

# Church, Clergy and Society in Victorian Britain<sup>1</sup>

SINCE the publication of the first part of Professor Owen Chadwick's *magnum opus* on *The Victorian Church*,<sup>2</sup> three North American scholars have offered their interpretations of the rise and fall of the Victorian Church.

In *Prelates and People* Professor Soloway uses an analysis of episcopal writings in the period 1783-1852 to provide a useful account of how the mind of the leadership of the Church of England changed in response to social, political and industrial revolutions—part in fact of the very stuff of history, an emphasis upon and explanation of the chronology of change. The study begins with a social and cultural analysis of the bench: throughout the period, the bishops were essentially eighteenth century men—men of the counties, ignorant of the newer urban and industrial way of life—men who by reason of the laicisation of the Church in the eighteenth century shared the dominant secular ideas and interests of the age. In that age the bench had become very much an aristocratic preserve so that even when the tie of blood of marriage was lacking, the influence of tutorships could prevail—not that the prelates had a bad conscience about this, they were only anxious lest this trend should not continue. “The history of ecclesiastical patronage in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century is more a history of whom one knew and whom one was related to, than it is a study of rewards and merits.”<sup>3</sup> But as other English institutions were reformed in the nineteenth century in terms of new standards of professional excellence, so too, the Church was called upon to conform to the new utilitarian values and social realities of the new age.

Such men as those who became bishops in this period were not by inclination interested in either schemes for social reform or even the theory of society, since even the academic posing of questions about social structure stood in danger of suggesting that social change was possible or even desirable. Increasingly, however, they were driven to theorise—but whatever the nature of the argument—whether it derived from natural law, utilitarian psychology, social contract theory or the older Christian notion of providence—whatever the argument, the conclusion was the same, namely that there was an inevitability about inequality that man could not change, and therefore, the most Christian thing to do was to defend the *status quo*. Thus it is no surprise that when the Revolution broke in France, the most common ecclesiastical reaction was a pietistic retreat in which a frightened laity participated, which is one explanation of the increased sympathy

that evangelical preaching secured in this generation: indeed, in the rebirth of aristocratic morality in the late eighteenth century, Revival and Revolution are joint progenitors. Only Richard Watson of Llandaff amongst all the bishops had a good word to say of the French Revolution and even he despaired of it with the advent of Napoleon. Horsley, successively of St. Davids, Rochester and St. Asaph even held the English responsible for the death of Louis XVI. Preaching in commemoration of the death of Charles I, he complained "O my country! Read the horror of thy own deed in this recent heightened imitation! Lament and weep, that this black French treason should have found its example, in the crime of thy unnatural sons."<sup>4</sup> After the fall of the Bastille, no bishop was prepared to discuss openly the question of social causation: all such discussion was now too dangerous.

Arising out of the episcopal reaction to the French Revolution we have something of a corrective to E. P. Thompson's exclusive association of millenarianism with the frustrations of working-class democrats<sup>5</sup>: it was, as Professor Soloway clearly shows, just as much the possession of aristocratic prelates; and again, like their concern for morality, these new adventist enthusiasms were born of both Revival and Revolution.<sup>6</sup> This eschatological explanation of contemporary history also existed in a secularised form for those whose rationalist theological sympathies disinclined them to apocalyptic explanations in terms of a theory of international conspiracy: in vain might Van Mildert lament that the English Channel had not been dug wide enough to secure effective separation of this island from the continent. Only Randolph of Oxford adopted a sober view of things: explanations in terms of an understanding of human nature and history were more appropriate than the exegesis of the Apocalypse or resort to dubious accounts of grand international machinations.

A third way in which Revolution and Revival worked together was in their insistence on the need for Church Reform and a reinvigorating of parochial religion. But as yet Watson's was the only clear voice advocating radical reform. The issue was however again pressed upon ecclesiastical consciences by evidence indicating alarming decline in church attendance. Butler of Hereford was so distressed by a comparison of figures relating to 1747 and 1792 that he refused to divulge the latter statistic. A survey of part of the Lincoln diocese in 1800 produced the alarming statistic of only less than one-sixth of the persons above the age of fourteen as devoted participants in the life of the national Church. Perhaps one needs now to be more sceptical about the notion of rural fidelity that has for so long formed the base-line for the arguments that with the coming of the town and of the machine the working man lost his religion.<sup>7</sup> Meanwhile this weakness of religion in the counties led the bishops to call for more residence of their clergy, without, either themselves giving up non-residence, or, any sustained championship of legal changes.

