Over recent years British Baptists have become familiar with the emergence of new churches believing in the restoration of the ministries listed in Ephesians 4.11f - apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor and teacher - as a prerequisite of the Second Coming of Christ. Not infrequently such congregations have been given strength by secessions from Baptist churches; on occasion whole churches have adopted a restorationist theology and submitted to one or another of the apostles currently active in the United Kingdom. Considerable thought has been given within the Baptist constituency to the factors precipitating such events and the appropriate theological and pastoral responses to those who have seceded and those who have remained behind.

What is not commonly recognized, however, is that this is not a new phenomenon: the emergence of the Irvingite movement in the 1830s witnessed the accession of several Baptist ministers, including Thomas Thonger of Mount Zion, Birmingham, William Keene of Melksham and Thomas Groser of Wells. The most fascinating example of this, however, was James Hinton (1793-1862), whose father (of the same name) had been minister of New Road Baptist Church in Oxford from 1788 until his death in July 1823, and whose brother, John Howard Hinton (1791-1873), was to become a noted Baptist leader. Oxford in the early 1830s was a hotbed of religious ferment but, while the University was being shaken by the events which gave rise to Tractarianism, the local Baptists were being affected by Edward Irving’s ideas about the restoration of spiritual gifts and the ministries of Ephesians 4 before the return of Christ. Hinton’s story can be told in greater detail than those of the others because of the amount of available published and unpublished material relating to him and his friend, Henry Bulteel.

Like his elder brother, James Hinton junior studied at the University of Edinburgh, gaining the degree of MA. Returning to Oxford, he was instrumental in beginning a Sunday school work in the nearby village of Littlemore in 1813; by the following year he was assisting in his father’s day school. At some point he was ordained at Faringdon in Berkshire, being listed as pastor of the church there in 1823. In 1824 he became pastor of the newly-founded Baptist cause at George Street in the St Clement’s area of Oxford, which numbered several members from New Road among its Trustees. This was a work which his father had set in motion a few days before he died, and the younger James also took over his father’s educational work. Along with H.B. Bulteel, curate-in-charge of St Ebbe’s, he was influenced during the late 1820s by J. Haldane Stewart’s call to united prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. A close friendship developed between Hinton and Bulteel, and this was to have unsettling consequences for both.
The setting for many of the events described in this article was the village of Eynsham, a few miles west of Oxford, where in 1808 or 1810 New Road had opened a chapel for outreach work. The cause prospered, congregations rising to over two hundred, and on the expiry of the lease a new chapel was opened in 1818. A church had been formed between 1812 and 1814, and the members requested James Hinton senior to act as their pastor until they could provide for themselves; he administered the Lord’s Supper there once a month, other services being taken by lay preachers. By 1819, one J.T. Dobney was being described as ‘pastor-elect’, still ‘minister and pastor-elect’ in 1821, he finally settled as pastor in 1824 and served at least until 1831. The appointment of a pastor implies that the work at Eynsham was now independent from New Road.

At this point we encounter an apparent conflict between Baptist and Catholic Apostolic sources. The Catholic Apostolic version of events was that opposition from Calvinists in the congregation at Eynsham to changes in the younger Hinton’s preaching (apparently he and Bulteel were advocating belief in universal redemption and the immediate return of Christ - a very significant change, since his earlier ministry had been in Particular Baptist causes) meant that in July 1829 he ‘seceded’, along with seventy of his congregation. Soon after, Hinton and Bulteel visited Irving in London and on their return began to pray for Christ’s Second Coming. Irving was in close contact with John Macleod Campbell, who was deposed from the Church of Scotland ministry in 1831 because he rejected limited atonement and those influenced by Irving also tended to reject traditional Calvinist belief in limited atonement. Hinton would have been no exception.

The first problem with this version is that the pastor at Eynsham was not James Hinton but J.T. Dobney. Although a James Hinton was one of the original trustees of the Eynsham chapel appointed in 1816, this was more likely to have been the father. James junior participated in the annual meetings of the Oxfordshire Association on 9 June 1829; in view of his later vacillations as an Irvingite, it seems unlikely that he would have been capable of making up his mind to secede as early as the following month. However, it is recorded that on 22 August 1830 he attempted to enter the pulpit at Eynsham and, when prevented by several of the congregation, stood at the top of the pulpit steps and gave notice in accordance with the trust deeds of a church meeting to be held on 30 August. Another trustee, the maltster Robert Ford, wrote to the Bishop of Oxford on 22 September 1830 to certify that his house was being used as a dissenting meeting place, so some kind of breakaway group was then meeting. This would have been, by some months, the first ‘Irvingite’ schism in England, but it appears to have been precipitated by disagreement over soteriology (and possibly eschatology); as yet there was no sign of any belief in the restoration of charismatic gifts.

