

Baptist Provision for Ministerial Education in the 18th Century

IN THE early years of their history Baptists in this country were generally hostile towards the provision of an educated ministry, but in the latter years of the seventeenth century some of their number began to show an interest in such provision, an interest which resulted in the foundation by Particular Baptists of the Bristol Baptist College and a proposal in 1702 by the General Baptists to establish a similar institution in London.¹ This proposal came to nothing and for over a hundred years the Bristol college stood as the major provider of an educated ministry amongst the Baptists, while such other schemes as were launched in the eighteenth century only served to enhance the status of the college at Bristol. The purpose of this article is to attempt some answer to the question as to why London should fail where Bristol succeeded and to take note of the other schemes referred to and their enhancement of the Bristol enterprise.

The choice of London and Bristol at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as locations for Baptist colleges was understandable. Both were centres of Baptist strength and so, numerically, seemed capable of supporting a college: both were important centres of population and so would be of some attraction to students. London, with an estimated population of 200,000, was the larger of the two places but Bristol, with a population of about 20,000 was the second city of the land and a growing centre of trade and commerce.² These two cities were natural choices for the siting of colleges, hence the query as to why London should fail where Bristol succeeded. The answer to this query lies, it is suggested, in certain aspects of the history of the Broadmead Baptist church, Bristol, as compared with that of the London Baptist churches.

Broadmead began life in 1613 as an Independent congregation but in the mid-1650s began to accommodate within its membership some who were persuaded of the need for baptism as believers. By 1670 the majority of its membership was composed of baptised believers but an open-membership situation persisted until 1689 when Thomas Vaux, its minister, signed the Particular Baptist Confession of Faith.³ This open-membership structure would appear to indicate a certain tolerance within the church which would make it difficult, if not impossible, for a rigid stance to have been taken on something as controversial and divisive as the question of the desirability of an educated ministry. It would seem that flexibility was in fact maintained. Down to 1710 the Broadmead church had both educated and uneducated men (in the ministerial sense) as its ministers, with a preference shown for the former. William Yeamans (1613-33),⁴

Nathanael Ingello (1646-9),⁵ Thomas Hardcastle (1671-8)⁶ and George Fownes (1679-85)⁷ were university graduates and Caleb Jope (1710-20)⁸ had attended the Tewkesbury Dissenting Academy, whilst Thomas Ewins (1662-71),⁹ Thomas Vaux (1685-93),¹⁰ George Fownes Jnr. (1693-1707),¹¹ and Peter Kitterell (1707)¹² were not so educated. (In passing it should be borne in mind that, apart from Jope, none of these men was educated for the Baptist ministry as such but rather for that of the Established Church—their espousal of the Independent or Baptist cause came after they had commenced their ministerial duties.)

Broadmead would seem, therefore, to have had a preference for an educated ministry and was likely to be sympathetic towards any suggestions for its provision within the Baptist denomination. Additionally, however, and most significantly, the church possessed the financial means to make such provision itself. Indications of the wealth of Broadmead are, first, the care it took over the maintenance of its ministers. Thus Hardcastle and Fownes received stipends of £80 per annum and at Hardcastle's death his widow was given £150 whilst the church paid funeral expenses totalling £30.¹³ Secondly, in 1696 eleven of the Broadmead members were deemed wealthy enough to pay more than the standard rate of tax levied under the 1694 Act for taxing burials, births, marriages, bachelors aged twenty-five years and over and childless widowers in order to raise additional funds to finance the war against France.¹⁴ Thirdly, in 1715 the wealth of the church, which then had four to five hundred members, was reckoned at £50,000, whilst the sister church at Pithay, with a membership of 1,200, was estimated to be worth £160,000.¹⁵

It is difficult because of lack of evidence to make detailed comparisons with other Baptist churches but by any reckoning the figures quoted above show that at the time of their recording Broadmead was a wealthy church, even though not the most wealthy in Bristol. What figures we do possess of stipends of Baptist ministers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries indicate how well cared for was the incumbent of Broadmead. The following serve to illustrate the point:

1705	Francis Turner, Hill Cliff	£30 p.a. ¹⁶
1730	John Turner, Liverpool	£19 p.a. ¹⁷
1737	Mr. Haydon, Shortwood	£30 p.a. ¹⁸
1753	Robert Hall, Arnesby	£14 p.a. ¹⁹
	but increased to	£32 p.a. ¹⁹
1761	Robert Robinson, Cambridge	£13 4s. p.a. ²⁰
1763	John Fawcett, Hebden Bridge	£25 p.a. ²¹
1764	James Pyne, Lyme	£36 p.a. ²²
1770	David Kinghorn, Bishops Burton	£26 p.a. ²³
1786	George Whitfield, Hamsterley	£30 p.a. ²⁴

Of these stipends all but one are attributed to the poor economic standing of the churches concerned. The one exception is that of John Turner, the minister of a church in Liverpool which was reckoned to be wealthy but whose members did not regard it as

necessary to make sufficient provision for him.²⁵ As far as can be gathered, most Baptist ministers were expected to eke out their stipends by undertaking other work and, whilst we must be wary of arguing too strongly on the basis of the few illustrations quoted above, it would seem that financially the lot of the Baptist minister in the period under review was not a happy one. The Particular Baptist Fund, established in 1717, is noted as making grants to over one hundred Baptist ministers, that is, about one-third of those in service, whose stipends were less than £25 per annum. It is true there were well-paid men in the Baptist ministry; L. G. Champion quotes the example of Joseph Stennett, minister of Little Wild Street, London, for one²⁶ and it would seem that the minister of Broadmead was another, but these men were exceptions rather than the rule.²⁷

To return to the main argument: not only did the Broadmead church possess wealth, it also had wealthy members who were sufficiently interested in the cause of ministerial education to make provision for its support in their wills, and it was due to such legacies that the Bristol College was able to progress as it did in the eighteenth century. In all there are five legacies dating from this period which benefited the College, those of Edward Terrill, Dorothy Vaux (Terrill's widow), Robert Bodenham, Bernard Foskett and Sir John Eyle.

On his death in 1685, Edward Terrill left a sum of money to the minister of Broadmead church on condition that he was fluent in Greek and Hebrew and devoted not more than three afternoons per week instructing up to twelve young men, recommended by Baptist churches, in those languages and other suitable literature. In addition he bequeathed his library of 200 books (works in English, Greek, Hebrew and Latin) to Broadmead,²⁸ as well as leaving certain properties the income of which was to be used in specific ways, including a donation to what later became the Bristol Education Society; by the end of the eighteenth century the donation amounted to £10 per annum.²⁹

Dorothy Vaux (formerly Terrill) who died in 1697 bequeathed the sum of £500 to Andrew Gifford, minister of Pithay Baptist church, Bristol. Of this the interest on £100 was to be paid to the minister of Broadmead church and that on a further £100 was to be devoted to "educating young brethren in the tongues in which the Scriptures were written, in order to their help in the ministry". From these bequests £5 per annum was paid to each of the recipients, the Broadmead minister and the Baptist college.³⁰ Sir John Eyle also bequeathed £100 for the education of young men for the ministry and the interest on this, too, amounted to £5 per annum which went to the College funds.³¹

Robert Bodenham made two bequests which were of great benefit to the College. By a deed poll of 13th January 1715, he stipulated that the rents and profits from certain properties should fall to Andrew Gifford and his successors to be used "for the maintenance,

support and education, from time to time, of such sober young men, for the ministry of the gospel . . .". Rents from other properties were to be used for the support of the minister of the Broadmead church.⁸² By the end of the eighteenth century the rent from the properties for the College amounted to £60 10s. whilst those for the support of Broadmead's minister came to £70 per annum.⁸³ The second bequest was by indenture of 27th August 1720, between Bodenham, Bernard Foskett and John Shuter (a milliner and member of Broadmead),⁸⁴ which gave a newly erected house and buildings in Broadmead to Bernard Foskett and others, their heirs and assigns for ever, to be used as manse and College.⁸⁵ Finally, Bernard Foskett in 1745 donated the rents of certain properties in Bristol for the support and maintenance of the minister and assistant minister of Broadmead.⁸⁶