Whilst the episcopal view of society shared all the neuroses of an

aristocratic establishment, and whilst it still held doggedly to the religious importance of the inevitability of inequality, it also upheld the Christian obligation to exercise charity which in practice tempered some of the harshness of the philosophical unconcern. The exception once more was Watson: most bishops saw the Poor Laws in operation as an expression of Christian philanthropy but Watson condemned them on Whig utilitarian grounds. But after the war, influenced by the political economists' analysis, more was said about the evils of undeserved relief than about charity. At the same time although the war could no longer be used as an excuse for putting off reform, society was still under pressure, not now from French hostilities but from civil grievances at home. In consequence sensitive clergy were driven back to a study of society: whereas the older bishops were steeped in Locke the new appointees, reflecting the new monied wealth which was now an alternative to landed wealth, were at least acquainted with Adam Smith, Malthus and Bentham, and indeed, for some Political Economy became a supplementary revelation. Malthus in particular presented them with a problem: he was a clergyman and yet he seemed to be denying the value of Christian charity. It fell to John Bird Sumner, the future Evangelical Bishop of Chester and subsequently Archbishop of Canterbury to reconcile Malthusian teaching with the "wisdom and goodness of the Deity" in his *Treatise on the Records of the Creation* (1816): he succeeded—political economy and Christian revelation were reconciled to the satisfaction of his generation. The Christian's charitable responsibilities were not denied but it needed to be carefully regulated in order that it should not impede the energetic employment of the more important divine gift of individual free-will. This led on to a distinction between poverty as a *class* category which was part of the order of things, a not unendurable condition for being in which a man was not personally responsible, and the *economic* category of indigence for which a man, through intemperance, improvidence and early and ill-disciplined marriage, was responsible.

What did all this add up to? Professor Soloway's assessment is judicious: "Not only had the Establishment lost much of its effective contact in traditional agricultural areas as a result of indifference, non-residence and spiritual apathy, but it was clearly without the means and often the will to establish any viable relationship with the great numbers of poor workers increasingly inhabiting the neglected manufacturing and mining towns. Escape into a logical fantasy, built upon necessary assumptions translated into natural law, was a common reaction of conservative clergymen confronted with staggering problems they feared to contemplate."<sup>8</sup> And those whose thinking was subsequently formulated in the language of political economy hardly fared better—the argument might appear more modern, but the conclusions and the ensuing attitudes were the same, if not even harsher. Richard Whateley, Archbishop of Dublin, even wanted all paupers tattooed for purposes of recognition, the females to be shaven

and their hair sold at a profit. Others were prevented from speaking against relief by fear of damaging their image in the eyes of the people at a time when the survival of the Church itself was under threat. The trouble was that the Church was prevented from thinking in positive terms by reason of her aristocratic associations and her fear of radical thought and political insurrection: "much," says Professor Soloway, "of the harshness of political economy grafted to clerical social thought in the first half of the nineteenth century was motivated by a determination sometimes conscious, often unconscious, to destroy the lingering infections of *The Rights of Man*." Blomfield, "the real power in the Establishment" in the thirties and forties early despaired of organised relief and turned instead to the building of churches and schools as a means of revitalising parochial religion in urban areas, and at the same time of educating "the poor to providence and self-reliance once they were relieved from their dependence upon the soured milk of indiscriminate charity and perpetual relief."<sup>10</sup>

Sumner, his successor at Chester, also turned from his earlier optimism concerning the improvement of the lot of the poor, to a pessimistic pietism: poverty was the necessary testing of a poor man's faith. The most outspoken advocates of relief were now the most old-fashioned men of the bench—the surviving eighteenth century paternalists, men like Phillpotts of Exeter, whose objection to the New Poor Law was essentially that the establishment of the Workhouse extracted the paupers from the natural and healthy influence of parochial life.

