies.

people" implies, it stands for the conception of worship as a corporate act, not performed by an individual priest on behalf of—still less instead of—the people, nor yet performed solely for the edification of individuals, but an act in which God in Christ speaks to and listens to and indwells Christ's body, the Church. This runs counter to some of the ideas of pietistic individualism, but is congenial to the true heart of Methodism.

This movement, as outlined in various standard works in the 1950s,<sup>4</sup> had begun in the Roman Catholic Church as far back as 1903, and it had to some extent influenced Continental Protestantism.<sup>5</sup> It took shape in the Church of England in the form of the Parish and People Movement.<sup>6</sup> But the liturgical books of the period such as the revised Prayer Book of 1928, rejected by Parliament, and the Methodist book of 1936, showed no trace of it. It did not begin to affect actual service-books until the late 1960s. The Second Vatican Council gave the impetus to Roman Catholic reform; and the Mass of 1970 replaced the Tridentine Mass of 1570. The Church of England obtained authority from Parliament in 1965 to use experimental services, and subsequently in 1974<sup>7</sup> to issue new services to supplement the Prayer Book of 1662. The numerous paper-back services which have thus appeared are expected to culminate in a new Prayer Book in 1980, which will co-exist with that of 1662. It is significant that the published collections of liturgies from Anglican provinces throughout the world consist of three volumes—one from 1549 to 1958, one from 1958 to 1968, and one from 1968 to 1975.<sup>8</sup> Liturgies frozen for three or four hundred years have thawed.

Methodism, like the other English free churches, was at first fairly complacent about all this. If other churches cared to catch up with the Reformation, for example by having their services in the vernacular, we noted it with approval, but had no need to do anything ourselves. But gradually it dawned on us that we too had something to learn.<sup>9</sup> In 1957 the Conference appointed a committee to examine the nature of Christian worship, and received its report in 1960. It also resolved, at the instigation of the Faith and Order Committee, that forms of worship intended for regular and general use in Methodist public worship should be submitted to Conference for approval after a period of experimentation, on the Faith and

<sup>4</sup> e.g. J. H. Srawley: *The Liturgical Movement* (1954); E. B. Koenker: *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (1954); A. R. Shands: *The Liturgical Movement and the Local Church* (1959).

<sup>5</sup> e.g. J.-D. Benoit: *Liturgical Renewal* (1958).

<sup>6</sup> e.g. A. G. Hebert: *Liturgy and Society* (1935); A. G. Hebert (ed.): *The Parish Communion* (1937); P. J. Jagger: *Bishop Henry de Candole: his Life and Times, 1895-1971* (1975).

<sup>7</sup> Each of these measures came into force in the following year.

<sup>8</sup> B. Wigan (ed.): *The Liturgy in English* (1962); C. O. Buchanan (ed.): *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968* (1968) and *Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968-1975* (1975).

<sup>9</sup> cf. R. J. Billington: *The Liturgical Movement and Methodism* (1969).

Order Committee's recommendation.<sup>10</sup> The Epworth Press thereafter always sent such services, e.g. an Order of Service for Ascension Day (1962), to the Faith and Order Committee, which gave its advice and after discussion was always able to recommend them to the Conference.

In 1961 the Conference asked that Committee to investigate the desirability of—and procedures involved in—revising the 1936 book. In 1962 the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* carried four articles designed to pave the way for that revision,<sup>11</sup> and in the same year the Conference resolved, on receiving the report of the Faith and Order Committee, that

the Book of Offices be revised over a period of years; that the baptismal services and the Service for the Public Reception of New Members be considered first; that a draft revision of these services be prepared and submitted to a future Conference with a view to experimental use; and that the Faith and Order Committee be authorized to co-opt suitable people on to a sub-Committee to prepare such a draft.

There were two new features in this procedure. One was the use of an existing committee rather than the appointment of a special committee. The other was the resolution to publish experimental drafts. The Faith and Order Committee proceeded to appoint a number of sub-committees, which included people not on the Committee itself, and for several years these were invited to a conference just after Christmas, usually at Chester House, at which the work of all the sub-committees was reviewed. Early drafts were sent to many Methodist Conferences and Districts overseas and to individual experts in other denominations in Britain, and all their replies were carefully collated and considered. There was a heavy expenditure of both time and money, though the procedure was far less elaborate than that in some other churches.

In 1967 the Conference approved the first-fruits of this procedure—the baptismal services and Public Reception into Full Membership, or Confirmation—for experimental use for three years, a period which was afterwards extended. The services were marked “subject to revision”, and Chairmen of Districts were asked to send reports at the end of the period of experimentation. In 1968 came The Sunday Service and the Burial or Cremation of the Dead, in 1969 the Covenant Service, and in 1970 the Marriage Service and the Blessing of a Marriage previously solemnized. Certain services were also approved which were not to be included in the final book. Their omission arose from the need to keep the book within reasonable bounds of size and cost, resembling to some extent *The Shorter Book of Offices*, which had contained only a selection from the services of 1936. But it was understood that the omitted services, when approved by the Conference, would have the same authority as the services in the book, though not actually bound within its covers.

<sup>10</sup> *Daily Record*, 1960, p. 34, which shows that the resolution was carried in a slightly different form from that in the Conference Agenda.

<sup>11</sup> pp. 28-33, 110-16, 207-12, 270-6.

In this way the Conference approved in 1970 the Welcome of a New Minister, and in 1971 the Thanksgiving of Parents after the birth of a child and the Commissioning of Sunday School Teachers and Youth Workers, of Class Leaders, and of Local Preachers. This part of the work is as yet incomplete. The Ordination of Deaconesses is still to be revised. There is also the question of Morning Prayer; this had been subtly distinguished from the other services by the subtitle of *The Book of Offices* of 1936, which read "being the Orders of Service authorized for use in the Methodist Church together with the Order for Morning Prayer". In recent years the Faith and Order Committee actually prepared a revision of it, but on reflection did not take it to the Conference. Its future is still undetermined.

Meanwhile in 1969 another committee, containing representatives of the Faith and Order Committee but also, for historical reasons, of various other committees, had prepared Collects, Lessons and Psalms,<sup>12</sup> and the Conference of 1969, whilst authorizing this experimentally, nevertheless resolved that it should constitute from January 1971 the Lectionary annually printed in the *Minutes*, which until then had been unrelated to the Epistles and Gospels in *The Book of Offices*. The morning lessons were derived almost exactly from *The Calendar and Lectionary* (1967), the evening lessons from *An Additional Lectionary for use at a Second Sunday Service* (1969), and the Collects from *The Daily Office* (1968)—all publications of Joint Liturgical Group (JLG). That Group did not suggest any Psalms, though the Church of England Liturgical Commission had suggested Psalms to fit those Lessons. Methodism, however, produced its own Psalms, using chiefly but not exclusively those printed in *The Methodist Hymn-Book* (1933). JLG, founded in 1963, had as its Methodist representatives Rupert Davies, subsequently replaced by Gordon Wakefield, and Raymond George throughout, all of whom were closely associated with the work proceeding in Methodism.

There was some concern that these lessons did not coincide with those contained in the British Lessons Council syllabus and the publications based on it, and this led to discussions which are likely to lead shortly to a considerable—though not complete—assimilation of the British Lessons Council scheme to the Church's lectionary.

These years were marked by increasing ecumenical co-operation. The Roman Catholics after the Second Vatican Council began increasingly to obtain permission to use the vernacular, and in a short time vernacular services became almost universal among them. They were not familiar with the Tudor English of the Prayer Book, and set to work to produce their own vernacular versions of common liturgical texts. In order to secure uniformity throughout the English-speaking world, they set up the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL), and largely through its initiative an ecumenical body was also formed—the International Consultation on

<sup>12</sup> cf. *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, October 1958, pp. 298-304.

English Texts (ICET), on which Methodism was represented by Raymond George, who had been an observer for the World Council of Churches at the Commission (Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia) which had met twice a year at the Vatican to carry out the liturgical reforms presented by the Council. ICET produced *Prayers we have in common*—first edition 1970; revised and enlarged 1971; second edition (revised) 1975.

During these years the custom of addressing God as “you” grew with unexpected rapidity. The services of 1967 had addressed God and even the candidate for baptism as “thee”, but subsequent services had had alternative forms, except that the Collects used only the “thou” forms. But in 1973, in the course of the revision, the Conference, on the recommendation of the Committee, directed that in the volume God should be addressed in the second person plural—itself a rather archaic way of putting it to a generation which regards “you” as equally the second person singular. For legal reasons, however, “thee” was retained in the marriage vows.

In 1971 the Committee began the work of revising the experimental services, asking each year for comments on some of them. These arrived in considerable quantity, and were carefully considered by the sub-committees, now reduced in size. In 1974, after long and detailed debate, Conference gave final approval to most of the new services. They had been distributed in proof to members of the Conference, and with the necessary corrections were subsequently on sale, as they still are, each having a cover of a distinctive colour. The use of red print for the rubrics gave the pages a very attractive appearance.<sup>18</sup> The Conference also approved the title *The Methodist Service Book*, and in its Ministerial Session authorized the Ordination Service, to be used from the Conference of 1975. There was no period of experimental use for this, as such an experiment could have been only a very limited one. It was to some extent based on the proposed *Ordinal* of the Anglican-Methodist Unity Commission (1968).

The booklets used the ICET texts of the Gloria in excelsis, the Sursum Corda, Sanctus and Benedictus qui venit, a paraphrase of the Agnus Dei, and the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. They contained a slightly modified form of the traditional version of the Lord's Prayer, and also the ICET version. Suggestions were sometimes made that Methodism should assimilate its services more closely to the new services of the Church of England, especially to Holy Communion, Series 2 (1967) and Series 3 (1973). There are indeed marked resemblances, but these are mostly due to the general trend of development in those years. Methodism felt it right to make its own contribution. Indeed, there were several respects in

<sup>18</sup> When, however, in a leaflet advertising the booklets I stated that two-colour printing had been used “for the first time in Methodist liturgical typography in this country”, various correspondents pointed out some exceptions invalidating this generalization. It is, nevertheless, true of the main tradition.

which the Methodist Sunday Service of 1968, declining to follow the lead given by Series 2, was itself followed by Series 3. There was, however, one exception. It seemed foolish to have forms of confessions of sins largely identical but differing in small details, and so the Methodist Sunday Services of 1968 and 1974 were conformed in this respect to Holy Communion, Series 2 (1967) and Series 3 (1973) respectively.<sup>14</sup>

By 1975 the work was completed by the Conference's authorizing what remained. Collects, Lessons and Psalms had been revised by an almost entirely fresh committee. The Lessons had been very slightly revised in accordance with suggestions made by the Church of England. The Collects had been considerably modified and put into the "you" form. Changes in these were under discussion at the time both in JLG and in the Church of England, but Methodism could not afford the time to wait to see the results. The Church of England has since published them in another form (*Collects*, Series 3), and JLG may do so in yet another. The *Methodist Service Book* included "The Lord's Supper or Holy Communion (1936 Service)", i.e. the first order from 1936, retaining the exact text,<sup>15</sup> including the "thou" forms, with only typographical alterations (apart from the Lord's Prayer); the rubrics, however, were simplified. A Preface to the book was also approved. It had by this time become clear that very few denominations were likely to use the ICET form of the Lord's Prayer; so the Series 3 form was substituted for it, even though this caused a discrepancy between the book itself and some of the booklets. The book, a most handsome product of the printer's art and the work of the Methodist Publishing House, came on sale later in the same year. The same Conference authorized the revised form of the services not actually included therein.<sup>16</sup>

To describe the contents of the book would need a whole series of articles, but reference may briefly be made to a few points.