From these bequests it can be seen that by 1726 the College had been provided with premises and certain funds (£80 10s. by the end of the century) for its support whilst provision had also been made both financially and by way of accommodation for the man deputed to be in charge of the College, that is, the minister of Broadmead. Irrespective of any payment which the members of Broadmead might make him, the minister was assured, by the end of the century, of £75 per annum and free accommodation. Through the foresight and care of its founders the Bristol College had been provided with a sound basis upon which its work could be built and developed.

When this situation at Bristol is compared with that at London in the same period a markedly different picture emerges. It is difficult to find any church comparable to that at Broadmead either by virtue of its open-membership or succession of educated ministers. As to the financial state of the London churches we have little information although in 1739 William Maitland estimated that they collected £700 annually for the support of the ministry.⁸⁷ There were individuals in membership with London Baptist churches who were known to be wealthy. In the seventeenth century these included men such as Samuel Moyer and William Kiffin, the latter of whom was reputed on one occasion to have given Charles II the sum of £10,000 rather than enter into the more perilous transaction of lending the monarch £40,000.⁸⁸ Whether either of these two men was ever inspired to donate liberally towards the cause of ministerial education is not known but there is no evidence to suggest that they did. Thomas Guy (1645-1724) was another wealthy London Baptist of this period. He made a fortune through his book-selling business and the successful sale of his South Sea Stock and used his fortune to establish Guy's Hospital but made no contribution to any of the educational schemes discussed here.⁸⁹ One who did make some contribution was Thomas Hollis (1658-1730) who gave some money to the Particular Baptist Fund in 1726, of which more will be said later, but his major interest lay overseas and is marked by his endowment of professorial chairs at Harvard University in philosophy and mathematics and in divinity and his donations of money, apparatus and books.⁴⁰ The impression

is gained that those London Baptists who possessed wealth were not as interested in the provision of an educated ministry as were their Bristol counterparts. This impression is supported by the Baptist historian, Ivimey, who regards this failure of the wealthy Baptists as the major reason for the cause of an educated ministry making no headway in London.⁴¹

A second reason advanced by Ivimey for the failure of London Baptists to support the project for an educated ministry is the absence of any centralised organisation within the denomination.⁴² Whilst there may be some force in this argument it is equally arguable that another, perhaps major, reason for the success of Bristol in founding a college was that only one church—or at the most two if we include the Pithay church—was involved. No central association or body was required to give its approval to the project and so the work was able to progress without any undue hindrance. This is in contrast to the example afforded by the General Baptists in the efforts they made in the first half of the eighteenth century to provide for an educated ministry.

Reference was made at the beginning of this article to the proposal in 1702 by the General Baptists to establish a college in London for the education of prospective ministers. The Annual Assembly which approved that proposal appointed a committee of five men to act as collectors and organisers of the project. These men, Robert Cousins, Samuel Keeling, Robert Hore, Robert Chandler and "one Burkit" were drawn from two churches—Hart Street, Covent Garden and White's Alley.⁴³ Nothing more was heard of the project until some seventy or eighty years later. Why? It seems to be more than coincidence that the lapsing of the project occurred at the same time as the churches at Hart Street and White's Alley broke with the General Baptists on doctrinal matters; they were not reconciled until 1736, and then only for a short time.⁴⁴ This incident would seem to indicate the probability that it was the churches at Hart Street and White's Alley who were the instigators of the project and on their secession no other churches were willing to take it up. The fact that the decision to establish the college was one taken by a national Assembly was of little weight in this instance.