The second problem with the Catholic Apostolic version is presented by Bulteel’s adoption of high Calvinism, which predated his conversion to belief in general atonement. The train which led to his secession from the Establishment was laid by
his sermon before the University of Oxford on 6 February 1831. In this he
defended the Calvinism of the Thirty-Nine Articles and attacked Anglican clergy for
their Arminianism.\textsuperscript{28} J.C. Philpot, an Anglican clergyman and Fellow of Worcester
College, who seceded in 1835 and became a Strict Baptist, described it as ‘a bold
and faithful discourse, distinctly and clearly advocating the doctrines of grace’,\textsuperscript{29}
Bulteel was still proclaiming Calvinist doctrines during his preaching tour of the
West Country in June 1831 with William Tiptaft, another Calvinist clergyman who
was to become a Strict Baptist and close friend of Philpot.\textsuperscript{30} Dr John Hill, an
earnest evangelical whose tea-parties at St Edmund Hall formed the centre of a
social network which took in many of the evangelicals of the day, recorded on 10
August 1831 that the Bishop of Oxford had given Bulteel notice of withdrawal of his
licence as curate at St Ebbe’s, the preaching tour doubtless being the final indictment
of a man who had been the subject of complaints by his churchwardens for several
years.\textsuperscript{31} The following Sunday Bulteel laid down his charge under protest,
denouncing the Bishop as ‘an officer of the Church of Antichrist’ and announcing
a service in his garden that evening. A thousand people turned up, and Bulteel
publicly tore up the Bishop’s letter to him.\textsuperscript{32} For some weeks he preached in his
back garden to large congregations. In September he stayed with Tiptaft and
preached for him in Abingdon, a collection being taken towards the cost of building
his new chapel; this was erected in Commercial Road and opened in 1832, drawing
away a few from New Road.\textsuperscript{33}

Bulteel’s adoption of Irvingite views therefore came as something of a bombshell
to his friends. The initial evidence was the occurrence of several healings through
the ministry of Bulteel and his wife, the first happening while he spent a week with
Irving’s congregation during October 1831.\textsuperscript{34} On his return, he made known his
belief in the genuineness of the charismatic manifestations, as Hill recorded: ‘Bulteel
has been spending a week with some of Mr Irving’s friends & is come back satisfied
of the genuineness of the miracles of healing + tongues:- and convinced moreover
of their doctrine of general redemption’.\textsuperscript{35} According to the Brethren leader, B.W.
Newton, who had been greatly influenced by Bulteel’s ministry at St Ebbe’s, Bulteel
had been introduced by a clergyman to Irving. He

saw Irving at his house, and some ‘prophets’ were there too. Bulteel said
something severe in his bold way against the ministers who were in favour of
Catholic emancipation, and one of the inspired persons said in an impressive
manner, ‘Is this the way that God’s servants speak evil of dignities?’ Bulteel
quailed at her power, and gave in - \textbf{He returned to Oxford an altered man}.\textsuperscript{36}

Newton was unimpressed by the change:

\textbf{Bulteel fell into connexion with Irvingism.} - I knew it was injurious. I was
myself at one of the Meetings and felt a supernatural power over me. - I went
home and couldn’t read my Bible, & I resolved never to be again within that
circle. I left Oxford soon after. \textbf{These things caused my leaving Oxford}.\textsuperscript{37}
Tiptaft knew of Bulteel’s change of views very soon after: he talked much with Bulteel, whom he considered was confusing those who sat under his ministry, but failed to win him back. In the end he was forced to break the friendship: ‘My old friend Bulteel and I can have now no communion. He holds the doctrine of universal pardon, is now distinguished for universal charity, and accuses God’s children, who hold the doctrine of particular redemption, as having a bad spirit.’