The items pursue a logical order, beginning with Entry into the Church, which is preferred to the word "initiation" often used by other denominations in discussion. As the commonest method is Infant Baptism followed later by Public Reception into Full Membership, or Confirmation, they are put first. Then follows the less common service of The Baptism of those who are able to answer for themselves, with the Public Reception into Full Membership, or Confirmation. It is an innovation to bring these into the same

<sup>14</sup> Some supplementary material was also taken from the Church of England, as also from other sources, as shown by the Acknowledgements in the book (p. vi).

<sup>15</sup> Thus in the book as a whole the traditional forms are available as well as the ICET forms. The traditional form of the Apostles' Creed, which does not occur in the Holy Communion, had already been included, together with the ICET form, in the appropriate booklets, and thus also came into the book itself.

<sup>16</sup> The title of the Commissioning Services was altered to "Recognition and Commissioning Services", and the phrase "Sunday School Teachers and Youth Workers" to "Workers with Children and Young People".

service, though provision is also made for an alternative ending "if, in exceptional circumstances and for good reason, Confirmation does not immediately follow the Baptism of those who are able to answer for themselves". One of the hymns in this service is not in the present *Methodist Hymn-Book*, but is taken from earlier hymn-books. Other optional innovations are the appointment of sponsors, the lighted candle at Infant Baptism, the laying-on of hands at Confirmation, and the instructions for receiving Christians from other communions.

The Sunday Service takes the title which John Wesley gave to his whole book in 1784, though the full title concludes "with other Occasional Services". It then presumably referred to Morning and Evening Prayer, though presumably also to the Holy Communion, which Wesley would hardly have regarded as "occasional". Now it is deliberately used to describe the full service of word and sacrament. As the first General Direction says,

The worship of the Church is the offering of praise and prayer in which God's Word is read and preached, and in its fullness it includes the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.

But the full service is followed by "The Sunday Service without the Lord's Supper", which is set out first as an outline—what the Puritans would have called a directory rather than a complete liturgy. But "one way of using this outline" is given, which includes a Prayer of Thanksgiving and Dedication. By loose analogy with the term *missa sicca*,<sup>17</sup> this might be called a "dry anaphora", and the appendices contain alternative thanksgivings and intercessions. Thus the lack of organic relationship between the ordinary "preaching service" and the Lord's Supper, which has troubled Methodism from the beginning, has been overcome, and the unification of the Lectionary is consistent with this. Previously the Public Lessons appointed annually by the Conference stood in no relationship with the Epistles and Gospels in the *Book of Offices*. "Collects, Lessons and Psalms" has overcome this difficulty.

The Covenant Service<sup>18</sup> has been brought into organic relation with the Lord's Supper. This service has a traditional core, which someone has picturesquely called its "Canon". The meagre portion of this which was retained in the booklet that preceded 1936 and in 1936 itself has still been retained, but the other material from that period has been abbreviated. The short homily is new.

The Marriage Service can now take various shapes, and to it are added instructions for Inter-Faith Marriages and a Service for the Blessing of a Marriage previously solemnized. This was not designed, as some have supposed, for use after the re-marriage of divorced

<sup>17</sup> cf. W. D. Maxwell: *An Outline of Christian Worship* (1936), especially pp. 64-5, III, 170, which advocated a "eucharistic norm" for Free Church worship.

<sup>18</sup> cf. David H. Tripp: *The Renewal of the Covenant in the Methodist Tradition* (1969).



persons in a register office, for such re-marriages can in some cases take place in a Methodist church. There are, however, other cases where for various reasons a civil marriage takes place first.

The Burial or Cremation of the Dead contains a new item called "The Commendation", and is followed by some directions for the burial or cremation of a child.

The Ordination Service has a new and significant title: "The Ordination of Ministers also called Presbyters".

Reference might be made to many other features of the book. The structure of the sentences has been modernized, as the "you" style requires, but the scriptural imagery has largely been retained. The "angels and archangels" have indeed disappeared, except in the 1936 Lord's Supper, but Christ is still said to "ascend" into heaven; God is still King, and not president or chairperson. It is for the preacher to expound this imagery. The people are encouraged in various ways to take a more active part. But the most important development is that all the services have been conformed more or less to a eucharistic shape: preparation, ministry of the Word, and then the distinctive act for which the Scripture gives warrant, with its own elements of thanksgiving and intercession. Sometimes, as in Confirmation, Covenant Service, and Ordination, this actually moves on into the Lord's Supper. Sometimes, as in Marriage, there is a choice between the Lord's Supper and a striking alternative Thanksgiving. Sometimes, as in Infant Baptism and in Burial, there is no mention of the Lord's Supper, but the shape is to some extent retained.

The effect of all this is to give more emphasis to the resurrection and to strike the note of joyful thanksgiving. The Wesley brothers were well aware, as their *Hymns on the Lord's Supper* show, that Christian worship is not only the remembrance of a crucified Saviour, but the celebration of the presence of a risen Lord.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE.

---

We have received an offprint from *The British Journal of Sociology*, volume 28, No. 2 (June 1977), containing an article by Dr. Clive D. Field, who is a member of our Society, entitled "The Social Structure of English Methodism: Eighteenth-Twentieth Centuries". The title is a clear indication of the contents of the article, which is a scholarly survey by one who has mastered the technique of handling statistics. We commend it to our readers—and would also draw their attention to Dr. Field's note on "The Methodist Sociological Group" which appears on page 94.

---

Details of publications by overseas branches of our Society are always of interest, and we are pleased to notice a "Short History of the Methodist Church in North and South Canterbury from 1950-1975" (pp. 88) by W. A. Chambers, under title *The Winds of Change*. Published as Nos. 1-4 of volume 30 of the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand*, copies, price \$2.25, are obtainable from the Rev. Leslie R. M. Gilmore, 15, Brookfield Terrace, Otumoetai, Tauranga, New Zealand.

## JOHN — OR CHARLES — WESLEY ?

SCHOLARS seem never to have had any hesitation in tabulating generalized lists of technical differences between the verse of John and Charles Wesley. Thus Dr. Henry Bett, as far back as 1913, gives John an almost exclusive use of octosyllabic metres, run-on lines, restricted diction, and stiffness of movement.<sup>1</sup> (This is a mere selection from Dr. Bett's findings.) These characteristics are contrasted with the "lyrical freedom and spontaneity" of Charles Wesley's poetry. Dr. Frank Baker, in his works on Charles's verse,<sup>2</sup> substantially agrees with Dr. Bett.

To question the findings of accredited scholars usually invites confusion. A host of reliable MSS. and other material not easily available to the public may be in their hands. But when such generalized distinctions are either made the criterion for the vexed question of authorship or else disregarded at will; or when Dr. Baker, for instance, arbitrarily publishes poems formerly considered the work of John as that of Charles, one looks again at these alleged differences. Thus both the scholars mentioned state that Charles hardly used run-on lines. This would, of course, deprive Charles of a valuable means of free expression. A bad metrist and unconscious comedian might "line out":

The Lord will come, and He will not  
Keep silence, but speak out;

but all poets, good and bad, have used enjambment. And both John and Charles read Shakespeare and George Herbert, even in the eighteenth century. Some of the best of Pope's couplets, as Professor Tillotson has shown,<sup>3</sup> are "run-ons". John singled out Pope as superior to Prior, as, above all, Pope was the poet of "easiness". Charles certainly wrote many superb poems without resorting to this device. But—is it true that he almost always confined his thought within a single line-unit?

Did John, then, write "Short Hymns"? Charles published his *Short Hymns on Selected Passages from Holy Scripture* (in two volumes) in 1762. They contain almost more run-on lines than can be counted in a first examination. Among them are:

Their earthly task who fail to do,  
Neglect their heavenly business too;  
Nor know what faith and duty mean  
Who use religion as a screen,  
Asunder put what God hath joined—  
A diligent and pious mind.

Happy we live when God doth join,  
Our hands with work, our hearts with zeal.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Henry Bett: *The Hymns of Methodism in their Literary Relations* (1913) (revised and enlarged as *The Hymns of Methodism* in 1945).

<sup>2</sup> *Representative Verse of Charles Wesley* (1962) and *Charles Wesley's Verse* (1964).

<sup>3</sup> Geoffrey Tillotson: *Augustan Studies*, 1961.

<sup>4</sup> *Short Hymns* . . . (I), Hymn 286.