From the preceding observations the conclusion is drawn that a college was successfully established at Bristol because the following conditions prevailed: first, the Broadmead church had a high appreciation of an educated ministry. Secondly, it possessed within its membership those of wealth and love of learning who were prepared to endow the cause of ministerial education, and thirdly, this objective could be pursued without hindrance because it was, initially, the project of one church and not dependent for its success upon the support of other churches or associations.

These conditions did not pertain in London at one and the same time and it was not until the nineteenth century that it proved possible to establish a comparable Baptist college there. That this did happen

illustrates the importance of the second point in the preceding paragraph because this college, at Stepney, was only founded through the generosity of William Taylor, a wealthy hosier, who purchased the premises to house the new institution as well as giving money for its support.⁴⁵

We now turn to a consideration of other schemes floated by Baptists in the eighteenth century for the education of ministers. Note has been made of the abortive proposal by General Baptists in 1702 to establish a college in London. By 1724 the shortage of ministers forced the General Baptists to consider the question of ministerial education again but their solution was not the erection of a college but an exhortation to ministers to "instruct the young and best knowing in the ministriall work".⁴⁶ It was not until 1772 that the matter was raised again. At their Assembly of that year the General Baptists discussed a proposal from the Canterbury church for the education of young men *already in the ministry* but no action was taken because of the difficulty which it was believed would be encountered in trying to raise funds for the venture.⁴⁷ No further reference is made to the subject in the Assembly Minutes until 1790 when the church at Saffron Walden "intimated a desire for some plan to be adopted for the Education of Young Ministers".⁴⁸ This proposal was accepted and in 1793 we read that the Rev. Mr. Freeman had agreed to instruct such students as might be sent to him by the Assembly.⁴⁹ (Freeman had been admitted to Bristol as a student in 1783 and in 1793 was resident at Ponders End, Middlesex.)⁵⁰ At their 1794 Assembly the General Baptists agreed to launch a fund to meet the expenses of educating ministerial candidates⁵¹ and by 1796 the first student to be educated by the Fund had been admitted to Mr. Freeman's charge.⁵² (The General Baptists do not appear to have been very successful in publicising their new venture for in 1796 the *Protestant Dissenters Magazine* published a letter asking what provision existed, if any, for the education of General Baptist ministers. A letter in reply informed the enquirer of the establishment of the new venture as well as providing the name and address of the Treasurer. It was also stated that hitherto General Baptist ministers had been educated by the Presbyterians but no details are given in support of this claim.)⁵³

So the General Baptists' scheme for ministerial education got under way more than ninety years after its first proposal. The workings of the scheme, however, serve only to show the superiority of the Bristol College. Thus, as far as funds for the venture were concerned, the General Baptists appear to have experienced some difficulty in obtaining an adequate supply. The first appeal made for money in 1794 resulted in subscriptions totalling £34 13s. from fifteen subscribers.⁵⁴ In 1795 a further £36 8s. and an annual donation of £10 10s. had been promised from an additional ten subscribers⁵⁵ whilst in 1797 £11 4s. was promised from another four subscribers.⁵⁶ By 1800 it was reported that total receipts since 1794 were £158 12s.⁵⁷ When