In November, a rumour that Bulteel had begun to preach universal redemption reached the ears of the Strict Baptist, Henry Fowler, minister of the church at Gower Street in London. Bulteel met his enquiry as to the truth of this with a defence of the new light he had received which was as robust as his university sermon had been, but such changeability led Fowler to raise doubts regarding his conversion.

Early in 1832, Bulteel published an apologia for his change of views, entitled *The Doctrine of the Miraculous Interference of Jesus on behalf of believers, both in the first and in the last days of the Gentile dispensation, Asserted from Scripture and proved from Facts*. Affirming his belief that miracles were always meant to be present in the church’s life, he expressed the conviction that those associated with his ministry were clearly ‘connected with the fact of my having been cast out by one of the chief officers of a carnal church’.

Since 6 November 1831, Bulteel had been preaching regularly in James Hinton’s pulpit at St Clement’s. On 12 February 1832, Bulteel preached for Hinton and was then baptized by him in the same service. This provoked a pamphlet exchange between Hinton and the high-churchman, William Palmer of Worcester College. Palmer’s first tract appeared just five days after Bulteel’s baptism; in it he castigated Bulteel as a false prophet, rejecting the miracles which Bulteel claimed had occurred through his ministry. His baptism by Hinton confirmed this, since it implied that he had been calling himself the only true minister of God in Oxford while yet unbaptized. Palmer impaled his opponent on the horns of a dilemma: Mr Bulteel must himself confess, that he has *never yet been a minister of God*, unless he chooses to say, that his ordination and baptism in the Church were sufficient; in which case he condemns himself for separating from the Church, and receiving baptism *a second time* contrary to Scripture.

Either way, Palmer considered him under a spirit of delusion. If Bulteel had been a minister before the miraculous cures took place, he could only prove it by acknowledging the sufficiency of his Anglican baptism; if he was not a minister, then he must admit that he was wrong in believing that the miracles were a testimony to the Bishop’s error in depriving him of his curacy.

Hinton responded on 25 February by undercutting Palmer’s argument, denying the necessity of baptism as a pre-requisite for ministry; even strict-communionists, he revealed, would allow persons to preach whom they considered unbaptized. He himself had not been baptized when he began preaching (with his father’s concurrence) in the villages around Oxford. He accused Palmer of approaching
the case with his mind already made up, and of wilfully refusing to listen to the
evidence - a token that he was the one under a spirit of delusion!49

A postscript to the second edition of Bulteel’s *Miraculous Interference* expressed
the conviction that sprinkling was not to be equated with baptism, and that while he
was inclined to baptize his own children, he would wait for more light on the
matter, either from Scripture or through prophecy.50 Palmer responded with
another pamphlet, *At him again! or the fox without a tail, Being Another Word for
Mr Bulteel*. Expressing surprise at his antagonist’s unwonted silence,51 he put his
finger on Bulteel’s weak spot - his combination of instability and aggressive
promotion of his latest doctrinal position:

He has already been a Calvinist, an Antinomian, a Paedo-Baptist, a Puritan,
a Seceder, an Arminian, and is now a sort of mongrel Baptist. In a month
hence he may be a Quaker, in two, a Socinian, in three, an Infidel, in four,
a Papist. He cannot give us any security that his creed will not differ next
Sunday from what it is now ... And yet can Mr Bulteel deny that, amidst all his changes of religion, he has
been continually in the habit of declaring, that he was the only true minister
of God in Oxford, and even of threatening eternal damnation to all who would
not embrace the very opinions which he himself gave up immediately
afterwards?52

Denying that any of the evidence adduced by Hinton proved that Bulteel was truly
a minister of God, Palmer expressed the suspicion that Bulteel would change his
mind again and himself declare that he was not.53 His ignorance regarding whether
or not he should baptize his own children proved him incapable of acting as a
reformer of the church.54 Palmer challenged Hinton to go all the way and give up
contending for believer’s baptism, and indeed to give up practising baptism
altogether, since his practice of open communion proved that it was not an
essential.55

Hinton’s support for Bulteel must have strained his relationship with the New
Road church, although it would seem likely that St Clement’s had been independent
since his settlement there. New Road’s membership list records that several
members were put out of fellowship in March 1832 for following Bulteel’s delusions
and errors - presumably his belief in the manifestations.56 Newton recalled that
Bulteel sought to preach ‘in the power’ (i.e. under the immediate inspiration of the
Holy Ghost), and that ‘Such excitement prevailed amongst his congregation that
several rushed one night out of their beds and baptized one another in the Isis.57
One contemporary report alleged that the manifestations among Bulteel’s
congregation were even more powerful than those anywhere else, including Regent
Square, and that Bulteel himself spoke often ‘in the power’.58