Plunge in the depth of Deity—  
 A soul that to Thy bosom flies—  
 From sin; possess of this high prize,  
 I ask no other Paradise.<sup>5</sup>

The selections were taken at random, but in the first are examples of the consecutive rhymes that have been considered characteristic of John, and in the last that "central cæsura" that is supposed to halt John's verse. If we take the first hundred hymns only, in the current *Methodist Hymn-Book*, we find that thirteen out of the seventeen ascribed to Charles contain at least one—often more than one—run-on line. One such group constitutes the distinctive stanza (originally "by John and Charles Wesley")

Spirit of Holiness,  
 Let all Thy saints adore—  
 Thy sacred energy, and bless—  
 Thine heart-renewing power.  
 Not angel-tongues can tell—  
 Thy love's ecstatic height,  
 The glorious joy unspeakable,  
 The beatific sight.<sup>6</sup>

Anyone may find the scores of similar run-on lines attributed to Charles in this famous hymn-book—in its range and selection probably the most truly catholic of any modern collection. *Hymns Ancient and Modern* includes two more (at least) of Charles's run-on couplets:

Jesus, confirm my heart's desire—  
 To work, and speak, and think for Thee;<sup>7</sup>

and (from the Communion hymn "How glorious is the life above")

The light of life eternal darts—  
 Into our souls a dazzling ray.<sup>8</sup>

It is not doubted, here, that Charles was solely responsible for "Short Hymns", and that the immense numerical superiority of his output makes multiplication of examples such as the above easy. But in the light of these examples, further examination of John's verse seems necessary. A good deal might be said about the freedom with which, in the "translations" (which were often such in name only), John transfers the accent (from iambic to trochaic) for purposes of emphasis or intensification. Emerson called John's early rendering of Tersteegen's "Verborgne Gottesliebe du" (MHB 433) the finest hymn in the language; and Augustin Leger, writing of John's poem on Grace Murray, mentions the "rich, grave, psalm-like tone" of this octosyllabic verse. But one must return to the brothers' use of run-on lines, particularly in Short Metre (6.6.8.6), as in the extract from MHB 39 above.

John used it (but not "doubled") for his translation of Paulus Gerhardt's "Befiehl du deine Wege", in which there are about an equal number of run-on and end-stopped lines:

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, Hymn 792.

<sup>7</sup> A & M Revised 329 [MHB 386], stanza 3.

<sup>6</sup> MHB 39, stanza 3.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.* 420, stanza 3.

Commit thou all thy griefs,  
 And ways into His hands,  
 To His sure truth and tender care,  
 Who heaven and earth commands.<sup>9</sup>

He used it again in some of his adaptations of George Herbert's "Temple" lyrics, which he attempted to simplify for eighteenth-century congregational use. Above all, he used it, doubled this time, in *The Final Perseverance of the Saints* (London, 1754). This is an ironic verse-pamphlet in thirty-eight stanzas, answering "All which Dr. Gill has printed" on the "final" security of "the Elect", irrespective of conduct. This is not the place to discuss the orderly construction and the sustained, deadly humour of John's "answer" to Dr. Gill, and his bold use of metaphor. The point to notice is the "free", "spontaneous" metrical skill shown in the verse—indistinguishable as it is from Charles's use of doubled Short Metre. A couple of stanzas must suffice as illustration, but the poem should be judged "whole". John describes what happened when his narrator listened to the "subtle foe" and ceased to watch and pray :

Freed from the inward Cross,  
 Of all corruption full,  
 A prophet of smooth things I was  
 To my own worthless Soul.  
 Unchanged and unrenewed,  
 Yet still I could not fall:  
 Daub'd with the untempered mortar stood,  
 A tottering, whited wall.<sup>10</sup>

What if I sinned sometimes  
 In this imperfect state?  
 It was not like the damning crimes  
 Of a lost Reprobate.  
 Sin was not sin in ME,  
 God doth protect His own,  
 Does not behold Iniquity,  
 In any Chosen One.<sup>11</sup>

The poem illustrates John's frequent use of the prefix "un-", first pointed out by Dr. Bett; and there is certainly no lack of run-on lines. The value for the inquiry, however, lies in the poem's direct likeness to many of the hymns refuting Calvin's "horrible decree" that only "the elect" could be saved.

*Hymns on God's Everlasting Love* was published in 1741 at Bristol, whilst another volume with this title appeared (without date) in London. There seems no doubt that both were the joint productions of John and Charles Wesley. Now, however, without MS. evidence, they are assigned to Charles.

Only a few considerations have been raised here. Do they not, however, suggest that the whole question of authorship should be

<sup>9</sup> MHB 507, stanza 1.

<sup>10</sup> *The Final Perseverance of the Saints*, stanza 26.    <sup>11</sup> *ibid.*, stanza 29.

re-opened, and that by means of such an exercise some of the lost vigour and "energy"<sup>12</sup> that marked the so strangely called "Methodist" revival might be recovered? As is so often demonstrated in these days of proposed church unity, John introduced no doctrine other than is contained in the Catholic faith. What is not now so often demonstrated is that its dynamic power gave the Church new life, and that this life breathes in the hymns—the poetry of *John* and Charles Wesley.

E. M. HODGSON.

[Miss E. M. Hodgson, B.A., Ph.D. (Birkbeck College, London University, 1970), daughter of the late Rev. James Penrose Hodgson, is a retired headmistress with a career in Great Britain and the Argentine.]

<sup>12</sup> Which the Wesleys, the author of the Acts of the Apostles, and William Blake considered to be the work of the Holy Spirit.

---



---

## THE ANNUAL MEETING AND LECTURE

THE Annual Meeting, Tea and Lecture were held at Princes Avenue chapel, Hull, on Monday, 27th June. An attendance of 28 members showed the advantage of a meeting-place conveniently near to the Conference hall. Mr. J. C. Watson expressed the thanks of those present to Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Swift, who had provided the tea again this year.

### Business Meeting

The Rev. W. Russell Shearer presided at the Annual Meeting, which again proved a time of fellowship as well as business. The Rev. Kenneth Garlick as registrar reported a membership of 987—a reminder that the one-thousand mark has still to be reached. The Society's assets amount to £2,031 15p., of which £872 50p. represents subscriptions paid in advance. It was reported that the 1972 Lecture, *S. E. Keeble: The Rejected Prophet*, by the Rev. Michael S. Edwards, was now on sale. Mr. J. C. Watson was congratulated on the excellence of the Exhibition of Hull Methodist history so well arranged in the architecturally-attractive setting of the Docks Office, within easy reach of the Conference hall. The meeting was glad to hear that the transfer of the Wesley Historical Society Library to Southlands College was almost complete.

The financial statement for the year ended 31st December 1976 appears on page 96.

### The Annual Lecture

How our Wesleyan forefathers understood 1 John ii. 15-17, and its effect on their whole attitude to life around them, was clearly set out by the Rev. Henry D. Rack in his lecture on "Wesleyanism and the World in the later nineteenth century": it was an attitude clearly inherited from Wesley himself. Other influences than his, however, were at work among the Methodists of the period, and acted as a corrective to the narrower view. Perhaps the remark of the Rev. Rupert Davies at a Conference Ordination Service the following day "that a failure to relate positively to the worlds of nature and art is not a virtue but a defect" is an indication that the Wesleyan view of "the world" has not been entirely modified even in the later twentieth century. The chair was taken by the Rev. Dr. John A. Newton. It is much to be desired that this lecture will find a publisher.

THOMAS SHAW.

# THE EXTINCT METHODIST SOCIETIES OF SOUTH-EAST SCOTLAND

## 3. Musselburgh

THE small town of Musselburgh occupies a special place in the hearts of Scottish Methodists, for it was here, on 24th April 1751, that John Wesley first preached in Scotland. He records in his *Journal* :

We reached Musselburgh between four and five. I had no intention to preach in Scotland, nor did I imagine there were any that desired I should. But I was mistaken. Curiosity (if nothing else) brought abundance of people together in the evening.<sup>1</sup>

This, then, was the simple beginning of the whole Methodist work in Scotland. Wesley preached again in Musselburgh in 1757, 1759, 1761, 1764, and 1765. On the last occasion he noted : "About noon I preached at Musselburgh, where are a few living souls still."<sup>2</sup> A further five years were to elapse before his next visit, when he writes :

At five in the morning I took a solemn leave of our friends at Edinburgh. About eight I preached at Musselburgh, and found some hope there will be a blessing in the remnant.<sup>3</sup>

Three years later, a letter written by Christopher Hopper to Joseph Benson, dated 22nd November 1773, contains the following passage :

Good Mr W[es]ley says, "If I was in Jos : B——n's place I would not be buried at Dunbar or any other place, the land is before him." Leave y<sup>r</sup> warm fire and elegant room, run thro' every street, watch every corner, ransack every garrett and cell, search out every Lazarus in the old and new city [of Edinburgh], run from house to house, sound y<sup>e</sup> trumpet in Leith, Musselburgh and Dalkeith every week . . .<sup>4</sup>

A more determined effort to consolidate the Musselburgh work was made following the Conference of 1786. Zechariah Yewdall was first appointed to the Berwick-on-Tweed circuit, but no sooner had he arrived there than the "assistant" visited him with the news that a preacher was required for Musselburgh, and that Yewdall was to go there immediately.<sup>5</sup> According to Wesley Swift,<sup>6</sup> he found the outlook promising ; and Yewdall's diary confirms this view :

Musselburgh was the first place we preached at in Scotland, but as they have not been preaching on the Lord's days, our success has been but small. The people of the English Church having built a new meeting, our friend Bourhill [a resident of Musselburgh with property at Newbigging] has bought the forms, pulpit &c, as they stood for little, and taken the place. Being desirous to give his neighbours a fair trial he desired to have constant preaching on the Lord's day. On this account Mr Pawson wrote to desire one of us from Berwick to come : as I had been disappointed in coming to Edinburgh I thought now Providence had fully opened my way . . .<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, iii, p. 522.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, v, p. 112.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, v, p. 368.

<sup>4</sup> This letter is in the Methodist Archives.

<sup>5</sup>, <sup>6</sup> Wesley F. Swift : "Early Methodism in Dalkeith, Scotland" (*Proceedings*, xvii, pp. 125-32).

<sup>7</sup> Methodist Archives.

A letter from Wesley to Yewdall on 20th December 1786 suggests that the Musselburgh cause was promising: "I am glad to hear that you find some fruit again even at poor Musselburgh."<sup>8</sup> At the ensuing Conference, Musselburgh was given circuit status, with Yewdall as the preacher; but this arrangement was short-lived, the circuit disappearing from the stations the following year. Nevertheless, another letter from Wesley to Yewdall at the end of 1787 indicates continued hope at Musselburgh:

I have no hope of our doing any good at Preston Pans for the present. Wherever a door is open there press forward. I do not despair of having some fruit at Musselburgh.<sup>9</sup>

In contrast, it is clear from the *Gleanings* that the hope expressed by Wesley was not to materialize:

Mr Yewdall after a trial of 21 months, no longer preached at Musselburgh on the Sabbath, though he still continued to visit it on the weekday.<sup>10</sup>

There then follows a gap of over forty years, during which there is little indication of the state of affairs at Musselburgh. The Edinburgh society book<sup>11</sup> shows no society there between 1806 and 1831, and moreover the 1825 Plan fails to list Musselburgh as one of the preaching-places in the Edinburgh circuit.<sup>12</sup> The first hint of a resurgence comes in a letter from the Rev. John Partis Haswell, then superintendent of the Edinburgh circuit, to Jabez Bunting:

Edinburgh March 19th 1832

My Dear Sir,

... We have thought of raising a *monument* to the memory of Mr Wesley in Musselburgh where he first preached in Scotland. A small pious Society is raised there, & if a Chapel could be raised so as to give stability to our cause several persons would leave the Calvinists and come over to us—though heartily sick of Calvinism they can have no certainty of a permanent Church where our doctrines would be preached till we build a Chapel. A piece of Freehold ground can be obtained for 100£ and 300£ more would build a sufficient Chapel. A new Church has been built in Edinburgh by persons who hold shares of 10£ each and take the seat rents for interest, less or more. Some of our friends have suggested to me that 40 10£ shares would build the Musselburgh Chapel and they are willing to relinquish all government of the premises; make the Chapel bone fide [sic] to the Conference—only retaining the seat rents as interest—no person could call in money, though they may transfer their shares. I should be obliged by your opinion of this plan.<sup>13</sup>

It is important to remember here that the Scottish Districts had just passed through the period of disastrous chapel speculation as a result of the activities of Valentine Ward,<sup>14</sup> and that ten years earlier

<sup>8</sup> *Letters*, vii, pp. 359-60.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, viii, p. 20.