this situation is compared to that of Bristol the paucity of the General Baptists' effort is obvious. The Bristol Education Society began its existence in 1770 with a capital and annual income of £596⁵⁸ (excluding the various bequests referred to earlier in this article) and by 1781 the capital had risen to £1,279.⁵⁹ The annual subscriptions to the Society totalled, in 1785, £229. 19s.,⁶⁰ a sum which had risen to £306 by 1798.⁶¹ In other words, the Bristol Society received in one year almost twice the amount collected by the General Baptists in six years. As far as the raising of these monies was concerned, the General Baptists had a small number of individual subscribers but appeared to rely upon contributions from the churches for most of their money. By 1800 they had collecting agencies in fifteen churches, mainly in the London and Kent areas but including some as far west as Taunton and Frome, and, in the Midlands, Leicester.⁶² The Bristol Society, on the other hand, relied almost entirely upon private subscriptions for its support. The first list of subscribers to the Society in 1770 includes only one Baptist church although it is possible that the use of the phrase "by the hands of" in five other cases could refer to collections made in churches. In contrast to this small number of churches, the names of sixty-eight individual subscribers are listed.⁶³ The subscription list for 1785 consists of 171 individual subscribers,⁶⁴ a number which was increased in that year to 185 with an extra £42 11s in donations.⁶⁵ The majority of these subscribers came from the west country, although there were some from the Midlands and forty-two from the London area, which would appear to indicate that the Bristol College enjoyed a fairly wide support.

Another point of contrast between the General Baptist scheme and the Bristol College is in the matter of students. As far as numbers are concerned, at no time before 1811 were the General Baptists able to support more than two students a year whereas the Bristol Fund was, in 1798, supporting seventeen students.⁶⁶ On the matter of curriculum, that of the Bristol College was typical of what was available in the Dissenting Academies in the latter half of the eighteenth century, that is, comparable to, if not better than, that of the two English universities and usually requiring a course of four years' duration to complete. The General Baptist students had only two years' education which had as its main object "to teach them to speak and write the English language with propriety". "Sacred and Profane History" would also be taught, with reading suitable for the "illustration of the Holy Scriptures". New Testament Greek might be taught "sometimes".⁶⁷ The impression gained from reading this curriculum for ministerial studies is that there must have existed in General Baptist circles a very low standard of literacy and culture, a view supported by Baptist historians.⁶⁸

In 1770 a division occurred in the ranks of the General Baptists when eleven churches broke away to form the group which became known as the New Connexion.⁶⁹ This group increased in numbers over the ensuing years and was particularly strong in the East Mid-

lands. For many years the leader of the new group was the Rev. Dan Taylor and in 1779 he advocated the training of ministerial candidates.⁷⁰ Nothing came of this until 1796 when the New Connexion Association agreed to open a subscription appeal for funds to assist in this work.⁷¹ At the 1797 Association the sum of £175 was realised for this end through donations, with a further £16 per annum promised in subscriptions. The churches were approached for gifts and in 1798 an Academy was opened at Mile End, London, under the charge of Dan Taylor.⁷² The curriculum consisted of English, the Bible, History, Geography, and Moral Philosophy; the charge for each student per annum was £50 which included tuition, board and lodging, and in the period 1798 to 1813 nineteen students were trained and entered the ministry.⁷³

The Particular Baptists of London were in agreement with the desirability of having an educated ministry when the matter was discussed at the General Assemblies of 1689, 1691, 1692 and 1693 but, by their absence from the 1694 Assembly, would appear to have withdrawn their support from the project. They did not, however, lose all interest in the subject for in 1704 an Assembly of thirteen London churches agreed that it would be "highly useful" if a fund was established for the education of young men desirous of entering the ministry and also for the provision of books to serving ministers.⁷⁴ It was not until 1717, however, that steps were taken to implement this proposal. In that year the Particular Baptist London Fund was set up with two objects: first, the assistance of necessitous ministers, and secondly, the education of young men called to the ministry. It was decreed that the Fund should be confined to Particular Baptists and this brought a protest from Benjamin Stinton, an elder of the Horsleydown church, who believed that the Fund should not be so restricted.⁷⁵ Stinton's argument on this may be summarised as follows: Such restriction would open the doors to endless argument and debate as the managers of the Fund determined who could be assisted from it. There were several Baptist churches and ministers who had no desire to be classed as either General or Particular. The restriction would show Baptists as a people of narrow party spirit and lacking in charity, unlike the Presbyterians and Congregationalists who showed no restriction in the distribution of their charities. It would also prevent many wealthy Baptists from contributing to the Fund.⁷⁶ In spite of these protests the regulations governing the application of the Fund remained unaltered and Stinton appears to have accepted defeat gracefully, becoming a founder member of the Fund.⁷⁷