But out of this poverty of thought and in the context of the inhumane realities of the life of the poor of which prelates became increasingly aware through government reports and through their own educational activities in their dioceses, new attitudes emerged: fear of social disintegration "drove the Edward Duncombes, the George Stringer Bulls, the Walter F. Hooks and many other clergymen to find some way to restore meaningful relationships between all classes"<sup>11</sup> But for the most part the ecclesiastical establishment moved towards reform only as fast as the civil establishment, that is in matters of social conscience prelates were more often followers than leaders. By the 1840s, however, some prelates at least were campaigners once more. Again the chronology is important: Professor Soloway writes of Blomfield, "His laissez-faire days were over when in 1842 he insisted that the legislature was not only able, but was obligated to step in and remedy the great evils existing not only in the collieries then under investigation, but in manufacturing towns as well,"<sup>12</sup> and in this he had the support of many of the more recently appointed bishops. The emphasis was no longer exclusively on schools and churches, but involvement in the "total" improvement of the working population, for it was doubted whether any spiritual impression could be made whilst physical conditions remained so desperate. The Church had to re-establish itself as that which it once had been, a national institution concerned for the whole life of the whole nation:

indeed when social schism seemed so near, the Church alone, it was claimed, offered the possibility of national unity. But even this emphasis could be distorted so that the Established Church came to think of the securing of social harmony rather than spiritual satisfaction as its principal task, and conversely the great peril against which to fight, not the loss of immortal souls but the possibility of civil strife.

In consequence, an early optimism in what might be achieved by church extension gives way to pessimism concerning half-filled new churches which in its turn gives birth to a more complete attempt at the revival of parochial life.

"The very concept and language of parson, parish and flock were permeated with pastoral premises of a simple, rural society that had no connection whatsoever with the sprawling, teeming manufacturing districts that had spread out around the small parochial boundaries of a different age. New concepts and a new language were needed: lay reader, district visitor, city mission, outdoor evangelist, parochial redistricting—these were the terms and innovations of a modern, industrial church no longer bound by the precedent of a squirearchical society obscured by the thick and acrid smoke of thousands of smokestacks, and the dreary rows of tenements enclosing the fetid alleys of mining and manufacturing towns throughout the country. These were the terms and innovations with which the bench had to come to grips, their eighteenth-century pastoral-social values rubbed raw by the difficult realisation of their irrelevancy to millions of restless and alienated Englishmen working out their own values in an environment utterly beyond the comprehension of the majority of the clergy."<sup>13</sup>

The new language is significant for it is essentially the language of a missionary society rather than of an establishment. As Professor Soloway perceives

"To a Church that justified its privileges primarily in terms of eighteenth-century Warburtonian utility, and, later, Benthamite concepts of rational effectiveness, the possibility that it might no longer be the Church of the majority was most alarming."<sup>14</sup>

What the great Anglican missionary society of the nineteenth century achieved was the survival of the Church of England, but no longer could it be pretended that it was in fact the Church of the English nation.

Professor Marsh's *The Victorian Church in Decline* which is well sub-titled *Archbishop Tait and the Church of England 1862-82* operates at two distinct levels: there is first a general account of the Church of England in mid-Victorian England as it gradually becomes aware that the zenith of its achievement is in the past rather than the future, and secondly a study of Tait's personality, his ambitions for the church he so dearly loved and his work as an ecclesiastical administrator.

Before Tait's translation to Canterbury the vulnerable position of the Church of England within the life of the English nation had been reformed in three particular respects; her *religious life* had been reformed by the Evangelical and Catholic revivals, her *structure* by the administrative energies of the Ecclesiastical Commission and of reforming diocesans, and by a relaxation of the civil disabilities of the dissenters, and thirdly, *the area of her concern* had been kept in broadest definition by a perpetuation of the idea of the national church which inspired her members to prodigious labours in church and school building: Professor Marsh's judgement is that, "It was in providing elementary schools for the children of the labouring classes in town and county that the established church made its highest, most costly bid to maintain something of its medieval social functions and, more important, to continue to form the mind of the nation."<sup>15</sup> But massive as the effort was to secure a truly national church, it became increasingly anachronistic: "The census (of 1851) proved statistically what the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts had implied theoretically: that the Church of England's right to continued recognition as the national Church was shaky."<sup>16</sup>

But, in a pre-ecumenical age, it was the preservation of the Church of England as the national church that was the fatal *ignis fatuus* of Tait's relentless pursuit. Comprehending the changed social, political and economic temper of his times, Tait realised that the legal statement of establishment was insufficient; though in times of crisis he constantly reverted to the mechanism of the law, it was better that the national church should exist by consent of the nation. Since he believed that the nation was faithful at heart, he constantly sought to make the Church's life, ministry and worship congenial to Parliament and the public. In this respect the enthusiasms of the new high churchmen seemed so unhelpful, with their concern for ritualism, auricular confession and the distinctiveness of the clerical life. "Common Prayer" which had been the glory of the Church of England was now that which most conspicuously she no longer possessed.