<sup>10</sup> R. Spence Hardy: *Gleanings in Methodism to be re-scattered in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1857).

<sup>11</sup> Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh (SRO in subsequent footnotes), CH. 11/1/22.

<sup>12</sup> A. J. Hayes: *Edinburgh Methodism, 1761-1975: The Mother Churches* (Edinburgh, 1976).

<sup>13</sup> *Methodist Archives*.

<sup>14</sup> Wesley F. Swift: *Methodism in Scotland: The First Hundred Years* (Eppworth Press, 1947).

the Edinburgh District chapel debts had amounted to £34,000. Indeed, the future of much of Scottish Methodism was by this time in the balance. Nor did the state of chapel debts connexionally give much cause for complacency, for it was not until 1834 that the Chapel Fund Report first gave a cheering account of the new plan to pay off the connexional debt, enabling Jabez Bunting to remark: "This shows we have got over the worst."<sup>15</sup>

In these circumstances it is all the more surprising to find that the District Meeting of 1832 sanctioned the building of a chapel in Musselburgh:<sup>16</sup>

... We consider this place as having peculiar claims upon us, Mr Wesley's first sermon in Scotland having been preached there . . . the whole cost of the erection to be subscribed . . .<sup>18</sup>

The Edinburgh society book contains this account of the Musselburgh chapel:

#### MUSSELBURGH CHAPEL

The consent of the building committee has been obtained.

The application distinctly states:—

- (1) The chapel shall be 33' long, 27' broad
- (2) The number in Society is 19
- (3) The average number of hearers 60
- (4) The population of Musselburgh and Fisherrow 8,000
- (5) The cost of the land £60 15/-
- (6) The cost of the building £160
- (7) The possible subscriptions £140
- (8) Seat rents and door collections £8 10/-
- (9) The chapel shall be properly settled
- (10) The erection has been sanctioned by Quarterly and District Meetings
- (11) The property is freehold
- (12) No gallery
- (13) Lighting and cleaning probably cost £1 10/-
- (14) Defrayed by the door collections.

Registered p. 143, No. 901

R. ALDER, *Secretary*.<sup>17</sup>

At about this time, a parcel of land in Musselburgh (or rather the adjoining Fisherrow) and marked on Hay's map of Musselburgh, 1824,<sup>18</sup> was purchased for the building:

Know all men by this present public instrument that upon the fourth day of September 1833 . . . compeared personally John Carr mason in Newbigging as Procurator and Attorney for and in the name of the Reverend John Partis Haswell, minister of the Gospel, lately residing in Edinburgh, James Mackenzie, working jeweller in Edinburgh, Robert Anderson, printer there, David Rutherford hairdresser there, Robert Lees, draper, Hanover St, there, George Hume, whitesmith in Edinburgh, Richard Thompson joiner there, James Milnes gardener Fisherrow and Joseph Carr, cratemaker Musselburgh; Trustees for the uses, ends and purposes aforementioned, whose power of procuratory was

<sup>15</sup> B. Gregory: *Side Lights on the Conflicts of Methodism* (London, 1898).

<sup>16</sup> Edinburgh District Meeting Minutes. (Methodist Archives.)

<sup>17</sup> SRO. CH.11/1/22.

<sup>18</sup> National Library of Scotland, Map Room.



sufficiently known to me notary public, and passed with us and Robert Collier Mason in Musselburgh . . . to the piece of ground . . . having and holding in his hands a DISPOSITION . . . granted and made by William Dudgeon Flesher in Musselburgh, heritable proprietor . . . in favour of the Reverend John Partis Haswell [etc.] . . . as Trustees for the Society or People in Musselburgh called Methodists . . . whereby . . . William Dudgeon . . . SOLD, ALIENATED and DISPONED . . . to John Partis Haswell [etc.] . . . ALL and WHOLE that piece of ground measuring in front from north to south forty feet along the east side of the Vennel [Street] of Fisherrow and in breadth at the north end thereof forty feet and at the south end thereof fifty two feet and at the back thereof from north to south forty feet, lying in the Parish of Inveresk and County of Edinburgh and bounded on the West by the Vennel of Fisherrow and on the north, south and east parts by the remaining property belonging to . . . William Dudgeon, with free ish and entry thereto from the Vennel and common street of Fisherrow . . .<sup>19</sup>

In addition to the usual clauses found in a Scottish sasine (transfer of property), the trustees assumed certain powers. First, that although the Conference had the whole power in perpetuity of appointing the preacher, it should not have the power to appoint the same preacher for more than three years. Second, if any preacher was deficient in ministerial ability, etc., he could be prevented from continuing to officiate. Third, the trustees were empowered to raise money by borrowing or upon annuity, and to grant heritable bonds or other legal securities in the most full and ample manner. Fourth, the trustees should have the power to sell the ground and buildings, provided that permission had been obtained from the President of the Conference. Fifth, the seat rents should be applied to reducing the debt and towards keeping the property wind- and weathertight, and only when the debt had been extinguished could the income be applied to the support and maintenance of the preacher—or to any other purposes connected with the spread of Methodism in Scotland. Sixth, the trust was always to be kept up to eleven members, but if the number of trustees was ever reduced to four or less, additional trustees should be immediately assumed. The preacher to be appointed to Musselburgh should preside at all trustees' meetings, failing which the superintendent of the Edinburgh circuit. It is clear, then, that this document was modelled on the Nicolson Square<sup>20</sup> and Dunfermline patterns.<sup>21</sup>

Before leaving the sasine, a little should be said about some of the personalities. The trustees' solicitor, Mr. Robert Barclay Selby, was also a trustee of Nicolson Square, Edinburgh, and was involved in at least two of the three lawsuits which affected that chapel during its early years. Both James Mackenzie and Robert Anderson were also trustees at Nicolson Square, and were heavily implicated in the Warrenite secession from that society in 1835.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> SRO: New Particular Register of Sasines, Edinburgh, &c. RS 27, Vol. 1388, pp. 224-31.

<sup>20</sup> Hayes, op. cit.

<sup>21</sup> See *Proceedings*, xli, p. 14.

<sup>22</sup> A. J. Hayes: "A Warrenite Secession in Edinburgh" (*Journal of the Scottish Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, 1977).

£160. 0. 0

Edinb<sup>g</sup> July 8<sup>th</sup> 1833

Three Months after Notice we jointly and  
severally promise to pay Thomas Hughes Esq<sup>r</sup> or order  
the sum of One Hundred and Sixty pounds Sterling with  
4 per cent per Ann Interest for value received, as Trustees of the  
Wesleyan Chapel in Musselburgh.  
George Home

John P. Haswell  
James McIlwain  
Wesley Thompson  
Robert Lees

THE MUSSELBURGH TRUSTEES' PROMISSORY NOTE TO THOMAS HUGHES FOR £160.  
(Opposite: Endorsements on the reverse side of the document.)

March 18<sup>th</sup> 1857

Received from Mr. Selby the  
sum of \$1000 for account of interest

Received from J. Hughes  
Mr. Selby by Mr. Pickens the  
sum of six hundred & being  
paying the within interest up to  
15<sup>th</sup> Nov - 1856 J. H.

Pay the contents of the within  
Pro: Note to Mr. Wm. Nicholas  
or order Thomas Hughes

Paid as Interest up to July 1856  
L. H. W. J. J. Baker

The within contents has  
this day been fully  
discharged. Wm. W. Nicholas

Witness  
29. Dec  
1856

In 1834, the District Meeting reported briefly: "Musselburgh chapel opened, but we believe the terms on which the erection was permitted have not been complied with".<sup>23</sup> In the face of this evidence, it is surprising that Wesley Swift, in his *Methodism in Scotland*, makes no reference to the Musselburgh chapel. Indeed, in some manuscript notes to that work, he wrote:

Edinburgh, Leith and Dalkeith are the only places from which subscriptions are given to the Chapel Fund under the head Edinburgh. Does this mean that no chapel was built at Musselburgh?<sup>24</sup>

It is evident that the conditions on which the building was allowed to proceed were honoured more in the breach than in the observance, for, far from the cost of the building having been subscribed, Thomas Hughes of Inveresk had lent the Musselburgh trustees the entire amount—£160—on a three-month bill! The actual date of this bill, which still survives, is 8th July 1833—a few months before the sasine. Thomas Hughes was an influential local Methodist—one of the first trustees of Nicolson Square and of Haddington. In addition to Hughes's loan, other loans were made by interested parties. The circuit superintendent himself, John Partis Haswell, lent approximately £80, Miss Young £17, Miss Elisabeth Sands £15, and Alex Redpath (another of the Nicolson Square trustees) a final £20. In due time, this latter bill was passed on to John Jones (also a trustee of Nicolson Square), and finally to Miss Lindsay, who had lent money to Nicolson Square also.<sup>25</sup> There is some indication that Miss Sands may at some time have passed her bill to Robert Anderson, but nowhere is this explicitly stated.

The stage was thus set for a financial scene which would have been familiar to Valentine Ward: the new chapel being in debt to the tune of £350 on the day of its opening. Nevertheless, it is clear from a page of accounts for the period 1838-41, which has survived by chance, that the Musselburgh trustees found it possible to service all these loans and yet to leave a reasonable balance in hand. The "Mr. Milne" in these accounts is presumably James Milnes, gardener of Fisherrow, one of the trustees, acting in the capacity of trustees' treasurer or else of society steward. The healthy financial situation is also confirmed by a number of receipts for payments of interest.