Initially, the Fund was supported by six churches—Tallow Chandlers' Hall, Little Wild Street, Devonshire Square, Cripplegate, Horsleydown, and Flower-de-luce Court. They promised to raise a total of £910, of which by 1718 £874 14s. 6d. had been realised.⁷⁸ This money appears to have been intended for the first of the Fund's objectives (the support of ministers) for we read of a separate sum of money being raised in 1720 for the second objective (ministerial

education). £300 was invested in South Sea Stock, the interest from which was to be used for the stated purpose.⁷⁹ The Fund was augmented by a donation of £500 from Thomas Hollis in 1731⁸⁰ but the interest realised was only sufficient to support two or three students a year at Bristol: it was never enough to realise the aim of providing "a succession of able and well-qualified ministers".⁸¹

In 1752 the Baptist Society for Assisting Young Men in Grammar and Academic Learning was founded. £356 was donated as capital and £60 promised in annual subscriptions. Until 1760 students (very few, exact number unknown) were tutored by Thomas Llewellyn at Trowbridge⁸² and then the work was taken over by Samuel Stennett. Interest in the Society was short-lived and subscriptions dried up by 1774. What remained of the Society's funds was merged with that of the Particular Baptist Fund to assist in the work of the Stepney College founded in 1810.⁸³

Disappointed by the exclusive nature of the Particular Baptist Fund, the church at Paul's Alley, London, drew up a plan for educating prospective ministers of Baptist churches irrespective of their Particular or General status. This plan allowed for a course of study lasting for three years at least with the possibility of an extension for a further two years and for bursaries of not more than £20 per annum, for not more than two years after completion of the course of study. It would seem that some money was raised but nothing came of the educational proposals.⁸⁴

Another scheme worthy of note is the Dr. Ward Foundation. This was bequeathed by Dr. John Ward (1679-1758) for the education of Protestant Dissenting ministers at Aberdeen University. Ward, a Baptist, was a member of the Little Wild Street church, London. In 1720 he was elected Professor of Rhetoric at Gresham College: in 1751 he was awarded the LL.D. of Edinburgh University, in 1752 he became a Vice-President of the Royal Society and in 1753 a Trustee of the British Museum. Through his endowment a small number of exhibitions were available at Aberdeen but these were open to all Nonconformists and not confined to Baptists.⁸⁵

Finally, we might note the endeavours of two Particular Baptist ministers in the field of ministerial training. John Fawcett (1740-1817) trained ministers at Hebden Bridge from about 1773⁸⁶ and John Sutcliff (1752-1814), an old Bristolian, is said to have trained at least thirty-three students over a number of years at Olney.⁸⁷

None of these schemes and endeavours can be regarded as making any major contribution to the cause of ministerial education amongst Baptists in the eighteenth century. Individually they were incapable of fulfilling what was usually regarded as their main function, the provision of a continuing good supply of well-qualified ministers for the denomination. They do, however, serve to illustrate two points. First, that whilst it was true that majority opinion within the Baptist ranks was opposed, or at least apathetic, towards a learned ministry, there was a body of opinion favourable towards the idea sufficiently

strong enough to make its voice heard and achieve some result. Second, the pre-eminence of the Bristol College was emphasised. The education afforded the General Baptist ministerial students was extremely rudimentary, in marked contrast to that given to Bristol students. Particular Baptists outside of Bristol found that the best use which could be made of the funds they raised was to allocate them for the education of students from London and the provinces at the Bristol College, and the fact that no other Baptist college was founded until the early years of the nineteenth century meant that for more than one hundred years the Bristol College stood alone as a permanent Baptist venture into the field of ministerial education.