Thus it was that Tait's concern for the Church's impact upon the country was deflected into a struggle for the Church's unity, a deflection which was, of course, the common lot of English Christianity, provoking General Booth's question, "Is it not time that, forgetting for a moment their wranglings about the infinitely little or infinitely obscure, they should concentrate all their energies on a united effort to break this terrible perpetuity of perdition and to rescue some at least of those for whom they profess to believe their Founder came to die?"<sup>17</sup> The eirenical Tait had, therefore, to deal with a novel partisanship which seemed to mock so much of what he thought the Church stood for, and to reflect in the public sphere the tragedies of his personal life, which was constantly sharpened by pain, death and loss. In short Tait believed that the Church should exist for the nation and not for itself. Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln had never,

he said, perfectly mastered "what I conceive to be the glory of the Church of England, that it is a National Church, wide as the nation, ready to embrace all in the nation who are anxious to join it, and not making narrow sectarian distinctions between those who adhere very rigidly to one or another set of opinions."<sup>18</sup>

But this idea was under threat, particularly because challenges to Church Order, arising out of both doctrinal and liturgical issues, served to underline the confusion that existed concerning ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The crisis of conscience, witnessed by the period, was not new, but in the context of Darwin, Huxley, Tylor and the new Biblical Criticism, it took on a new urgency. The Church's response lacked unanimity; on the one hand the evangelicals and some high-churchmen wanted a determined restatement of the old verities, whereas on the other, some of the braver spirits from the Broad Church tradition wanted some kind of rapprochement with the new knowledge. The result was theological paralysis: even suggestions that the Athanasian Creed be removed from the liturgy and put with the Articles as a statement of faith provoked ugly threats of secessions, whilst a re-writing of the lectionary required a major political operation. It seemed that any attempt to make the liturgy more congenial to the pew was destined to drive a sizeable element of the clergy out of the church. "The energy intended for defence of the faith against outside attack was dissipated in a fight between the defenders, leaving the enemy unaffected or amused."<sup>19</sup>

If in doctrinal cases the courts had appeared indulgent, in matters of ceremony, their cumulative judgement seemed rigorously and narrowly definitive. Although in the short-term, the rough and punitive use of the courts and their penalties to secure uniformity may have appeared to work against the ritualists, in the longer term the real losers were the evangelicals, since the organisation of the church made it impossible for them to prosecute what they conscientiously saw as an abuse of the practice of the church, without arousing more antipathy to themselves than the deviants. This whole ugly episode suggests that the ecclesiastical activists of the seventies were ignorant alike of history and of theology. Some heeding of the counsel of Gamaliel in Acts 5 v. 33-39 might have led to a different outcome, but that was not altogether possible because the situation was essentially a political and not a religious one, and so all the folly of the campaigns for and against the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, one of the great monuments in English history to the limitations of what can be achieved by law. Once more tensions within the Church as far as they underlined the unsatisfactory role of the courts had served to provoke tension between Church and State, and to discredit all parties within the Church.

If from within, partisanship made it difficult for the Church to obtain consent for changes, reform was also retarded by an increasingly a-religious Parliament's grudging of parliamentary time to ecclesiastical business<sup>20</sup>: increasingly this became part of the cost of

establishment. On the other hand Parliament was loth to hand over its authority to an exclusively clerical Convocation, especially since it was widely assumed that ritualism was part of a clerical conspiracy.<sup>21</sup> High church consciences protested against the idea of a "Parliamentary Church" whilst laymen feared an autonomous church which had no mechanism for considering the views of the laity. One of Tait's chaplains wrote "How to give the Church greater freedom in regulating its own spiritual affairs without weakening the bonds which unite it to the nation is a problem of the greatest difficulty but it is a problem which must be solved if we are to continue to have a National Church."<sup>22</sup>