There then follows an extraordinary series of letters from the Rev. J. P. Haswell, first to the Rev. Peter Duncan in 1841, and later, in 1847, to the Rev. Charles Clay.<sup>26</sup> (These were respectively superintendents in the Edinburgh circuit in 1841-3 and 1846-7.) To Duncan, Haswell writes:

Chelsea Sept 16th 1841

My Dear Brother,

By this time you will have seen your circuit and especially have looked at the case of Musselburgh—It gave me pleasure to receive a letter

<sup>23</sup> Edinburgh District Meeting Minutes.

<sup>24</sup> Methodist Archives.

<sup>25</sup> Hayes (1976), op. cit.

<sup>26</sup> Edinburgh (Nicolson Square) circuit records in circuit safe.

somewhat encouraging from Mr. Bates [Peter Duncan's predecessor] previous to his leaving Edinburgh in which he states that the sale of the Musselburgh Chapel would in his estimation be bad policy inasmuch *as it pays its way*. Certainly his balance sheet shows this—but I cannot understand why the *interest* of borrowed money was not paid when a surplus of income was in the Stewards hand.

My A/c is as under

May 14 1835	Balance of A/c	£61	8	0	
	Miss Young paid off	17	0	0	
		<hr/>			
		£78	8	0	
		<hr/>			
Interest of A/c	May 14 1836 Int at 4%	£3	2	9	
	1837	3	2	9	
	1838	3	2	9	
	1839	3	2	9	
	1840	3	2	9	
	1841	3	2	9	
			18	16	6
August 17 1840	Rec'd of Rev. Bates	3	2	9	
	Balance due on interest account	15	13	9	

I thought that as Mr. Hughes received only 4% I ought not to charge more though that has been you are aware a permanent loss to me.—The sum left in your hands by Mr. Bates will nearly pay my deficient interest and I think few of the Creditors will be able to show a better claim but I stand in the awkward situation of both Dr. and Cr. Should Mr. Nicholson be determined on having his 160£ unless some person who is in your neighbourhood will find it I feel all must be obliged to act on the grant of Conference to sell.

If you could see Mr. Nicholson and assure him of the safety of his money—& persuade him to allow it to remain till the Lord Ordinary gives judgement in the pending suit we should have time to look about us . . .

P.S. I hope you will be able to send me a part of the Interest. Present my own and Mrs. Haswells kindest regards to all our old and respected friends Wilsons, Gardner, Selby, Darling &c &c.

From this letter it is clear that it had been agreed to sell the Musselburgh chapel. The reason for this decision is not immediately apparent, but from the Haddington material it is clear that between 1840 and 1847 Thomas Hughes had died, and that his nephew, Thomas William Nicholson, as residuary legatee, had called in the £160 bill drawn in 1833. This caused Haswell some pain, as at that time he himself was still owed over £100. The lawsuit referred to in this letter is the action first raised in 1837 by John Jones and Thomas Hughes against James Mackenzie and Robert Anderson, among others. This was consequent upon the latter forming a society of the Wesleyan Methodist Association (Warrenites)—a connexion “adverse to, or at variance with the [Wesleyan] Methodist Society in Edinburgh”.<sup>27</sup> Thomas Hughes, as principal creditor at

<sup>27</sup> SRO. Court of Session Records, CS239, 1SK I & J 16/10.

Musselburgh, was thus involved on one side of this suit, and the two principal trustees, Mackenzie and Anderson, represented the opposing faction. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that Thomas Nicholson should feel apprehensive concerning the safety of the £160 which his uncle had lent to the Musselburgh trust!

J. P. Haswell writes to Charles Clay :

Exeter February 17th 1847

My Dear Brother,

I am glad that you have so far succeeded as to get Mr. Nicholson paid off—but my reason for writing so soon after the receipt of yours is to say that while I am willing to be the greatest sufferer among the Trustees, I do hope that my co-Trustees are not to go scot free. There can be no reason and most assuredly no religion in Mr. Anderson and some others paying nothing while I am to suffer to the amount of nearly £100 in principal and interest—In this matter I can only look to you to protect my interest and of course I shall never sign a transfer of the property if I am to be the *only* sufferer—but I persuade myself my co-Trustees will never act so dishonourable a part. Mr. Taylor [the baker to whom the chapel was eventually sold] of course will not pay any more than the £160 to Mr. Nicholson until the transfer is completed. I wrote to Mr. Hume in Manchester some time ago informing him that we should want his subscription. Can you kindly oblige me with the statement of affairs—Mr. Selby in his days of piety and usefulness would have helped you materially but at present I do not like to write to him on this subject—though I lament over him.

I am well aware of the difficulties with which you may have to contend and the very peculiar tact required in dealing with such difficult subjects—but your caution will not forsake you under the plausibility of statements from interested parties—you especially need to think for yourself. Of the extreme kindness of many of the Edinburgh Friends I am well aware and with them I could have lived and died, but at the same time an *Itinerant Preacher* must not commit himself to men, however pious and kind—we had far more difficulties when I was in Edinburgh than you can have and the Leith Chapel involved me in what might have been my ruin—At this day I am £120 out of pocket—although for years past the Chapel Fund has reimbursed me the annual expenditure . . .

It is not certain, however, just how Charles Clay had been able to pay off Thomas Nicholson, unless further loans had been raised among the trustees or else Peter Taylor had paid over the £160 as part of the total purchase price, pending the completion of the sale.

Two months later, Haswell wrote again to Clay concerning the signing of the disposition of sale to Thomas Nicholson, but in the event it was not until 1st August 1847 that he actually signed the document.

Exeter April 24th 1847

My Dear Brother,

When the Musselburgh deed is ready, I will sign it and leave you to obtain for me the best amount you can, but were I not a preacher I should soon settle the amount of my loss among my Co-Trustees. My earnest desire is to hear of the propriety of God's cause in Musselburgh

—Could I but see that, my loss w[oul]d be little thought of—When you send the deed send me also an account of the appropriation . . .

The last letter in the series deals with the apportionment of losses among the various trustees. It is clear that Haswell was still indignant at having to bear the bulk of the loss.

Exeter June 25th 1847

My Dear Bror. Clay,

Read the note to Mr. Anderson and then forward it—Mr. Howie will I believe go to £12 10/-—if Anderson will give 25£ and you may put me 60 if he will give 25£ and Bro. Anderson must know that he is as liable as myself and though I deprecate a lawsuit yet I feel indignant at Anderson very unwilling to suffer anything. I will examine the disposition in a day or two and forward it with my remarks—but I trust you may be able to realise a little by a private effort. Had I paid off Mr. Nicholson and got possession of the Note I could have come on my Co-Trustees for their share of the loss, but while I am aware of my remedy—it is not for a Preacher to go to law. I think the other Trustees should see the Disposition as well as I . . .

On 3rd August 1850, the chapel passed out of Methodist control, though initially not out of Methodist hands, for the buyer, Peter Taylor, baker, is presumably also the Peter Taylor whose name appears in 1846 as society steward at Musselburgh.<sup>28</sup>

This was not the end of the story, for, two years after the sale, the following entry appears in the District minutes:

. . . Miss Lindsay still owed £24 from the Musselburgh Trust: there are no means of paying it on the spot, the chapel having been sold a few years ago and this meeting recommends the case to the consideration of the Chapel Relief Fund.<sup>29</sup>

It is not certain whether Miss Lindsay ever received her money.

The later history of the site is difficult to determine. Although the nineteenth-century street-system still survives in Fisherrow, the the chapel building has long since disappeared. The probable site is now occupied by the Union Bar, at the corner of South Street and Bridge Street.

The subordinate position of Musselburgh in the Edinburgh circuit and the small size of the cause (see table on the opposite page) meant that the majority of the services, at least in the later years, were conducted by local preachers—few of the circuit ministers apparently visiting the chapel. The two circuit plans which survive from this period (1836 and 1845)<sup>30</sup> indicate that in 1836 there were three Sunday services—at 11 a.m., 2 p.m. and 6 p.m.—and that over half of the services were conducted by local preachers on trial. The circuit ministers—Dr. Joseph Beaumont (the superintendent), Robert Bond and John Ryan—each preached at one service during the quarter. There was one celebration of the Holy Communion during the quarter. By 1845 none of the circuit ministers visited Musselburgh in the course of the spring quarter—the majority of the services being

<sup>28</sup> SRO. CH.11/1/2.

<sup>29</sup> Edinburgh District Meeting Minutes.

<sup>30</sup> Methodist Archives; also Hayes (1976), *op. cit.*

conducted by Bros. Dixon, Turner and Bentham. Jabez Cole, soon to be implicated in the Reform movement,<sup>81</sup> had one appointment at Musselburgh during this quarter. This pattern is in conformity with mid-nineteenth-century practice in the Edinburgh circuit—the ordained ministers largely remaining at their own chapels.

That Musselburgh was never a strong cause is evident from the membership returns, again in the Edinburgh society book.<sup>82</sup> The largest number of members occurred three years after the opening (1836), but thereafter the membership declined steadily until 1850, the year which saw the society's final demise.

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE MUSSELBURGH SOCIETY, 1833-50

Year	Classes	Members	Year	Classes	Members
1833	2	16	1844	1	7
1836	1	21	1845	1	6
1837	1	17	1846	1	4
1838	2	15	1847	1	11
1841	1	11	1848	1	5
1842	1	11	1849	1	5
1843	1	8	1850		<i>Defunct</i>

Apart from the list of trustees, there is little information concerning the officials of the society during its brief life. The circuit schedules indicate that, one year before the closure, P. Taylor was society steward, with the Rev. J. P. Haswell and Mr. R. Anderson as trustees.<sup>83</sup>

Early in the present century (1901) consideration was given by the circuit Local Preachers' Meeting to re-commencing preaching at Musselburgh, but "after consultation with the Newcraighall officials, the time was not considered opportune".<sup>84</sup> It is tempting to speculate what might have happened had the Rev. Jonathan Bates's feelings been implemented and the Musselburgh chapel been allowed to remain open. Perhaps the site of "Mr. Wesley's first sermon in Scotland" would still be included in the list of stations!

ALAN J. HAYES.

<sup>81</sup> Hayes (1976), op. cit.

<sup>83</sup> SRO. CH.11/1/2.

<sup>82</sup> SRO. CH.11/1/22.

<sup>84</sup> SRO. CH.11/1/19.