Developments in Eynsham were keeping pace with those in Oxford. One of
Hinton’s supporters there was a baker, Jonathan Smith,59 who was developing a
deeper spiritual life, studying the works of Richard Baxter and John Wesley, fasting
regularly, and praying seven times a day. With the prophet Edward Taplin from Irving’s church in Regent Square, Smith had visited one of the charismatic movement’s leaders, J.B. Cardale, in the autumn of 1831, and came away convinced that the work was of God. He had been assured in prayer that God would restore his church, and exercised considerable influence when during the autumn of 1832 the first utterances in power at Eynsham took place. Hinton, as well as Bulteel, had now observed the gifts in London, and it appears that both their congregations had begun to pray for them to be manifested locally.

Bulteel and Irving had agreed that ministers involved should confer informally regarding the gifts, but otherwise remain independent. According to Catholic Apostolic writers, Bulteel preferred the autonomy of such a network of gifted congregations and could not accept the introduction of the office of apostleship with its claim to universal jurisdiction; however, the excesses associated with his ministry were probably a more important factor in his change of mind. Criticism of Bulteel had come not only from those opposed to the manifestations but also from the ‘gifted persons’ (i.e. those considered to possess the gifts of tongues and prophecy) in Irving’s London circle, who disapproved of the rash manner in which he sought to implement his convictions, and early in 1832 prophecy through the influential Robert Baxter had warned a group at Irving’s house against grieving God by following Bulteel’s course. Further testimony to his fanaticism comes from another friend of Irving’s, the converted Jew Ridley Herschell, who recorded that for six weeks in the spring of 1832 he filled the pulpit of an Oxford friend who needed a break in order to reflect on the excitement induced by the appearance there of the charismatic manifestations; in view of Herschell’s comment that this individual scarcely knew whether he was in heaven or hell, it seems that he is referring to Bulteel, who later spoke in similar terms of his experience. Herschell had already warned him of the danger of allowing these to continue unchecked: when, in the middle of his first sermon there, a woman began to speak in tongues, he silenced her with the assertion that he also had a message from God, insisting on observing the apostolic injunction that all things should be done decently and in order. He stated that such phenomena would be allowed after the service, when the unbelieving had retired, but the tongues gradually petered out.

Bulteel had evidently begun to doubt the gifts after Herschell’s visit, some months before any apostles were called, and came by April 1833 to reject the gifts, along with Irving’s christology. It seems that his recantation was also partly due to reading that of the former prophet, Robert Baxter: realizing that he had never asked God to show him whether the spirit behind the manifestations was the Holy Spirit, Bulteel now prayed that if it was, the manifestations would increase, and that if it was not, they would cease. The next morning, the ‘gifted persons’ in his congregation were silent. He later recalled how, during his belief in the manifestations, the Bible had been a sealed book to him: he could not read two pages of it without falling asleep. Philpot mentions further factors in Bulteel’s
change of mind: 'What was called the spirit fell on his two children, then quite young, and this, with other circumstances - among others, that these views led him quite away from Christ crucified - instrumentally opened his eyes to see how he had been deluded, and to renounce his errors'.

Bulteel's deliverance was gradual, however: part of his congregation joined Hinton's (presumably at St Clement's), the rest refused to accept the gifts, and Bulteel himself retired temporarily from all religious activity, suffering some kind of breakdown. In a letter to Baxter he spoke of his severe mental suffering under the assaults of Satan presenting himself as the risen Christ, which he resisted by looking to Christ crucified. He visited Hill on 18 May, giving:

an account of his gracious deliverance from the awful delusions concerning supernatural gifts (of miracles, tongues, prophesying & visions) which he has so long been carried into ...

He spoke with horror of two of Irving’s errors - concerning the human nature of Christ, & perfectibility on earth.