Yet beneath the bold title *The Victorian Church in Decline* Professor Marsh's account is unduly limited to ecclesiastical concerns—concerns of church order, jurisdiction and administration. But in themselves these are an insufficient explanation of the church's decline; the broad impact of intellectual trends, of patterns of cultural behaviour, and of the sober realities of social structure have also a part to play. The author is aware of these issues—as for example in his analysis of Tait's writings on unbelief and in his discussion of Brownlow Maitland's *The Argument from Prophecy*,<sup>23</sup> but even here his concern is with the difficulties that the book caused for the working of the S.P.C.K. rather than with any sustained analysis of the intellectual crisis, though he does bring the dilemma of Christian apologetic into focus when he says: "This is the quandary in which the Church found itself. The only faith which could retain popular acceptance was an unquestioning one. To accept some criticisms and reject others required an amount of study for which few men had the time, ability, or confidence."<sup>24</sup> Again the sociological problem is raised,<sup>25</sup> but rather as an appendix to the discussion of education. Well noted is Tait's concern over "the emergence in London of single class parishes caused by the flight of the middle-classes to suburbs . . . The proliferation of single class parishes, however, was a sign that the parochial system was anachronistic in an industrial society."<sup>26</sup> This is well said—but like Tait—Professor Marsh fails to sustain concern at this most crucial juncture, seeming to be content with the fact that as parishes became *de facto* congregations, so ritualism could be contained within the establishment.<sup>27</sup> All this may well underline one of the principle temptations of the historian—to confine his account to discreet, manageable projects and to put on one side larger and unmanageable tasks: church history becomes not a history of religion but narrowly an account of ecclesiastical administration. As an account of *The Victorian Church in Decline* Professor Marsh's book is too forensic and institutional, at once stunted in both the theological and sociological dimensions.

Professor Bowen, for his part, contends that when Beatrice Webb said that "it was during the middle decades of the nineteenth century that, in England, the impulse of self-subordinating service was transferred consciously and overtly from God to man", this occurred not



against the intentions of churchmen but largely on their sponsorship: "the main argument of this work is that churchmen led in the development of this new ethic of service. . . . This study argues that the Church saw the great danger in class warfare in England and, as part of a deliberate policy of reconciliation, sought to instil in the middle class the spirit of *noblesse oblige* which Victorians assumed the aristocracy still maintained. The success of this venture is reflected in the absence of overt class warfare in the nation, and the growth of the distinctive Christian character which historians attribute to Victorian society."<sup>28</sup>

But around this specific intention, there is a general rewriting of the history of the Victorian Church, which is generally intent on condemning the bishops of the century for not seeing that the salvation of the Church of England lay within the Pusey-Keble tradition, that is, once they had been liberated from the episcopal loyalties of Newman by his secession to Rome<sup>29</sup>, and had opened their minds to the insights of F. D. Maurice. Even though it is now recognised that in the past the role of the slum priests has been over-written,<sup>30</sup> there is no need to belittle their valuable and devoted labours. But issue does need to be taken with their protagonist, who in a well-established Tractarian tradition, attempts to champion their endeavours by slighting that of others; thus W. F. Hook and C. T. Longley are written off as Establishment men, and Evangelicals as those who put doctrinal niceties before pastoral mission.<sup>31</sup> One's respect for such judgements becomes attenuated when Professor Bowen shows himself ill-informed on fact, as for example the bizarre statement that when Samuel Wilberforce "became Bishop of Oxford, the see was comparatively new"<sup>32</sup>: it had in fact been created by Henry VIII in 1542. Again it is curious that the "fanatical" evangelical Church Association should be made the principal source of bitter partisanship within the Church, whilst the older and equally determined English Church Union, the ritualist's propaganda machine, is not even mentioned.<sup>33</sup> Nonconformity was apparently responsible for the Anglican Church turning away from disestablishment, since "at least the State connection kept the Church from suffering schism which was so common among the Free Churches;"<sup>34</sup> but one of the most important characteristics of new dissent in the century was that it so often represented secession from the Anglican Church at just that time when some of the older denominations began to examine schemes of reunion. The climax of the whole discussion, which we are now reminded is about church-state relations, is Benson's pronouncement in the Lincoln Judgment of 1890, that Bishop King's use of the eastward position, the *Angus Dei* and the ablution of the communion vessels were legal, but not his use of the sign of the cross or the mixing of the Chalice in the service. "The acceptance of the Lincoln Judgment by churchmen showed the way ahead—the solution of the long-protracted struggle between the bishops and the Ritualists."<sup>35</sup> Ryle is quoted as having no fear now for the Church-State connexion

—but unfortunately the quotation is from 1885. The Lincoln Judgment seems to me to have been no more respected than the earlier Privy Council decisions, and hardly to have brought to an end parliamentary concern with the Church's doctrine and practice: within fifteen years yet again a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline was to be appointed.