Once again the Editor has pleasure in acknowledging the receipt of various contemporary periodicals issued by other denominational societies and the like, some of which are sent to us on a reciprocal basis. The following have come in since the last published list.

*Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, Vol. xvi, No. 3 (September 1977).

*The Local Historian*, Vol. 12, No. 7.

*Methodist History*, July 1977.

*The Baptist Quarterly*, July and October 1977.

*Cirplan*, Michaelmas 1977.



## BOOK NOTICES

*Religion and Rural Society: South Lindsey 1825-1875*, by James Obelkevich. (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1976: pp. xiii, 353, £12.)

This study belongs to that ill-defined territory on the borders between social history and sociology, and (with a change of metaphor) shows how fruitful a union of these closely-related disciplines may be. The sub-title may suggest a volume of limited if not parochial interest, but nothing could be farther from the truth. Dr. Obelkevich's self-imposed geographical and chronological limits enable him to examine in depth a rural society that was an epitome, rather than an average example, of the kind of conditions most favourable to the Established Church. Yet, as he says, the period was for the Church of England "less a 'Golden Age' than a time of troubles, of which Methodism was only the largest".

Using a wide variety of secular and ecclesiastical sources, the author deploys a wealth of statistical and other detail, and opens up perspectives on the Church in Victorian England which will be new and instructive to many students of local Methodist history. (Parts of his task would have been impossible but for the labours of Mr. William Leary as archivist of the Lincoln Methodist District, and there is an urgent moral in this for those Districts where the work of safeguarding circuit records has scarcely been begun.) In a substantial opening chapter, he examines his chosen area of central Lincolnshire during a period in which traditional village society disintegrated in the face of the growth of capitalist farming and the consequent separation of classes. He then proceeds against this background to deal with the Church of England, the Wesleyans, and the Primitive Methodists—ignoring the Roman Catholics and other forms of Dissent as of negligible significance in the area.

What he terms "the Anglican Counter-Reformation", which was the clergy's response to "the Methodist Reformation" after about 1860, had only limited success—containing the advance of Wesleyanism, but failing to force it into retreat. Up to about 1870, on the other hand, the Church of England could justly claim some success in its endeavours to "stabilize rather than Christianize" society by preaching "paternalism in the rich and acceptance and resignation in the poor" (pp. 175 ff.)—a success whose consequences it has yet to outlive. Wesleyanism at its zenith met a specific need by providing a sense of community that was no longer provided by the disintegrating village community; but "the final ambiguity or irony . . . is that it helped to create the self-consciousness that undermined its own institutions" (p. 219). Similarly, Primitive Methodism "may be seen as a religious response to social change which in its turn foreshadowed later developments in the secular culture" (p. 258). Or, from an alternative point of view, we may trace its internal development during this period from an evangelizing "conversionist" sect, through a period of revivalism, to a denomination whose missionary zeal "shifted its aim from outsiders to insiders, from adults to children, from the ungodly to the immature" (p. 235). Through the Sunday-school and other annuaries of this latest phase "Primitive Methodists now sought to entertain their fellow-villagers rather than convert them, and asked for their financial contributions rather than their spiritual commitment" (p. 254). (The two are not, of course, incompatible; but the shift of emphasis is significant.)

A further chapter deals with the superstitious beliefs and customs of "popular religion" as a continuing substratum of paganism in the lives of

villagers. This is perhaps the least satisfactory in so far as it relies more heavily on secondary and literary sources, though one might have looked for some use of "oral history" techniques to confirm and perhaps elaborate the printed material. It is none the less a welcome reminder of an aspect of the religious spectrum which is all too often overlooked or too hastily dismissed.

Despite its wealth of statistical detail, the book is a joy to read, and never loses sight of the wider perspectives. It is clearly organized, and written with a welcome lack of sociological jargon (despite "a privatized style of life" on page 126!). There are many happy turns of phrase, as when, writing of the village friendly societies, he points out that whilst "villagers, as good practical Protestants, objected to ritualism in their churches", they "relished ritual when it was secular and held outdoors and above all when they performed it themselves". This, he says, "was the Englishman's religious ideal—morality and ritualized conviviality and no theology" (p. 90). The clarity of his vision may owe something to his approaching English society from the outside, as when he sets side by side as incompatible sets of values the Christian ideal and "the pagan ideal of the gentleman" (p. 44).

One does not have to accept all Dr. Obelkevich's interpretations or conclusions to enjoy or profit from this book. Here and there one would welcome more evidence than is offered in support of an interesting or important judgement—e.g. that the harvest thanksgiving was an expression of pagan rather than of Christian feelings. (His distinction between the "divinity creativity" of God and of Nature (pp. 159 f.) perhaps underestimates the influence of biblical theology on even the humblest levels of Christian worship.) Similarly, the single example he gives of supposed erotic imagery in the spiritual language of Primitive Methodism seems more biblical than erotic:

"No sooner did Mr. Smith taste the sweets of pardoning mercy, than he panted for additional holiness and fuller joys. He pressed forward into the possession of entire sanctification." (p. 231)

It would surely be as plausible to detect phallic overtones in Dr. Obelkevich's own words when a little later he speaks of the development of Primitive Methodism in the villages in terms of "expansion . . . followed by irregular contractions" (p. 250).

A regrettable minor irritant is that the Clarendon Press has departed from Methodist usage in favour of its own house rules in allowing the author a repeated use of "connection" and "connectional". Serious misprints are few. Two footnotes on page 140 have been transposed; and "craftsmen and labourers" in line 30 of page 202 should presumably read "craftsmen and shopkeepers". Joseph Bush became a *District* chairman (p. 206). Otherwise, the sprinkling of misprints may be left for the reader to find rather than be paraded as evidence of the reviewer's diligence and keenness of eye. (It will suffice for the latter purpose to note an inverted "n" instead of a "u" on page 45 and an apparent neologism—"anthrology" on page 86.)

The author's general conclusion is that "The religious life of south Lindsey cannot be 'reduced' to its social foundations, but is unintelligible without them" (p. 313). No one reading this fascinating book can fail to take from it a new breadth of approach and new levels of interpretation to benefit his own study of local Methodism, whatever its location.

JOHN A. VICKERS.

*So down to Prayers: Studies in English Nonconformity, 1780-1920*, by Clyde Binfield. (J. M. Dent, 1977: pp. xiv. 296, £8 50p.)

*Nineteenth Century Nonconformity*, by Ian Sellers. (Edward Arnold, 1977: pp. 102, £2 95p.)

Clyde Binfield's book is one of the most important works on "Orthodox Dissent" since Bernard Lord Manning. Dr. Binfield, of Sheffield University, combines the qualities of a first-class historian and sympathy with his subject. He writes as a convinced Free Churchman. We have in this book a penetrating mixture of general survey and perceptive detailed local study. We are shown vividly the life of the old classic dissent of Essex; the nonconformity of Leeds with the Baines the apostles of voluntarism, which Binfield vindicates somewhat; and the battling Edward Miall with his radical journalism and passion for disestablishment and influence on the formation of the Liberal Party. The complexities of a local election in 1885 after franchise reform show the intricacies of any analysis of Victorian politics, the martyrdom of James Chalmers and Oliver Tompkins in 1901 in New Guinea typifying the sacrificial side of a church with a global view. Dr. Binfield then depicts the life-style of late-Victorian and Edwardian Free Churchmanship, politically idealist and muddled sometimes, striving after culture (Matthew Arnold's critique was revealing but impertinent). Ministers like Baldwin Brown, Silvester Horne and Leyton Richards illustrate the theological and ethical tensions which by the First World War had become intolerable for some and marked the virtual end of the "nonconformist platform". Binfield's description of the pacifist dilemma is illuminating—Christians who engage in politics are necessarily involved in compromise, and to see all this in terms of a large dissenting congregation (The Downs, Manchester) is fascinating.

On the national scale, Binfield shows the enormous growth and then the decline of the Free Churches against the background of a reviving Anglicanism, underlining the recent research of A. D. Gilbert and W. R. Ward. The great strength of the book is the delineation of the formidable combination of responsible, aspiring laymen and their ministers, with consequent great influence on local politics. Congregationalism is taken as representative dissent. Methodism was decisive in establishing the strength of evangelicalism, helping to renew older dissent as it began to expand. A Binfield analysis of the "cousinhood" of the Osborns, Gregorys and Macdonalds of Wesleyanism would have been an interesting parallel with "Bainesocracy" and the "Cottontots". When it is so easy to sneer at Victorian nonconformity for its stifling bourgeois respectability, Dr. Binfield shows lovingly yet critically its endearing virtues:

This is the context of chapel, a model of self-control expressed collectively, offering a life of obedience, discipline, duty and noseyneess to individuals. In a world where you had only your feet to stand on, there could be no better recipe for stepping heavenwards.

Binfield has a nose for detail: the Independents of Witham praying standing facing away from the preacher, then sitting for hymns "lined out" by the clerk; the United Methodist *Minutes* of 1907 which list China between Chesterfield and Chorley, giving even liberal imperialism a human face! The style is excellent, with a wealth of neat epigrams and a total lack of ugly jargon and supercilious superiority.

In criticism, there is more to be said from the Anglican side in the Education debates of 1843 and 1902-8, especially the latter. The strictures

of a John Neville Figgis might balance the anti-Anglicanism of John Clifford, who seemed to concede too much to the state—the reversal of voluntarism with a vengeance! It is useful, however, to have a Free Church case stated again. Perhaps there is a generation-gap here, but the “pulpit giants” like Horne seem a trifle romanticized. Certainly Dr. Binfield would agree, I think, that they perished in “the strange death of liberal England”.

If Clyde Binfield's *So down to Prayers* is caviare for the general, then Ian Sellers's book is solid fare for the troops! This is a useful introduction which can be recommended to students, especially if read alongside the recent document collections edited by J. Briggs and I. Sellers—*Victorian Nonconformity* (Arnold, 1973) and D. Thompson—*Nonconformity in the Nineteenth Century* (R.K.P., 1972). Dr. Sellers, who is now a Methodist scholar of repute, draws heavily on recent research, and is especially good in showing the transition from undenominational itinerancy to denominational selfconsciousness in which Jabez Bunting is the typical figure. The role of Dissent in politics is given due weight, though here, occasionally, Dr. Sellers is hypercritical. There are, I think, more positive things to be said about Free Church federalism and Hugh Price Hughes. The 1902-8 Education controversy was surely more than just “the last frenzied vapourings of moribund conscience politics”, even if John Clifford was mistaken! The section on Revivalism is interesting and important: D. L. Moody was clearly a pioneer of ecumenism, though he is not stressed in Sellers's argument. Is it fair to describe the “institutional Church” as an attempt at “cultural domination”, especially if other-worldly pietism is also frowned upon? I would have wished for a little more on worship, theology and spirituality and the contribution of nonconformity to the aspiring artisan for which many of us have personal cause for gratitude. There are a number of typographical errors: “Rowland” for Warren (p. 8); “O'Brien” for O'Bryan (p. 9); “Alfred” for Adolf Harnack; and we ought to be spared horrid neologisms like “ecumenicalism” and “nothing-arianism”. These criticisms, however, are not meant to detract from the value of a workmanlike textbook.