Hinton commented that several who came to him from Bulteel’s congregation had initially evidenced a rebellious spirit, especially towards his own position as pastor, arising out of their being misinformed regarding his pastoral conduct. It appears that his assistant Symes had also come from Bulteel’s congregation, and that he and James did not always see eye to eye. Hinton evidently found it hard to give decisive leadership (a problem which would have been exacerbated by the gifted persons’ claim to speak from God), and apparently suspended the observance of the Lord’s Supper for a time, writing on 27 July 1833 to Spencer Perceval to request his advice:

On Lord’s Day week, the period for the Lord’s Supper returns, and I feel very reluctant to pass it by a second time; and yet I feel still more reluctant to celebrate it any more according to the fleshly ordinance, greatly desiring the ordinance from heaven. O thou Watchman, enquire of the Lord for me by his Holy Apostle, what He would have me do.

During the summer of 1833, there was another outbreak of prophecy at Oxford and Eynsham. Problems soon manifested themselves: a woman began to speak in power, forbidding the practice of infant baptism which was general among those who accepted the restoration of spiritual gifts. She commanded that instead the children be blessed by the pastor and that she should then lay hands on them. The Irvingite leaders watched anxiously from London, awaiting the Spirit’s direction, and wrote a warning letter. On 8 May she declared herself an apostle, calling on Hinton to accompany her to London where she would show herself to be such. Irving was under the impression that Hinton and Symes approved of this development, but Hinton considered that her ‘call’ proved that she spoke by an evil spirit. Prophecy directed Cardale, now an apostle, and Perceval to go to Oxford at once to sort things out. An evil spirit was cast out and the woman repented.
Cardale stayed teaching for some weeks, carefully including the subject of infant baptism, and Perceval remained for a time ministering on behalf of the Apostles to strengthen Hinton until full ordination should be given him. During this time, it would seem, prophecy called Hinton and Symes to minister in Oxford and surrounding villages: this may be interpreted as a call to the 'spiritual ministry', exercised in the power of the Spirit and attended by the charismata, which was expected to supersede existing ordination, which would have been viewed as lacking the ability to convey spiritual grace. Hinton testified to encouraging response to his ministry, which included gospel services, in the villages, although not in Oxford. On 10 August he wrote again to Perceval in discouragement, confessing that he and Symes disagreed as to how to handle the manifestations, and that when testing one woman claiming the gift of prophecy, they came to contradictory conclusions; unsurprisingly, he felt out of his depth when it came to 'trying the spirits' by demanding testimony to Christ. ‘Oh my ignorance and poverty! - May the Lord Jesus mercifully send down His Apostle to try the Spirits by the Spirit of Discernment of the Holy Ghost’. It was the practice at this time for those claiming charismatic gifts to be tested to see whether, ‘in the power’, they would acknowledge Christ as come in the flesh (I John 4.1), in the sense entailed by Irving’s christology, i.e. as peccable and maintained sinless only through the power of the Holy Spirit. What worried Hinton was Cardale’s warning that even Satan could inspire individuals to confess Christ verbally in this manner, which limited the value of verbal assent to 1 John 4.1 as a test of the spirits. He noted that three-sevenths of his congregation at St Clement’s had left as a result of the gifts, while others would be caused to stumble when the prophetic command to practise baptism of infant children of believers had to be acted on; he expected to be called upon to give up the chapel by the denomination. His desire to engage in full-time ministry, for whose fulfilment he had prayed for fifteen years, seemed less likely than ever to come to fruition. He asked Perceval to lay the letter before God for an answer; it was read by Cardale, who penned a response to which Perceval added.

Such dependence upon outside direction is remarkable when one remembers, firstly, the strong Baptist tradition of congregational independence, and secondly, Hinton’s own background as the son and brother of notable pastors. Rossteuscher attributes the change in baptismal practice to the action of the Holy Spirit:

This breath of the Lord carried them over an obstacle, that would otherwise have stood very much in the way of the restoration of a congregation of Baptists. In the fact that the spiritual gifts were bestowed 1st on such as had been baptized as infants, the most stiff-necked could not but see that Infant Baptism had been ordained of the Lord, and it was acknowledged by Him. And express words of prophecy confirmed this truth and rebuked the sectarian error. Surely such doctrines never were put forth by the Baptist spirit. Mr Hinton immediately declared himself ready for the future to baptize Infants. For a moment the people seemed shocked at beholding the fall of their idols. But could they contradict the Holy Ghost Himself who was commanding it?
... the introduction of Infant Baptism met with no opposition in these congregations, except one that was demoniacal ... The Lord Himself had cured these people of their Baptist errors. 81

Hinton was not the only Baptist whose thinking changed in this way; Thomas Groser, too, produced a work advocating infant baptism in 1834, soon after his conversion to Irvingism, again adducing prophetic words in favour of infant baptism as an important reason for accepting it. 82 It is intriguing to note that Groser’s pamphlet earned a reply from none other than John Howard Hinton, after James had sent him a copy for comment. 83 Tantalizingly, John sidesteps any direct comment on his brother’s involvement in Irvingism.