NOTES

This article is based on the author's unpublished Ph.D. thesis, "The Early Separatists, the Baptists and Education 1580-1780 (with special reference to the education of the clergy)" (University of Leeds, 1976).

¹ W. T. Whitley (ed.), *Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptists 1654-1811* (1912), vol. I, p. 35.

² M. D. George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (1964), p. 319; W. Minchinton, "The Port of Bristol in the Eighteenth Century" in P. McGrath (ed.), *Bristol in the Eighteenth Century* (1972), p. 128.

³ R. Hayden (ed.), *The Records of a Church of Christ in Bristol 1640-1687* (Bristol Record Society's Publications, vol. XXVII, 1974), p. 17.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 17, 310.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 34-42.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 43-6.

⁸ S. A. Swaine, *Faithful Men; or Memorials of Bristol Baptist College* (1884), p. 31; J. Rippon, *A Brief Essay Towards an History of the Baptist Academy at Bristol* (1795), p. 13.

⁹ Hayden, pp. 27-34.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 46, n. 23.

¹² Swaine, p. 31.

¹³ Hayden, pp. 134-6, 204-5.

¹⁴ E. Ralph and M. E. Williams, *Inhabitants of Bristol in 1696* (Bristol Record Society's Publications, vol. XXV, 1968). The members concerned were Edward Bright (p. 142), John Burcombe (p. 110), Henry Gibbs (p. 15), Giles Gough (p. 86), Richard Higgins (p. 38), Samuel Hunt (p. 90), David Philipps (p. 222), Thomas Sanders (p. 51), Thomas Scroop (p. 222), Dorothy Vaux (formerly Terrill) (p. 177), and John Whiting (p. 168). The standard assessment was Burials 4s., Births 2s., Marriages 2s. 6d., but that paid by all the above was £1 4s., £1 2s., and £1 2s. 6d. respectively. Four of these people, Gough, Hunt, Philipps and Sanders, were recorded as possessing personalities of £600.

¹⁵ *Records of Nonconformity, No. 4*, pp. 102, 147, Dr. Williams's Library. There were five Dissenting congregations in Bristol in 1715 and the relevant figures for the other three (denominations unspecified) are (a) 500 members worth £100,000; (b) 1,600 members worth £400,000; (c) 500 members worth "between £60,000 and £70,000".

¹⁶ W. T. Whitley, *Baptists in Yorkshire and the North West* (1912), p. 60.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

¹⁸ J. Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists* (1811), vol. IV, p. 474.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 603.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 453.

²¹ *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 568; Whitley, *Baptists in Yorks.*, p. 110.