J. MUNSEY TURNER.

*Fire of Love: The Spirituality of John Wesley*, by Gordon S. Wakefield. (Darton, Longman & Todd: 95p.)

*Fire of Love* is the fifth in a simple and attractively-arranged and -produced series of “Masters of the Spiritual Life”. That Wesley should be included in a series with such intensely Catholic saints and spiritual writers as Teresa of Avila, John of the Cross and Charles de Foucauld may seem surprising, even to members of the Wesley Historical Society. The reason, one would guess, is that the “Todd” of Darton, Longman & Todd is none other than John M. Todd, the Catholic biographer of John Wesley. Todd has read Wesley “broad and deep”, and obviously counts him among the great masters of Christian spirituality; and who better could he have chosen to present Wesley's spirituality to a largely Catholic public than Gordon Wakefield?

As is the case with the other titles, the first part of the book is biographical: “John Wesley—Wesley's Spiritual Pilgrimage—Wesley's Spirituality”—a fine 28-page Introduction. One could wish to see this part of the book published in cheaper pamphlet form for wider distribution within Methodism—which it certainly deserves.

Part Two is a series of extracts from Wesley's voluminous writings,

collected and arranged under the following headings: "The Christian Way—Rule of Life—The Catholic Spirit—Sacrament and Prayer—Journeys and Perils—The Burning Charity". Passages chosen are fresh, and a clear indication of Mr. Wakefield's tremendous range of reading; they are finely illustrative of Wesley's religion as "the religion of Love".

Undoubtedly this book, like Neville Ward's *The Use of Praying*, etc., will be widely read by Roman and Anglican Catholics, to whom it has already been warmly commended. It is to be hoped that members of the Wesley Historical Society will commend it as warmly to their Methodist brethren.

EDWIN THOMPSON.

*Just Men: Historical Pieces*, by Gordon Rupp. (Epworth Press, 1977: pp. 182, £2 75p.)

*John Wesley, Founder of Methodism*, by John A. Vickers. (Ladybird Books Ltd., 1977: pp. 53, 24p.)

*The Methodist Church* (Christian Denominations Series), by Jim Bates, with a Foreword by Lord Soper. (Religious Education Press, 1977: pp. 64, 90p.)

Dr. Rupp's title itself provides matter for reflection before the reader even turns to his historical sketches of eleven "just men" who were "just men". Despite the incidental differences between these men, they clearly had far more in common than any chance compartmentful of fellow travellers from Paddington. But it is to "Just Man No. 8" that our readers will turn first and last. They will find that the chapter is a reprint of the author's contribution to the symposium *The Place of Wesley in the Christian Tradition* reviewed in our June issue. Dr. Rupp points out that there are no great areas of Wesley study still unexplored, but in this study he succeeds in making a closer examination of Wesley's spiritual inheritance, applying the microscope particularly to John's spiritual indebtedness to his father. Both Samuel and Susanna were converts to the Church of England (Dr. Rupp warns us of the pitfalls in writing of them as "Anglicans")—and the Non-juring wing at that. This is not another study of *John Wesley, Anglican*, but of *Son to Samuel: John Wesley, Church of England Man*. Dr. Rupp also points out (and how many of us had noticed this?) that although John Wesley was usually his mother's "dutiful son", he was always his father's "dutiful and affectionate son". We may continue to wonder whether he was a debtor most to his father or to his mother; but when we see him in the company of his ten companions in this book we realize that he was a debtor, if not to all men, then at any rate to all Christian traditions which stemmed from the "Early Christianity" which he valued so highly.

There has long been a felt need for simple reading material about John Wesley and Methodism, incorporating suggestions for project work and further reading, designed for recommendation to schoolchildren and other beginners in the subject. It was to meet that need that our Society published *John Wesley and Methodism: A Guide for Schools*. Mr. Vickers and Mr. Bates have now produced further material which, we think, supplements rather than replaces our own guide. The "Ladybird" is a most attractively produced little book, with as accurate a text as we should expect from its author. It is profusely, colourfully and evocatively illustrated by Ronald Jackson—though in our opinion the cover-illustration falls far below the rest in the book. Every child in Methodism ought to have a copy in his or her Christmas stocking.

Mr. Bates's book will also prove of real value to those who use it as a guide, both in and out of school. Unfortunately the present edition contains a number of inaccuracies: John Wesley went to Charterhouse School at the age of ten, not eleven (p. 19); the Moravian service was on 25th January 1736, not 25th November 1735 (p. 21); the New Room was opened in 1739, not in 1741 (pp. 28, 55), nor even in 1748 (p. 30)—in which year it was substantially rebuilt; the Bristol ordinations took place in 1784 (as correctly stated on page 56), and not in 1785 (p. 33); James Thorne (1795-1872), whose name is misspelt, and whose date of death is given as 1813, was not a farmer but a farmer's son (p. 36); the Bible Christians started at Week St. Mary, not at Shebbear (p. 39); Dr. T. B. Stephenson's work at Lambeth was begun in 1869, not in 1870 (p. 47). Four of the "Important Dates" on pages 55-7 are incorrect—those relating to the New Room, the first theological college, and the National Children's Home. The chart on page 52 shows "How the Methodist Church is Governed"; but there must have been a revolution in recent Methodism, unnoticed by us, if "delegates" have been taken into our system (see also page 33)!

We hope that the first edition of this useful book is quickly sold out, so that a much more accurate second edition can take its place.

THOMAS SHAW.

*Edinburgh Methodism, 1761-1975: The Mother Churches*, by Alan J. Hayes. (Published by the author, Edinburgh, 1976: pp. x, 260, £2 75p. plus postage from Dr. A. J. Hayes, 31, Liberton Brae, Edinburgh, EH16 6AG or from WMHS Publications, 87, Marshall Avenue, Bognor Regis, Sussex, PO21 2TW.)

As befits his profession as a microbiologist, the author has put Edinburgh Wesleyan Methodism under the microscope, and has produced an historical study remarkable for the richness of its vivid detail. His account covers more than two centuries, but is more full in the one hundred years or so from Wesley's first visits to the 1860s—a period which saw the Edinburgh society worshipping first in a room in Bailie Fyfe's Close, then in the Calton Octagon (which served from 1765 to 1815), and finally (from 1816) in the famous Nicolson Square chapel, with its splendid Renaissance front, which continues to serve the Edinburgh Methodists today, and whose architectural merit has been recognized by a Grade A listing. In this first century Dr. Hayes's story is well set in the wider context of Wesleyan life and work as it affected the nation as a whole. After the 1860s his account becomes rather more fragmented, and one is also less aware of the general setting. Nevertheless there is much of value here also, and the story is brought usefully up to 1975.

One cannot but admire the zeal with which the author has pursued his task. He has combed the standard printed sources, and searched also for documentary evidence in the records of the Edinburgh circuit and of the City depositories, the Scottish Record Office, and the Methodist Church Archives. In his enthusiasm at discovering a wealth of unpublished material, he could not forbear to quote much of it verbatim and often in full. Whilst one may occasionally feel that more selection and analysis of this primary evidence would have made it easier to see the wood instead of the trees, it has to be admitted that there is considerable merit in Dr. Hayes's method. He has virtually provided a documentary source-book on Edinburgh Methodism (with commentary) which will be invaluable to other scholars who follow in his footsteps. Also of value are the many tables, the glossary of Scottish legal terms, and the eighteen-page list of

references—though the latter in fact could have been both more concise (by using abbreviated references) and more exact (by quoting precise page-numbers, which are not given in all cases). There are over forty illustrations of a wide variety of subject-matter—portraits, buildings, maps, manuscripts, circuit plans, press notices, and so on—all sensibly related to the text and demonstrating visually the kinds of sources and tools that a good local historian of Methodism needs to be aware of.

Dr. Hayes is to be congratulated on this book on many counts. It is most attractively printed and bound, and shows the professional quality possible using reprographic processes—a timely example when rising costs are making it hard to get local histories into print through the usual channels of publication. Moreover it demonstrates the rewards which a painstaking search of archival repositories brings for local historians of Methodism. If one may express a single regret, it is that the social and religious environment in which Wesleyan Methodism operated is not sufficiently described. The fascination of Methodist archives can sometimes beguile us into an over-concentration on the inner life of the movement, to the detriment of an awareness of the wider society which both influenced and was influenced by Methodist work and witness.

This reservation, however, must not detract from what Dr. Hayes *has* given us, and we look forward to further studies from his pen.

GEOFFREY E. MILBURN.

---

*Writing a Church Guide*, by David Dymond (CIO Publishing, London : pp. 20, 75p.) is a booklet guide on "How to write a Parish Church History". This is a very different enterprise from *How to write a Local History of Methodism*, but it will be of interest to many of our historians who are prepared to learn from guides to disciplines parallel with their own. Every local historian "needs the ability to criticise their evidence, historical imagination, and a capacity to write straightforward prose".

T.S.

---

### MORE LOCAL HISTORIES

Handbooks and brochures from all parts of the Connexion continue to reach us, and for these we are grateful. The following are some of those which have recently come to hand.

*The Story of Methodism in Thorpe Willoughby*, by C. R. Moody, with illustrations by L. Walters (pp. 12) : copies, price 20p. plus postage, from the author at Lynton, Doncaster Road, Brayton, Selby, N. Yorks, YO8 9HD.

*The First Hundred Years*—a brief history of Trinity Methodist church, Clacton-on-Sea (pp. 32) : copies, price 25p. plus postage, from Mr. J. L. Nicholls, 51, Queen's Road, Clacton-on-Sea, Essex.

Trinity Methodist church, Shettleston, seventy-fifth anniversary brochure (pp. 16) : copies, price 25p. plus 10p. postage, etc. from the Rev. Peter Whittaker, 3, Mansion House Drive, Springboig, Glasgow, G32 0HN.