If Rossteuscher’s concluding sentence leaves us unconvinced, what are we to make of James’s adoption of paedobaptist convictions? Part of the reason for his readiness to change his views may have been the fact that they were already, as we have seen, fairly liberal, probably having been shaped by his family and church background. His mother had been a paedobaptist and in membership at New Road before her baptism. 84 When refounded in the late eighteenth century, the church had incorporated Presbyterians from the old cause as well as Baptists in its fellowship, whilst Independents were also received into membership there. 85 However, we must not underestimate the influence of the prophetic manifestations: Hinton’s background merely made him more receptive to their message, as did his temperament. By contrast, it is significant that Bulteel’s adoption of Irvingite views coincided with his rejection of paedobaptism; we have also noted Newton’s reference to spirit-inspired baptism of believers alleged to have occurred among Bulteel’s congregation. It is possible, in view of the wariness shown by the ‘gifted persons’ in London concerning events in Bulteel’s congregation, that the content, as well as the tenor, of the prophetic manifestations occurring under his ministry was unacceptable to them, especially if these manifestations were causing people to reject infant baptism. The London group would have been predisposed to paedobaptist views because of Irving’s strong advocacy of an ecclesiology founded thereon, and this would not be the only occasion in the emergent Irvingite movement when prophecy was deemed not to be of God because it took an independent line on some doctrinal or practical matter. 86

Prophecy was to play a determinative role in shaping the course of the church at Eynsham; two of the seven Prophets who accompanied the newly-separated Apostles into retreat at Albury in 1835-6 were Jonathan Smith and J. Hester, another Oxford Baptist. 87 Yet events also demonstrated the need for it to be firmly handled: Rossteuscher comments that evil spirits were able to gain entry to the congregation because Hinton had failed to understand fully or exercise the rule and discernment which belonged to his office. 88 This weakness notwithstanding, Hinton was ordained as Angel (presiding minister or bishop of a congregation) for Oxford and Eynsham on 19 June 1834. 89 It has been suggested that the Irvingite congregation was initially set up at Eynsham rather than Oxford ‘because the
University used its influence to prevent any church in Oxford itself, although it may have been felt best to allow the furor surrounding the excesses in Bulteel’s congregation to die down before attempting to establish an independent work in the city. On 25 December 1835, however, an independent Irvingite church was established in Oxford by the separation of the two congregations which had been under Hinton’s oversight, Hinton continuing as Angel at Eynsham. Cardale paid a visit to Eynsham in July 1836, and a church building was consecrated on 17 May 1837 on ground hitherto owned by Robert Ford. Prophecy continued to cause problems, for Hinton’s successor at Oxford, James Wells, wrote several letters to Perceval during 1837 about pastoral issues, including the case of another doubtful prophetess.

James Hinton married Rachel Wall at Eynsham in February 1838 and, although he became Angel of the Paddington congregation in August of that year, he was resident in Eynsham again by 1840: the parish registers record the baptism of his daughters, Sarah and Eliza, on 18 January and their burial on the 24th. Irvingite services in Eynsham ceased in 1843, probably as a result of the introduction that year of an elaborate liturgy which required more ministers to perform it than most Irvingite congregations could supply, and which led to the closure of many outposts and the concentration of ministers in larger centres (members of closed churches would normally have attended their parish church). Of James’s later life we have few details; the register of ministers at Paddington has only the note ‘?alive 1851’. He died at Oxford on 11 February 1862. However, the Eynsham church was in use again by 1860, and was one of the last Catholic Apostolic churches in Britain to remain open, not closing until 1982.