- ²² Ivimey, vol. IV, p. 294.
- ²³ Whitley, *Baptists in Yorks.*, p. 203.
- ²⁴ D. Douglas, *Northern Baptist Churches 1648-1845* (1846), p. 219.
- ²⁵ Whitley, *Baptists in Yorks.*, p. 65.
- ²⁶ L. G. Champion, "The Social Status of some Eighteenth Century Baptist Ministers", *Baptist Quarterly*, XXV (1973), pp. 10-14.
- ²⁷ As late as 1796 it was estimated that most Dissenting ministers had stipends of less than £60 per annum. "Great numbers" had less than £40 and many had less than £30. Such stipends were "inadequate to the support of a family" so that those ministers without a private income were obliged to supplement their stipend by seeking additional employment. (*The Protestant Dissenters Magazine*, III (1796), pp. 68-70, 150; cf. Ivimey, vol. III, p. 117).
- ²⁸ T. J. Manchee, *The Bristol Charities* (1831), vol. I, p. 281.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 284.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 300-1.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 301.
- ³² *Ibid.*, p. 277. Robert Bodenham (d. 1726) was a sailmaker and associated with Terrill in the sugar trade.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 278-9.
- ³⁴ Bernard Foskett was minister of Broadmead and tutor to the Baptist college from 1720-1758; John Shuter was a milliner.
- ³⁵ Manchee, p. 275.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 288-9.
- ³⁷ W. T. Whitley, *Baptists of London 1612-1928* (1928), p. 38. The basis of Maitland's estimate is not known.
- ³⁸ Ivimey, vol. I, p. 338.
- ³⁹ A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists* (1947), p. 146; D. Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660-1960* (1964), pp. 43-6.
- ⁴⁰ Ivimey, vol. III, pp. 387-9.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 33.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³ Whitley, *Minutes of the General Assembly of General Baptists*, vol. 1, p. 75.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- ⁴⁵ Underwood, p. 181.
- ⁴⁶ Whitley, *Minutes*, vol. 1, p. 142.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 144.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 203.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 209.
- ⁵⁰ *Accounts of the Bristol Education Society 1798*, p. 18.
- ⁵¹ Whitley, *Minutes*, vol. 2, p. 214.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 222.
- ⁵³ *The Protestant Dissenters Magazine*, vol. III (1796), pp. 347-8, 390.
- ⁵⁴ Whitley, *Minutes*, vol. 2, pp. 214-15.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 217-18.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 225.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 236.
- ⁵⁸ *Accounts of the Bristol Education Society*, 1771, p. 15. The Society was founded in 1770 in an endeavour to improve and expand the work of the Bristol College.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 1785, p. 8.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 1793, p. 10.
- ⁶² Whitley, *Minutes*, vol. 2, p. 236.
- ⁶³ *Accounts of the Bristol Education Society*, 1771, pp. 13-15.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 1785, pp. 9-13.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1798, p. 8.
- ⁶⁷ Whitley, *Minutes*, vol. 2, p. 249.

- ⁶⁸ E.g., Underwood, pp. 125-7.
⁶⁹ Whitley, *Minutes*, vol. 2, p. 259.
⁷⁰ A. Taylor, *The History of the English General Baptists* (1818), vol. II, p. 329.
⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 330.
⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 331.
⁷³ F. M. W. Harrison, "The Nottinghamshire Baptists: Mission, Worship and Training", *Baptist Quarterly*, XXV (1973-4), pp. 323-4.
⁷⁴ T. Crosby, *History of the English Baptists* (1738), vol. IV, pp. 8-9.
⁷⁵ Ivimey, vol. IV, pp. 150-2.
⁷⁶ Crosby, vol. IV, pp. 350-6.
⁷⁷ Ivimey, vol. IV, p. 153.
... ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*
⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 159.
⁸⁰ "The Baptist Board Minutes", *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society*, vol. VI (1918-19), p. 114.
⁸¹ Ivimey, vol. IV, p. 160.
⁸² Swaine, pp. 65-7; J. W. Ashley Smith, *The Birth of Modern Education* (1953), pp. 206-7.
⁸³ Ivimey, vol. IV, p. 160.
⁸⁴ Crosby, vol. IV, pp. 205-6; Whitley, *Minutes*, vol. 2, p. 306.
⁸⁵ Ivimey, vol. IV, pp. 46-7, 610-2; W. T. Whitley, "Pupils of John Ward", *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society*, vol. IV (1914-15).
⁸⁶ J. Fawcett, *An Account of the Life, Ministry and Writings of the Late Rev. John Fawcett, D.D.* (1818), p. 176.
⁸⁷ Ashley Smith, pp. 218-19.

H. FOREMAN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Clifford H. Cleal, M.A., B.D., formerly Director, Christian Citizenship Department, Baptist Union.

Harry Foreman, M.A.(Ed.), B.D., Ph.D., Principal Lecturer in History, Wolverhampton Polytechnic.

Keith Robbins, M.A., D.Phil., Professor of History, University College of North Wales, Bangor.

Eileen Simpson, B.A., Assistant Archivist, Cheshire Record Office.

Reviews: D. W. Bebbington, N. Clark, T. S. H. Elwyn, D. L. Jones, E. A. Payne.