Rather stunted and fragmentary discussions of the intellectual crisis of Victorian Christendom and of the Church's role in education bring Professor Bowen back to his main theme: the failure to get the working classes to return to church through a programme of state-aided church extension led to a deliberate plan "to create a Christian social climate which would by 'osmosis' influence the lives of even the workers. It did this by an ideological capturing of the middle class (with the aid of Nonconformity), and by giving the middle class the conviction that it should reconcile the divided classes in England."<sup>36</sup> In order to achieve this, Professor Bowen contends that an alliance was made with Nonconformity, which became in effect a satellite to the Church of England's endeavours. Errors of fact and interpretation lead up to the remarkable conclusion: "No one would seek to deny the importance of the 'Nonconformist Conscience'<sup>37</sup> in Victorian society: but it is seldom recognised that this social viewpoint was a reflection of Catholic ideology which matured in the Church and then by 'osmosis' influenced the major Dissenting sects who joined in the mission to Christianise the nation."<sup>38</sup>

Professor Bowen takes issue with social historians for their miscreant account of the Victorian Church: "The latter day Benthamite may choose to scorn the churchman of the nineteenth century for being religious, and for not acting in the fashion for an enlightened modern social reformer; but when he makes value judgements of this nature, he does not write good history."<sup>39</sup> The point is properly made, but *The Idea of the Victorian Church* is not the book to correct the record. The Halevy thesis—that Methodism saved England from class warfare in the age of the French Revolution—still stands, notwithstanding much attack,<sup>40</sup> the Bowen thesis,—that Anglicanism served a similar function in high Victorian society—is unlikely to have as long a life.

Indeed, in itself this might be a misleading book if the author's prejudices were not so clearly revealed and if the evidence produced did not so patently fail to substantiate the conclusions reached. The social historians will need a better answer than this.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> R. A. Soloway, *Prelates and People: Ecclesiastical Social Thought in England 1783-1852*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969, 464 pp. 84/-; P. T. Marsh, *The Victorian Church in Decline: Archbishop Tait and The Church of England, 1868-1882*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969, 344 pp. 56/-; D. Bowen, *The Idea of the Victorian Church: A Study of the Church of England, 1833-89*, Montreal, McGill University Press, 1968, 421 pp. 108/-.

<sup>2</sup> O. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, Part I, London, 1966.

- <sup>3</sup> Soloway, p. 17.
- <sup>4</sup> S. Horsley, *A Sermon . . . on the anniversary of the Martyrdom of King Charles I*, 1793, pp. 22-3. Cited Soloway, p. 32.
- <sup>5</sup> E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, London, 1965, pp. 116-9.
- <sup>6</sup> Soloway, p. 34.
- <sup>7</sup> Cf. K. S. Inglis, *Churches and The Working Classes in Victorian England*, London, 1963, pp. 3-4, cf. Soloway, pp. 50-52.
- <sup>8</sup> Soloway, pp. 115-6.
- <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 129.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 151.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 182.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 205.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 317.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 349.
- <sup>15</sup> Marsh, p. 5. Soloway and Bowen also give considerable attention to the Church's role in education.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- <sup>17</sup> W. Booth, *In Darkest England and The Way Out*, London, 1890, p. 16.
- <sup>18</sup> Hansard 2nd Series. CCLII (1880), 1023, cited Marsh, p. 259.
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 280.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 182, 213.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 214-5.
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 51ff.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 89-93.
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 90.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 265.
- <sup>28</sup> Bowen p. viii citing B. Webb. "*My Apprenticeship*," 1950, p. 123.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 89ff.
- <sup>30</sup> e.g. S. Mayor, *The Churches and The Labour Movement*, London, 1967, p. 351.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 116-7.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 131 but cf. Marsh, p. 124.
- <sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 132.
- <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.
- <sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256.
- <sup>37</sup> But *vide* J. H. S. Kent, "Hugh Price Hughes and The Nonconformist Conscience" in ed. G. V. Bennett & J. D. Walsh, *Essays in Modern English Church History*, pp. 181-205.
- <sup>38</sup> Bowen, p. 386.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 241.
- <sup>40</sup> *Vide*, G. Himmelfarb, "Postscript on the Halevy Thesis", in her *Victorian Minds*, London, 1968, pp. 292-9.

J. H. Y. BRIGGS

#### Annual General Meeting

The speaker at the Annual General Meeting on Monday, 27 April, 1970, will be Dr. Stephen Mayor of Westminster College, Cambridge. The meeting will be held in the Institute Hall, Westminster Chapel, commencing with tea at 4.15 p.m. Admission to tea will be by ticket only, price 2/-. Those hoping to attend should apply to the Baptist Historical Society, 4, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1 enclosing a postal order for 2/- and a stamped addressed envelope. Replies will be sent out from the Church House in April.