The Baptist cause at Eynsham experienced a revival of its fortunes during the early 1830s before declining, probably as a result of the ferment introduced by Irvingism. The St Clement’s church did not appear in a list of Baptist churches compiled in 1835, although Bulteel’s church did; the following year, the St Clement’s building was put up for sale to discharge the mortgage debt. New Road itself saw another secession in 1830, when Independents who had formed part of the congregation were amicably dismissed to form a new church, building their own chapel in George Street in 1832. Bulteel’s congregation experienced a secession in 1840 which resulted in the founding of the first regular Brethren meeting in Oxford. Bulteel himself continued changeable in his religious opinions; by 1844 we find him involved in the founding of the Free Church of England, preaching at the opening of its church in Exeter, and he died at Plymouth, where he had associated with Brethren.

In this narrative, prophetic utterance has appeared in turn as the problem and, when it came through the ‘gifted persons’ in London or was in accord with the tenor of their utterances, as part of the solution. It seems likely that the charismatic movement’s leaders were concerned to avoid the possibility of contradictory prophecy which had already been evident within their circle. They were learning
by experience how to test claims to prophetic gifting and it may be significant that
the mercurial prophet, Edward Taplin, was not sent to Oxford at any point; with
his record of unacceptable prophecy and his refusal on occasion to accept the
decisions of the Apostles, he might have proved of doubtful assistance in such a
volatile situation.

The immediate effect of this episode on the evangelical cause within the
University was perceived by some in negative terms: in Newton’s opinion,
‘Newmanism would never be the success it is if it hadn’t been for that flood of
Irvingism.’ Henry Fowler concurred with the judgement of the high Calvinist,
Dr Hawker, that those who had recently seceded from the Establishment had all
fallen into error, and that they would have done better to have remained where they
were. Certainly it was St Ebbe’s which fared better than any of the other
churches in this story, being served by a succession of respected evangelical
clergymen through the rest of the nineteenth century and beyond. Furthermore,
Reynolds chronicles an increasing number of evangelicals nurtured at Oxford after
this period, so the long-term effect on more moderate evangelicalism of these events
must have been less than the foregoing judgements might imply. It is debatable
whether the evidence justifies Newton’s assertion that the rise of Tractarianism owed
much to Irvingite excess, as though the failure of one attempt to realize a ‘high’
ecclesiology led to the success of another. More probably, the forces which shaped
the destinies of both movements were acting on each at the same time.

On a more general level, this episode highlights the turmoil affecting Baptists at
the time: we hear of Baptists turning to Brethrenism (e.g. Robert Chapman at
Barnstaple), high Calvinism (as seen in the events leading to the formation of the
‘new association’ in Suffolk in 1830), and here to Irvingism. Similar troubles beset
the Independents and the Presbyterians. All this was part of the unsettlement which
affected the ‘second generation’ of evangelicals, an unsettlement which reflected the
disturbances on the wider social and political scene and which led many to conclude,
as have Restorationists today, that evangelicalism needed something more in the way
of an ecclesiology than it had hitherto possessed.

NOTES

1 Lest anyone should consider this a term loaded
with pejorative connotations, I should explain
that the movement’s formal title of ‘Catholic
Apostolic Church’ did not come into use until
1849 (H.B. Copinger, ‘Annals: The Lord’s work
in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’,
typescript [1951], 101). I have used S.
Newman-Norton’s edited and updated transcript
of this important Catholic Apostolic history in
the library of the British Orthodox Church, but
a copy of the original is in the Bodleian Library
Bodl.MS.Facs.b.61).

2 Thomas Grosner (1802-98), brother of the Baptist
leader, William Grosner (1791-1856), Baptist
minister at Wells 1827-34; ‘cast out’ 18 May
1834 for preaching the Second Advent and
accepting the restored apostleship; Irvingite
Angel at Wells 1835-47; from the 1850s often
preached at the Catholic Apostolic Church in
Gordon Square, London (C.G. Flegg, Gathered
Under Apostles, Oxford 1992, 16; S. Newman-
Norton, ‘A Biographical Index of those
associated with the Lord’s Work’, s.v. ‘Grosner,
Thomas’, British Library typescript [1972],
I have drawn extensively on Irvingite sources, but Anglicans, Brethren and Strict Baptist writers have also furnished valuable insights. Relatively little material has been found in other Baptist sources, however; if any readers can provide further information, I should be pleased to hear from them.


Ibid. 65; *Baptist Magazine* 15 (1823), 27 (hereinafter BM). I have not been able to trace when the ordination took place.
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