*Methodism in a Cathedral City*—the story of Southgate Methodist church, Chichester, 1877-1977, by John and Hilary Vickers (pp. 32) : copies, price 95p. post free, from WMHS Publications, 87, Marshall Avenue, Bognor Regis, Sussex, PO21 2TW.

## NOTES AND QUERIES

### 1295. CURRENT RESEARCH IN METHODIST HISTORY.

Lists of completed theses on Methodist topics have appeared from time to time in the pages of the *Proceedings*. Readers may be interested to know that a comprehensive listing of subjects in post-graduate historical research has been published: *History Theses 1901-70: Historical research for higher degrees in the Universities of the United Kingdom*, compiled by P. M. Jacobs and published by the University of London Institute of Historical Research, 1976.

Information on the subjects of research currently in progress in British and Irish universities is given in a publication of the Institute of Religion and Theology of Great Britain and Ireland. The following details are extracted from *Current Research 1976* by kind permission of the Rev. Ian Calvert, Assistant General Secretary of the Institute. The serial numbers are those given in the original list.

- 287 Harding, A.—“The Countess of Huntingdon and her Connexion in the eighteenth century” (Oxford Ph.D.).
- 288 Robson, G.—“Church and Society in Central Birmingham in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries” (Birmingham Ph.D.).
- 301 Sheard, M. R.—“The Origins and Development of Primitive Methodism in Cheshire” (Manchester Ph.D.).
- 303 Barber, B. R.—“The Origins of Primitive Methodism from the death of John Wesley to the year 1820” (Manchester M.A.).
- 321 Howarth, D. H.—“Methodist Strands of Teaching on Christian Perfection since 1870 with special reference to its social and ethical implications” (Lancaster M.Litt.).
- 324 Ollerhead, P. E.—“Religious Nonconformity in Crewe, 1840-1940” (Keele M.A.).
- 327 Coppedge, W. A.—“The Doctrine of Predestination in John Wesley’s Theology” (Cambridge Ph.D.).
- 333 Knickerbocker, R.—“The Development and Growth of the Religious Tract in England, 1790-1840” (Oxford B.Lett.).
- 343 Rack, H. D.—“Religion and Society in Manchester, 1688-1800” (Manchester Ph.D.).
- 349 Kitching, R. J.—“The Conservative Evangelical Movement in Methodism” (Birmingham M.A.).
- 352 Wallwork, C. N. R.—“Aspects of Discipline and Worship in the Methodist Tradition” (Birmingham M.A.).
- 354 Batty, M.—“Lay Leadership in the Wesleyan Connexion until 1932” (London Ph.D.).
- 358 Clarke, D. F.—“The Holy Communion in isolation: with special reference to Methodism in and around Westmorland” (Leicester Ph.D.).
- 359 Scotland, N. A. D.—“Methodism and Agricultural Trade Unionism in the nineteenth century” (Aberdeen M.Litt.).
- 374 Vickers, J. A.—“Methodism and Society in Central Southern England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries” (Southampton Ph.D.).
- 375 Monkton, D.—“An Ecumenical Study of mid-nineteenth-century rural mission in East Anglia” (Open University).



- 391 Murray, D. B.—“The Social and Religious Origins of non-Presbyterian Protestant Churches in Scotland, 1730-1870” (St. Andrews Ph.D.).
- 434 Williams, C. V.—“The Methodist Contribution to Education in the Bahamas” (Lampeter M.A.).
- 437 Ayankop, E.—“The Primitive Methodist Mission in Nigeria, 1893-1932” (Aberdeen M.Th.).
- 454 Wilson, J. D.—“History of the Methodist Church in Ceylon” (Oxford B.Lett.).

JOHN A. VICKERS.

1296. THE METHODIST SOCIOLOGICAL GROUP.

Dr. Clive D. Field writes :

The Methodist Sociological Group is anxious to promote a series of local surveys of Methodist membership and adherence to coincide with the 1981 civilian census. Any reader of these *Proceedings* who would like to participate in the project is invited to get into touch with me at the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PP.

1297. WEEKDAY MEETINGS.

Mr. William Leary, of Brantwood, 58, St. Edward's Drive, Sudbrooke, Lincoln, LN2 2QR, writes :

I am seeking information on the practice of holding Local Preachers' and Quarterly Meetings in the morning and/or afternoon of a weekday during the middle and latter years of the last century. The problem it creates is that of how lay people could have been expected to attend when fairly obviously they, then as now, would be immersed in working or business life. If any of our readers can shed light on this subject, I shall be grateful.

1298. WESLEY HYMNS IN NON-METHODIST COLLECTIONS.

The Rev. Robert Emsley, of 432, Eden Street, Buffalo, New York, 14220, USA, writes :

Regarding Notes and Queries No. 1285 (*Proceedings*, xl, p. 123), it might be worth noting that about eighteen Wesley hymns are to be found in the 1972 edition of *Worship and Song*, the hymnal of the Church of the Nazarene. However, “Lo! He comes with clouds descending” is attributed to John Cennick (and only “altered” by Charles Wesley). The tune is *Regent Square*. “O for a thousand tongues to sing” appears twice : once in its usual four-line stanza form and set to the tune *Azmon* [as also in the American *Methodist Hymnal*—ED.]; the other setting has a tune (and words to a chorus) by Ralph E. Hudson.

1299. WESLEYAN METHODISM AND EDUCATION.

Mr. Duane McDonald, of International House, Brookhill Road, Woolwich, London, S.E.18 6RZ, writes :

For a study of the development of the Wesleyan Methodist elementary school system in the nineteenth century, I would appreciate any information pertaining to the location of the papers of John Scott, James Harrison Rigg, Hugh Price Hughes, William Arthur, G. W. Olver and D. J. Walter, as well as material relating to the Wesleyan Education Committee, and local school records, especially log-books and minute-books of school and teachers' committees.

## 1300. LOCAL PREACHERS' RAILWAY-TRACK PASS.

Mr. Laurence S. Porter, of 62, Beattyville Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford, Essex, IG6 1JY, writes :

Members may be interested in a document, a facsimile of which appears in *North Eastern Album*, by K. Hoole, published in 1974 by Ian Allan. The text reads as set out below. (I am indebted to Messrs. Ian Allan for kindly permitting me to reproduce it.)

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY.

PERMIT the Bearer, a Local Preacher on the Crook Wesleyan Circuit, to walk on Sundays over and along the Company's Railway between Stanley Colliery and Hedley Hill, near Waterhouses, in the County of Durham.

Dated the 7th day of February, 1893.

*Secretary.*

NOTE. This pass is issued at the risk of the holder, and is subject to the terms and conditions contained in a Licence and Indemnity of even date signed by the Rev. C. Lumsden and the Rev. W. A. Phillips, and is to be exhibited when required and to be given up when permission to walk on the Railway is withdrawn.

It would be interesting to know how long this arrangement continued, and whether similar permission was given at other places served by the North Eastern Railway or others.

In addition to the list printed on page 92, copies of the following local history booklets have recently come to hand :

*The Christian Lay Churches: their Origin and Progress*, by Geoffrey E. Milburn (pp. 48). Published to celebrate the centenary (1977) of Independent Methodism in Sunderland and district. Copies, price 60p. plus postage, from the author at 8, Ashbrooke Mount, Sunderland, Tyne and Wear, SR2 7SD.

Birley Carr Mount Zion centenary brochure (pp. 24) : copies, price 50p., from the Rev. Kenneth R. Brown, Ingledene, 5, Overton Road, Sheffield, S6 1WG.

Hillsborough Trinity (Sheffield) seventy-fifth anniversary programme (pp. 8) : copies also from the Rev. Kenneth R. Brown as above.

Tetney (Lincs) St. John's centenary brochure (pp. 12) : copies from Mr. William Leary, Brantwood, 58, St. Edward's Drive, Sudbrooke, Lincoln, LN2 2QR.

Pelton (Co. Durham) centenary brochure (pp. 24) : copies, price 25p., from the Rev. Walter Best, 5, Newcastle Road, Chester-le-Street, Co. Durham, DH3 3TS.

Gosforth West Avenue centenary brochure (pp. 12) : copies, price 25p., from Miss N. Humphrey, 45, Alwinton Terrace, Gosforth, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE3 1UD.

## WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

## Financial Statement, 1st January to 31st December 1976

EXPENDITURE.		£	p.	INCOME.		£	p.
<i>Proceedings</i> and Printing		638	55	Subscriptions in advance br't forward from previous year—			
Insurance	...	10	0	Ordinary Members	...	691	20
Secretarial, Editorial and Registrar's Expenses	...	105	67	Life Members	...	308	0
Lecturer's Honorarium	...	10	50	Received during year	...	395	63
World Methodist Historical Society (2 years)	...	6	0			1,394	83
National Council of Social Service	...	2	50	<i>Less</i> Unexpired Subscriptions (see Balance Sheet)	...	872	50
Sundry Expenses	...	5	0			522	33
Excess of Income over Expenditure	...	221	66	<i>Proceedings</i> (back nos.) sold	...	94	8
				Advertisements	...	33	70
				Irish Branch	...	54	0
				War Stock Dividend	...	7	68
				Conference Lecture Collect'n	...	5	10
				Publications sold	...	73	13
				Library Sales	...	66	15
				Bank Interest	...	143	71
						£999	88

## Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1976

LIABILITIES.		£	p.	ASSETS.		£	p.
Unexpired Subscriptions—				Cash in hand—Treasurer	...	21	10
Ordinary Members	...	547	0	Registrar	...	3	67
Life Members (74) (say)	...	325	50	War Stock (at cost)	...	225	0
				(Market Value £57)			
				Trustee Savings Bank	...	996	19
Accumulated Funds b/fwd.	...	872	50	Midland Bank Deposit A/c	...	785	19
				Library, Publications Stocks, Filing Cabinet, etc. unvalued	...		
<i>Add</i> Excess of Income over Expenditure	...	1,809	49				
						£2,031	15
						£2,031	15

(Signed)

27th June 1977.

ROWLAND C. SWIFT, *Treasurer.*

## AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE

I have examined the Income and Expenditure Account and Balance Sheet with the books and records of the Society. No account has been taken of subscriptions in arrears at 31st December 1976, whether or not recovered since, but any arrears from previous years recovered during 1976 are included in Subscription Income. Subject to the foregoing, in my view the Balance Sheet and Account show a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Society as at 31st December 1976, and of the excess of Income over Expenditure for the year ended on that date.

(Signed)

High Beech,  
Long Park Close,  
Chesham Bois,  
Amersham, Bucks.

F. J. HAMMOND, F.C.A., *Auditor.*